



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, Kim Van Pelt, Robert McAnally (absent)
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting

DATE: October 28, 1999

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD

GISB BUSINESS PRACTICES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Teleconference Call: October 28, 1999

FINAL MINUTES

I. Administrative

Mr. Lander chaired the meeting and welcomed the participants. Mr. Lander identified the participants in a roll call, Jim Buccigross will take minutes. The antitrust advice was given. The agenda was modified to postpone the discussion of R98013 from today's meeting to a later meeting. The agenda was then adopted as modified without objection.

The draft minutes of October 21, 1999 were modified in the meeting and the modified minutes were adopted as final.

II. Review of the following Capacity Release Category of Business Practices Subcommittee Requests for **discussion & possible 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 : The discussion began with the language offered by Mr. Lander last week:

The purpose of the "blank" document is to inform the party sending the Withdrawal Upload that either: a) There is an error in the Withdrawal Upload which prevents the withdrawal from being processed; or, b) The withdrawal is technically OK and has been processed.

Mr. Aschbrenner asked for clarification on the specific purpose of the document.

Ms. McCain noted that the intent of the request was to electronically inform the offeror/bidder that the offer or bid was withdrawn.

Ms. Van Pelt asked whether the document was intended to be a validation or a quick response type of document or as a disposition.



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

Mr. Lander explained that the reason for his language was to attempt to separate the implications of the information sent from the purpose of the document and that he did not believe it was different than the request.

Ms. McCain agreed and stated that she was indifferent as to whether the document simply indicated yes or no to the withdrawal, or whether a reason for a "no" answer was included in the document.

Ms. Davis re-stated that her and Mr. Young's issue centered around the difference between the document saying that the withdrawal had been accepted for processing - or - saying that the actual withdrawal had taken place.

Mr. Lander stated that he sensed general agreement on the purpose of the document, that is, to indicate whether there were technical or business reasons which would prevent the withdrawal from taking place. In other words, any business information outside of the go/no-go (i.e., is it withdrawn or not) would be Senders Option. He then suggested that the group concentrate on timing and other issues related to the document.

Mr. Keisler stated his belief that in the case of a no-go that a mandatory reason (error message) for the no-go *should* be sent. In the case of a go situation, a warning message *could* be sent.

Mr. Lander asked the group whether the requirement to send reasons for a no-go would cause issues related to timing and/or support for this request.

Mr. Aschbrenner noted that providing reasons would require an analysis of the withdrawal and would clearly impact the timing for processing.

Ms. Hess noted that like the nomination quick response, if applicable, providing one no-go reason would be mandatory, but the number and level of reasons supplied would not be specified or mandated.

There was further discussion on this concept and there was general agreement.

Mr. Lander then changed the discussion to that of timing of the document. He (with assistance from Mr. Keisler) proposed a 15-minute window to respond to the Withdrawal Upload for a bid. Ms. Hess noted that some pipelines may still do this manually and proposed 30 minutes.

Ms. Van Pelt asked what the usage of the data set would be (i.e., mandatory, mutually agreeable, etc.) Mr. Lander responded that it was his belief that it would be mandatory for TSPs to send this response and for the sender of the withdrawal to receive this response.

Ms. Davis clarified that this meant that other methods (i.e., phone calls) would not be required.

As for Offers, Mr. Lander proposed that response withdrawal of an offer during the open season would be by the earlier of 2 hours or by the end of the evaluation period. Withdrawal of an Offer outside of the open season would be within 2 hours of the Withdrawal Upload.

Ms. Turley noted that there could be an issue on her pipeline where when an Offer is posted the MDQ for the offer is "tied up" on the releasing shipper's contract and cannot be utilized by that



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

shipper until the withdrawal is processed. In addition, there could be a situation whereby a pre-arranged deal could be withdrawn by the releasing shipper up until the point where the bidder confirms his bid (if applicable). In this case, she believes that 2 hours could be excessive.

Mr. Lander noted that if the language was "by 2 hours" she could exceed the standard and send out the document as quickly as her system would permit.

In further discussion, many TSPs noted that they could do this well within the 2-hour timeframe and Ms. Hess proposed a 30 minute time limit on the response to a withdrawal of an offer. There was no stated disagreement.

Action: Mr. Lander asked if there were any other issues regarding the request. He proposed that a work paper be prepared which formalizes the agreements on purpose and timing and puts it into "standard type language." There was general agreement on this approach.

R97011 Submitted by Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation

Request: Duke Energy pipelines *et al* request that the Bidder Company Code be moved to the detail level of the 567 Final Disposition.

Discussion : There were previous questions on Request No. R97111 on what parties get sent the Final Disposition. While the answer to these questions from BPS are relevant to this discussion, they do not answer the instant questions.

Mr. Lander proposed the following: In the case of multiple winning bidders, the Final Disposition document should support and require multiple Bidder Company Codes being sent to the releasing shipper.

In the case of multiple winning bidders, other winning Bidder Company Codes may be sent to a winning bidder, at the option of the TSP.

In this manner, TSPs may create only one document and send it to all applicable parties.

Ms. Hess brought up the issue of contract numbers, and whether, in the case of multiple winning bidders, other winning bidders' contract numbers would be sent. She also identified a potential contradiction in the Final Disposition TIBP as to whether a non-prearranged bidder should receive his contract number in the Final Disposition. (This is due to the conditionality of the contract number in the final disposition.)

Mr. Lander noted that there are 3 potential issues:

- There is no communication of the identity of non-winning, non-prearranged bidders
- There is communication of winning bidders to the Releasing Shipper, and the datasets should accommodate the mandatory sending of this information to the releaser.
- In the case of multiple bids, as to sending other winning bidders identity to other winning bidders, this information may be sent to a winning bidder, at the option of the TSP.
- In the case of non-winning bidders, the TSP has the choice of sending the same document (with all parties identified) to non-winning prearranged bidders.



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

Mr. Aschbrenner noted that EDI transactions would not be sent to EBB users who submit a bid via the EBB. There was general agreement.

Action: The discussion ended at this point as the allotted time had elapsed.

III. Next Meeting and Agenda

The next conference call is scheduled for November 4, 1999. The agenda will be as follows:

For Discussion and possible vote:

R96115 - Texas Eastern

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

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

R97110

R96018

V. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned without objection 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

VI. Meeting Attendees & Voting Record

Name	Company	Email ¹	Vote?
Pipelines:			
Theresa Hess	Enron-Transwestern	thess@enron.com	Yes
Betty Barnum	CMS Panhandle Eastern	babarnum@cmsenergy.com	Yes
Jim Keisler	Williams Gas Pipeline		No
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes
Marcy McCain	Duke Energy		Yes
Sally Turley	El Paso		Yes
Clancy Aschbrenner	CIG		Yes
Kim Van Pelt	CMS Trunkline Gas Co.		Yes
Services:			
Greg Lander	Skipping Stone	glander@skippingstone.com	Yes
Jim Buccigross	National Registry		Yes
End Users:			
Diane McVicker	Salt River Project	dmvicker@srpnet.com	Yes

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.