



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, Robert McAnally (absent)
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting

DATE: December 16, 1999

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD

GISB BUSINESS PRACTICES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Teleconference Call: December 16, 1999

FINAL MINUTES

I. Administrative

Mr. Lander chaired the meeting and welcomed the participants. Mr. Buccigross identified the participants in a roll call and will take minutes. Mr. Lander gave the antitrust advice. The agenda was modified to defer review of the draft minutes of November 4, 1999 as they were only recently posted.

The modified agenda was then adopted without objection.

The draft minutes of December 9, 1999 were modified in the meeting and the modified minutes were adopted as final without objection.

II. Review of the following Capacity Release Category of Business Practices Subcommittee Requests for discussion & possible vote.

Request: R97011 – Texas Eastern

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

Motion: The following motion on this request was made by Mr. Lander at the November 18, 1999 meeting and was deferred to this meeting. Mr. Lander asked Ms. Van Pelt to chair the meeting for this request and she agreed.

As a 5.3.x standard:

There should be no communication of the identity of non-winning, non-prearranged bidders in the OfferUpload Final Disposition.

There should be communication of the identity of winning bidder(s) to the Releasing Shipper in one communication.

In the case of multiple bids upon one offer, the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should have the choice of either sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to the winning bidder(s) identifying all winning bidders, or sending to each winning bidder an Offer Upload Final Disposition identifying only that winning 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

In the case of a non-winning pre-arranged bidder, the TSP should have the choice of either sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to the non-winning pre-arranged bidder identifying all winning bidders and identifying the pre-arranged bidder as a non-winning bidder, or communicating to the non-winning pre-arranged bidder an Offer Upload Final Disposition identifying only the pre-arranged bidder as a non-winning bidder.

As Instructions to IR:

The Offer Upload Final Disposition should accommodate the communication of the identity of winning bidder(s) to the Releasing Shipper in one communication.

Modify the condition of Replacement Shipper Contract Number in the Offer Upload Final Disposition such that the winning bidder's contract number be communicated to that winning bidder. This is not intended to conflict with the ability of a TSP to send the same Offer Upload Final Disposition document to all winning bidders.

Mr. Keisler proposed modifications to the motion and Mr. Lander and Mr. Buccigross accepted the modifications. The motion was modified to the following:

As a 5.3.x standard (as modified):

There should be no communication of the identity of non-winning, non-prearranged bidders in the Offer Upload Final Disposition.

The identity of the winning bidder(s) should be sent to the releasing shipper in the Offer Upload Final Disposition.

In the case of multiple bids upon one offer, the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should have the choice of either sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to the winning bidder(s) identifying all winning bidders, or sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to each winning bidder identifying only that party as a winning bidder

In the case of a non-winning prearranged bidder, the TSP should have the choice of either sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to the non-winning prearranged bidder identifying all winning bidders and identifying the pre-arranged bidder as a non-winning bidder, or sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to the non-winning prearranged bidder identifying only the prearranged bidder as a non-winning bidder.

As Instructions to IR:

The Offer Upload Final Disposition should accommodate the communication of the identity of winning bidder(s) to the Releasing Shipper in one communication.

Modify the condition of Replacement Shipper Contract Number in the Offer Upload Final Disposition such that the winning bidder's contract number be communicated to that winning bidder. This is not intended to conflict with the ability of a TSP to send the same Offer Upload Final Disposition document to all winning 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

Ms. Corcoran asked if a standard was necessary and if the intent of the request could not be accomplished by changes to the Technical Implementation of Business Process (TIBP) document for this dataset.

Mr. Lander stated his reasons for proposing a discrete standard and believed in this case it was better to be explicit and have a standard as opposed to burying a requirement in the TIBP language.

Action: The motion carried unanimously. See voting record for specifics.

III. Review of the following questions from IR for discussion & possible vote:

R98013 – Questions from Information Requirements Subcommittee

Ms. Hess reviewed the workpaper from the Information Requirements Subcommittee regarding this request, which reads in part:

The issue was raised that IR is trying to manipulate code values that do not have a corresponding GISB data element. Therefore, IR recommends the following to the Business Practices Subcommittee:

IR recommends the following revisions to the Measured Volume Audit Statement:

- Delete Static Pressure Indicator.
- Add Unit of Measure data element. (see table below)

Business Name: Unit of Measure

Definition: Specifies the unit or basis for measurement for the corresponding measurement value.

Usage: M

Condition:

IR approved this recommendation by the following sense of the room: 11 In Favor; 0 Opposed

Motion: Mr. Lander made the following motion which Ms. Hess seconded:

As modifications to the Measured Volume Audit Statement:

- Delete Static Pressure Indicator data element
- Add Unit of Measure data element as described below:

Business Name: Unit of Measure

Definition: Specifies the unit or basis for measurement for the corresponding measurement value.

Usage: M

Action: The motion passed unanimously. See voting record for specifics.

IV. Review of the following Capacity Release Category of Business Practices Subcommittee Requests for discussion only:

R98037 Columbia Gas

Mr. Stodola described his request. When multiple offers are packaged together in an Offer Upload, the various offer numbers are contained in a text field which is essentially impossible for a computer to interpret. Therefore the request proposes that these go into a "non-textual" data element.



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

He noted that this same issue exists in the Bid Upload where multiple bids can be tied together and a similar solution should be undertaken here.

Mr. Lander noted that the content of the data elements should be unique per sending party / per TSP, such that the TSP can identify which offers (or bids) are associated by the sending party.

Mr. Keisler asked whether this would replace the data elements Not a Stand Alone Offer Terms and Conditions and Not a Stand Alone Bid Terms and Conditions. Ms. Hess and others noted that this would not replace these data elements, but rather add a data element to tie the various offers (and bids) together.

Ms. Hess asked what the proposed usage of this data element was. Mr. Stodola noted that if the value of the Stand Alone Offer Indicator indicates that other offers are associated with it, then the new data element would then be required. He noted that the overall condition would thus be conditional. A similar situation would exist in the Bid Upload where the Stand Alone Bid Indicator indicates that other bids are associated with that one.

Mr. Lander then asked how people believed this should best be accomplished, purely by a data element, or whether a standard is required. He asked whether there was general agreement that a standard was not required in this case, but rather that this could be accomplished via BPS instructions to Information Requirements. There was general agreement as to this concept.

Mr. Keisler then asked whether this data element needs to be added to the Bid Download and Offer Download. Mr. Stodola indicated that this made sense given that receivers of the data had to determine the same association. There was no objection to adding these datasets to the instructions when drafted.

As this request was up for discussion only, further resolution was deferred to a subsequent meeting.

V. Review of the following question from IR for discussion only:

Shipper Imbalance Questions from Information Requirements Subcommittee
(memo dated 10/10/99)

Mr. Keisler reviewed the work paper from the Information Requirements Subcommittee regarding this request, which reads as follows:

The Information Requirements Subcommittee is in the process of addressing several requests which affect the Shipper Imbalance (2.4.4). IR raised the following issues regarding existing data elements that are used to convey adjustment information:

1. Is the Adjustment Quantity data element needed? How is this data element used? Since the adjusted quantity is shown at the line item level, what goes in this data element?
2. If the Adjustment Quantity is used, does it reflect the difference or the net quantity? And, the difference or net between which two quantities?
3. Additional Adjustment Type code values are needed to specify adjustments made to any of the quantities that are included in the statement.



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

Various requests were involved, Ms. Hess listed the following request numbers R96124, R97020, R98064, R98069, R99005.

Regarding Item 1: Mr. Lander asked who, if anyone, on the call was using the Adjustment Quantity Data Element. Mr. Keisler stated that Williams would not use this data element when sending an adjusted quantity. Mr. Lander asked if there was a distinction between an *adjusted* quantity and an *adjustment* quantity.

Mr. Lander asked if this request could be deferred to the next call until Ms. Barnum or Ms. Van Pelt was available. There was no objection.

VI. Review of the following Capacity Release Category of Business Practices Subcommittee Requests for discussion only:

R97110 TransCapacity
R96018 TransCapacity

These items were deferred to a future meeting.

VII. Review of the following Invoice Category of Business Practices Subcommittee Requests for discussion only:

R99049 Williams
R99051 Williams

R99049: Mr. Keisler described this request.

Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) on behalf of the ANSI Compliance Team requests that the data element Remit to Party be added to the Transportation/Sales Invoice (GISB Std. 3.4.1). In the current Invoice, the Remittance Address data element is used to send both the name and the address for the Remit to Party.

This request is similar to request R98009, which asked that the Remit to Party be added to the Payment Remittance (GISB Std. 3.4.2) and the Statement of Account (GISB Std. 3.4.3). Like the Invoice, those datasets had used the Remittance Address to send both the name and the address for the Remit to Party. . On January 21, 1999 the Executive Committee adopted the recommendation and it is reflected in Version 1.4.

WGP suggests that the definition and usage of the data element Remit to Party conform to the definition and usage used for this data element in the Payment Remittance and the Statement of Account datasets, as follows:

Transportation / Sales Invoice (GISB Std. 3.4.1)

Business Name: Remit to Party*

Abbreviation: Remit to Pty

Definition: Party to which payment of an invoice should be sent.

Data Group: BEDG

EDI / FF Usage: C

Condition: Mandatory when Remittance Address is sent

This item was up for discussion only. There were no objections made to this request.

Mr. Lander asked whether this request could be handled as instructions to IR (as opposed to a standard).



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. Keisler believed it could.

R99051: Mr. Keisler described this request.

Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) on behalf of the ANSI Compliance Team requests that the fields on the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1) whose usage code is Business Conditional (BC) be changed to Sender's Option (SO). A usage code of BC would be appropriate if the presence or absence of these fields was dependent on the business practices of the receiver of the document, but this is not what was envisioned for these fields. The sending of these data elements is determined by the sender of the document. Therefore, the usage code for the following data elements needs to be changed:

Currency
Effective Exchange Date
Electronic Funds Transfer Address
Electronic Funds Transfer Due Date
Exchange Rate
Price Tier
Tax Identification Code

This item was up for discussion only. There were no objections made to this request. Mr. Lander asked whether this request could also be handled as instructions to IR (as opposed to a standard). Mr. Keisler believed this one could be dealt with that way also.

VIII. Next Meeting and Agenda

The next conference call is scheduled for January 6, 2000. The agenda will be as follows:

Review and adopt draft minutes of November 4, 1999 and December 16, 1999.

For discussion and possible vote:

R98037 - Columbia Gas

R99049 - Williams

R99051 - Williams

For discussion only:

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

For discussion only (limited to 1 hour):

R97110 – TransCapacity

R96018 - TransCapacity

For discussion only:

R98085 – Issues from Information Requirements, IR memo 11/29/99

IX. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned without objection at 4:20 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?	R97011	R98013 - IR
Pipelines:					
Betty Barnum	CMS Panhandle Eastern	babarnum@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jim Keisler	Williams Gas Pipeline		No	Yes	Yes
Marcy McCain	Algonquin		Yes	Yes	Yes
Trish Meigs	Texas Eastern		Yes	Yes	Yes
Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway		Yes	Yes	Yes
Kim Van Pelt	CMS Trunkline Gas Co.		Yes	Yes	
Chuck Stodola	Columbia Gas Transmission		Yes	Abstain	Yes
Mike Schisler	NGPL		Yes	Yes	Yes
Theresa Hess	Enron – Transwestern		Yes	Yes	Yes
Services:					
Jim Buccigross	National Registry		Yes	Yes	Yes
Greg Lander	Skipping Stone/TransCapacity		Yes	Yes	Yes
Gary Payne	Enron North America		Yes	Yes	Yes
Cynthia Corcoran	Cynthia Corcoran Attorney At Law		Yes	Yes	Yes
Producers:					
Joyce Phillips	PanCanadian		Yes	Yes	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.