



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

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting

DATE: July 1, 1999

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
GISB BUSINESS PRACTICES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
Teleconference Call: July 1, 1999
FINAL MINUTES

I. Administrative

Mr. Lander chaired the meeting and welcomed the participants. Ms. McQuade identified the participants in a roll call. Mr. Lander gave the antitrust advice. The revised draft agenda was adopted with no changes. The redlined minutes of June 17 were modified during the review and accepted as final.

II. Technical Subcommittee Response and Request No. R98091

R98091 Submitted by ANR

Request: ANR would like to submit the following request for change to the GISB Invoicing Implementation Guides related to the ANSI ASC X-12 structure of the invoice:

Add a DTM segment to the sub-detail level of the GISB Transportation/Sales Invoice (G811TSIN) to reduce the number of **detail** loops required for each contract when multiple date ranges are needed to reflect volume or rate changes for different dates.

Currently, the DTM segment is only at the detail level which requires multiple occurrences (detail loops) of the same contract when different date ranges are needed. Since the "hierarchical level" is based on the contract, it is felt each contract should appear only once in the detail looping. A DTM segment in the sub-detail level will allow one detail loop per contract.

Implementation of this request would provide the benefit of consistency in detail looping by contract.

Technical R: Question from BPS (see BPS minutes 4/09/99):

How many different occurrences of contract/date level information can be included with an invoice? If there is a limit, what is it?

Verbal Response Given to BPS (see BPS minutes 4/29/99):

"...there are unlimited different occurrences of contract/date level information that can be included on an invoice."

Formal Written Response (see Technical minutes 4/27-28/99)



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

The number of occurrences of contract/date level information which can be included with an invoice is ">1", i.e. unlimited.

If there is a need to send more than one date range (Beginning Transaction Date, Beginning Transaction Time, Ending Transaction Date, Ending Transaction Time) per Service Requester Contract, then the contract/date loop should be repeated with the same Service Requester Contract for each separate date range.
sense of the room: recommended (7-0)

Discussion: Mr. Lander recapped the effort so far on this request. On May 6, Ms. LeCureaux noted that this request was forwarded to the Technical Subcommittee, excerpted here: "Transfer Request No. R98091 to the Technical Subcommittee to review and determine the manner in which multiple occurrences of Beginning Transaction Date, Beginning Transaction Time, Ending Transaction Date and Ending Transaction Time data elements are sent for a Service Requester contract in the Transportation/Sales Invoice. It is not the intent that these data elements be provided at multiple levels in the document. Action: The motion passed unanimously (Voting record shown in the attendance list as M1)." Mr. Lander asked how the Technical Subcommittee would avoid the ambiguity of dates. Ms. Van Pelt replied that if the dates are not shown in multiple levels, then there should be no ambiguity. It was transferred to the Technical Subcommittee and is not expected to be returned to the BPS as there are no business practices. The Technical Subcommittee has not yet addressed this request.

Action: This request was transferred by the BPS to the Technical Subcommittee on May 6.

III. EDM Requests

R97071 Request submitted by TransCapacity

Request: The request is to add a new standard or standards language to the current GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards. These proposed standards deal with the use of ISA (Envelope) Sender Identification codes when sending EDI files. We believe the proposed standard language below, while somewhat technical, clearly describes the changes we believe are necessary.

Proposed Standard:

- The sender of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and receivers should accept, the ISA Sender ID in the EDI envelope specified by the sender. The receiver of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and senders should support sending of, the ISA Receiver ID in the EDI envelope specified by the receiver. The IDs associated with the applicable sending or receiving party may differ from the IDs of the entity(ies) identified between the ST and SE segments of the transmission.

Motion: The motion was made to adopt the standard as revised in the previous minutes:

- The sender of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and receivers should accept, the ISA Sender ID in the EDI envelope specified by the sender. The receiver of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and senders should support sending of, the ISA Receiver ID in



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

the EDI envelope specified by the receiver. The IDs associated with the applicable sending or receiving party may differ from the IDs of the entity(ies) identified between the ST and SE segments of the transmission.

- Action: The motion passed unanimously through a roll call.
- Motion: Send this recommendation to the Technical Subcommittee to be processed in their normal course of business.
- Action: The motion passed unanimously with no objection noted.

R97103 Submitted by Enron Administrative Corp.

The version and revision level of technology standards* adopted by GISB and referenced in GISB standards should be clearly stated in the applicable standard(s). Any implementation of GISB standards should, at a minimum, be compatible with this version. Changes to the version and revision level of open standards should be made only through the GISB standards process. *Note: This refers only to technology standards formulated by other standards organizations such as the Internet Engineering Task Force and the World-Wide Web Consortium.

Discussion: [This request was addressed out of order – as the last request addressed during the meeting.]

Mr. Sicignano noted that modifications to GISB Standard No. 4.3.59 could be sufficient to support the intent of the request. Mr. Lander offered that a separate standard consistent with GISB Standard No. 4.3.59 (s33 -- EII) may be a better approach. A work paper will be provided for the next meeting.

Action: A work paper will be provided by Mr. Sicignano prior to the next meeting, at which time the request will be further discussed and possibly voted.

R97104 Submitted by TransCapacity

Request: The request is to add a new standard to the current GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards. This proposed standard deals with testing, and as such can and should be read in conjunction with existing GISB Standard No. 4.3.14 which reads in part: "The industry should use standard policies and guidelines for testing new data sets."

Proposed Standard:

"Testing of new data sets includes testing of the current and/or future electronic delivery mechanisms including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). Standard policies and guidelines should be developed to test these aspects."

While standard 4.1.14 indicates that the industry use standard testing methodology for testing of the GISB standardized datasets, this is only a piece of the overall testing which must take place. TransCapacity believes that this standardized testing methodology should be applied to the underlying communication methodology (Electronic Delivery Mechanisms), security features, and EDI enveloping, as well as to the datasets themselves.



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

This new standard would apply to testing of the electronic delivery mechanisms and communication procedures. Mere testing of datasets, without the surrounding methods of communication, accomplishes neither the purpose nor spirit of the existing standards. Standardized testing methodologies are clearly beneficial to the goal of a seamless electronic marketplace for natural gas. Participants in the GISB standards initiation and adoption process recognized this in enacting the existing GISB standard No. 4.1.14. However, this standard - as written - is arguably applicable only to the datasets themselves. (Though this is not TransCapacity's view, it can rationalize a reading of the standard in this manner.)

The proposed additional standard language will clarify the issue that standardized testing also applies to the electronic delivery mechanism including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). This will ease implementation for all parties involved and will identify any potential obstacles earlier in the process. Certainly testing has a cost associated with it. However, this testing must be undertaken, and currently is. The only difference is the standardization aspect that this language would add. Therefore, the true incremental cost is marginal, and we believe it will be recovered through a less labor intensive (and smoother) implementation down the line.

Work Paper¹: The following two standards replace the previously proposed standard in R97104:

Proposed Standard 4.2.x

- Testing ~~of new~~ data sets between trading partners includes testing of intended business results, proposed electronic delivery mechanisms, and, related EDI/EDM and, where supported, FF/EDM implementation issues (i.e., enveloping, security, data validity, and standards compliance (e.g. ANSI X12, and GISB EDM Related Standards)).

Proposed Standard 4.3.x

- When the receiver of a Nomination, Predetermined Allocation, or a Request for Confirmation has determined to change the business rules it will apply to the processing of (and/or response to) one or more of these documents, the receiver should notify their sending trading partners of same at least two weeks in advance of the change. The notification should include identification of the data elements that are changing (or whose content is changing), the results (content(s) of response documents) that will change as a result of the change in the business rules and the date of such change.

When the sender of a Confirmation Response (including unsolicited), Scheduled Quantity, Allocation Statement, Operator Scheduled Quantity, Imbalance Statement, or Invoice document has determined to change the business rules, it will apply to the generating of (and/or content within) one or more of these documents, the sender should notify its receiving trading partners of same at least two weeks in advance of the change. The notification should include identification of the data elements that are changing (or whose content is changing), the intended business result of such change in the business rules, and the date of such change.

¹ The work paper is redlined with changes supported by the submitter during the discussion on the work paper.



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 the purposes of this standard, a business rule change is any change in:

- a) the conditionality of a data element sent or received (by the trading partner sending notice under this standard);
- b) the acceptable content of a data element (received by receiver sending notice);
- c) a new business response to a previously accepted data element (received by receiver sending notice);
- d) a new business response to previously accepted data element content (received by a receiver sending notice); or,
- e) a new intended business result to be communicated to a receiver (by a sender sending notice).

Trading partners notifying their sending or receiving trading partners of a change under this standard should provide ~~an environment~~ the means to test such changes during at least a the two week time period prior to ~~between the notice and~~ the effective date of the change.

Discussion: Mr. Lander described the work paper. Mr. McAnally took over the responsibilities of facilitator for the meeting. In discussion, the proposed standards underwent changes that are reflected as a redlines to the work paper. Mr. Young asked for simplifying changes to the proposed standards and to identify transportation service providers. Mr. Aschbrenner noted that the business rules might not always only apply to pipelines, but with GISB definitions, transportation service providers include LDCs. Clarifying changes were made regarding the time period of the availability of the testing environment to the trading partners and the reference to "environment" was removed. Mr. Lander will provide marked up language to the first two paragraphs of 4.3.x.

Action: A new work paper will be provided by Mr. Lander prior to the next meeting, at which time the request will be further discussed and possibly voted.

IV. Agenda for next meeting

The next teleconference meeting, to be held on Thursday, July 8, from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. central, will review the following requests for discussion and possible vote, unless otherwise noted:

- EDM Request Nos. R97104 Discussion and possible vote
R97103 Discussion and possible vote
- Determine priority for general category of BPS requests, and discuss content of the general requests.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. central.



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

V. Meeting Attendees & Voting Record

Name	Company	Email Address ²	Voting?	R97091 ³	GISB Member
PIPELINES:					
Kelly Adolf	Williston Basin	brookr@wbip.com	Yes	Yes	Yes
Theresa Hess	Enron - Northern Border	thess@enron.com	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bill Griffith	CIG	william.griffith@coastalcorp.com	No	NA	Yes
C. Aschbrenner	CIG	clancy.aschbrenner@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Abstain	Yes
S. LeCureaux	ANR	stephanie.lecureaux@coastalcorp.com	Yes	NA	Yes
Betty Barnum	CMS Panhandle Eastern	babarnum@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kim Van Pelt	CMS Trunkline	kvanpelt@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes	Yes
Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway	Unruhj@kochind.com	Yes	NA	Yes
Jim Keisler	Transco		Yes	Yes	No
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	Dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes	NA	Yes
LDCs:					
Rick Ishikawa	SoCal Gas	rishikawa@socalgas.com	Yes	Yes	Yes
Robert McAnally	Northwest Natural	rfm@nwnatural.com	Yes	Yes	Yes
SERVICES:					
Greg Lander	TransCapacity	exec@tcapserv.com	Yes	Yes	Yes
Randy Young	Koch Midstream	Young0r@kochind.com	Yes	Yes	Yes
Andy Sicignano	Enron Administrative Corp.	asicign@ect.enron.com	Yes	NA	Yes

² The privacy policy stated on the GISB Web Site ("www.gisb.org") governs the use of information, such as email addresses, collected by GISB on its members and meeting participants. Members and participants are not required to give such information to GISB.

³ "NA" in this column means not in attendance when the vote was called.