



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 (absent)
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting

DATE: July 8, 1999

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
GISB BUSINESS PRACTICES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
Teleconference Call: July 8, 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 23 were modified during the review and accepted as final. The minutes of July 1 were also accepted as final.

II. EDM Requests

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.

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.



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

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: Mr. Lander explained the provided work paper, which was revised during the meeting:

Proposed Standard 4.2.x

Testing data sets between trading partners includes testing of:

- a) intended business results,
- b) proposed electronic delivery mechanisms, and
- c) related EDI/EDM and, where supported, FF/EDM implementation issues.

Testing should include 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:

- 1) a Nomination,
- 2) a Predetermined Allocation, or,
- 3) 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; or, when the sender of:

- 1) a Confirmation Response (including unsolicited),
- 2) a Scheduled Quantity,
- 3) an Allocation Statement,
- 4) an Operator Scheduled Quantity,
- 5) an Imbalance Statement, or,
- 6) an 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, then it should notify its 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 effective date of such change.

¹ The work paper is revised 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 presence and/or the acceptable content of a data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice;
- b) a new business response to an accepted data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice;
- c) a new business response to the acceptable content of a data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice; or,
- d) a new intended business result to be communicated to a receiver by the trading partner sending notice;

Absent mutual agreement between the affected trading partners to the contrary, trading partners notifying their sending or receiving trading partners of a change under this standard should provide the means to test such changes during at least a two week time period prior to the effective date of the change.

Trading partners receiving notice of such changes from their trading partner should be prepared (even after testing has been completed) to not implement such changes, as the notifying trading partner is permitted to cancel or postpone such change. Notifying trading partners canceling or postponing the effective date of a change should provide affected trading partners with notice of cancellation or postponement at least one business day prior to the applicable effective date.

Discussion: There were several minor changes made for clarity. There was discussion on whether one business day was sufficient for notice. After discussion, it was not changed. Mr. Lander gave examples of business rule changes that would affect whether a TSP supported certain data elements and data content. He further described the roles of the sender and receiver. This is not intended to apply to the migration from one version of GISB standards to another version, such as from version 1.3 to version 1.4. After further discussion, other changes were made to the list of changes that constitute business rules changes. Mr. Lander explained the intended business result and gave several examples. Again, he reiterated that it would not be applicable to version changes.

Some concern was raised that a two week test period could be construed as lack of response to customer requests or to the need for an immediate implementation. An example was given that a pipeline might want to change its response to no longer send an error message but instead provide a warning message which would be delayed two weeks for implementation based on a requirement of a two week test period. This delay may be avoided through mutual agreement and reasonable communication of expectations between parties. There was discussion on the timing of change implementation and whether the timing of the testing period could imply that a change should be implemented in the middle of the month when it is more appropriate to implement the change at the beginning of the month. It was noted that this request addresses testing, not the effective date of implementation, and it is not the intent that the testing period prescribe the effective date of implementation of the change.

Action: The discussion will continue with a limit of 15 minutes on the next call after which it will be voted.



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 teleconference meeting, to be held on Thursday, July 22, from 3:00 to 5:00 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 4:40 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

IV. Meeting Attendees & Voting Record

Name	Company	Email Address ²	Voting?	GISB Member
PIPELINES:				
Kelly Adolf	Williston Basin	brookr@wbip.com	Yes	Yes
Theresa Hess	Enron - Northern Border	thess@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Betty Barnum	CMS Panhandle Eastern	babarnum@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Kim Van Pelt	CMS Trunkline	kvanpelt@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway	Unruhj@kochind.com	Yes	Yes
Jim Keisler	Transco		Yes	No
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	Dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes	Yes
LDCs:				
Rick Ishikawa	SoCal Gas	rishikawa@socalgas.com	Yes	Yes
SERVICES:				
Greg Lander	TransCapacity	exec@tcapserv.com	Yes	Yes
Jim Buccigross	Registry	legaljb@tcapserv.com	Yes	Yes
Mark Scheel	Dynegy Inc.	masc@dynegy.com	Yes	Yes
Gary Payne	Enron Capital and Trade	gpayne@ect.enron.com	Yes	Yes
Andy Sicignano	Enron Capital and Trade	asicign@ect.enron.com	No	Yes
Donna Scott	Enron Administrative Corp.	dscott2@ect.enron.com	Yes	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.