

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

TO: Business Practices Subcommittee Chairs, Interested Industry Participants
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director
RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting
DATE: May 4, 2000

1. Administrative

Mr. Lander chaired the meeting, welcomed the participants and gave the anti-trust advice. The agenda was adopted as posted.

The red-lined Draft Minutes of 4/27/2000 were adopted as final.

2. IR Questions transmitted 4/26/2000 related to

A. R98041 – Columbia

Text of IR Question:

At its meeting on April 10 - 11, 2000, the Information Requirements (IR) subcommittee discussed request **R98041** from Columbia Gas Transmission relating to Super Nominations, and determined to send questions regarding the request to BPS.

In the processing of the request, IR discussed the following items:

- 1) GISB **Principle 1.1.3**: "There is a need for an infrastructure that would support seamless nominations across transportation service providers. However, transportation service providers would not be required to accept super-nominations nor would a shipper be required to supply one. A super-nomination is a nomination that contains all the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burnertip."
- 2) EII Task Force proposed Standard **s66 (104)**: "The data elements should accommodate super-nominations. If a Transportation Service Provider chooses to support super-nominations, the GISB standard data sets should accommodate it."
- 3) EII Task Force Instruction **IR2**: "The request was transferred to Information Requirements Subcommittee for implementation."

As a result of the discussion of these items, IR requests a clarification of the intent of the term 'Super-Nomination'.

Is a 'Super-Nomination' a nomination that contains:

- a) **all** of the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burnertip; **or**

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

-
- b) **all or some** of the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burner-tip; **or**
 - c) **all or some** of the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burner-tip **within a single corporate family?**

Discussion: Jim Keisler presented the question. He mentioned that in the case of Columbia, you send all of your nominations to the same URL. There was a question as to whether or not the super-nomination described in 1.1.3 is the same as the one implied in Columbia's request. Following Mr. Keisler's presentation, Greg Lander explained how, in his opinion, and given his interpretation of the meaning of super-nomination in the existing standard, the existing EDI datasets already accommodated super-nominations. He recounted his recollection that the standard 1.1.3 was one of, if not the first standard agreed to back in the original round of standard-setting (1995/96). At the time, he related, the term "nomination" was ambiguous. Some felt "nomination" meant a single instruction to take gas from a receipt point to a delivery point – a line item instruction. Others felt it was all activity by a shipper under a contract. Still others felt it was all activity by a shipper. He further related that it was not until the last day of the initial BPS meetings that the idea of a line item and a key were fleshed out. He also noted that back then, there was no attempt (like there tends to be today) to go back through and square early standards with later standards. Mr. Lander also pointed out that unlike today where principles and definitions are separated out, in his opinion GISB Standard No. 1.1.3, is both a principle and a definition. He pointed to the fact that in 1.1.3 the word "nomination" is something that contains all "nominations". In his mind, the use of the singular "nomination" implies the later-developed term "transmittal".

Dale Davis pointed out using the current use of the term nomination to mean a line item, then a super-nomination would be one line item that contains all of the information that describes the path from the wellhead to the burner-tip rather than a file containing all of the line items that describe the path.

Bill Griffith stated that the existing infrastructure does not "support seamless nominations across transportation service providers" as stated in 1.1.3. A service requester cannot send out one nomination, or even one file for that matter, that satisfies all of the requirements of multiple transportation service providers who are not in the same corporate family. Overcoming the complexity of nominating across non-corporate family transportation service providers would be a major hurdle in the implementation of the super-nomination.

Mr. Lander pointed out that in fact, the current standards do provide the infrastructure to support a super-nomination based upon the interpretation that the first occurrence of the word nomination in standard 1.1.3 means "transmittal". He observed that the standards do permit nominations in one transmittal to cross several service providers. His old company, TransCapacity did just that. It accepted nominations from a single shipper that could go from one receipt point, across multiple transporters to a delivery point.

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Several people observed that Columbia's definition of a super-nomination may be different than that described in 1.1.3. Their request asks for an implementation which allows the service requester to combine four different contract/bid rates in one line item.

Marcy McCain mentioned that the Columbia request was submitted after a FERC ruling that required pipelines to request EDI standardization of services provided on their EBBs.

Several proposals as to how to deal with the issue were mentioned. One was to "fix" 1.1.3 to change the first occurrence of "nomination" to the word transmittal. One was to make 1.1.3 refer to a single transportation service provider-family (corporate family). Another was to decline the request. Still another was to implement a "single line item" in a manner that could transmit all information needed to go across multiple service providers. On this last point, Mr. Lander objected to the wholesale re-engineering of the nominations dataset that would likely ensue. He mentioned that there was nothing preventing a TSP from accepting nominations at its URL for other TSP's and transmitting them to that TSP. He further stated that a TSP could today use the existing standards to accept line items from other TSPs and transmit them to that TSP. As for deadlines and so on, there were no prohibitions on them, they could employ the same standards as are in place to day to accomplish this. In addition, he mentioned that the TSP could employ their web-site to accomplish this as well. He asked that if anyone knew of a reason why a TSP could not use the existing standards, or if the existing standards prohibited a TSP from accepting nominations for a different TSP? Several questions as to Columbia's intent were raised. Some of these were, was Columbia simply seeking approval to accept both Columbia Gulf and Columbia Gas nominations on the same screen? Was there a problem with the current standards that prevented the implementation? Did they feel that they had to request the standard due to the way that they accept nominations for both pipelines on one screen? Mr. Lander noted that the contract numbering convention that Columbia used permitted them to identify which contracts were on which systems.

Ms. Hess proposed that the discussion be postponed as no representative from Columbia was present. It was agreed that consideration of the request would await until the next meeting.

B. R98061 – CIG

Text of IR Question:

At its meeting on April 10 - 11, 2000, the Information Requirements (IR) subcommittee discussed request **R98061** from Colorado Interstate Gas relating to an Authorization for Overrun Deliveries, and determined to send the following question regarding the request to BPS.

During the processing of R98061, IR raised the issue of whether a No-notice shipper's request for authorization of No-notice overrun deliveries requires EDI implementation. There was discussion that this process may be inappropriate for implementation in EDI because there are few data elements associated with this process

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

and it is used infrequently. IR asks that BPS consider this information and instruct IR as to the appropriate course of action in processing this request.

Discussion: Jim Keisler presented the question.

Motion: BPS finds that a No-Notice Shipper's request for authorization of No-Notice Over-run deliveries does not require EDI implementation. Therefore BPS declines this request.

Moved by Dale Davis, seconded by Theresa Hess.

Vote was tied (See attendance list for voting record). As the Motion did not pass, it is still on BPS's agenda.

Mr. Lander recommended that BPS defer consideration of the question from IR until the third round of nominations. His feeling was that it would not be a good precedent to not implement a standard that was passed simply on the basis that the standard might be used infrequently. The request said that it was used often. His observation was that it would be a relatively simple dataset. Simple in terms of number of data elements. Lastly, he stated that he could be persuaded that it was a low-priority dataset and its implementation could be deferred until the third round, thereby side-stepping both the precedent issue and satisfying the current question as to whether or not to implement now. Mark Scheel suggested that this formulation might be a sort of compromise. Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

C. R98062 – CIG

Text of IR Question:

At its meeting on April 10 - 11, 2000, the Information Requirements (IR) subcommittee discussed request **R98062** from Colorado Interstate Gas relating to a Request for a Specific Park/Loan Deal, and determined to send the following question regarding the request to BPS.

During the processing of R98062, IR raised the issue of whether a shipper's request for a specific Park/Loan deal requires EDI implementation. There was discussion that this process may be inappropriate for implementation in EDI because there are few data elements associated with this process and it is used infrequently. IR asks that BPS consider this information and instruct IR as to the appropriate course of action in processing this request.

Discussion: This item was not discussed.

3. **R97019 Noram** – for discussion and possible vote

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Request: Add looping of the N1 data element within the nominations to enable communication of provider, supplier, provider contract, etc.

Discussion: This item was not discussed.

4. Category 3 - Capacity Priority for Scheduling - for possible discussion only
 - R97070 – El Paso
 - R97082 – Florida Gas
 - R00006 – Southern Natural
 - R00003 – Great Lakes

5. Next meeting and agenda
 1. Administrative:

 2. IR Questions transmitted 4/26/2000 related to
 - R98041 – Columbia
 - R98061 – CIG
 - R98062 - CIG
 3. R97019 Noram – for discussion and possible vote
 4. Category 3 - Capacity Priority for Scheduling - for possible discussion only
 - R97070 – El Paso
 - R97082 – Florida Gas
 - R00006 – Southern Natural
 - R00003 – Great Lakes
 5. Next meeting and agenda
 6. Adjourn

The meeting Adjourned at 4:35 Central Time

Next meeting is May 11, 2000

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Meeting Attendees and Voting Record

<u>Segment</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Voting</u>	<u>GISB</u>	<u>Vote 1</u>	<u>Vote 2</u>	<u>Vote 3</u>
		<u>Member</u>				
Pipelines:						
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	X	X	Yes		
Dale Smith	ANR Pipeline	X	X	Yes		
Todd Hudson	El Paso Natural Gas	X	X	Abstain		
Mike Schisler	Natural Gas Pipeline	X	X	NV		
Theresa Hess	Enron - Transwestern	X	X	Yes		
Tammy Hopkins	Enron - Northern Border	X	X	Yes		
Bill Griffith	CIG	X	X	Yes		
Fred Cumminger	Texas Eastern	X	X	NV		
Marcy McCain	Algonquin Gas Transmission	X	X	NV		
Kim Van Pelt	CMS-Panhandle			NV		
Iris King	CNGT			Yes		
Jim Keisler	Williams Gas Pipeline		X			
Prince McDougal;	Southern Natural	X	X	Yes		
Services:						
Debra Stubblefield	Corocoran Law Office			Abstain		
Greg Lander	Skipping Stone	X	X	No		
Mark Scheel	Dynegy	X	X	Abstain		
Joyce Phillips				No		
Randy Young	Koch Midstream			NV		
Producers:						
End Users:						
Cary Metz	MCV			Abstain		
LDC's:						

Bold signifies a BPS Chair