

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, 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: October 10 and 11, 2000

1. Administrative¹

The meeting opened at 1:00 p.m. mountain time. Ms. Van Pelt opened the meeting and gave the anti-trust advice. She thanked Mr. Aschbrenner and CIG for hosting today's meeting. Mr. Aschbrenner covered some general information. Participants introduced themselves. Opening remarks were made by Mr. Hebenstreit and Mr. Lander. The agenda was adopted with the modification to add the adoption of the draft October 5 minutes. The draft minutes of October 5 were adopted with changes noted in the meeting.

2. Organization of Topics

Issues as noted in the minutes of October 5 will be organized into five topic areas: Index of Customers, Releasing, Bidding, Recall and Reput. The number reference (#) includes the group (1, 2 or 3) and the sequential number of the item within that group as specified in the October 5 minutes.

Group	#	Item
Releasing	G1.1	Whether there are reason(s) that replacement shippers (acquiring shippers) should have to wait for a contract on biddable deals.
	G1.4	Do we want to have bidding this afternoon and nomination for flow at the start of the 9:00 AM Gas day tomorrow?
	G1.5	Want to complete a biddable release for nomination at the next nomination cycle.
	G1.7	Comparability should be the issue and not whether it is biddable or not.
	G1.8	There are issues with respect to the bidding timelines whenever bidding is required. The two cases where this applies are: deal durations less than one year and more than 31 days as well as where bidding is required due to "rollover(s)". The issue is the length of time

¹ Ms. Copeland is transcribing the meeting. For a full accounting of the discussion from today's meeting, the transcripts should be ordered from Ms. Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting, (361-882-9037). These minutes will record the motions and voting results. The discussion is captured in the transcripts.

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Group	#	Item
		between deal consummation, nomination and flow from that nomination when bidding is required.
	G1.9	Should the GISB definition of short term (less than 5 months) and the FERC definition of Short term (less than 1 year) be reconciled? Or, is it OK to keep the 5 months plus deal duration time line as long as it is not inconsistent with the FERC definition of long term deal duration and associated timeline.
	G1.10	There is no issue with the under 31 day non-biddable deal time lines, other than the 30 minutes adjustment to posting time and contract tendering time proposed by the LDC's work paper.
	G1.11	What is meant by Partial Day release?
Bidding	G1.1	Whether there are reason(s) that replacement shippers (acquiring shippers) should have to wait for a contract on biddable deals.
	G1.3	Is there a need to be able to have bidding timelines on all deals of all durations?
	G1.4	Do we want to have bidding this afternoon and nomination for flow at the start of the 9:00 AM Gas day tomorrow?
	G1.5	Want to complete a biddable release for nomination at the next nomination cycle.
	G1.6	Why is bidding important?
	G1.8	There are issues with respect to the bidding timelines whenever bidding is required. The two cases where this applies are: deal durations less than one year and more than 31 days as well as where bidding is required due to "rollover(s)". The issue is the length of time between deal consummation, nomination and flow from that nomination when bidding is required.
	G1.9	Should the GISB definition of short term (less than 5 months) and the FERC definition of Short term (less than 1 year) be reconciled? Or, is it OK to keep the 5 months plus deal duration time line as long as it is not inconsistent with the FERC definition of long term deal duration and associated timeline.
Misc.	G1.2	Should GISB standards conform with Order 637?

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Group	#	Item
	G2.19	Should Order 637 guide how we determine these issues?
Recall	G2.1	Is there such a thing as a “partial day recall”?
	G2.2	What is meant by the phrase “partial day recall”?
	G2.3	Is there a difference between normal recall, late recall and flowing recall?
	G2.4	Should releasers and acquirers agree in advance to the types of recalls that are in the contract?
	G2.5	To what extent should TSP’s be involved in the types of recalls that are in a contract?
	G2.6	Should there be a later deadline for recalling recallable capacity?
	G2.7	Should there be another, later deadline for a different type of recall?
	G2.8	Should there be a GISB Standard established for “partial day recalls”?
	G2.9	Should GISB Standard 5.3.6 be modified to include “partial day recalls” and to modify the existing notice timeline?
	G2.10	Should there be standardized alternative(s) to the existing type of recall?
	G2.11	Should previously negotiated releases involving recall be impacted by action taken with respect to new or different types of recalls?
	G2.12	Should there be limits of any kind on the types of recalls negotiated between releasers and replacement shippers?
	G2.14	Should 5.3.7 be modified to eliminate the prohibition on “partial day recall”?
	G2.15	Should 5.3.7 be modified to permit releasing shippers with recall rights exercise such rights at any time by notifying the TSP?
	G2.16	Should 5.3.7 be modified to explicitly allow the recalling shipper to nominate at the next available nomination deadline following recall notification?
	G2.17	Should 5.3.7 be reviewed in the light of any changes to the other recall and “reput” standards?
Reput	G2.13	What is meant by “reputting”?

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Group	#	Item
	G2.17	Should 5.3.7 be reviewed in the light of any changes to the other recall and "reput" standards?
	G2.18	Should the reference to "reputting" be removed from 5.3.7?
Index	G3.1	Should 4.3.35 be revised to eliminate ambiguity and discord?
	G3.2	Should 4.3.35 be revised to mirror the FERC layout requirements?

3. Index of Customers Issues

GISB Standard 4.3.35 for version 1.4 is:

4.3.35 The header information should be displayed at the top before the columnar information. The column headings for the posting of "Index of Customers" should be displayed as follows:

- Rate Schedule
- Customer
- Contract Effective Date
- Contract Termination Date
- Maximum Daily Quantity
- Maximum Storage Quantity
- Rollover Period
- Footnotes (when applicable)

These columns should appear in this order from left to right. The data should be sorted in ascending order by rate schedule and then by customer name within rate schedule. Footnote text should be displayed below the columnar information.

Mr. Lander suggested the following standard to replace GISB Standard No. 4.3.35:

- The ordering of the Index of Customers information should follow that set forth in GISB Standard No. 4.3.16.

After discussion, he amended his proposal to:

Modify GISB Standard No. 4.3.35, by replacing it with:

- For the "Index of Customers", the column headings for the web site display for the "Index of Customers" should be displayed in the order provided for in reference Order No. 637, Docket No. RM 98-10-000, issued June 29, 2000, "Appendix A, Instruction Manual for Electronic Filing of the Index of Customers" issued with the above

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

referenced order, for those fields identified as “detail fields.” In addition, the other Index of Customers information not included in the columnar display should be accessible from the columnar display.

The motion was made by Mr. Lander and seconded by Mr. Novak to adopt the above language as a replacement for GISB Standard No. 4.3.35. The motion passed unanimously as shown by the below table of voting results.

Voting Results:

Segment	Actual Count				Balanced Count		
	For	Against	Abstain	Total	For	Against	Total
End User	2	0	0	2	2	0	2
LDC	2	0	0	2	2	0	2
Pipelines	13	0	0	13	2	0	2
Producers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Services	4	0	1	5	2	0	2
Total	21	0	1	22	8	0	8

It was the general consensus of the group that this action resolved the Index of Customer issues.

4. Recall Issues

Mr. Novak described his concerns with the timeline, ability to recall released capacity and inability to make the deadline to provide a timely nomination. He suggested changes to implement a more flexible and market responsive recall mechanism: namely, changing the recall deadline from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. CCT to coincide with the timely nomination cycle and provide for an evening recall with a 4:30 p.m. deadline to coincide with the evening intraday nomination cycle. He also noted that this would also address some gas reliability concerns and provide for a more stable market. To implement these changes, GISB Standard Nos. 5.3.6² and 5.3.7³ would require changes.

After much discussion, several issues⁴ with Mr. Novak’s proposal were highlighted, and Mr. Novak made the following motion to replace the existing GISB Standard No. 5.3.6:

² GISB Standard No. 5.3.6 currently reads: “If the releasing shipper wishes to recall capacity to be effective for a gas day, the notice should be provided to the transportation service provider and the acquiring shipper no later than 8 A.M. Central Clock Time on nomination day.”

³ GISB Standard No. 5.3.7 currently reads: “There should be no partial day recalls of capacity. Transportation service providers should support the function of reputting by releasing shippers.”

⁴ The issues and discussion can be found in the transcripts are not provided in these draft minutes.

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

- Recall terms should be agreed to in advance between the releasing and acquiring shippers. Where the releasing shipper wishes to recall capacity to be effective for a gas day, releases with an award posting date prior to **[month day, 2001]**, are grand-fathered and the recall notice should be provided to the transportation service provider and the acquiring shipper no later than 8 A.M. Central Clock Time on the nomination day. Otherwise, the timely recall notice should be provided to the transportation service provider and the acquiring shipper no later than 10 A.M. Central Clock Time on nomination day such that the releasing shipper may place a timely nomination for the next day's gas flow. Additionally, evening recall notice can be provided to the transportation service provider and the acquiring shipper no later than 4 P.M. Central Clock Time on nomination day such that the releasing shipper may place an evening nomination for the next day's gas flow.

Mr. Novak's motion was seconded by Mr. Lander. There was discussion on the motion but no vote was taken.

5. Recess

The meeting was recessed through a motion from Mr. Bass, seconded by Ms. Turley. The discussion tomorrow will begin with the above motion. The meeting recessed at 5:45 p.m.

October 11, 2000

1. Administrative⁵

The meeting opened at 9:00 a.m. mountain time. Ms. Van Pelt opened the meeting and attendees introduced themselves. The antitrust advice given on October 10 stands for this meeting.

2. Continuation of Discussion on Recall Issues

Mr. Novak reworded his motion, which was supported by Mr. Lander:

Recall terms should be agreed to in advance between the releasing and acquiring shippers.

- Where the releasing shipper wishes to recall capacity to be effective for a gas day, releases with an award posting date prior to **[month day, 2001]**, are grand-fathered and the recall notice should be provided to the transportation service provider and the acquiring shipper no later than 8 A.M. Central Clock Time on the nomination day.

For releases with an award posting date on or after **[month day, 2001]**:

- Timely recall notice should be provided to the transportation service provider and the

⁵ Ms. Copeland is transcribing the meeting. For a full accounting of the discussion from today's meeting, the transcripts should be ordered from Ms. Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting, (361-882-9037). These minutes will record the motions and voting results. The discussion is captured in the transcripts.

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

acquiring shipper no later than 9:30 A.M. Central Clock Time on the nomination day such that the releasing shipper may place a timely nomination for the next day's gas flow.

- Evening recall notice can be provided to the transportation service provider and the acquiring shipper no later than 4 P.M. Central Clock Time on the nomination day such that the releasing shipper may place a evening nomination for the next day's gas flow.

Mr. Whatley noted that the following items related, at least partially, to the above motion: G2.4, G2.6, G2.7, G2.9, G2.10, G2.11, G2.14, G2.15, G2.16 and G2.17. He requested that the motion be withdrawn until these items were discussed.

Mr. Novak withdrew his motion. Discussion began with the recall issues.

For the following issues:

G2.1 Is there such a thing as a "partial day recall"?

G2.2 What is meant by the phrase "partial day recall"?

Mr. Lander asked that the term "partial day recall" be eliminated from discussion because it is misleading. It should be a "flow day recall." After discussion, Mr. Whatley provided a definition for "flow day recall," which was amended by Mr. Lander. The definition provided is "recall by the releasing shipper of gas from the acquiring shipper during a gas day for the remainder of the gas day." After a break, Mr. Novak asked that the definition be book-marked as a concept, which was later noted as a working term:

- "Flow Day Recall" is defined as recall of capacity by a releasing shipper of gas from the acquiring shipper during a gas day for the remainder of the gas day.

Several issues were raised on whether the "flow day recall" issue is or is not related to Order 637. Moving forward, Mr. Lander asked that the discussion continue on the mechanics of a "flow day recall." On the mechanics, various points were made with no general consensus.

G2.3: "Is there a difference between normal recall, late recall and flowing recall?", Mr. Lander noted that there should be three recalls as noted in the work papers provided, synchronized with the intraday nominations cycle:

- Timely (normal) recall - provided by 9:30 a.m. the day of the recall,
- Evening (late) recall - provided by 4:00 p.m., and
- Flow day recall - for the remainder of the gas day, and affects the 9:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. period of the day.

Mr. Whatley gave differing opinions that flow day recall should only be defined as the working term above. On further discussion, it was noted that for the mechanics, clear rules will be needed to ensure that the billing and other function administered by pipelines require no interpretations by the pipelines.

For issue G2.4, "Should releasers and acquirers agree in advance to the types of recalls

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

that are in the contract?”, Mr. Lander responded that they should agree in advance to the types of recalls that are in the contract.

After lunch, Mr. Novak expressed his disappointment that the level of urgency in discussion has not been present and progress has not been made as expected.

For issue G2.5, “To what extent should TSP’s be involved in the types of recalls that are in a contract?”, comments were made concerning the TSP position in a contract to which they are not a party. Mr. Lander noted that there should be some involvement. He proposed that on a full day recall (either timely or evening), the extent of TSP involvement would be limited to knowing about it in advance, and knowing that this potential existed. For flow day recall, the TSPs should know about it in advance, and be told by the acquiring and releasing shippers which of them should be billed for that day’s activity. Concern was raised that there may be customized billing agreements between two parties, rather than simply a “bill party A or bill party B” arrangement. Mr. Lander responded that it will only ever be the “bill party A or bill party B” arrangement.

El Paso Natural Gas has specific contractual requirements on MDQ that do not fit into the mechanism discussed. There are other examples where MDQs and over-runs do not fit easily into the recall mechanism discussed, affecting priority of service. Other issues and responses were discussed, including a formulation that necessary recall information is specified in tariffs and Mr. Whatley’s formulation that no additional recall information other than that currently provided is needed.

For issue G2.6, “Should there be a later deadline for recalling recallable capacity?”, Mr. Novak noted that the deadline for timely recalls should be delayed and an evening recall should be added.

For the following issues, the discussion this morning has addressed these items:

- G2.7 Should there be another, later deadline for a different type of recall?
- G2.8 Should there be a GISB Standard established for “partial day recalls”?
- G2.9 Should GISB Standard 5.3.6 be modified to include “partial day recalls” and to modify the existing notice timeline?
- G2.10 Should there be standardized alternative(s) to the existing type of recall?

and further discussion is not needed.

For issue G2.11, “Should previously negotiated releases involving recall be impacted by action taken with respect to new or different types of recalls?”, Mr. Lander noted that GISB should not set standards that affect previous agreements, which was covered in the “grandfathering” language noted yesterday afternoon and this morning.

For issue G2.12, “Should there be limits of any kind on the types of recalls negotiated between releasers and replacement shippers?”, Mr. Novak and Mr. Lander noted that there

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

should be some limits specified.

For the following issues,

- G2.14 Should 5.3.7 be modified to eliminate the prohibition on “partial day recall”?
- G2.15 Should 5.3.7 be modified to permit releasing shippers with recall rights exercise such rights at any time by notifying the TSP?

the issues have already been discussed. For G2.15, Ms. Davis noted her concern with the term “any” rather than “specified.” Mr. Novak clarified that the notification is at “any” specified time to take effect at “any” specified time.

For issue G2.16, “Should 5.3.7 be modified to explicitly allow the recalling shipper to nominate at the next available nomination deadline following recall notification?”, it was noted that until there is agreement on the recall periods, there can not be agreement on specifying which nomination cycles to used.

For issue G2.17, “Should 5.3.7 be reviewed in the light of any changes to the other recall and “reput” standards?”, these changes should be considered if the recall process is modified.

3. Reput Issues

For issue G2.13, “What is meant by “reputting”?”, Mr. Lander offered that “reput” be defined as a return to the acquiring shipper of the recalled capacity under the terms and conditions of the initial release. He further noted that it is done without prejudice to subsequent releases and recalls, and it is done without use of the offer, bid and award procedures. Mr. Novak added that reput should exist with recall. Mr. Scheel added that the practice in existence today does not need altering. Mr. Young asked for simplicity, and noted that the definition should be “the return of recall capacity to the acquiring shipper.” Mr. Whatley added that the definition should be “the return of recalled capacity to the acquiring shipper as originally negotiated without a offer/award process. Reput terms are negotiated as part of the contract.” This definition is the working term for this item.

For issue G2.17, “Should 5.3.7 be reviewed in the light of any changes to the other recall and “reput” standards?”, Mr. Lander noted that the recaller’s option and acquirer’s option as they relate to reputing should be defined. Mr. Whatley added that related standards should be reviewed depending on the decision to change recall processes.

For issue G2.18, “Should the reference to “reputting” be removed from 5.3.7?”, Mr. Lander noted that it should not be removed, and Mr. Whatley agreed.

4. Release Issues

For issue G1.1, “Whether there are reason(s) that replacement shippers (acquiring shippers) should have to wait for a contract on biddable deals.”, Mr. Love noted that same day biddable releasing is a reason for why the replacement shippers should be required to wait for a contract. As a practical matter, Mr. Novak noted that the time should be shortened from the

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

current practice which includes dead time from 5 p.m. to 10 a.m. as specified in GISB Standard No. 5.3.2.⁶

It was observed that the TSP does require some time to generate the contract in its system. The 10 a.m. time was originally noted to allow for nightly batch processing. Mr. Novak noted that the TSP is required via FERC Order No. 637 to provide a contract within one hour to the replacement shipper. Mr. Scheel suggested that the time be moved so that an evening intraday cycle could be met.

For issue G1.4, "Do we want to have bidding this afternoon and nomination for flow at the start of the 9:00 AM gas day tomorrow?", the discussion is more appropriate under bidding.

For issue G1.5, "Do we want to complete a biddable release for nomination at the next nomination cycle.", the discussion is more appropriate under bidding.

For issue G1.6, "Why is bidding important?", the discussion is more appropriate under bidding.

For issue G1.7, "Comparability should be the issue and not whether it is biddable or not.", Mr. Young noted that nominations were permitted at the next cycle. Mr. Lander explained that with the recall process as it is today, there is a comparability issue on scheduling equality. There was a question on scope – Mr. Young observed that these issues should have been filed as comments in the Order 637 process, or should be filed as a request in the GISB process. As a response, Mr. Novak noted that there were no filings at the FERC because LDCs did not expect it was needed.

For issue G1.8, "There are issues with respect to the bidding timelines whenever bidding is required. The two cases where this applies are: deal durations less than one year and more than 31 days as well as where bidding is required due to "rollover(s)". The issue is the length of time between deal consummation, nomination and flow from that nomination when bidding is required.", the discussion is more appropriate under bidding.

For issue G1.9, "Should the GISB definition of short term (less than 5 months) and the FERC definition of Short term (less than 1 year) be reconciled? Or, is it OK to keep the 5 months plus deal duration time line as long as it is not inconsistent with the FERC definition

⁶ 5.3.2 For short-term releases (less than 5 months): Offers should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. on the day before nominations for short-term releases (less than 5 months); open season ends no later than 2 P.M. on the day before nominations are due (evaluation period begins at 2 P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken); evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.; match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.; match response by 4 P.M.; award posting by 5 P.M.; posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid by 9 A.M. the day of nominations; contract tendered with contract # by 10 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

of long term deal duration and associated timeline.”, the discussion is more appropriate under bidding.

For the G1.10 issue, “There is no issue with the under 31 day non-biddable deal time lines, other than the 30 minutes adjustment to posting time and contract tendering time proposed by the LDC’s work paper.”, the discussion is more appropriate under bidding.

For G1.11 issue, “What is meant by Partial Day release?”, Mr. Lander noted that the term “partial day” should be struck. It should be called an intraday release, and he offered the following definition as “a release which corresponds to the ability of the acquiring shipper to nominate on the next available intraday nomination cycle for the first gas day of the release.”

After further discussion, Mr. Lander formulated the following working term for “intra-day release”:

- The releasing shipper should renominate to the extent the intraday release affects previously scheduled transactions. The shipper is responsible for the consequences of the absence of renomination, if any.

There was considerable discussion on this item and no consensus that the term was needed.

5. Bidding Issues

For issue G1.1, “Whether there are reason(s) that replacement shippers (acquiring shippers) should have to wait for a contract on biddable deals.”, this was discussed previously. Mr. Lander noted that without creating existing timelines, the existing timelines can be used to support contractual needs and intraday nomination cycles.

For issue G1.3, “Is there a need to be able to have bidding timelines on all deals of all durations?”, Mr. Novak noted that bidding timelines are needed to support the management of the released capacity of a shipper for day-to-day deals, otherwise they can only participate in the market one day per month. Mr. Lander gave an example and did not support Mr. Novak’s explanation. Ms. Lewis explained why this was needed and explained why Mr. Lander’s explanation was incorrect.

For issue G1.4, “Do we want to have bidding this afternoon and nomination for flow at the start of the 9:00 AM gas day tomorrow?”, no discussion was needed.

For issue G1.5, “Want to complete a biddable release for nomination at the next nomination cycle.”, the issue of contention is the intraday 1 cycle.

For issue G1.6, “Why is bidding important?”, no discussion was needed.

For issue G1.8, “There are issues with respect to the bidding timelines whenever bidding is required. The two cases where this applies are: deal durations less than one year and more than 31 days as well as where bidding is required due to “rollover(s)”. The issue is the length of time between deal consummation, nomination and flow from that nomination when bidding is required.”, the discussion is not needed.

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

For issue G1.9, "Should the GISB definition of short term (less than 5 months) and the FERC definition of Short term (less than 1 year) be reconciled? Or, is it OK to keep the 5 months plus deal duration time line as long as it is not inconsistent with the FERC definition of long term deal duration and associated timeline.", Mr. Novak explained that the inconsistency is with deals of less than 31 days – in particularly day-to-day deals.

For issue G1.10, "Are there any other issues with the under 31 day non-biddable deal time lines, aside from the 30 minutes adjustment to posting time and contract tendering time proposed by the LDC's work paper.", Mr. Novak noted that the objective is to have a contract in place so that an intraday nomination cycle can be made. Mr. Young was unsure of the existence of other issues, and did not agree with the phrase "there is no issue ... other than ..." as this item was originally phrased, so the item was rephrased as shown above. After further review, Mr. Novak noted that there may be no issue with short-term non-biddable deal timelines.

6. Miscellaneous

For issues G1.2 and G2.19, "Should GISB standards conform with Order 637?" and "Should Order 637 guide how we determine these issues?", the discussion was on these issues were combined. Mr. Novak observed that GISB standards should conform to Order 637 and Order 637 should give determination of these issues, but that there are interpretations of Order 637. Mr. Young noted that GISB standards should not necessarily "conform", but they should not "conflict" and should certainly support regulations. He noted that the standards are minimum. Mr. Lander, in reply, noted that GISB standards should improve upon regulations.

7. Adjournment

The BPS will provide an update to the EC at the meeting tomorrow. The update is as follows:

"The BPS developed a list of questions, categorized and discussed each of them, and while the BPS does not yet have a recommendation regarding these discussions, it is feasible to create such a recommendation. It is possible that some of these issues will come into discussion today at the EC and potentially be resolved, such as the items for the Index of Customers. The BPS will schedule another meeting expeditiously to continue discussions and possibly draft language based on these discussions. The absence of recommendations now is not evidence of the inability to reach a consensus – rather that the discussions were lengthy and productive."

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

8. Meeting Attendees and Voting Record

Attendee	Organization	10/10 (nv) -- not voting	10/11 (nv)	GISB Member?
Pipelines:				
Joe Bianchi	ANR		✓	✓
Clancy Aschbrenner	CIG	✓ (nv)	✓ (nv)	✓
Bill Griffith	CIG	✓	✓	✓
Kim Van Pelt	CMS - Panhandle Eastern	✓	✓	✓
Mark Wilke	CMS -- Trunkline	✓	✓	✓
Kathryn Burch	Duke - Texas Eastern	✓	✓	✓
Sally Turley	El Paso Natural Gas	✓	✓	✓
Tammy Hopkins	Enron - FGT	✓	✓	✓
Mary Draemer	Enron - Northern Natural	✓	✓	✓
Theresa Hess	Enron - Transwestern	✓	✓	✓
Randy Young	Koch Gateway	✓	✓	✓
Paul Love (phone 10/10)	NGPL	✓		✓
Prince McDougal	SoNat Gas Pipeline	✓	✓	✓
Charlie Bass	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	✓ (nv)	✓ (nv)	✓
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	✓	✓	✓
Jim Keisler	Williams Gas Pipeline	✓ (nv)	✓ (nv)	✓
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	✓	✓	✓
Services:				
Gina McMahon(phone both days)	BTUWatch.com	✓	✓	✓
Greg Lander	CapacityCenter.com	✓	✓	✓
Pete Whatley	Dynegy Marketing & Trade	✓	✓	✓
Mark Scheel (phone 10/10)	Dynegy Inc.	✓	✓	✓
Gary Payne	Enron North America	✓	✓	✓
Producers:				
No producers attended the meeting, either in person or by phone.				
End Users:				
Bill Hebenstreit	El Paso Merchant Energy	✓	✓	✓
Joel Greene	Arizona Public Service	✓	✓	✓
Diane McVicker	Salt River Project		✓	✓
LDC's:				
Mariam Arnaout	AGA	✓ (nv)	✓ (nv)	
Jane Lewis	AGA	✓	✓	

Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Mike Novak

Audrey Bragg (phone 10/10)

National Fuel Gas Dist.

Washington Gas

✓	✓	✓
✓		✓

GISB:

Rae McQuade

Jane Copeland

GISB

Ak/Ret Reporting

✓ (nv)	✓ (nv)	✓
✓ (nv)	✓ (nv)	

Bold signifies a BPS Chair