



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 (BPS) Chairs: Greg Lander, Producer Segment Vacancy, Diane McVicker (absent), Kim Van Pelt (absent), Robert McAnally (absent)
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting

DATE: October 21, 1999

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD

GISB BUSINESS PRACTICES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Teleconference Call: October 14, 1999

FINAL MINUTES

I. Administrative

Mr. Lander chaired the meeting and welcomed the participants. Mr. Lander identified the participants in a roll call and will take minutes. The antitrust advice was given. The revised agenda was adopted. The draft minutes of October 7, 1999 were modified in the meeting and the modified minutes were adopted as final.

II. Invoicing Related request handled as a high priority matter per the Executive Committee (9/16/99 Mtg.)

R99047 Submitted by Williams Gas Pipeline

Request: Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) requests that a means of sending the data element Accounting Period be provided in the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1). Currently, this data element is sent in several other GISB documents, such as the Pre-Determined Allocation, Allocation, Shipper Imbalance and Measurement Information. However, it is not currently in the Invoice. This data element is defined as "The month and year the information was recorded," and WGP believes that this definition is adequate for the Invoice. WGP would like this data element to be added to the Invoice Data Dictionary as a Mandatory data element. When this request is satisfied, the Transportation/Sales Invoice will accommodate sending the Accounting Period, and thereby be able to represent the invoice in EDI as it is used in the industry.

Discussion: Dale Davis provided an example of how the dates in an "Accounting Period" data element would/could be different from the date in an "invoice prepared date" data element or in the beginning / ending transaction date data element. She gave a two-part example. The first part would be the initial communication with respect to a transaction in the invoice as follows:

Beginning / Ending Transaction Date	= 9/1/99 - 9/30/99
Invoice prepared date	= 10/10/99
Accounting Period	= 9/99



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

Then part two, the TSP determines in December that more flowed in Sept. than originally billed. Thus, the subsequent communication with respect to the transaction would be like what follows:

Beginning / Ending Transaction Date = 9/1/99 - 9/30/99
Invoice prepared date = 1/10/2000
Accounting Period = 12/99

Discussion continued. Noreen Griffith of CNGT stated that they book things like Dale's example and would find it more useful for accounting period to be there. Bill Griffith of CIG asked, "Why not use Previous Invoice Identifier?" Ms. Davis answered that such could work for revised invoices but not for the above example. Mr. Griffith stated that he felt it was an internal piece of information that might help some but he does not want it as a mandatory data element. Ms. Davis then asked if there would be objection to making it an SO (Sender's Option) data element. Mr. Griffith stated that doing so would alleviate 99% of his concerns. Theresa Hess of Enron stated that she agreed with Bill that the accounting period is internal information and that Enron does not feel it is necessary to send it on the invoice. She does not object to adding it as an SO data because doing so would not make it mandatory on the TSP sending the Invoice.

MOTION: (Dale Davis moving with Sally Turley of El Paso seconding)

"BPS instructs the Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a sender's option data element 'Accounting Period' to be provided in the Transportation/Sales Invoice (GISB Std. 3.4.1) so that a transaction may be identified as to the accounting period that the provided information was recorded in the books of the sender."

Vote: passed unanimously (see appendix for actual vote)

R96115 Submitted by Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation

Request: Texas Eastern Transmission requests that a Withdrawal Quick Response document be created to respond to Uploads of Offer Withdrawal and Bid Withdrawal documents.

Discussion : Mr. JR Thompson of Texas Eastern (TETCO) explained the request. He said that it was intended for the Withdrawal Quick Response (WQR) to function like the nominations quick response does. It would be for when a customer uploads to the TSP a withdrawal of an offer or bid, and the TSP responds with a quick response that they got it and it was processed all right, or that it had problems with it. In the case of problems, there would be a need for error /warning codes to tell the uploading party what was wrong when they sent their data in. Mr. Lander asked if it was proposed as a mandatory business process. Mr. Thompson thought it should be mandatory to use this data set in response to an uploaded withdrawal document. Julie Unruh asked if the document would essentially say to the uploading party yes we got it and no problem, or we got it but there were problems? Mr. Thompson said, he wanted there to be errors and warnings on the data elements. Mr. Lander asked if the errors / warnings are on the technical or on the business side? As an example he cited the Nom QR and in it, the only mandatory error in the Nom QR that has to be sent is that the nom is for a period beyond the contract. The Nom QR does not require you to say what other errors might be in the nomination. He said that the only requirement was that the errors sent be accurate and "truthful" but that there was not requirement to have a process that generated any particular error



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

validation. Of course there is on-line versus EDI comparability but there is no GISB standard that says a particular level or extent of validation is required.

Mr. Lander went on to suggest that we (BPS) can require a particular level of validation like “Yes it was processed and the item withdrawn”, or “No there was an error and it was not processed”. This minimal messaging could be required plus, the IR could provide the numerous codes so that they be available to assist the uploading party regarding what is wrong. Or, BPS could go further and require specific checking and associated error messaging be supported. Mr. Griffith stated that maybe this is more of a Withdrawal Response and have more info as to what happened within the document versus a QR that says yes or no I got it and it is processable. Ms. Hess stated that it seems more like a confirmation that the withdrawal occurred and not a QR saying I got your request and I will process it. It was suggested that the new document could be named Confirmation of Withdrawal.

Mr. Lander then asked, what about the time frame for this document, whatever we call it? Discussion reviewed the various withdrawal time lines and rules regarding what could be withdrawn when. For the Offer it could be withdrawn prior to the end of the open season only and only if there had not yet been a valid bid meeting the minimum criteria. For Bids, it was anytime prior to the end of the Open Season. Mr. Aschbrenner noted that there would/could be two different processing requirements for an Offer withdrawal and a Bid withdrawal. One, the offer, would require a more extensive checking than the other, the bid. With the bid for instance it is sufficient to check and determine if the withdrawal was in before the end of the open season. He could also see a need to process the bid withdrawal faster because there are many situations in the industry where the bidder must withdraw an old bid before putting in a new one. At the same time, he was concerned about creating new time windows. Mr. Lander summarized by saying that the withdrawal of an offer may have more validation than the withdrawal of the bid and responding to the offer withdrawal is also less time sensitive versus responding to the Bid withdrawal. In addition, the bid withdrawal has less data to check and is more time sensitive -- due to the desire of a bidder to possibly withdraw one bid so they can submit another bid as a replacement. In preparation for the next meeting, Mr. Lander framed the following questions for people to review and return with thoughts on.

QUESTIONS:

- Would there be an objection to a requirement that a bid withdrawal be responded to within 15 minutes of receipt of the upload requesting withdrawal?
- Would there be objection to a requirement that an Upload of Offer Withdrawal received during the Open Season be responded to by the end of the 1 hour post-open season evaluation period?
- Would there be objection to a requirement that an Upload of Offer Withdrawal received outside of the Open Season (1:00 PM to 2:00 PM) time period be responded to within 2 hours?
- If we go with these ideas, do we still need to have the same “after-hours-down-for-maintenance” processing exception here that we have for the nominations etc.?

Discussion moved to the next request on the agenda.



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

R97003A

Submitted by Enron

Ms. Hess explained that this issue (i.e., the "A" designation) arose when BPS addressed the original request. At that time it reserved determination as to whether the UPPD number should be unique. The UPPD has been changed to Offer Upload and the UPPD number has been changed to an Offer Tracking Identifier. It is not like the nom tracking id that have multiple noms in one file and they have to be unique. In the Offer Upload, it is one per document. Ms. Hess stated that she felt that the tracking id in the Offer does not need to be unique. When the upload is received by the TSP it is, at that time, attached to the unique offer number and the tracking id (from the TSP's point of view) is lost from that point forward and the uniqueness resides on the offer number and that is the number that is carried forward throughout the other documents. Based upon that Enron stated that they wished to withdraw this request. Mr. Lander wanted to research the TIBP with respect to instructions regarding this identifier. Is it recommended that the identifier be unique? The sender is the one who sends the number. If the language in the TIBP does not say that the number has to be unique, Mr. Lander wants to check with his people to see if there is an implementation problem for the receiver (the TSP) if this identifier is not unique. If there is, then Mr. Lander wants to adopt the request so that language can be added to the TIBP recommending to the sender of the Offer Upload that they make the identifiers unique. Ms. Hess agreed to hold off on withdrawal of the request until the next BPS meeting to allow Mr. Lander time to check with his people.

Discussion then passed to the next request.

R97011

Submitted by Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation

Request:

PanEnergy Corp pipelines (Algonquin Gas Transmission, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, and Trunkline Gas Company) request that the Bidder Company Code be moved to the detail level of the 567 Final Disposition.

Discussion:

How to handle multiple awards in the Final disposition document. The request was explained by JR Thompson. Mr. Lander asked wasn't the issue of who gets the final disposition in IR and it got back to BPS with a question, BPS answered the question and this is done with? Ms. Hess offered that there were issues sent to BPS back in 8/97. She read from the notes (for the exact words from the IR memo 8/29/99 see the posting under the BPS calendar.) As she identified it the primary issue was:

Under what circumstances is the identity of the winning bidder (including, if applicable, multiple winning bidders) identified on Final Disposition documents sent to the various parties (other bidders both winners and non-winners and the releaser parties? In short, what parties receive what information via the Final Disposition?

The Sub Issues were:

A) If the pre-arranged bidder is subsequently out bid, is the new winning bidder identified in the Final Disposition sent to the releasing shipper? In the same situation, is the new winning bidder identified in the Final Disposition sent to the pre-arranged bidder?



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

B) In the case where there are multiple winning bids, are all winning bidders identified in the Final Disposition sent to the releasing shipper? In the same situation, are any or all winning bidders identified in the Final Disposition sent to the pre-arranged bidder?;

C) Is a Final Disposition sent to a replacement shipper who was not the pre-arranged bidder? and, lastly,

D) What information is conveyed to whom in the event of multiple winning bids?

III. Next week's agenda:

The next conference call is scheduled for October 21, 1999. The agenda will be as follows:

For Discussion and possible vote:

R96115 - Texas Eastern

R97003A - Enron

R97011 - Texas Eastern

R98013 – Question from IR memo 10/10/99

R98042 – Question from IR memo 10/10/99

For Possible Discussion:

R98037 - Columbia Gas

~~**R97001A**~~ - was determined earlier that this in ISC – will be stricken from future agendas

Shipper Imbalance – Questions from IR memo 10/10/99

R97110

R96018

V. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned without objection at 4:35 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

VI. Meeting Attendees & Voting Record

Name	Company	Email ¹	Vote?	R97047
Pipelines:				
Theresa Hess	Enron-Transwestern	thess@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Betty Barnum	CMS Panhandle Eastern	babarnum@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Bill Griffith	CIG	bill.griffith@coastalcorp.com	No	
Clancy Aschbrenner	CIG	clancy.aschbrenner@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes	Yes
Noreen Griffith	CNG Transmission		Yes	Yes
Salley Turley	El Paso		Yes	Yes
Mark Gracey	Tennessee		Yes	Yes
Mary Dramer	Enron – Northern Natural		Yes	Yes
Julie Unruh	Koch		Yes	Yes
Fred Cumminger	Texas Eastern		No	
JR Thompson	Texas Eastern		Yes	Yes
Services:				
Greg Lander	Skipping Stone	glander@skippingstone.com	Yes	Yes
GISB Office:				

¹ 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.