



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925

HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, EMAIL - gisb@aol.com

FEBRUARY 28, 1997

TO: GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS, POSTING ON THE GISB HOME PAGE

FROM: RAE MCQUADE

RE: COMMENTARY ON THE PROPOSED STANDARDS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR VOTE ON MARCH 5 AND 6, 1997

The industry comment period for the following twenty-two recommended actions on requests for modifications to existing standards or creation of new standards concluded on February 28. The Executive Committee will be asked to vote on these proposed standards on March 5 and March 6. The GISB office received three sets of comments on these proposed standards:

- Koch Gateway, abbreviated KOCH
- Natural Gas Pipe Line, abbreviated NGPL
- TransCapacity, abbreviated TCAP

plus the office has had indications that the Technical Task Force will be filing comments late. As such they are not included in this commentary, but will be posted when they are received.

The comments in their entirety are posted on the GISB home page. The attached commentary is a summary of the comments received and a summary of the proposed standard as drafted by the assigned task force. The proposed standards are changes to existing data sets either to add new data elements, change the usage codes of data elements, or add additional code values to data elements.

For further information, the original request for a standard and the proposed standard as drafted by the appropriate task force (noted as recommendation) can be downloaded from the home page in the "Request for Standards" area. Please call the GISB office if you need further information or have difficulty retrieving this information.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

R96050      Modify the Upload of a Pre-Arranged Deal, Offer Download, and Invoicing Transactions to include a new data element - rate basis indicator

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Market Settlement Task Force reviewed Northern Border's request with modifications requested by Sponsor, Theresa Hess. Northern Border's rate is per 100 dekatherm miles for all services. For shorthauls and/or small quantities using a quantity per 100 dekatherm miles results in quantities less than 1 dekatherm. Technical recommended to the chairs of Market Settlement that we implement the above request by using a qualifier that was previously defaulted instead of adding a data element of Unit Price Basis Code, and the chairs agreed.

Add new code to "Quantity Qualifier" of "dekatherm mile".

Sense of the Room Results:    15 support    0 opposed

Add new data element "Unit Price Basis Code", usage is "BC" and the code is "per 100 dekatherm miles".

Sense of the Room Results:    9 support    6 opposed

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends decline.

As modified by the Market Initiation Task Force - Capacity Release, the recommendation now requests the addition of a new code value named 100 Thermal (Dth) Basis to the existing Measurement Basis data element. This change would apply to the UPPD, Offer, Bid, Award, Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity, and Replacement Capacity datasets. TransCapacity believes that this code represents another "one-off" approach to capacity release rate structures and does not represent a standardized approach to rate codes for releases. TransCapacity believes that this issue should ultimately be decided by the BPS as it represents a business practice issue. Therefore, TransCapacity would recommend that this request be transferred to the BPS for discussion of a standardized implementation. TransCapacity notes that while the rate may be composed of pennies per Dth of capacity per hundred miles of distance or two Dths for fifty miles or one hundred Dths for one mile, that in the end the capacity offered and traded (awarded) can be stated in dollars and cents per day (usage or reservation at one hundred percent load factor) or per reservation month (reservation) for the capacity so traded. Parties not knowing or caring about the distance between the receipt and delivery points cannot compare a cents per hundred Dth miles to a rate per Dth for the entire deal. The only reason the rate per one hundred Dth miles matters is that when the release is at or near the max. rate, there may be a need for an apples to apples comparison. Even in this instance, the pipeline and not any of the other parties to the transaction is the only party needing to know if the rate is in excess of the FERC determined max. rate.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

Finally, standard ----- requires that a one hundred percent load factor restatement of rates be undertaken for all pipelines' services. TransCapacity believes that it is preferable that Northern Border do this change now instead of others having to change for a short period to accommodate a non-standard business practice which will be mooted by the application of the one-hundred percent load factor restatement of rates.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96074 Modify the capacity release related transactions to add notice types

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Notices in the Capacity Release Related Standards book. The two types being requested are "Capacity Discount" and "Market Affiliates". These two Notice types would be used to better clarify the types of notices that can occur in the System-wide Notices transaction. The Market Initiation Task Force voted separately on the two requested notice types. The "Capacity Discount" code is a recommended addition, but is not required to be supported by all transportation service providers. The task force does not recommend the addition of the requested "Market Affiliates" Notice Type code at this time - EDM is in the process of making recommendations for this item, which is required to be available through the Internet.

Sense of the Room: "Capacity Discount" 6 In Favor; 2 Opposed  
"Market Affiliates" 2 In Favor, 7 Opposed

### System-Wide Notices

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Notice Type	M	1	Critical Period
		2	System or segment maintenance
		3	Curtailment
		4	System-wide or segment-wide operational flow order
		5	Force majeure
		6	Other
		74a	Capacity discount
		74b	Market affiliate report

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends accept.

This request proposes to add Capacity Discount and Market Affiliate Report to the Notice Type data element in the System Wide Notices dataset. TransCapacity notes that under GISB Standard No. 4.3.6 these notice types will be required on a Transportation Service Provider's HTML page beginning August 1, 1997. This recommendation proposes addition of these types to the EDI implementation guides for X12 transactions. TransCapacity supports this request and further suggests that standard language be adopted to implement this method of communication of these reports on all transportation service providers.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96075      Modify the capacity release related transactions to add an additional data element - indemnification clauses

**PROPOSED STANDARD:**

Request for addition of new data element "Indemnification Clause" to the Capacity Release Standards book. The data element would be used to provide the text that describes any and all indemnification provisions necessary when posting an offer. The data element is necessary to comply with Columbia's tariff and, at this time, can only be viewed using the EBB. Usage would be MA in the UPPD, C in the UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm, and SO in the Offer.

Sense of the Room Results:    6 In Favor;    2 Opposed

**UPPD**

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Indemnification Clause	A description specifying the releasing shipper's indemnification clause.	MA	

**UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm**

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Indemnification Clause	A description specifying the releasing shipper's indemnification clause.	C	Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the UPPD and when provided in the UPPD to which this document pertains.

**Offer**

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Indemnification Clause	A description specifying the releasing shipper's indemnification clause.	SO	

**COMMENTS:**

**KOCH:** Koch asks that the GISB Executive Committee clarify in their recommendation that the term "Offer" as used in the request, applies to the GISB Firm Transportation and Storage Offer Download dataset, not to any Offer transaction that might be uploaded via the UPPD dataset, which supports both offers and pre-arranged bids. This clarification is necessary to assure that the usage condition of SO is applicable only to the Firm Transportation and Storage Offer Download dataset not to the UPPD (the usage for the UPPD is MA).

**TCAP:** TransCapacity recommends accept.

The data element as proposed is mutually agreeable (MA) in the UPPD (and conditional in the UPPD Notification) so it would not impact those trading partners who do not choose to send indemnification clause information to those who are required to support it the ability of releasers to craft indemnification clauses. Nevertheless, TransCapacity believes that it may impact Transportation Service Provider's other than the requester, so that a standardized



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

implementation is to the benefit of all participants. As a receiver of downloaded capacity release documents, TransCapacity has no objection to it being treated as a Sender's Option (SO) data element in the Offer download.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96076 Modify the upload of pre-arranged deals transaction to add new status codes

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Provide UPPD Status Codes in the UPPD Validation for non-biddable prearranged deals on Transportation Service Providers (TSP) that do not require replacement shipper confirmation and have not awarded the capacity.

Sense of the Room Results: 8 In Favor, 0 Opposed

#### UPPD Validation

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
UPPD Status	M	76a	Request passed edits, UPPD accepted, No Confirmation Required, Award Pending
		76b	Request passed edits, UPPD accepted (with Warnings), No confirmation Required, Award Pending

Values 1 through 9 with corresponding descriptions exist in the UPPD Validation dataset.

### COMMENTS:

KOCH: Koch supports and also has need for the new UPPD status code requested. The new code provides for accepting a prearranged deal, but allows leaving the status as "pending" until we can verify the deal with the prearranged party.

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends accept.

Precisely, this recommendation proposes adding codes to the UPPD Validation document for non-biddable pre-arranged deals which indicates that the UPPD has been accepted, and will be awarded. The point is to allow the validation to be sent back in a timely manner with the final disposition document to follow. This implementation will allow uploaders of this information to have a quicker response time and surety of result, without having to potentially wait up to one hour for the notification of award. TransCapacity supports this request with the caveat that it does not in any way change the requirements for non-biddable pre-arranged deals that the contract with contract number be issued by 10 AM. (See GISB Standard No. 5.3.2.)



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96082

Modify the capacity release offer review, award notice, upload of pre-arranged deals and upload of pre-arranged deals request to confirm transactions to add rate identification code and a conforming change to upload of pre-arranged deals surcharge identification codes

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Add an additional "surcharge identification code" of "capacity" to the Capacity Release Offer, Bid Review, Award Notice, UPPD, UPPD Validation and UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm transaction sets. The new code will be used by firm storage customers releasing capacity to identify the rate as a "capacity" rate.

Applicable Documents: Offer, Bid Review, Award Notice, UPPD, UPPD Validation, UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm

Sense of the Room Results: 8 In Favor, 0 Opposed

#### Offer

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		CAP	Capacity

#### Bid Review

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		CAP	Capacity

### Award Notice

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		CAP	Capacity

### UPPD

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment

Prepared February 28, 1997



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

		CAP	Capacity
--	--	-----	----------

### UPPD Validation

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		CAP	Capacity

### UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		CAP	Capacity

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends decline.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

TransCapacity disagrees with the entire spate of separate surcharge identification codes. Sending these codes separately requires the receiver of the document to total up all transportation charges plus surcharges to come up with a total number. In the cases where bidding is involved, these surcharges are not only stated separately but are separately biddable. This would be akin to stating rates as made up - on a per unit of capacity basis - of O&M, Taxes, Depreciation, Profit, Amortization, interest on debt, and so forth. We don't do it with rates, why should it be done with surcharges. It makes much more sense to simply state a total price for the capacity where possible. TransCapacity recommends the following as an acceptable substitute: "All capacity Release business practices with respect to rates, charges and surcharges, should be accommodated through one or more of the following manners: 1) total demand - service, 2) total usage - service, 3) total surcharge - contract, 4) total demand - surcharges, and 5) total usage - surcharges. And the individual components of the charges that make up 'surcharges', or that make up rates should not be individually communicated as a part of the standardized EDI datasets."

To this end TransCapacity proposes a true standardization of this business practice by the following modification to GISB Standard No. 5.3.27. Plus, TransCapacity recommends the following change to Standard 5.3.27 as a true standardization of this business practice: 5.3.27 For purposes of bidding and awarding, maximum/minimum rates specified by the releasing shipper should include 1) the tariff reservation rate for the capacity subject to the bidding and awarding; and 2) the total of all applicable demand surcharges assessed at the contract level subject to the bidding and awarding and, 3) the total of applicable surcharges assessed on a per unit of usage basis which would be subject to the bidding and awarding of the released capacity. , as a total number of as stated separately. This modification would solve the issues surrounding surcharges and negate any need for this and other proposed changes related to surcharge identification codes.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96086

Modify the capacity release transactions to add surcharge identification codes

**PROPOSED STANDARD:**

Add an additional "surcharge identification code" of "MARQ" to support 1) Maximum Appalachian Receipt Quantity (MARQ) and 2) Capacity (for Storage) to the Capacity Release Offer, Bid Review, Award Notice, UPPD, UPPD Validation and UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm transaction sets. The new code will be used to differentiate MARQ quantities as opposed to MDQ quantities on offers.

See Market Initiation Task Force recommendation for "capacity" in Request #R96082.

Sense of the Room Results: 10 In Favor, 0 Opposed

**Offer**

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		MARQ	Maximum Appalachian Receipt Quantity

**Bid Review**

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation

Prepared February 28, 1997



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		MARQ	Maximum Appalachian Receipt Quantity

### Award Notice

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		MARQ	<i>Maximum Appalachian Receipt Quantity</i>

### UPPD

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		MARQ	Maximum Appalachian Receipt Quantity



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

### UPPD Validation

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		MARQ	Maximum Appalachian Receipt Quantity

### UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Surcharge Identification Code	BC	DEM	Demand
		CTS	Contract Adjustment
		GSD	GSD Demand
		RCA	Reservation Charge Adjustment
		GRI	GRI Demand
		GRIL	GRI Demand - Low Load
		GRIH	GRI Demand - High Load
		GRL	GRI load factor low
		GRH	GRI load factor high
		RES	Reservation
		REV	Reservation volumetric
		REB	Reservation balancing
		ACA	Annual Charge Adjustment
		MARQ	Maximum Appalachian Receipt Quantity

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends refer this request for MARQ and Columbia's request for Associated Contract to BPS for one solution to both, the same way we handled the two of them in the nominations dataset.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

See comments above on R96082. Based on its review of the request, TransCapacity believes that MARQ represents a separate chargeable rate under a separate contract and not a surcharge. If so, then an applicable "Associated Contract" type approach should be adopted. (Note this is not contradictory to our comments in R96086 where the point was our objection to a list of separately stated surcharge identification codes.)



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96088 Add new code values for Service Code to the Transportation / Sales Invoice

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

The Market Settlement Task Force recommends approval of the four requested service codes. The four service codes are commonly used throughout the industry. The members of the Market Settlement Committee reviewed the request and agreed that these services codes are needed to provide customers adequate information about the services being invoice.

Applicable Documents: Invoicing data sets - Data Set 3.4.x

Sense of the Room Results: 17 support ; 0 Opposed - October 17, 1996 Meeting

Data Element	Usage	Code Name	Code	Code Value Description
Service Code	M	Operational Balancing	OB	An agreement between the service provider and a service requester or between two interconnecting service providers used to establish rules for treatment of differences between actual and scheduled quantities.
		Imbalance Settlement	IB	An agreement under which a service requester would reconcile and settle an imbalance.
		Parking and Lending	PK	A service that provides a service requester flexibility in balancing their receipt and/or deliveries.
		No Notice Service Small Customers	SN	A delivery service that can be used to provide traditionally small service requesters a supply of gas without prior notice.

### COMMENTS:

KOCH: Koch wants to re-emphasize that the Service Code requested for Park and Loan is still needed, despite the fact that transaction codes were approved last month for Park, Park Withdrawal, Loan, and Loan Withdrawal. The Service Code is needed in addition to the transaction types because it is Service Code, and not Transaction Type, that is used to describe the charges on the GISB Invoice document. Transaction Type is not currently included in the Invoice Data Dictionary.

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends accept.

TransCapacity has no specific objection to this request, however it suggests the following: As part of the agreed future review of code values (error codes, warning codes, transaction types, etc.) that the list of Service Codes on the be added to this review. In this case, these lists will hopefully not continue to grow and a higher degree of standardization can be achieved.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96089      Add Replacement Shipper Contract Number to UPPD and UPPD-Notify and Request to Confirm

**PROPOSED STANDARD:**

Add a data element to the UPPD and UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm documents called "Replacement Shipper Contract Number." Data element would be mutually agreeable (MA) in the UPPD document, conditional in the UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm document. This data element currently exists in the UPPD Final Disposition document.

Some Transportation Service Provider's tariffs allow replacement shipper's to "stack" capacity acquired on their existing contract. If this is the case, this data element in the UPPD and UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm, would allow this replacement shipper contract number to be specified. To allow for flexibility of implementation, the Market Initiation Task Force requests implementation at the detail level of these documents.

Sense of the Room Results:      10   In Favor;      0   Opposed

**UPPD**

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Replacement Shipper Contract Number	A unique identifier assigned by each transportation service provider identifying the replacement contract assigned to the replacement shipper for the awarded released capacity.	MA	

**UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm**

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Replacement Shipper Contract Number	A unique identifier assigned by each transportation service provider identifying the replacement contract assigned to the replacement shipper for the awarded released capacity.	C	Mandatory when contained in the UPPD this document pertains to.

**COMMENTS:**

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends accept.

TransCapacity has no specific objection to this request. However, it feels this recommendation represents another "one-off" type of fix to the capacity release documents. If "stacking" of capacity is desirable and adds value to released capacity, TransCapacity suggests that the business practice of allowing an acquiring shipper to add capacity to their contract be considered for standardization at the BPS level.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96090      Add a business conditional indicator to the UPPD and UPPD-Notify and Request to Confirm to allow releasing shippers to release their right to change points

**PROPOSED STANDARD:**

Add a data element to the UPPD, UPPD Validation, and Capacity Release Offer documents called "Change Points Indicator." Data element would be mutually agreeable (MA) in the UPPD document, conditional in the UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm document, and sender's option (SO) in the Capacity Release Offer document.

Some Transportation Service Provider's tariffs allow a releasing shipper to also release the right to the replacement shipper to change the gas transaction points of the release. This indicator would communicate in the UPPD, UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm, and Capacity Release Offer documents whether the right to change points is contained in the release or not.

Sense of the Room Results:      6   In Favor;      1   Opposed

**UPPD**

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Change Points Indicator	An indicator which tells whether the Releasing Shipper is releasing the right to the Replacement Shipper to change the specified gas transaction points of the release	MA	

**UPPD Notify and Request to Confirm**

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Change Points Indicator	An indicator which tells whether the Releasing Shipper is releasing the right to the Replacement Shipper to change the specified gas transaction points of the release	C	Mandatory when contained in the UPPD this document pertains to.

**Capacity Release Offer**

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Change Points Indicator	An indicator which tells whether the Releasing Shipper is releasing the right to the Replacement Shipper to change the specified gas transaction points of the release	SO	

**COMMENTS:**

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends decline or, refer to BPS for further work.

TransCapacity believes that the right to "change points" is inherent in any release of capacity under FERC regulations and questions the need for this indicator. In addition it asks what effect of the absence of this indicator would



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

have? (A pertinent question as this indicator does not currently exist in the capacity release datasets.) If this indicator represents something different than the explanation above, then TransCapacity requires additional information regarding this request. If it in fact does represent the right as stated above, we feel there is no need for this indicator as the right exists in all releases.

KOCH: Koch asks that the GISB Executive Committee clarify in their recommendation that the term "Offer" as used in the request, applies to the GISB Firm Transportation and Storage Offer Download dataset, not to any Offer transaction that might be uploaded via the UPPD dataset, which supports both offers and pre-arranged bids. This clarification is necessary to assure that the usage condition of SO is applicable only to the Firm Transportation and Storage Offer Download dataset, not to the UPPD (the usage for the UPPD is MA).



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96091 Add a Return Addressee company code to the Notes / Special Instructions document for UPPD purposes

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Add a conditional data element, Releaser Company Code, to 864 Notes documents associated with Upload of Pre-arranged Deal's. This information, combined with the existing UPPD Number, will allow specific identification of Notes documents with the applicable UPPD document. The condition would be applicable to all Notes documents associated with a UPPD document.

Without this information, it could be difficult, and in some cases not possible, to coordinate Notes documents associated with Upload of Pre-arranged Deal's to the relevant UPPD document.

Note that this implementation recommendation is a change to the original request where Return Addressee was requested. Requester agreed with the modification to include Releaser Company Code rather than Return Addressee in the Notes documents.

Sense of the Room Results: 8 In Favor; 1 Opposed

### Notes

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Releaser Company Code *	The legal entity which signed the contract with the transportation service provider	C	Mandatory when the Notes document is associated with a UPPD document

\* Indicates Common Code

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends accept.

This request, as modified by the Market Initiation Task Force's recommendation, now proposes adding the Releaser Company Code to the Notes / Special Instructions documents accompanying a UPPD. The ultimate purpose is the same however, it allows the matching of specific 864 documents to the UPPD document they are associated with. TransCapacity has no objection to this recommendation. It should be noted however, that this "matching up problem" has existed for receivers of information since the inception of the capacity release datasets, and it was a problem which TransCapacity solved. This represents something of a "shoe on the other foot" issue now that the sending and receiving roles are reversed. Nonetheless, in the interests of clear and unambiguous communication, TransCapacity wholeheartedly supports this request.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

R96093      Modify the Notes/Special Instruction document to remove the Gas Transaction Point

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Request asked that Gas Transaction Point data element be removed from capacity release related Notes documents as a mandatory data element as in many instances it would not be applicable in this document.

Review of implementation documentation by the group determined that this was not a mandatory data element, but rather a Sender's Option data element, and as such did not present any problems. No change to current data dictionary is necessary.

Request was voluntarily withdrawn by the requester, no further action is needed.

Sense of the Room Results:    \_\_\_ In Favor;    \_\_\_ Opposed

No vote taken, request was withdrawn by the requester after explanation.

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: As this request was withdrawn by the requester and no change was necessary, it should be terminated.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

R96094      Add the Surcharge Identification Code values from the UPPD to the UPPD - Validation document's Surcharge Identification Code element values

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Clarification and correction request only. The Surcharge Identification Tables were different in the "EDISIM" documents for the UPPD and UPPD Validation documents. They should be the same.

This correction was already noted by the Technical Task Force, and they have undertaken to correct the EDISIM documentation. Market Initiation Task Force agreed with the correction and the sense of the room was taken to validate this correction. No specific action is needed on this request, correction will be made pursuant to another request.

Sense of the Room Results:   7   In Favor;   0   Opposed

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends decline.

There are numerous proposed changes brought about by the introduction of this one field, (Surcharge Identification Code) including a request (now withdrawn -- but which may re-appear) to change the entire structure of the EDI rate and charge communication method (replace the SAC segment with another segment that could hold more than 25 separate "rates" and rate codes) to accommodate the proliferation of "surcharge codes" which were first introduced into the capacity release process as part of the UPPD last June.

As noted in our comments to R96082 however, TransCapacity repeats its objection to the separate itemization of surcharges and believes this practice should be eliminated by standardizing that all stated rates in the capacity release documents be stated as total demand, total usage, total surcharge contract, total demand surcharge, and total usage surcharge but that the individual components of the "surcharges, or the rates not be a part of the standardized EDI datasets.

As previously proposed, TransCapacity recommends the following modification to GISB Standard No. 5.3.27: 5.3.27 For purposes of bidding and awarding, maximum/minimum rates specified by the releasing shipper should include 1) the tariff reservation rate for the capacity subject to the bidding and awarding; and 2) the total of all applicable demand surcharges assessed at the contract level subject to the bidding and awarding and, 3) the total of applicable surcharges assessed on a per unit of usage basis which would be subject to the bidding and awarding of the released capacity., as a total number of as stated separately. This modification, in addition to solving R96082 would eliminate the need for this request/recommendation also.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R96099      Modify the UPPD Validation to include location information for error conditions

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Reclassify the use of a current mandatory ANSI data element and add a data element to the UPPD Validation data dictionary. This mandatory data element, "UPPD Level Error/Warning ID" would be used in the UPPD Validation document to identify which level (PO1 loop) any errors or warnings were encountered in the original UPPD.

UPPD documents can contain multiple loops of data. This change would allow specific identification of detail errors and warnings in the validation document by returning the assigned PO1 line identification number(s) of the loop(s) containing errors or warnings. This data element is currently ANSI mandatory, this change would only mandate what information would be contained in the data element.

The request was modified by the requester for a November, 1997 implementation, and this implementation date is what the group considered in it's sense of the room.

Sense of the Room Results: 6 In Favor; 0 Opposed

### UPPD Validation

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
UPPD Level Error/Warning ID	Identifies the PO1 assigned line ID in the UPPD where any detail errors and/or warnings are being reported.	C	Mandatory when detail level error or warning codes are contained in the UPPD validation document

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends accept.

TransCapacity supports this request. The more information in an error message, the easier the solution. TransCapacity also notes that supplying the Loop ID in a response document is something that many off the shelf translators can be set up to do with little or no programming.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

R96118      Add two code types of "Capacity Discount" and "Market Affiliates" to the Notice Type on the System-Wide Notice.

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Add two new Notice Type codes to the System-wide Notices in the Capacity Release Related Standards book. The two types being requested are "Capacity Discount" and "Market Affiliates". These two Notice types would be used to better clarify the types of notices that can occur in the System-wide Notices transaction.

This is a duplicate request of number R96074 which was acted on at the January 28, 1997 Market Initiation Task Force - Capacity Release meeting. No action need be taken on this request.

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: As this request is a duplicate of R96074, no further action is necessary on this request and it should be terminated.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

R96119      Add a new data element, Indemnification Clauses, to datasets in Capacity Release Standards.

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Request for addition of new data element "Indemnification Clause" to the Capacity Release Standards book. The data element would be used to provide the text that describes any and all indemnification provisions necessary when posting an offer. The data element is necessary to comply with Columbia's tariff and, at this time, can only be viewed using the EBB.

This is a duplicate request of number R96075 which was acted on at the January 28, 1997 Market Initiation Task Force - Capacity Release meeting. No action need be taken on this request.

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: As this request is a duplicate of R96075, no further action is necessary on this request and it should be terminated.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

R96121      Add clarifying descriptions to 2 code values on the Charge Type on the Transportation/Sales Invoice.

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

The Market Settlement Task Force recommends that no action is necessary on this request. Code descriptions are currently not included in the implementation guides.

Sense of the Room Results:      Discussed in the January Market Settlement Task Force Meeting.

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends accept.

TransCapacity agrees with the task force recommendation that no action is necessary on this request, and agrees that it should be terminated. As with our comments to R96088 however, TransCapacity suggests that as part of the agreed future review of code values (error codes, warning codes, transaction types, etc.) that the list of Charge Types be added to this review. In this case, these lists will hopefully not continue to grow and a higher degree of standardization can be achieved.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

R96122 Add 2 new code values to Service Code on the Transportation/Sales Invoice.

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

The Market Settlement Task Force recommends adding the two additional Service Codes. The transactions are significantly different from other services covered by the current list of Service Codes.

Sense of the Room Results: January MSTF meeting. Support 24 oppose 0

Data Element	Usage	Code Names	Codes	Code Value Description
Service Code	M	Transition Costs		A principal/interest type of service charge.
		Market Balancing Service		A type of Service designed to eliminate imbalances as deliveries are allocated on actual usage.

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends accept.

As per our comments on R96088 and R96121, TransCapacity is concerned with the ever expanding code lists and would reiterate its comments that these lists be reviewed in the near future with an eye towards reducing the total number of codes and truly standardizing on a reduced list.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R97004 Add 5 new Charge Type codes to the Transportation/Sales Invoice

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

In August 1996, the Market Settlement Committee formed a special subgroup to review charge types, transaction types and service type codes. The sub-group presented a report with a series of recommendations in the October Market Settlement Committee meeting. One of the recommendations was to add a group of individual charge type codes to the Charge Type Codes Table of the Invoice Data Set. The five Charge Type Codes presented in this request were included in that recommendation. The Market Settlement Task Force recommends the approval of the five new charge type codes.

Sense of the Room Results: 15 support ; 0 Opposed - October 17, 1996 Meeting

Data Element	Usage	Code Names	Code s	Code Value Description
Charge Type	MA	Miscellaneous Charge		A charge that is used in unusual situations that cannot be anticipated by a Service Provider.
		Prepayment		A charge associated with prepayments connected to a service.
		Extended Delivery		A charge for transportation deliveries outside of the area included in the rights defined by the contract.
		Fuel Volumes Retained		A fuel volume reduction.
		Reservation/Demand with Surcharges		Demand/reservation charges inclusive of surcharges.

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends decline and refer to BPS for adequate definitions and supporting information.

Five new charge type codes of Miscellaneous Charge, Prepayment, Extended Delivery, Fuel Volumes Retained, and Reservation/Demand with Surcharges are proposed. These may be valid and necessary codes, but adequate supporting information and detail are not provided in the recommendation. TransCapacity recommends this request be transferred to the BPS to further clarify the issues and determine a recommendation on the additional proposed codes and standardization of use. In addition, TransCapacity repeats its recommendation that all Charge Type Codes be reviewed for applicability and reduction in number.

KOCH: Since Koch will not be present at the EC meeting when the voting occurs to request a second vote, we request here, in advance, that if this request is not

Prepared February 28, 1997



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

initially approved due to objections regarding the Fuel Volume Reduction (FVR) charge type code, that a second vote be taken so that the other codes requested can be approved without the FVR code.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R97020 Modify the shipper imbalance statement for use with all nomination model types

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

In order to use this data set to accommodate both path nominations and unpathed nominations, the Market Settlement Task Force is asking that the data element "Model Type" be added to the data set. The usage code on other data elements in the data set will also have to be reviewed to determine which of the data element should have a usage code of conditional based on the new "Model Type" data element.

Sense of the Room Results: 17 For; 0 Opposed

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Model Type	This field identifies the type of nomination structure being used. Types are: Pathed and Non-Pathed	M	

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends the following be adopted as a standard:

"The Shipper Imbalance Statement should support all nomination model types." TransCapacity recommends the following be adopted as instructions to the Information Requirements subcommittee: "The Information Requirements Subcommittee is requested to formulate appropriate datasets and return to the EC with recommendations for same, including usage codes, definitions, and data elements the support the above standard. Technical review should be included for appropriate treatment of the above data elements and usage codes; and, the BPS should review the final product from a Business Practice perspective and formulate a recommendation to the EC prior to final submission for industry comment and EC vote."

KOCH: Koch supports the revisions to the Technical Implementation Guide for the Pathed Non-Threaded model that were submitted by NGPL. We feel that the addition of this data element, without the supporting detail proposed by NGPL, would not be appropriate. Both the new data element and the detail explaining how the new data element impacts the use of the dataset are needed.

NGPL: R97020 was drafted by the Market Settlement task force to address the inability of the GISB Imbalance Statement to accommodate all GISB nomination models. R97020 was drafted by MSTF partly in response to NGPL's R96124 requesting support for the Pathed Non-Threaded model. R97020 describes a new data element "Model Type" to be included as part of a revised Imbalance Statement. The proposed definition of the element mentions model types of "Pathed" and "Non-Pathed". The exclusion of "Pathed Non-Threaded" may be due to the fact that it is dealt with in NGPL's R96124 or, more likely, in anticipation of the new Model Type codes which describe pathed, non-pathed, pathed non-threaded "pathed and non-pathed segments". NGPL's recommended changes to the implementation materials apply to the Pathed Non-Threaded model only and assume the new Model Type codes (P,N,T,U). Additional changes for the Non Pathed model should be developed by the MSTF as needed. These

Prepared February 28, 1997



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

recommended changes (attached) are displayed as bold italics for additions and strikeouts for deletions to the original GISB documentation.

These changes are required to reflect the business practices incorporated into the Pathed Non-Threaded nomination model. This nomination model was designed to remove the requirement of "threading" a supply quantity to a specific market. This is accomplished by allowing both aggregation and dis-aggregation of quantities at nominated points. The imbalance statement cannot reflect these practices without minor modification.

The recommended changes to the documentation are drafted so as to remove the requirements for Upstream and Downstream Identifiers on the imbalance statement for the Pathed Non-Threaded nomination model. The extent of the changes are as follows: 1) one data element (Model Type, which presently exists in nominations) has been added 2) the Upstream and Downstream identifiers and contract numbers remain "Conditional" in their usage, but the condition now includes "Not used for Pathed Non-Threaded model" on each.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

R97021 Add 'Adjustment Type' code values to the Measurement Information Statement

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

A data element - "Adjustment Type" is included on the Measurement Information Statement without any valid code values defined. This request is to update the Measurement Information Statement Implementation Guides with a table of defined codes appropriate for use. Three types of adjustments have been identified and codes need to be defined for these Adjustment Types. The adjustments are energy adjustments, quantity adjustments, and energy/quantity adjustments. The changes are needed to support the following standards:

2.3.11 For treatment of measurement prior period adjustments, treat the adjustment by taking it back to the production month. A meter adjustment becomes a prior period adjustment after the fifth business day following the business month.

2.3.12 For reporting measurement prior period adjustments, report it with the restated line item with new total quantity for the day and the month.

2.3.13 Estimate missing or late measurement data and treat actual as a prior period adjustment, with the measuring party to provide the estimate.

Sense of the Room Results: 13 For; 0 Opposed

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Energy		*	Adjustment to measure quantity for Energy
Quantity		*	Volume adjustment to Measured Quantity
Energy/Quantity		*	Adjustment the measured amount for both Energy and quantity

\* To be defined by the GISB Technical Task Force

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends that only two values be added: 1) Energy and 2) Quantity and that "Adjustment type" be moved to the detail level so that specific detail records that are being "adjusted" are identifiable and that the two types of adjustment are separate and unambiguous.

The recommendation proposes adding code values to the Adjustment Type of Energy, Quantity, and Energy/Quantity. The combined Energy/Quantity adjustment type is ambiguous. The loops within the Measurement Information Statement dataset are separate for energy and quantity. The Adjustment type data element is today at the header level and should be at the detail.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

R97023 Further define GISB Standard 4.3.6 on formats for non-transactional data

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

Standard 4.3.6 states that Notices, Affiliated Marketer Information, Unsubscribed Capacity, Index of Customers and Tariff's must be accessible via the World Wide Web. The Future Technology Task Force examined the best format for posting this non-transactional data. After much consideration the task force approved (22 to 1) the following proposal:

"The documents identified in GISB Standard 4.3.6 should be made available in HTML and/or RTF format."

The standard would allow the transportation service provider (TSP) to post non-transactional data in the most appropriate format. HTML and RTF would be easily read by anyone who requires this information.

Information posted in HTML format is easily readable by a Web Browser. Though the committee believes that HTML editors will be more readily available in the very near future, editor are limited today.

As HTML editors may not be easily available and converting large documents could be time consuming and expensive, RTF should also be an option. RTF is a format that is readable by most word processors.

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: The proposed new standard would state, "The documents identified in GISB Standard 4.3.6 should be made available in HTML and/or RTF format."

TransCapacity is somewhat confused by the and/or clause in this recommendation. It seems it should only be "or" indicating that the information would at least be available in either one format or the other. It is probably not truly meant as "and" as this would require availability of the information in both formats. As all GISB standards are minimum formats, simply stating "or" would allow Transportation Service Provider's to meet the standard by making the documents available in either format. What additional formats are offered would then be exceeding the standard. TransCapacity requests a discussion and clarification at the EC meeting to determine the task force's intention as to the above issue.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

## COMMENTARY FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

March 5 and 6, 1997

---

R97024      Modify GISB Standard 4.3.1 to reflect the Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards adopted in September 1996.

### PROPOSED STANDARD:

The Future Technology Task Force recommends that standard 4.3.1 be modified from:

By 4/1/97, all parties sending and receiving data should accept a TCP/IP using PPP connection...

to:

By 4/1/97, all parties sending and receiving data should accept a TCP/IP connection...

Later standards that further define the electronic deliver mechanisms make the use of "PPP" an incorrect. Removing this from the standard clarifies the standards but does not change the intent.

### COMMENTS:

TCAP: TransCapacity agrees with this recommendation. The "using PPP connection" language may imply that dial-up capability is necessary to the various designated sites. That this is not necessary has always been the understanding of this standard, this language change clarifies it.