



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925

HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

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

February 3, 1997

TO: GISB Executive Committee & Alternates, Posting on the GISB Home Page
for access

FROM: Rae McQuade

RE: Commentary -- Errata

The commentary was distributed earlier today with three mistakes in it. The pages were not numbered, request R96045 was incomplete for comments submitted, and request R96110 was inadvertently left out. The errors have been fixed in this document, and corrections to R96045 and R96110 are at the back of the document beginning on page 31.

We apologize for any inconvenience that this may have caused you.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925
HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

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

February 1, 1997

TO: GISB Executive Committee & Alternates, Posting on the GISB Home Page for access

FROM: Rae McQuade

RE: Commentary

Attached please find the commentary on the requests to be voted on February 5 and 6. The commentary includes a one line description of the original request, a brief description of the recommendation from the appropriate task force or EC appointee to the EC, and a brief summary of the comments received. The full text of the request can be found on the home page in the "Request for Standards" area. The recommendations have been posted on the home page for more than one month for your review and can be found on the home page in the "Request for Comments" area. The full text of the comments are posted for your review in the "Executive Committee" area of the home page as part of the materials for the Executive Committee meeting.

Comments were received from four companies and one GISB task force regarding the requests and recommendations that were out for comment due on January 31:

Koch Gateway, abbreviated KOCH, commented on R96062, R96068, R96069, R96070, R96071, R96072, R96073, R96080, R96092, R96103, R96104, R96105, R96108, R96112

Natural Gas Clearinghouse, abbreviated NGC, commented on R96016, R96045, R96098, R96101, R96104

PanEnergy Corp, abbreviated PEC, commented on R96069, R96080, R96092, R96101, R96107, R96108

Technical Task Force, abbreviated TTF, commented on R96026 and R96108

TransCapacity, abbreviated TCAP, commented on R96016, R96045, R96062, R96068, R96069, R96070, R96071, R96072, R96073, R96080, R96081, R96085, R96087, R96092, R96096, R96098, R96100, R96101, R96102, R96103, R96104, R96105, R96106, R96107, R96108, R96112

These comments are included in their entirety, where possible, in the commentary. The commentary, along with the original requests, recommendations, and comments will be used by the Executive Committee as the members vote on each proposed standard. NGC commented on request R96110, which has not been included in the vote for February 5, and is not included in the commentary. PEC commented on requests R96109, R96110, R96111 and R96113 which have not been included in the vote for February 5, and are not included in the commentary. TCAP commented on request R96110 which is not included in the vote for February 5, and is not included in the commentary.

TransCapacity commented on R96028 in its previous set of comments which were forwarded to the GISB office regarding the Executive Committee vote on January 9. Similarly, Noram commented on R96026 regarding the Executive Committee vote on January 9. Both of those comments can be accessed from the GISB home page.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925

HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

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

The proposed standards are represented by the following requests:

- R96016 Modify Nominations Transaction to support source 2 data element
- R96026 Modify Nominations Quick Response Transaction to add four new error codes
- R96028 Modify Nominations Transaction to add additional codes to the transaction type data element
- R96045 Modify the Nominations Related Standards to add additional values to the transaction type data element to delineate fuel nominations and associated error messages
- R96062 Modify the Nominations Transaction to add a new data element - role
- R96068 Modify the nominations and shipper imbalance transaction to add transaction type codes.
- R96069 Modify the nomination quick response transaction to add a warning message
- R96070 Modify the nomination transaction to add an additional capacity type of primary firm
- R96071 Modify the nomination quick response transaction to add status of nomination
- R96072 Modify the scheduled quantity transaction to add additional reduction reason codes
- R96073 Modify the invoice transaction to add service codes
- R96080 Modify the measurement information and allocation statement transactions to add contact information at the detail level
- R96081 Modify the scheduled quantity and confirmation response transactions to add additional reduction reason codes
- R96085 Modify the nomination transactions to add reduction reason codes
- R96087 Modify the nominations transactions to add additional values to transaction type data element
- R96092 Modify the allocation statement data dictionary so that Beginning Flow Date/Time and Ending Flow Date/Time are split into four elements
- R96098 Modify the Transportation/Sales Invoice "Charge Type" element to add codes values
- R96100 Modify the Payment Remittance to allow for multiple service requesters per billable party
- R96101 Modify usage requirement of Service Requester and Account Number in Payment Remittance and Invoice datasets
- R96102 Modify Remittance Number element in Payment Remittance dataset to limit field size
- R96103 Modify Invoice dataset, Beginning Flow Date/Time and Ending Flow Date/Time to be Beginning Production Period and Ending Production Period
- R96104 Modify definition of Limit Value in Pre-determined Allocation data dictionary
- R96105 Add additional error codes and warning codes to Pre-determined Allocation Quick Response
- R96106 Modify usage requirement of Contact Person in all Flowing Gas and Invoicing Related Standards dictionaries



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925

HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

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

- | | |
|--------|---|
| R96107 | Add data element "Previous Balance Forward" to Invoice data dictionary |
| R96108 | Add error codes and warning codes to Nomination Quick Response |
| R96112 | Identify and assign adjustment reason codes for prior period adjustments on the Measurement Information Statement |

Please notify the GISB office if you need further information on the proposed standards, in your preparation to vote. If you are unable to attend the Executive Committee meeting, a ballot is contained within the materials sent out.

I look forward to seeing you on February 5 & 6.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

R96016 Modify Nominations Transaction to support source 2 data element

Recommendation :

The request to add the Reference Contract data element to the Nominations data sets was reviewed and passed by the Market Execution Task Force and the Market Settlement Task Force. Since the business use of the data element would be related to the transportation charges, the request was forwarded to the Market Settlement Task Force to add the data element to the PDA, Allocation Statement and the Invoice. Applicable documents are PDA Data Set Standard 2.4.1, Allocation Data Set Standard 2.4.2, Invoice Data Set Standard 3.4.1, and associated revisions are the data element to be added to the Nominations data sets.

DATA DICTIONARY REQUEST # PROPOSED REVISIONS

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Reference Contract	Associated contract that provides rights or information needed to process a transaction.	MA	

Comments:

NGC NGC does not agree with the METF recommendation that an additional contract field is needed to support CNG's business requirement. An additional contract field was voted 'passed' in the last EC meeting Jan 9. The EC voted to pass request R96023 for an additional contract field to support balancing contracts. Rather than continue to add contract fields for each new type of contract that comes up, NGC would like to see the balancing contract field redefined to support any additional contract fields that are necessary for nomination transactions and scheduled quantities. Per the METF's meeting minutes for December 18, the reference contract and balancing contract are mutually exclusive.

TCAP On the New data element for "Reference Contract.":
 TransCapacity recommends that this issue be referred to the BPS because there is ambiguity as to the business practice and the method of implementing. It sounds like this is a title transfer or pooling type of activity. It sounds like this activity, as it is described in the request, is in fact a transfer from a contract on CNGT to another contract on CNGT and that this could be accomplished by means of two nominations. The first nomination would nominate the gas from the Appalachian Aggregation contract (receipt at the aggregation point) on to the shippers contract (delivery at the aggregation point). The second nomination would be to nominate the gas under the shipper's contract from the aggregation point to the delivery point. This would obviate any need for a new data element, and would eliminate any need to change the PDA's. In any case the BPS can decide.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

If the EC fails to so recommend this disposition, TransCapacity notes that there is already an existing (pending membership ratification) data element for "Balancing Contract" and suggests that this data element be used to specify any reference contract information needed. This would negate the necessity for an additional data element and would not require any of the related new error messages proposed in this request.

For Add "Reference Contract" to the PDA, Allocation, and Invoice data sets.:

TransCapacity notes that these data sets currently allow "looping" at the SLN contract level. Therefore, information on multiple contracts can currently be accommodated by the existing data sets. Addition of this new data element seems unnecessary. Parties wishing to communicate information pertaining to a reference contract can simply supply the reference contract information in the current PDA and then follow it with the information relevant to that contract.

R96026 Modify Nominations Quick Response Transaction to add four new error codes

Recommendation:

There are existing error code values for missing upstream and downstream contract identifiers, but there are no error code values for invalid identifiers. It is possible that the Service Provider may be able to validate this information. Therefore, two additional error code values are necessary. Upstream and downstream ranks are mutually agreed (MA) fields. If the two parties have agreed to use this field and the Service Requester does not provide it on the Nomination, an error code value is needed to designate this on the Quick Response.

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Validation Code	M (C)	Invalid Downstream Contract Identifier	
Validation Code	M (C)	Invalid Upstream Contract Identifier	
Validation Code	M (C)	Upstream Rank Missing	
Validation Code	M (C)	Downstream Rank Missing	

Comments:

NORAM Noram supports the task force recommendations.
TTF Two of the error messages recommended by the Market Execution Task Force in request R96108 were also recommended for addition by request R96026. They are Invalid Downstream Contract Identifier and Invalid Upstream Contract Identifier. These messages were also assigned error

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

codes by the Technical Task Force on two separate occasions. They are ENMQR562 and ENMQR563 (R96026) and ENMQR568 and ENMQR569 (R96108). Both R96026 and R96108 are in front of the EC for approval on 2/5/97. Only one set of codes is needed and the Technical Subcommittee recommends that the two codes assigned for R96026 should be kept and the two codes assigned by R96108 should be discarded. This modification does not affect the other error and warning codes recommended by R96026 or R96108.

R96028 Modify Nominations Transaction to add additional codes to the transaction type data element

Recommendation:

These additional Transaction Type code values will be used to nominate different types of transactions. Transaction Type is 'mandatory' in the Nomination and 'conditional' in the Scheduled Quantity document. Per PanEnergy, the requested code values 'Operator Balancing Agreement' and 'Parking' are no longer needed. Also, PanEnergy is verifying whether 'No-Notice Due Transportation Service Provider In-Kind Balancing' and 'No-Notice Due Service Requester In-Kind Balancing' are still needed. These two code values are still open. Applicable documents are Nomination, and Scheduled Quantity.

Nominations

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Transaction Type	M	No-Notice Balancing	Used to differentiate between no-notice imbalance payback and other imbalance payback.
Transaction Type	M	Pre-Injection	Identifies a request to schedule additional receipts into pipeline in anticipation of an increase in demand.
Transaction Type	M	Suspense Gas Claim	Identifies claim of suspense gas. Suspense gas is gas delivered to a pipeline without any type of nomination.
Transaction Type	M	Delivery of Claimed Suspense	Identifies the physical delivery of claimed suspense quantities.
Transaction Type	M	Master Balancing Agreement Due Transportation Service Provider	Ties an imbalance correction due Transportation Service Provider for a Master Balancing Agreement to the designated Master Balancing Agreement contract.
Transaction Type	M	Master Balancing Agreement Due Service Requester	Ties an imbalance correction due Service Requester for a Master Balancing Agreement party to the designated Master Balancing Agreement contract.
Transaction Type	M	No-Notice Service	Identifies a request for no-notice service.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Transaction Type	M	Non-Contiguous Off-System	Identifies transportation occurring on laterals not connected to pipeline main line system. Allows the Transportation Service Provider to identify gas that will return to the main line.
Transaction Type	M	No-Notice Due Transportation Service Provider Retroactive In-Kind Balancing	Used to identify that quantities were nominated to resolve prior month due Transportation Service Provider imbalances.
Transaction Type	M	No-Notice Due Transportation Service Provider Retroactive In-Kind Balancing	Used to identify that quantities were nominated to resolve prior month due Service Requester imbalances.

Scheduled Quantities

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Transaction Type	C	No-Notice Balancing	Used to differentiate between no-notice imbalance payback and other imbalance payback.
Transaction Type	C	Pre-Injection	Identifies a request to schedule additional receipts into pipeline in anticipation of an increase in demand.
Transaction Type	C	Suspense Gas Claim	Identifies claim of suspense gas. Suspense gas is gas delivered to a pipeline without any type of nomination.
Transaction Type	C	Delivery of Claimed Suspense	Identifies the physical delivery of claimed suspense quantities.
Transaction Type	C	Master Balancing Agreement Due Transportation Service Provider	Ties an imbalance correction due Transportation Service Provider for a Master Balancing Agreement to the designated Master Balancing Agreement contract.
Transaction Type	C	Master Balancing Agreement Due Service Requester	Ties an imbalance correction due Service Requester for a Master Balancing Agreement party to the designated Master Balancing Agreement contract.
Transaction Type	C	No-Notice Service	Identifies a request for no-notice service.
Transaction Type	C	Non-Contiguous Off-System	Identifies transportation occurring on laterals not connected to pipeline main line system. Allows the Transportation Service Provider to identify gas that will return to the main line.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Transaction Type	C	No-Notice Due Transportation Service Provider Retroactive In-Kind Balancing	Used to identify that quantities were nominated to resolve prior month due Transportation Service Provider imbalances.
Transaction Type	C	No-Notice Due Transportation Service Provider Retroactive In-Kind Balancing	Used to identify that quantities were nominated to resolve prior month due Service Requester imbalances.

Comments:

TCAP

We recommend the following with respect to the Transaction Types requested in R96028:

Amend Code Value From: No-Notice Balancing to: No-Notice Payback

Explanation: See Code Value Description -- No other changes
Amend Code Value From: Pre-Injection to: "No-Notice Pre-Injection"

Explanation: See Code Value Description -- No other changes
Approve Code Value for: Suspense Gas Claim

Reject: Master Balancing Agreement Due TSP

Reason: Not needed, we have already approved "Balancing Contract" (R96023) and that should suffice to tell that there is a balancing contract, This, plus the transaction code of "makeup" (i.e., gas owed to shipper) or "payback" (gas owed to pipeline) should be used in conjunction with one another to eliminate this redundant and ambiguous code value.

Reject: Master Balancing Agreement Due TSR

Reason: Not needed, we have already approved "Balancing Contract" and (R96023) and that should suffice to tell that there is a balancing contract. This, plus the transaction code of "makeup" or "payback" should be used in conjunction with one another to eliminate this redundant and ambiguous code value

Approve Code Value for: No-Notice

Amend Usage to: SO

Reason: Although the definition of No-Notice is "no-notice" this may be useful as long as it is SO

Explanation: If not changed to SO, the requested standard should be rejected because adding the Transaction Type of "No-Notice" to the nomination standards with a Mandatory status means that TSPs can honor GISB standards and turn No-Notice Service into Notice Service.

Reject: Non-Contiguous Off System

Reason: Should be in the parsing of the code for the point by the TSP not in the system of the requester. Also, the Code Value Description is worded in such a way as it implies that gas will "return" to the mainline. Who and how is the user supposed

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Reject: No-Notice Due Transportation Service Provider Retroactive In-Kind Balancing

Reason: Already have No-Notice Payback, see above

Reject: No-Notice Due Transportation Service Requester Retroactive In-Kind Balancing

Reason: Already have No-Notice Make-up, see above

R96045 Modify the Nominations Related Standards to add additional values to the transaction type data element to delineate fuel nominations and associated error messages

Recommendation:

Add a new code value to the Transaction Type Indicator field to delineate fuel nominations. This would allow service requesters to nominate a fuel point with a zero quantity and have the Transportation Service Provider calculate the appropriate fuel. In order for this to work the Transportation Service Provider needs to be able to identify the fuel point transaction. Applicable Documents: Nomination, Scheduled Quantity. Associated Revisions: Relevant error messages.

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Transaction Type	M	01	Current Business (default)
		02	Authorized Overrun
		03	Imbalance Payback from Pipeline
		04	Imbalance Payback to Pipeline
		05	Plant Thermal Reduction
		06	Injection
		07	Withdrawal
		08	Pooling
		45	<i>Fuel</i>

Comments:

NGC: NGC would like to comment that currently there are 8 transaction types printed in the guide with over 40 additional transaction types requested to be added. Every pipeline will have it's own unique set of transaction types that they support. This is not a standard.

TCAP: TransCapacity notes that the request asks for a transaction type code, and this is consistent with the proposed code values revision table on the recommendation form. However, the abstract/discussion of the recommendation form references a "data element." These are two very different proposals. If the recommendation is truly for an additional transaction type code, TransCapacity has no objections. If the

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

R96062 Modify the Nominations Transaction to add a new data element - role

Recommendation

Add a data element "Role" to the Nomination data set and data dictionary. This data element would identify the role of the party submitting the transaction. The data element will be used by the Transportation Service Provider to determine what role the party transmitting the nomination is playing. El Paso Natural Gas uses this field to determine which type of edits to apply to each type of nomination and can distinguish different types of nominations with this information.

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Role	The code that identifies the role of the party submitting this transaction. SR = Shipper entering a nomination PR = Pooler entering a request for supply PC = Pooler confirming a supply to market or another pool	MA	

Comments

KOCH: Since the alternative recommended by the METF, use of Duns+4, seems inconsistent with recommendations of the Common Codes and FTTF committees, Koch recommends that this request be referred to the BPS for further review.

TCAP: TransCapacity is unsure, either from the request or the recommendation form why this information is necessary and what concerns El Paso has regarding routing of a "shipper" or "pooler" nomination. The question we ask is why these nominations would have to be processed separately. In addition, TransCapacity suggests that the information if in fact required, could possibly be determined by the enveloping information (as suggested by METF) or GS level information contained in the EDI transactions. TransCapacity recommends the request be referred to the BPS.

R96068 Modify the nominations and shipper imbalance transaction to add transaction type codes.

Recommendation:

Add new code values to the Transaction Type Indicator in the nomination to delineate further types of business. In this manner, customers will be able to nominate and achieve the level of service that they are currently receiving. Each service or transaction type may have rate implications for the invoice so customers can match up the nomination to invoice on these

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

types of services. In addition, these codes may be used to control authorization of the specific transactions.

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Transaction Type	M	01	Current Business (default)
		02	Authorized Overrun
		03	Imbalance Payback from Pipeline
		04	Imbalance Payback to Pipeline
		05	Plant Thermal Reduction
		06	Injection
		07	Withdrawal
		08	Pooling
		68A	<i>Makeup Delivered</i>
		68B	<i>Makeup Received</i>
		68C	<i>Pooler Request From Operator</i>
		68D	<i>Pool-To-Pool</i>
		68E	<i>Delivery Overpull</i>
		68F	<i>Delivery Underpull</i>
		68G	<i>Receipt Oversupply</i>
		68H	<i>Receipt Undersupply</i>
		68I	<i>Park</i>
		68J	<i>Ride</i>
		68K	<i>Loan</i>

This Request was originally addressed at the 11/21 METF meeting and a Recommendation to GISB Executive Committee was posted to GISB's home page on 11/26. The following requested Transaction Type code values were deferred to the 12/18 METF meeting: Delivery Overpull, Delivery Underpull, Receipt Oversupply, Receipt Undersupply.

These data elements were requested to facilitate the transmission of data between TSP and Operator at OBA points. Requester was trying to "fit" this data into a Nomination. After further discussion METF recommended a new document be requested (12/18).

Comments:

KOCH

With respect to the Park, Ride, & Loan Transaction Type code values El Paso requested, KGPC supported the original recommendation of the METF back in October, which was for El Paso to use the following code values that were requested by TransCanada:

- 26 Park
- 27 Park Withdrawal
- 28 Loan
- 29 Loan Payback

These values were approved unanimously by the METF in October prior to El Paso presenting their request at a later point in the same meeting. At the time, El Paso agreed with

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

this recommendation and withdrew this portion of their request.

However, because (1) TransCanada's code values never were submitted on the official paperwork, and thus never approved by the GISB EC and (2) El Paso's request was rejected by the task force, KGPC determined it was necessary to develop an alternative solution that would work within the framework of code values already approved by GISB.

The workaround we devised is to use existing transaction type code values of 06 Injection and 07 Withdrawal along with two logical points, one for parking and another for lending, to accomplish the same thing, as follows:

<u>Point Nominated</u>	<u>Transaction Type</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
Parking Point	06 Injection	Park
Parking Point	07 Withdrawal	Park Withdrawal
Loan Point	06 Injection	Loan Payback
Loan Point	07 Withdrawal	Loan

KGPC believes that this problem should be resolved in a consistent way across the industry in order to minimize confusion to the shippers who must nominate on numerous pipes. Rather than implementing the above workaround, we are willing to change our implementation plans and support the set of transaction types originally recommended by the METF:

26	Park
27	Park Withdrawal
28	Loan
29	Loan Withdrawal

We cannot, however, change our plans and support Park, Ride, and Loan codes as requested by El Paso, without the Park Withdrawal and Loan Withdrawal codes.

Additionally, we should note that KGPC has requested in R96088 a new service code, PK, for Parking and Lending Service. Since Transaction Type is not currently an invoice data element, regardless of whether or not the new transaction type code values proposed by El Paso are adopted, we still need the new Service Code proposed. Service Code is a Mandatory invoice data element. In order to accurately describe the charges for this parking and lending activity on our invoice as approved by FERC, the Park and Lend service code is needed.

TCAP: TransCapacity notes that the request was withdrawn by the requester, and that a new "Scheduled Quantity" document for Operators is being worked on by METF. Therefore it recommends this instant request be terminated.

R96069 Modify the nomination quick response transaction to add a warning message

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Recommendation:

The additional warning messages will be sent to the nominating party, as applicable.

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Validation Code	M (C)	Other Service Requester Warning	
Validation Code	M (C)	Other Service Requester Contract Warning	

Comments:

KOCH: KGPC supports the recommendations of METF to add "other" validation code values. Validation Code is a Mandatory data element and thus cannot be left blank. Due to the lag time required to get a new code value approved by GISB, it may be necessary to reject a nomination for a reason not supported by a current code value. We feel it would be better to respond in the interim period with "Other" than to respond with an inaccurate and/or misleading code.

PEC: This is a request to add a warning message (to mirror the existing error message) to the Nomination Quick Response which will be used to communicate warnings not covered by existing codes. This is needed to cover situations where codes have been requested but not yet assigned. The potential for abuse exists, but the trading partners could keep everyone honest by questioning the continued use of this code.

TCAP: These additional error messages, "Other Service Requester Warning," and "Other Service Requester Contract Warning," are too vague. It does not specify what effect these warnings would then have on the service requester. Standard 1.1.9 states in part, "Business practices should be sent to the Market Execution Task Force and meaningful error messages should only be developed for those practices." Clearly this language applies to warning messages also. This represents a business practices issue, and as such, should be sent to the BPS. TransCapacity recommends that this request be transferred to the BPS for further discussion and clarification.

R96070 Modify the nomination transaction to add an additional capacity type of primary firm

Recommendation:

This is a duplicate of R96067. Withdrawn by Requester at 12/18 METF meeting.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Comments:

KOCH: Duplicate of request R96067. Should not be voted on. R96067 was rejected by EC vote on January 9th.

TCAP: As this request was withdrawn by the requester as a duplicate of R96067, it should be terminated here without prejudice to determination of R96067.

R96071 Modify the nomination quick response transaction to add status of nomination

Recommendation:

This is a duplicate of R96097. Withdrawn by Requester at 12/18 METF meeting.

Comments:

KOCH: KGPC supports this request. Although this was a duplicate of R96097, it should still be voted on because R96097 was not included in the set of proposals sent out for member comment.

TCAP: As this request was withdrawn by the requester as a duplicate of R96097, it should be terminated here without prejudice to determination of R96097.

R96072 Modify the scheduled quantity transaction to add additional reduction reason codes

Recommendation:

This is a duplicate of R96081. Withdrawn by Requester at 12/18 METF meeting.

Comments:

KOCH: Duplicate of request R96081. Should not be voted on.

TCAP: As this request was withdrawn by the requester as a duplicate of R96081, it should be terminated here without prejudice to determination of R96081.

R96073 Modify the invoice transaction to add service codes

Recommendation:

Service Code "Other" will be used to allow for the billing of a new service during the period that GISB is reviewing a request for the more specific actual service code that will be used for the new service.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Other	M		Other Services

Comments:

KOCH: KGPC supports the recommendations of MSTF. Since Service Code is a mandatory data element on the invoice, the Service Provider does not have the option of leaving the field blank while waiting for GISB to approve a new Service Code value. Due to amount of lead time required to get new codes approved by GISB, we agree that a Service Code value of "Other" may be needed.

TCAP: This code would be used to allow the billing of a new service during the period that GISB is reviewing the request. TransCapacity supports this request.

R96080 Modify the measurement information and allocation statement transactions to add contact information at the detail level

Recommendation:

Change to the X12 mapping of a data element in the Implementation Guide of the allocation statement. Request to move the "Contact Information" data element from a header level to a detail level in the data set.

Some of the companies that use this data set have analyst assigned by meter versus business party. The data set currently only allows one contact per business party. The change would allow one contract per meter and multiple contact per business party. Members of the committee in opposition to this request had a problem sending all of this information at a detail level. It was argued that since this information did change that often there more efficient ways to communicate changes in meter analyst than sending it at a detailed level with every allocation data set

Comments:

KOCH: KGPC supports the MSTF recommendation to reject this request. This is a mapping issue. By sending more header records, one should be able to achieve the same results without changing the X12 mapping. The current mapping is not as straight forward as the proposed fix, but we feel we're to close to implementation to change the mapping now.

PEC: The request is to put contact information at the detail level on the Measurement and Allocation statements. Current implementation guide puts this information at the header (or company) level. TETCO assigns analyst responsibilities at a point level, not a company level. If we are required to put the contact information in the header, this could result in the submission of multiple files to a single trading partner because of the breaks which will occur in the data when multiple

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

analysts are assigned to a company's points. Including the contact information in the detail level of these statements will ensure that the trading partner receives only one file for each of these documents.

TCAP: TransCapacity agrees with the concept of supplying any additional required information. However, we feel that this issue is properly decided at the BPS level. Therefore, TransCapacity recommends that this request be transferred to the BPS to further identify the specific problem and to ensure that the fix is appropriate.

R96081 Modify the scheduled quantity and confirmation response transactions to add additional reduction reason codes

Recommendation:

Add new code values to the Reduction Reason data element in the Scheduled Quantity and Confirmation Response documents. Proposal requested the following:

- Market Reduction Covered by requested "Confirming Party at Delivery Location" (96032)
- Supply Reduction Covered by requested "Confirming Party at Receipt Location" (96032)
- Payback Reduction Used to notify that a reduction was due to payback. Adds detail to the reduction reasons. Only one new code was determined to be needed for use in conjunction with the "receipt" and "delivery indicators.

Note: Request No. R96072 was a duplicate of this request. R96072 was withdrawn and this request was acted upon.

Scheduled Quantity

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Reduction Reason	SO	PCC	Pipeline Capacity Constraint
		CBL	Contract Balancing
		CRI	Credit Issues
		FMJ	Force Majeure
		PLM	Pipeline Maintenance
		CRN	Confirmation Response Not Received
		CPR	Confirming Party Reduction
		ECM	Exceeded Contract MDQ
		EPM	Exceeded Point MDQ
		PLC	Pipeline Curtailment
		GQS	Gas Quality Specifications Not Met
		81A	<i>Payback Reduction</i>

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Confirmation Response

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Reduction Reason	SO	CAP	Capacity Constraint
		CBL	Contract Balancing
		FMJ	Force Majeure
		PLM	Pipeline Maintenance
		CPR	Confirming Party Reduction
		PLC	Pipeline Curtailment
		GQS	Gas Quality Specifications Not Met
		81A	<i>Payback Reduction</i>

Comments:

TCAP: TransCapacity agrees with the recommendation from METF that "Market Reduction" and "Supply Reduction" are covered by existing codes. TransCapacity further agrees that a "Payback Reduction" reason code be added to the Scheduled Quantity Document only.

TransCapacity disagrees with the proposal to add this code to the Confirmation Response document, as it is not applicable there. Before we begin passing business information to non-transacting parties we should be very careful. This request implies that a party responding to a confirmation requester will tell the Confirmation Requester that the upstream shipper is conducting a payback transaction. This is inappropriate.

TransCapacity recommends that the recommendation be modified to include only the Scheduled Quantity document, or that that addition of the codes be voted separately on the two documents.

R96085 Modify the nomination transactions to add reduction reason codes

Recommendation:

Add new code values to the Reduction Reason data element in the Scheduled Quantity and Confirmation Response documents. Proposal requested the following:

Capacity Recalled	Used when nominated quantity is reduced as a result of a capacity recall
Prior Period Adjustment	Used when nominated quantity is reduced due to an adjustment from a prior period.

METF determined that this was covered by "Balanced Corrected Routes" and Unbalanced Corrected Routes." Withdrawn by requester.

Scheduled Quantities

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
---------------	-------	------------	------------------------

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Reduction Reason	SO	PCC CBL CRI FMJ PLM CRN CPR ECM EPM PLC GQS 85A	Pipeline Capacity Constraint Contract Balancing Credit Issues Force Majeure Pipeline Maintenance Confirmation Response Not Received Confirming Party Reduction Exceeded Contract MDQ Exceeded Point MDQ Pipeline Curtailment Gas Quality Specifications Not Met <i>Capacity Recalled</i>
------------------	----	--	---

Confirmation Response

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Reduction Reason	SO	CAP CBL FMJ PLM CPR PLC GQS 85A	Capacity Constraint Contract Balancing Force Majeure Pipeline Maintenance Confirming Party Reduction Pipeline Curtailment Gas Quality Specifications Not Met <i>Capacity Recalled</i>

Comments:

TCAP: TransCapacity supports the recommendation as modified from the request, to add "Capacity Recalled" only and remove "Prior Period Adjustment." In the form specified, TransCapacity supports the recommendation.

R96087 Modify the nominations transactions to add additional values to transaction type data element

Recommendation:

Add new code values to the Transaction Type Indicator in the Nomination and Scheduled Quantity to delineate swing. Currently nominated as same receipt and delivery points with a zero quantity. Acts as a "place holder" on the nomination so that the PDA can be applied. Withdrawn by requester, alternate method will be used.

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
---------------	-------	------------	------------------------

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Transaction Type	M	01	Current Business (default)
		02	Authorized Overrun
		03	Imbalance Payback from Pipeline
		04	Imbalance Payback to Pipeline
		05	Plant Thermal Reduction
		06	Injection
		07	Withdrawal
		08	Pooling
		87A	<i>Swing</i>

Comments:

TCAP: As this request was withdrawn by the requester due to use of a currently available alternate method, it should be terminated.

R96092 Modify the allocation statement data dictionary so that Beginning Flow Date/Time and Ending Flow Date/Time are split into four elements

Recommendation:

Update the Flowing Gas and Invoice Data Set Implementation Guides to define a default for beginning time and ending time in the data element Beg Flow Date/Time and End Flow Date/Time. The change would make these data elements in the Flowing Gas and Invoicing data set more consistent with the way the data elements are described and discussed in the Nominations Data Set implementation guides. Applicable data sets are Flowing Gas and Invoicing data sets - Data Set 2.4.x and 3.4.x. Updates needed to the above stated implementation guides/standards, and should be referred to the Technical Task Force.

Comments:

KOCH: KGPC supports this technical correction which enhances the understandability/usability of the implementation guides

PEC: The Recommendation to GISB Executive Committee states that the associated revisions needed are "updates needed to the above stated implementation guides/standards. Technical Task Force", referring to the Flowing Gas and Invoicing data sets, and the page attached to the Task Force Recommendation reflects no revisions needed to the data dictionary. In fact, the December 19, 1996 meeting minutes of the Market Settlement Task Force states the following:

"Recommendation was made to make a default of the beginning and end of the gas day for the time element in the flowing gas and invoicing transaction sets. This would require a change to the data dictionary to reflect the default. The data elements would be left as is in the data sets.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

The Market Settlement Task Force Recommendation should reflect the following changes to the data dictionaries of the Pre-determined Allocation (2.4.1), the Allocation Statement (2.4.3), the Shipper Imbalance (2.4.4), and the Measurement Information Statement (2.4.5), and the Invoice (3.4.1):

Previous Implementation:

Beginning Flow Date/Time - The date and time on which the transportation/transaction first started.

Ending Flow Date/Time - The date and time on which the transportation/transaction ended.

Proposed Implementation:

Beginning Flow Date - The date on which the transportation/transaction first started.

Beginning Flow Time - The time in which the transportation/transaction first started. If the Beginning Flow Time is not sent, the time defaults to the beginning of the gas day.

Ending Flow Date - The date on which the transportation/transaction ended.

Ending Flow Time - The time in which the transportation/transaction ended. If the Ending Flow Time is not sent, the time defaults to the end of the gas day.

The usages and conditions, if applicable, are not affected by the splitting of the data elements and adding the defaulting time language. This change is consistent with the Beginning and Ending Dates and Times utilized in the Nomination (1.4.1), the Nomination Quick Response (1.4.2), the Request for Confirmation (1.4.3), the Confirmation Response (1.4.4), and the Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5).

The Technical Subcommittee should make the corresponding Data Element Cross Reference and X12 Data Set revisions.

TCAP:

TransCapacity recommends this recommendation be rejected. Contrary to assertions in the request, there is no "standard language" to justify this change. Nor is the change necessary. Those senders or receivers of data which wish to store the data in two separate fields may do so by processing at their end. This request forces everyone to process for no good reason. Changes should only be made where standards or standardized business practices necessitate change. This is not the case here. This request should be rejected.

R96098

Modify the Transportation/Sales Invoice "Charge Type" element to add codes

Recommendation:

The three codes requested -Volumetric Relinquishment GRI credit, Volumetric Relinquishments and Acquisitions, and Volumetric GRI are needed by the requesting pipeline in order for them to have the ability to invoice the very complicated rate structure of the GRI. The GRI's

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

complicated rate structure was discussed as an issue in the Invoicing Business Processes Task Force meetings, but no action was taken to address the complicated billing issues associated with it. Applicable documents are : Invoice data sets - Data Set 3.4.1. Updates are needed to the above stated implementation guides/standards and should be referred to the Technical Task Force.

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Volumetric Relinquishment GRI Credit	MA		GRI volumetric credit associated with capacity releases released on a volumetric basis at a equivalent demand rate of less than max.
Volumetric Relinquishments and Acquisitions	MA		
Volumetric GRI	MA		Volumetric GRI charge.

Comments:

NGC: NGC would like to comment that currently there are over 80 charge types for the invoice. The charge type is an MA field, but it is the field on the invoice that specifies what the charge is for. Again, every pipeline has it's own unique set of charge types that they support. This is not a standard.

TCAP: Three new charge type codes of "Volumetric Relinquishment GRI Credit, Volumetric Relinquishments and Acquisitions, and Volumetric GRI" are proposed. These may be valid and necessary codes, but supporting information and detail are not provided in either the recommendation or the request. TransCapacity recommends this request be transferred to the BPS to further clarify the issues and determine a recommendation on the additional proposed codes.

R96100 Modify the Payment Remittance to allow for multiple service requesters per billable party

Recommendation:

Request to restructure the X12 mapping of the Statement of Payment Remittance to allow for two more levels of detail to be allowed on a mutually agreeable basis. The change will allow for Service Providers that allow for the identification of service requester or billable party in the Statement of Payment Remittance to send the information in a one to many relationship. Billable party can identify payment for multiple service requester and Service Requester can identify payment for multiple invoices. Updates are needed to the above stated implementation guides/standards and should be referred to the Technical Task Force.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Comments:

TCAP: This request proposes to re-map the payment remittance document to add "two more levels of detail to be allowed on a mutually agreeable basis. This would result in at least two different maps for the same document. Inadequate detail has been provided. Neither the need for the change or nor discussion of the effects of changing the resulting map are discussed. There is no standard language requiring or supporting this proposed change at this late date. TransCapacity recommends that this request be rejected.

R96101 Modify usage requirement of Service Requester and Account Number in Payment Remittance and Invoice datasets

Recommendation:

Request for a change in the usage code for the data elements "Service Requester" and "Account Number" in the Invoice Data Set from Mutually agreeable to Sender's Option. Also a change in the usage code in the Payment Remittance Data set for the Data Element "Service Requester" from Mutually Agreeable to Conditional if sent in the Invoice Data Set. The change would allow for the use of the payment remittance data set information in accounts receivable systems that do not support an invoice level of tracking outstanding receivables. The group opposed to this change stated that the invoice level of tracking accounts receivable was a very common practice in the industry. They did not see why the data set should be changed to accommodate what could be considered a non standard method of tracking receivables.

Comments:

NGC: NGC disagrees with this proposal as stated in the discussion of the METF recommendation. Tracking accounts at the invoice level is standard. We do not understand why the dataset should be changed to accommodate a non-standard account tracking mechanism.

PEC: PanEnergy Corp pipelines request that the usage of the Service Requester and Account Number data elements in the Invoice data dictionary be modified to "SO" (sender's option) and in the Payment Remittance data dictionary from "MA" (mutually agreed to) to "C" (conditional). The condition would be defined as "Required if sent in the invoice."

When the remitting party sends a payment remittance for multiple service requesters, the remitting party will be able to relay which service requester he is remitting for. If these data elements are mutually agreed to in the invoice, there would be no obligation for the remitter to send the information back on

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

the payment remittance, thereby making it impossible for the transportation service provider to correctly apply the payment. Making the data elements sender's option on the invoice and conditional on the payment remittance ensures that the remitting party includes all valuable information on the remittance and that the transportation service provider applies the payment correctly.

PanEnergy disagrees with the task forces' comment contained in the recommendation to the GISB Executive Committee that tracking accounts receivable at an invoice level is a standard practice. Most invoices being billed by utilities, gas companies, or other sources require the payee to report their "Account Number" on the payment and not the invoice numbers being paid. By changing the "Service Requester" and "Account Number" to Sender's Option on the invoice, we are guaranteed that the customer will give us this information when submitting the Payment Remittance Statement. This information is very valuable in ensuring that cash is applied to the appropriate party in a timely manner as to avoid any interest charges.

TCAP

TransCapacity is opposed to this request. This is a major change to the usage codes, and, as proposed, would require the receiver of the document to now "receive and process" these data elements which are now mutually agreeable. (See standard 1.2.2.) As noted, this is a significant change and is not required or based on any current standards language. This change was not recommended by MSTF (see Sense of the Room Results) and should not be undertaken at this late date. It would require parties who are in the process of developing systems to undertake not insignificant changes. In addition, it makes the sender (in this case the service requester) able to unilaterally decline, without explanation or intention, to send to the pipeline (service provider), its ID and Account Number. Why is this a good idea?

R96102 Modify Remittance Number element in Payment Remittance dataset to limit field size

Recommendation:

The "Remittance Number" is defined as "the number associated with the remittance such as a check, wire transfer, EFT number." The Remittance Number is a mandatory data element. Request 96102 is to limit that size of the number to a 12 character field. This change is consistent with proposals submitted on the Invoice Number and the Package ID Number. The change would improve the efficiency of electronic exchange of information and would help prevent redesign of some of the accounts receivable systems currently in use.

Date Prepared: February 1, 1997

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Comments:

TCAP: TransCapacity is opposed to this request and recommends rejection. As it is associated with the change to limit the length of the Package ID, which was rejected, this request too should be rejected. To begin with, the length of the EDI field this data element is mapped to is 30 characters. We should not "sub-string" EDI data fields, nor should this field be re-mapped for no good reason. A 12 character limit on a remittance number would require all trading partners to modify their translators and database to code an arbitrarily limit on this field. This request should simply be rejected.

R96103 Modify Invoice dataset, Beginning Flow Date/Time and Ending Flow Date/Time to be Beginning Production Period and Ending Production Period

Recommendation:

Requested change to the name of two data elements in the Invoice Data Set. Change the names of the data elements "Beg Flow Date/Time" and "End Flow Date/Time" to "Beg Transaction Date/Time" and "Ending Transaction Date/Time". Times for beginning and ending of the Transactions periods will be defined with a default of beginning and ending chart times when not provided. Recommended abbreviations for these data elements are Beg Tran DT and End Tran DT. The two data elements Beg Flow Date/Time and End Flow Date/Time were originally given their names to be consistent with the nominations data set. In the current environment, this consistency is a good practice. In the post GISB standards world, the data elements Beg Flow Date/Time and End Flow Date/Time on the nominations data sets may be a completely different period than the time frame being represented in the invoice. In the nomination data set with the introduction of rolling nominations, a nominations time frame may cover a much longer period than what is being included on one invoice. This change is being proposed to recognize that the beginning and ending time period for a nomination and the beginning and ending time period for an invoice cycle could be different. The definition of a default for beginning and ending time is consistent with treatment of time periods in the nominations data set.

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Beg Transaction Date/Time	The Month, Day, and Year the Product began production or service	M	
Ending Transaction Date/Time	The Month, Day and Year the product ended production or service. Defaults to the end of the month.	M	

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Comments:

KOCH: KGPC supports this technical correction which enhances the understandability/usability of the implementation guides

TCAP: TransCapacity agrees with the proposed name changes as long as the changes to the proposed data dictionary definitions, as detailed below, are made concurrently.

Business Name -- Definition

Beg Transaction Date/Time -- Where the transaction began during the invoice period, the Month, Day, and Year the transaction began, and where the transaction began during a prior invoice period, the beginning of the subject invoice period.

Ending Transaction Date/Time -- Where the transaction ended during the invoice period, the Month, Day, and Year the transaction ended, and where the transaction is continuing as of the end of the invoice period, the end of the subject invoice period.

TransCapacity is opposed to the adding to the definition the default beginning and ending times called for in the request. Therefore TransCapacity will support the request only if the default beginning and ending time portion is removed and the above less ambiguous language is inserted.

R96104 Modify definition of Limit Value in Pre-determined Allocation data dictionary

Recommendation:

Request to change the Flowing Gas Implementation Guide definition of "Limit Value" in the Pre-determined Allocation data dictionary from - "Additional information for gas allocated using the ranking method to allow limitation of variances on a transaction." - to - "Additional information for gas allocated to allow limitation of variances on a transaction. "The change would allow for the use of the Limitation Variance with any allocation methodology offered by the service provider. Members of the task force in opposition of the change questioned if changing a definition was the correct method to address this issue. In the original discussion of the Flowing Gas BP task force, the limitation variance was discussed only in context of the ranking allocation methodology.

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Limit Value	Additional information for gas allocated to allow limitation of variances on a transaction.	BC	

Comments:

KOCH: Support - This is a BC field. Having more flexibility can only help long term. Just because a pipeline agrees to support this

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

BC data element, should not mean that they support the use of the data element for all allocation methods?

NGC: NGC agrees with the recommendation. This will allow more flexibility to the existing implementation and reduce the possibility of a request to add an additional Limit Value to accommodate other allocation methodologies.

TCAP: Request asked to change "Limit Value" definition from: "Additional information for gas allocated using the ranking method to allow limitation of variances on a transaction." to - "Additional information for gas allocated to allow limitation of variances on a transaction." TransCapacity has several questions as to this request and is not convinced the change is warranted. For instance, is this applicable to swing too? If so, what happens to the rest of the gas if flow is greater than the limit? This is not specified in the request. This issue, as well as the necessity of the change should be clarified at the BPS level.
TransCapacity recommends this request be properly assigned to the BPS for further review and clarification.

R96105 Add additional error codes and warning codes to Pre-determined Allocation Quick Response

Recommendation:
Request for additional warning codes for the PDA Quick Response. PDA date/time range is longer than nomination period. Did not process beyond nomination period.

- PDA date/time range is shorter than nomination period. PDA's for remaining nomination period defaulted to prorata.
- No PDA information is necessary.
- Limit Value not processed for under production.

These for codes would provide information that customers will need quickly to address potential problems with a PDA.

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
			PDA date/time range is longer than nomination period. Did not process beyond nomination period.
			PDA date/time range is shorter than nomination period. PDA's for remaining nomination period defaulted to prorata.
			No PDA information is necessary.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

			Limit Value not processed for under production.
--	--	--	---

Comments:

KOCH: KGPC Supports the MSTF recommendation to approve the request. We have also identified the need for some of the requested quick response code values, particularly the code for the response "No PDA information is necessary".

TCAP: The recommended additional warning codes are as follows. TransCapacity's recommended changes to some of the warning messages are displayed in "red-line" text.
 PDA date/time range is longer than nomination period. Did not process beyond nomination period.
 PDA date/time range is shorter than nomination period. PDA's for remaining nomination period will be defaulted to prorata if no PDA is submitted.
 No PDA information is necessary.
 Limit value not processed for under production.
 TransCapacity supports this request if the red-lined changes above are adopted. If not, TransCapacity recommends rejection of the request, or in the alternative, voting of the additional warning codes separately.

R96106 Modify usage requirement of Contact Person in all Flowing Gas and Invoicing Related Standards dictionaries

Recommendation:

Change the usage of the data element "contact Information" on all invoicing and flowing gas data sets from mandatory to mutually agreeable. Members of the committee agreed that since this information did not often change, there more efficient and less costly (and probably more accurate) ways to communicate changes in contact information than sending it each time a data set is sent.

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Contact Information		MA	

Comments:

TCAP: It is the receiver of these data sets who should determine whether this information is sent. Currently the only way to insure that this information is sent by the TSP is to make the data elements mandatory. The only other way to ensure that the receiver could get this information would be to have a new usage code of "Sender's Required" for these data elements. A proposed definition of "Sender's Required would be - "Must be sent when information in the sender's possession changes

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

from that previously supplied to receiver." Its purpose would be most evident through the Invoicing and flowing gas standards where there is contact information which need not be sent every time but should be sent when it changes. The alleged improvement in efficiency and cost are de minimus at best. The logic as to the argument that exclusion of information would somehow make the document "probably more accurate" escapes TransCapacity. TransCapacity recommends that this request be rejected or that the BPS undertake definition of an additional usage code of "Sender's required."

R96107 Add data element "Previous Balance Forward" to Invoice data dictionary

Recommendation:

Request for a new data element - Previous Balance Forward - in the Invoice Data Set. The change would allow companies to provide the total outstanding balance due in the invoice data set. Members of the Task Force in opposition pointed out that the Statement of Accounts Data Set is designed to provide information on the total amount due (current and past due). Adding the new data element invoice would be confusing to customers.

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Previous Balance Forward	Balance outstanding from all previous invoices.	BC	

Comments:

PEC: PanEnergy Corp pipelines request that a new data element be added to the invoice data dictionary. This new data elements is "Previous Balance Forward" and is defined as "the remaining balance due for each service requester/billable party at a summary level." This data element would have the usage of "SO" (sender's option).

It is usually the business practice of any company to pay for services from an actual invoice as opposed to a Statement of Account. By adding the unpaid balance to the invoice, the entire amount due is represented in one document, thereby, ensuring that the service requester/billable party is aware of the total amount due for a given month. Offering this information on the invoice allows PanEnergy's pipelines to maintain a level of service that is currently being offered to their customers.

By adding the Previous Balance Forward amount to the Invoice, it now correlates to the information being provided on the Statement of Account.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

PanEnergy believes that the comments about the Statement of Account in the Discussion section of the recommendation to the GISB Executive Committee are not valid. The Statement of Account provides only outstanding balances by invoice which does not include the CURRENT amount due. Therefore, by adding this new data element to the Invoice data set, the customer will be able to determine the TOTAL amount due (current and past due) in one document.

TCAP: TransCapacity is opposed to this request and recommends rejection. In addition to there being no standard language specifying this requirement, the recommendation form itself is confusing. The proposed Business Conditional (BC) usage code, when interpreted consistently with other BC data elements, would mean that the receiver of the document (the shipper) would be able to require the data element be sent to it. It would also require all other receivers who do not want the data element, but receive it anyway, to respond with a response document (which currently does not exist) indicating that the data element was ignored by the receiver (See standard no. 1.2.2). This was overwhelmingly opposed at the MSTF and should be rejected.

R96108 Add error codes and warning codes to Nomination Quick Response

Recommendation:

Add new error messages and warning messages (code values) to the Validation Code data element in the Nomination Quick Response document. Requested codes were modified from the proposal as follows:

Error Codes:

Invalid Downstream Contract Identifier --Identifies invalid Downstream Contract ID

Invalid Upstream Contract Identifier -- Identifies invalid Upstream Contract ID

Fuel Rate does not exist for the date range --Withdrawn by requester

Warning Codes:

Forward haul rates apply -- Used where backhaul was nominated, but forward haul rates apply

Service requester contract quantity exceeded -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.

Maximum daily injection quantity exceeded -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.

Maximum daily withdrawal quantity exceeded -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.

Receipt zone entitlement exceeded -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.

Delivery zone entitlement exceeded -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.

Zone entry quantity exceeded -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.

Zone exit quantity exceeded -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.

Date Prepared: February 1, 1997

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Zone limit exceeded -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.
 Access area zone limit exceeded -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.

Receipt Location not a firm point -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.
 Delivery Location not a firm point -- Explains reason quantity is reduced.
 Invalid ending time. Defaulted to end of gas day. -- Used where an ending time was sent, but it was invalid.

Error Codes - Only new proposed codes shown

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Validation Code	M (C)	108A 108B	Invalid Downstream Contract <i>Identifier</i> Invalid Upstream Contract <i>Identifier</i>

Warning Codes - Only new proposed codes shown

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Validation Code	M (C)	108C 108D 108E 108F 108G 108H 108I 108J 108K 108L 108M 108N	Service requester contract quantity <i>exceeded</i> Maximum daily injection quantity <i>exceeded</i> Maximum daily withdrawal quantity <i>exceeded</i> Receipt zone entitlement <i>exceeded</i> Delivery zone entitlement <i>exceeded</i> Zone entry quantity <i>exceeded</i> Zone exit quantity <i>exceeded</i> Zone limit <i>exceeded</i> Access area zone limit <i>exceeded</i> Receipt Location not a firm point Delivery Location not a firm point Invalid Ending Time. Defaulted to end of gas day.

Comments:

KOCH: KGPC Supports the METF recommendation to approve the request. We have also identified the need for some of the requested quick response code values.

PEC: PEC request to add 3 error messages and 14 warning messages to the Nomination Quick Response. One of the error messages was withdrawn at the 12/18 METF meeting because it only applies to EBB transactions. METF supported the remaining 2 error messages and all 14 of the warning messages, with minor modifications to the wording. The ME Task Force recommendation to the Executive Committee form reflects the two errors, but only 13 of the 14 warnings. The missing warning is "Node Quantity Exceeded", which needs to be included on the recommendation form to accurately reflect the results of the 12/18 METF meeting. The Technical Task Force has assigned a technical implementation value for this

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

	<p>warning. Attached hereto are the relevant minutes that were distributed at the 1/22/97 METF meeting.</p>
TCAP:	<p>TransCapacity opposes the following specified warning and error messages that are contained in this request:</p> <p>Error Codes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Invalid Downstream Contract Identifier (How could this be ascertained by the TSP?)Invalid Downstream Contract Identifier (How could this be ascertained by the TSP?) <p>Warning Codes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Zone limit exceededAccess area zone limit exceededReceipt location not a firm pointDelivery location not a firm pointInvalid ending time. Defaulted to end of gas day. <p>Error codes mean that something did not happen because of the existence of the error. What does it mean to have a "warning" that a zone limit of some kind was exceed? Is this a situation where sometimes the shipper can exceed and other times not? or that some shippers can and other shippers can't? Why is this not an overrun? why is this not a reduction reason code instead of a code in the nomination quick response. What is the effect of receiving this warning?</p> <p>If these error and warning codes are included in the request, TransCapacity recommends rejection. However, if these error and warning codes are removed from the request, TransCapacity will support the remaining codes in the request. In the alternative, each error and warning code should be voted separately.</p>
TTF	<p>Two of the error messages recommended by the Market Execution Task Force in this request were also recommended for addition by request R96026. They are Invalid Downstream Contract Identifier and Invalid Upstream Contract Identifier. These messages were also assigned error codes by the Technical Task Force on two separate occasions. They are ENMQR562 and ENMQR563 (R96026) and ENMQR568 and ENMQR569 (R96108). Both R96026 and R96108 are in front of the EC for approval on 2/5/97. Only one set of codes is needed and the Technical Subcommittee recommends that the two codes assigned for R96026 should be kept and the two codes assigned by R96108 should be discarded. This modification does not affect the other error and warning codes recommended by R96026 or R96108.</p>
R96112	<p>Identify and assign adjustment reason codes for prior period adjustments on the Measurement Information Statement</p>

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

Recommendation:

Update to the Flowing Gas Implementation Guide to add sixteen new codes to the "Adjustment Type" Data Element codes table in the Measurement Information Transaction Data Set. List of codes would provide more detail on why a measurement adjustment was being made.

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Adjustment Type		C	

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
			Invalid Gas Sample
			Quality data received late
			Incorrect chromatograph assignment / data
			Measured change not received
			Volume estimate - no data received
			Estimate replaced with actual: late
			Mechanical field equip. failure
			Late notification of station turn on
			EFM communication failure
			Incorrect EFM station configuration
			Integration/Scan process incorrect
			Invalid calculation type
			Incorrect gas quality
			Data /entry error
			Audit review - no adj. necessary
			Mission data, no volume estimate.

Comments:

KOCH: In the MSTF meeting, the requester acknowledged that these codes were intended for the Measurement Volume Audit Statement (R96005), not the Measurement Information Statement. The codes are not appropriate for the Measurement Information Statement.

TCAP: TransCapacity has no specific objection to the additional codes, but believes that additional detail needs to be provided on the need for these codes (i.e., do they apply to proprietary or standardized business practices). TransCapacity recommends further detail be provided regarding the standards under which these codes are being proposed. To accomplish

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997
COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

this , TransCapacity recommends this request be referred to the BPS for further detail and clarification.

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES ERRATA -- FEBRUARY 3, 1997

R96045 Modify the Nominations Related Standards to add additional values to the transaction type data element to delineate fuel nominations and associated error messages

Recommendation:

Add a new code value to the Transaction Type Indicator field to delineate fuel nominations. This would allow service requesters to nominate a fuel point with a zero quantity and have the Transportation Service Provider calculate the appropriate fuel. In order for this to work the Transportation Service Provider needs to be able to identify the fuel point transaction. Applicable Documents: Nomination, Scheduled Quantity. Associated Revisions: Relevant error messages.

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Transaction Type	M	01	Current Business (default)
		02	Authorized Overrun
		03	Imbalance Payback from Pipeline
		04	Imbalance Payback to Pipeline
		05	Plant Thermal Reduction
		06	Injection
		07	Withdrawal
		08	Pooling
		45	<i>Fuel</i>

Comments:

NGC: NGC would like to comment that currently there are 8 transaction types printed in the guide with over 40 additional transaction types requested to be added. Every pipeline will have it's own unique set of transaction types that they support. This is not a standard.

TCAP: TransCapacity notes that the request asks for a transaction type code, and this is consistent with the proposed code values revision table on the recommendation form. However, the abstract/discussion of the recommendation form references a "data element." These are two very different proposals. If the recommendation is truly for an additional transaction type code, TransCapacity has no objections. If the request is for an additional data element, TransCapacity opposes the request.

R96110 Add two business conditional data elements, Aggregator's Supply Point and Aggregator's Supplier to Confirmation, Confirmation Response and Allocation data sets

Recommendation:

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES ERRATA -- FEBRUARY 3, 1997

Add two new data elements to the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response data sets. Proposal was for Business Conditional in the Request for Confirmation, which was modified by the requester to be Mutually Agreeable (MA). These data elements would be Conditional (C) in the Confirmation Response, with the condition being that they would be mandatory in the response if mutually agreed to and present in the Request for Confirmation (corresponding to the modification of the usage by the requester).

Aggregator's Supply Point: A mutually agreeable (MA) field which is the receipt location, using the Industry Common Code, which is the source of the gas being put into a pool.

Aggregator's Supplier: A mutually agreeable (MA) field which is the upstream party, using the Industry Common Code, supplying the gas to the aggregator at the supply point.

Request for Confirmation

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Aggregator's Supply Point *	The receipt location which is the source of the gas being put into a pool.	MA	
Aggregator's Supplier *	The upstream party supplying the gas to the aggregator at the supply point.	MA	

Confirmation Response

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Aggregator's Supply Point *	The receipt location which is the source of the gas being put into a pool.	C	Mandatory where provided in the Request for Confirmation and mutually agreed to.
Aggregator's Supplier *	The upstream party supplying the gas to the aggregator at the supply point.	C	Mandatory where provided in the Request for Confirmation and mutually agreed to.

* Indicates Common Code

Comments:

NGC: NGC agrees with the METF recommendation to decline this request. The information already exists in the datasets in the Upstream Identifier and Location fields.

PEC: PEC request for two additional business conditional data elements in the Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response and Allocation data sets. These two data elements were requested so that TETCO could provide the same information to existing tariff approved "Transportation Aggregation Balancing Service" TABS parties via EDI as is currently available via the EBB. This information identifies the

Date Prepared: February 3, 1997

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR FEBRUARY 5 & 6, 1997 COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES ERRATA -- FEBRUARY 3, 1997

supplier and supply point of the gas which is being put into a TABS pool; it has been provided to the TABS parties since TETCO implemented its TABS service as part of its Order No. 636 restructuring in June 1993 and was deemed to be information needed by the TABS party to confirm the activity at his TABS point since other parties place nominations to move gas into and out of his pool. During the discussion at the 12/18 METF Meeting, the proposed usage of these data elements was changed from business conditional to mutually agreeable; however, the task force members voted to oppose the request to add these elements to the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response data sets. They felt that providing the supply information to the TABS party was providing him with confidential information to which he should not be entitled. The fact that we have been providing this information pursuant to Commission order for 3-1/2 years without adverse effects did not convince them to support the request. The request to add these elements to the Allocation data set was not addressed at the 12/19 MSTF meeting because PanEnergy did not have anyone in attendance to present our position and explain the need for the additional elements.

We have identified a way to use the existing data sets to provide the information which we are currently providing via the EBB, but it will result in some data elements being used for something other than their intended purpose. This is not an acceptable solution. This solution results in presenting virtually meaningless information to the TABS parties, and result in a degradation of existing services which is contrary to the express service of Order No. 587 and GISB's own principles.

TCAP: TransCapacity recommends this be referred to the TTTPT TF. TransCapacity opposes these additional data elements and recommends rejection at this time. This information is not required or specified by any of the adopted GISB standards. It was rejected by a margin of over 2 to 1 at METF. If relevant, this information appears to be related to title transfer tracking.

If not rejected, this request should await the outcome of the Title Transfer Tracking Pilot Test Task Force (TTT-PT-TF).