



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: Greg Lander (absent), Producer Segment Vacancy, Diane McVicker, Norm Walker (absent), Robert McAnally (absent)
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting

DATE: June 3, 1999

I. Administrative

Ms. McVicker chaired the meeting and welcomed the participants. Mr. Buccigross gave the antitrust advice. Ms. McQuade gave the roll call. In the discussion on the adoption of the agenda, Ms. Davis noted that it was inappropriate that R97049 be placed on this agenda as part of the request should be addressed with R98048 and another part of the request may be addressed through the efforts of AGDT. It should be addressed as originally assigned in BPS-N2. Ms. McQuade advised that the only reason R97049 was on the agenda was to determine if it should be reclassified from being addressed in BPS during the next round of nominations or be addressed in the next round of flowing gas related requests. The agenda was adopted with a reversal of R97049 and R98030. The minutes of May 27, 1999 were adopted as final with changes.

II. Review of Requests & Vote on Recommended Standards

R97049 Request submitted by Transco.

Request: Transco proposes that additional code values be added to the list of Allocation Type Codes in the Pre-Determined Allocation (PDA) Data Set and the Allocation Data Set. These code values are used in Transco's current business practice to determine the role that the sending party is playing within the multi-level ranking process. Our ability to use these code values in EDI exchanges is necessary to maintain our current level of service. Transco needs values to be assigned to the Allocation Type Code for the following type of allocation and levels:

- Multi-Level, Operator
- Multi-Level, Producer
- Multi-Level, First Supplier
- Multi-Level, Last Supplier.

Appropriate error messages will need to be developed for the PDA Quick Response. Values for the Allocation Type Codes above will also need to be developed.

Discussion: In the discussion on the agenda it was determined that R97049 was mis-classified and should be classified as a flowing gas item, (BPS-FG2).



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

Action: The motion was made and supported unanimously to reclassify the request as assigned to BPS-FG2.

R98030 Request submitted by Texaco.

Request: Reference is made to the above subject implementation guide which utilizes the consolidated service invoice/statement (transaction set 811) of the ASC X12 standard. The existing GISB Implementation Guide does not include a sample sales invoice and sample ASC X12 transaction for the sales invoice. Texaco Natural Gas Inc is implementing process improvements to send/receive sales invoices in the GISB EDI standards and developed the attached sample sales invoice and ASC X12 mapping for inclusion in the GISB Implementation Guide. In our review of the GISB Implementation Guide, we identified minor enhancements to the guideline to support natural gas sales invoices.

Discussion: Discussion began with the use of memos versus the use of reverse/restate process. Mr. Loesch supported the use of a corrected invoice – sending the original invoice again with the corrected information in the same billing cycle. Mr. Young noted that GISB Standard Nos. 2.3.7 and 2.3.12 indicate that a volume change would require the changes to be reflected as prior period adjustments. This highlights the question of when a correction becomes a prior period adjustment. Mr. Young also noted that with the time lines established for invoicing, it may be difficult to fit in a corrected invoice. While Mr. Loesch explained that in his current business practices, the corrected invoice has the same invoice number as the original invoice, others noted that in their current business practices, the invoices would have different numbers.

Use of the memos would require implementing change processing in the invoicing process. After further discussion, Mr. Loesch agreed to drop the portion of his request on credit and debit memos. Mr. Loesch still needs an indicator to identify the entire invoice as either original or corrected. Several noted that the invoice number could be the same on the corrected invoice – and in those cases, the Previous Invoice Identifier and the Invoice Identifier data elements would have the same value. Mr. Keisler did not support allowing the corrected invoice to have the same value for the Invoice Identifier data element as the original invoice. He noted that his concern was based on the possible manual intervention that may be needed. If used, he supported a change in the usage of the Previous Invoice Identifier from MA to C based on if the invoice was corrected.

Ms. Hess observed that since the Previous Invoice Identifier is in the header segment along with the Invoice Identifier, it is not clear that a separate data element needed to indicate if an invoice is corrected or not. After further discussion, it was noted that we should consider using a different document for sales and purchases versus transportation. GISB uses the 811 document for invoicing as does the telecommunication industry. Other industries use the 810 document. The 811 document allows for multiple levels of detail.

Action: This will be further discussed on June 17 specifically as it relates to whether transportation invoices and sales/purchases invoices should be maintained in the same document, or if the information needs of the two types of invoices are different enough that they warrant separate documents.



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

III. Agenda for next meeting

The next meeting, to be held on June 17, from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. central, will review the following request for discussion and possible vote on Request Nos. R98030 and prioritization of the next round of requests. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. central.

IV. Meeting Attendees & Voting Record

Name	Company	Email Address	Voting Participant	GISB Member
PIPELINES:				
Mike Culver	Algonquin	Mwculver@duke-energy.com	Yes	Yes
Eric Anderson	ANR	eric.anderson@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes
Betty Barnum	CMS Energy – Panhandle	Babarnum@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Kim Van Pelt	CMS Energy – Trunkline	kvanpelt@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Mary Sue McNeal	El Paso Natural Gas	mcnealm@epenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Theresa Hess	Enron – Northern Border	thess@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Hilda Lindley	Enron – FGT	hlindley@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Raetta Zadow	Enron – Northern Natural	rzadow@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Richard Hanagrif	Enron – Transwestern	rhanagrif@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway	Unruhj@kochind.com	Yes	Yes
Randy Young	Koch Midstream	Young0r@koching.com	Yes	Yes
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	graceym@epenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Hien Duong	Texas Eastern	Htduong@duke-energy.com	Yes	Yes
Jim Keisler	Transco	Jim.e.keisler@wgp.twc.com	Yes	NO
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	Dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes	Yes
PRODUCERS:				
Don Loesch	Texaco	Loescdr@texaco.com	Yes	Yes
SERVICES:				
Jim Buccigross	National Registry of C.R.	legaljb@tcapserv.com	Yes	Yes
Meg Healey			Yes	NO
Donna Scott	Enron Administrative Corp.	Dscott2@ect.enron.com	Yes	Yes
END USERS:				
Diane McVicker	Salt River Project	Dbmcvick@srpnet.com	Yes	Yes