

# 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 18, 2000

---

## 1. Administrative

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

The Draft Minutes of 5/04/2000 were modified and 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:

---

# 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

---

- a) all of the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burner-tip; **or**
- 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:** Discussion began with a review of the questions asked at the last meeting.

Mr. Lander asked 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?

Answers were: Mr. Keisler mentioned that only if the first occurrence of the word “nomination” in the last sentence of Standard 1.1.3 was changed to “transmittal” would it be clear. He suggested entertaining the notion that we should “clean-up” the wording of standard 1.1.3.

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?

The suggestion was made to send the following issue to the Interpretations Subcommittee.

**Motion:** Send the questions from Information Requirements regarding GISB standard 1.1.3 to the Interpretations Subcommittee along with the notes from the BPS meetings concerning this issue and the record associated with proposed standard S66. In particular, please interpret the meaning and intent of what a “super-nomination” is. Also, please clarify whether a TSP permitting (and not requiring) a shipper to nominate across pipelines in the same family is exceeding the GISB standard.

The Motion was made by Theresa Hess and seconded by Chuck Stodola. The motion passed unanimously and is recorded as vote 1 on the attendance list.

## **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

---

# 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 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 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:** Discussion began with a re-cap of the previous meeting's discussion.

Mr. Lander again recommended that BPS defer consideration of the question from IR until the third round of nominations. Others noted that there had been other determinations by GISB to decline to standardize a practice at the present time. Bill Griffith stated that if there were a need for an EDI data set for this activity in the future they would request it. After further discussion Mr. Lander determined not to oppose the decline of the request at this time and to have the record reflect that at any time another party or CIG could request that this practice be standardized and supported with an EDI dataset.

**Motion:** BPS recommends that request R98061 having to do with a No-notice shipper's request for authorization of No-notice overrun deliveries be declined, as the practice does not require standardization at this time.

Motion made by Dale Davis seconded by Randy Young  
The motion passed unanimously and is recorded as vote 2 on the attendance list.

## 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

---

# 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

---

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:** The question was read and the item was discussed. Discussion centered on whether there was the need to standardize the communication aspect for the process of contracting for park and loan service. Mr. Lander stated his concern that park and loan was a necessary attribute of transportation and that maybe the process of pricing, term and approval of locations needed to be standardized. Mr. Griffith stated that while the process of nominating park and loan was and could be done through the nomination process and therefore would be done in a standardized fashion, that the process of requesting the contract particulars need not be done in a standardized fashion. Mr. Lander asked if the only way one could initiate a particular park and loan deal under a contract was on line. Mr. Griffith said no, that people could call, fax, or do it on-line. He said that the way to think about this is not a pre-approval of a nomination but rather a contract amendment to create a particular deal for a particular quantity and time at a location. It was agreed by all that some more thinking should occur on the matter over the next week and pick it up then.

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

**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

None of these items were discussed

5. **Next meeting and agenda**

1. Administrative:
  2. IR Questions transmitted 4/26/2000 related to (for discussion and possible vote)  
R98062 - CIG
  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](mailto:gisb@aol.com)

Home Page: [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

---

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 25th, 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>				
<b>Pipelines:</b>						
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas	X	X	Yes	Yes	
Chuck Stodola	Columbia Gas	X	X	Yes	NV	
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	X	X	Yes	Yes	
Stephanie LeCureaux	ANR Pipeline	X	X	Yes	Yes	
Todd Hudson	El Paso Natural Gas	X	X	Yes	Yes	
Mike Schisler	Natural Gas Pipeline	X	X	Yes	NV	
Theresa Hess	Enron – Transwestern	X	X	Yes	Yes	
Tammy Hopkins	Enron – Northern Border	X	X	Yes	Yes	
Bill Griffith	CIG	X	X	Yes	Yes	
Clancy Aschbrenner	CIG		X			
Fred Cummingier	Texas Eastern	X	X	NV	Yes	
Marcy McCain	Algonquin Gas Transmission	X	X	Yes	Yes	
<b>Kim Van Pelt</b>	<b>CMS-Panhandle</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	Yes	Yes	
Jim Keisler	Williams Gas Pipeline		X			
<b>Services:</b>						
Debra Stubblefield	Corocoran Law Office			Abstain	Abstain	
<b>Greg Lander</b>	<b>CapacityCenter.com</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	Yes	Abstain	
Randy Young	Koch Midstream	X	X	Yes	Yes	
<b>Producers:</b>						
<b>Joyce Phillips</b>	PanCanadian Energy	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	Yes	Yes	
<b>End Users:</b>						
<b>LDC's:</b>						

**Bold signifies a BPS Chair**