



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: BPS Chairs (Bill Hebenstreit, Greg Lander, Mike Novak, Kim Van Pelt, Producer vacancy)
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes for the Business Practices Subcommittee - May 24, 2001

DATE: June 8, 2001

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
BUSINESS PRACTICES SUBCOMMITTEE
Thursday, May 24, 2001 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
~~DRAFT-FINAL~~ MEETING MINUTES**

1. Administrative

Ms. Van Pelt gave the anti-trust advice, chaired the meeting and took the meeting notes. The adoption of the May 10, 2001 meeting minutes will be postponed until the next meeting. It was requested that agenda items 2 and 3 be switched because, per the Board and EC, the Order 637 items have the highest priority. It was also noted that IR needs a response to their questions in order to continue working on the transactional reporting at their next meeting and BPS should allow sufficient time to complete this item. The agenda was adopted as amended with no opposition.

2. BPS Issues provided by IR on May 15, 2001 re: Order 637 Transactional Reporting (see posted workpapers)

Issue #1: Are the Contract Begin Time and Contract End Time necessary for Transactional Reporting or are Contract Begin Date and Contract End Date sufficient to communicate the duration of the contract?

Discussion:

Mr. Young asked the question if time was always used in conjunction with date in all the data sets. Ms. Hess stated that most of the data sets have times associated with a date and the times usually default to the beginning or end of the gas day. She stated that when GISB first developed the data sets, we developed them thinking that one day the industry would go to hourly business. So far we haven't made modifications to any of our business standards based on hourly business. Therefore, there is not a need for the times. It was stated that the times can be added to the data sets when there is a need for hourly information. Mr. Young agreed that if times are not needed at this point, there is no need to put them in the data sets. Mr. Smith agreed that times shouldn't be included as they are not needed at this time. He stated that he didn't know of any agreements that Exxon Mobil had made that included times, only dates, and in the future if the industry goes to hourly business, then the times may be pertinent. Other participants also stated that their contracts do not have an effective time; they only have an effective date. Mr. Griffith agreed and stated that he thought that it could be misleading as to what the time means.

Motion: (motioned by Bill Griffith, second by Theresa Hess)



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

BPS instructs Information Requirements that Contract Begin Time and Contract End Time are not required for transactional reporting and should not be included in any of the transactional reporting data sets.

Further Discussion:

Ms. Bragg read Mr. Novak's comments (see posted comments) and stated the Mr. Novak wanted to leave the contract begin and end times into the data sets at this time. Ms. Hess stated that she understands the nature of Mr. Novak's comments but believes that it won't be difficult to add them when they become necessary and that they are not necessary at this time.

Segment	Actual Count			Balanced Count		
	For	Against	Total	For	Against	Total
End User	0	0	0	0	0	0
LDC	0	1	1	0	1	1
Pipelines	7	0	7	2	0	2
Producers	1	0	1	1	0	1
Services	1	0	1	1	0	1
Total	9	1	10	4	1	5

Motion passes (see vote 1 on the attendee list)

Further Discussion:

Mr. Novak joined the meeting later and brought the subcommittee back to the discussion of this specific motion. Mr. Novak is involved in AGA's efforts regarding non-uniform rate of flow service. Mr. Novak would like to have the data sets accommodate this business practice. After much discussion, Ms. Van Pelt asked Mr. Novak if he would like his vote recorded in opposition of the motion. Mr. Novak stated that he did. Below are the revised results.

Segment	Actual Count			Balanced Count		
	For	Against	Total	For	Against	Total
End User	0	0	0	0	0	0
LDC	0	2	2	0	2	2
Pipelines	7	0	7	2	0	2
Producers	1	0	1	1	0	1
Services	1	0	1	1	0	1
Total	9	2	11	4	2	6

Motion passes (see revised vote 1 on the attendee list¹)

Issue #2: If a Transportation Service Provider opts to send "All Data" on a contract amendment, how is the recipient to discern what has changed? Should the handling of amendments be different between EDI implementations and visual displays on web pages?

¹ BPS voting procedures require that the voter be present at the time of the vote, therefore, the original vote stands.



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

For example, should changes be required to be distinguished on the web pages? Should “Changes Only” be the mandatory method?

Discussion:

Ms. Davis stated that she believes that “Changes Only” should not be the mandatory method. Mr. Smith asked what was the benefit of sending all of the data. Ms. Calcagno stated that it would probably depend on how you were designing your system. Mr. Smith stated that he doesn’t necessarily think ‘changes only’ should be mandatory, but he doesn’t understand the efficiency of sending all of the data instead of ‘changes only’. Ms. Calcagno stated that the ‘changes only’ makes sense in EDI, but for web site display, if all changes are displayed, some kind of mechanism would need to be used to show what has changed. Mr. Aschbrenner stated that he believes that the pipelines need some discretion on how to present the information. There are different ways to discern the information and the recipient of the data should be able to determine through processing. If “all data” is sent, it can be assumed that something changed on the line item. At the top level of the data set, the TSP specifies how it reports amendment information: by either sending “all data” or “changes only”. At the line item level, there is an indicator as to whether the line is for a “new” contract or for an “amendment”. Ms. Davis stated that the recipient will not only have to determine what has changed but also how it is changed. Ms. Calcagno is concerned about being able to determine which data changed (for “all data”) on web sites, but stated that for now she can agree to not requiring the pipelines to note which items changed, but reserves the right to come back and ask for modifications later. Mr. Smith stated that on the sites where ‘changes only’ were displayed, the information was more beneficial. Mr. Aschbrenner added that each pipeline’s implementation up to this point is based on their interpretation of the order without the benefit of standardization by GISB. Mr. Smith later stated that Mr. Aschbrenner’s explanation helped him to understand the issues better.

Motion: (motioned by Ms. Hess, seconded by Mr. Aschbrenner)

BPS reaffirms its previous instructions dated May 10, 2001 to Information Requirements to accommodate the sender’s option business practice of sending changes only for firm transactional reporting. Therefore, the “changes only” method should not be made mandatory. There are various implementations that a recipient can use to determine what has changed. There is no requirement that amendments be handled differently between EDI and visual display or for changes to be distinguished on web pages.

Segment	Actual Count			Balanced Count		
	For	Against	Total	For	Against	Total
End User	0	0	0	0	0	0
LDC	1	0	1	1	0	1
Pipelines	9	0	9	2	0	2
Producers	1	0	1	1	0	1
Services	1	0	1	1	0	1
Total	12	0	12	5	0	5

Motion passes with no opposition (see vote 2 on the attendee list)

R01014

Williams Gas Pipeline

discussion only



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

Discussion:

Ms. Davis explained the request to add the data elements Payee Bank Name, Payee Bank Location, and Payee Bank Reference Information to the Transportation/Sales Invoice and Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice as sender's option to provide clearer payment instructions to customers as to where Payment should be sent. In certain situations, as it relates to funding of a project, one of the conditions of the funding may be that the payments are required to be sent directly to the bank's main account and then they flow into the pipeline's account. The reference information would specify the specific pipeline account. The Payee Bank Name is the textual name of the bank. All three of the fields would contain textual information. Mr. Griffith asked how these data elements relate to the Remittance Address data element that already exists in the data set. Ms. Davis stated this information would be in addition to the Remittance Address information supplied. She stated that she will check with her Invoice staff to determine how the information relates with the data element that already exists. Mr. Griffith stated that we need to determine how these data elements inter-relate. His concern is that we would have two separate data elements that relay the same information. This request will be placed on the next meeting agenda for discussion and possible vote.

4. Discussion of BPS meeting procedures re: discussion and voting

Ms. Hess and Mr. Aschbrenner gave a detailed description of the issue discussed at previous BPS meetings.

If an item could be voted during a meeting, it should be labeled with "discussion and possible vote" so that there is no confusion as to what should happen during the meeting. Ms. Bragg stated that she supports the current practice of discussing at one meeting and voting at the next or a subsequent meeting. Mr. Novak stated that while it would be nice to dispose of issues quickly if there is no opposition, it doesn't really support due process of a request. Ms. Hess reiterated the discussions at the previous meetings that, if any one participant wanted to postpone the vote until a subsequent meeting, it would be postponed.

If what is being proposed conflicts with the governance documents, the Process Committee would have to make the modification. If it doesn't conflict, the BPS could change their procedures and if necessary the process documentation can follow.

BPS will report to the EC at its June meeting as to what is being considered. Subcommittee members should review the governance documents related to BPS and be ready to discuss and possibly vote on the issue at BPS' June 21, 2001 meeting. If it is determined that it is necessary to send the issue through the Process Subcommittee, the BPS vote will be available to them.

5. Next meeting and agenda

Thursday, June 21, 2001, 9:00a.m. – 12:00p.m.

- 1. Administrative: Welcome, Antitrust Advice, Roll Call, Adoption of Agenda, Adoption of Draft Meeting Minutes for May 10, 2001, Adoption of Draft Meeting Minutes for May 24, 2001**
- 2. Review of the following Invoicing Round 3 Category of Business Practices Requests:**



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

R01014

Williams Gas Pipeline

discussion and possible vote

3. **Discussion of BPS meeting procedures re: discussion and voting**
4. **Next Meeting and agenda**
5. **Adjourn**
6. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at about 12:00noon.



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

Attendee	Organization	Vote 1	Revised Vote 1 ²	Vote 2	GISB Member?
		(nv) – not voting			
Pipelines					
Kim Van Pelt	CMS – Panhandle Eastern	✓	✓	✓	✓
Theresa Hess	Enron – Transwestern	✓	✓	✓	✓
Clancy Aschbrenner	Colorado Interstate Gas	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	Abstain	Abstain	✓	✓
Randy Young	Gulf South Pipeline	✓	✓	✓	✓
Prince McDougal	Southern Natural Gas	✓	✓	✓	✓
Vickie Coen	Dominion Transmission	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bill Griffith	Colorado Interstate Gas	(nv)	(nv)	(nv)	✓
Sally Wood	Colorado Interstate Gas	(nv)	(nv)	(nv)	✓
Kathryn Burch	Texas Eastern	Abstain	Abstain	✓	✓
Services					
Suzanne Calcagno	Enron North America	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gina McMahon	BTU Watch	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	✓
Producers					
Richard Smith	Exxon Mobil	✓	✓	✓	✓
End Users					
LDCs					
Audrey Bragg	Washington Gas	X	X	✓	✓
Mike Novak	National Fuel Gas Distrib	Absent	X	Absent	✓
Associations					

Bold signifies a BPS Chair

² BPS voting procedures require that the voter be present at the time of the vote, therefore, the original vote stands.