

March 18, 1998

To: Rae McQuade and Members of the Executive Committee
From: Amoco, Exxon, Enron Capital & Trade, NGC Corp., and Texaco Natural Gas Inc.
Re: Minority Positions - Internet Look & Feel Task Force

The following is being offered by the companies signing on to this position paper for two reasons:

- 1) It represents viewpoints of the minority as defined in the voting record of the Internet Look & Feel Task Force(IL&F). It is offered to assist the Executive Committee in understanding a broader range of the discussions that occurred in the task force meetings, and
- 2) To call the Executive Committee's attention to the need for greater clarity of objective within the subcommittee and task force activities. (Please refer to the attached statement of objectives of the GISB Board of Directors.)

All the signatories were active in the IL&F meetings and offered proposals for its consideration. We are pleased with much of the progress made in this important effort. IL&F was successful in achieving consensus in a number of areas such as:

- a) Definition of navigational procedures for the non-transactional Web site.
- b) Recommendation for a Central Address Repository.
- c) Definition of the content area for Notices & Tariffs.

We support the body of work submitted to you, but also recognize that additional progress should be made. Specifically, we call your attention to items marked Standard Numbers 16,17, 18, 21, 22, 26 & 27 in the attachments hereto. (Screen mockups were presented and are available.) All of these items were proposed by the minority group but were tabled whereby discussion ended abruptly. Included with each of the tabled standards are the segment checks that were requested during the meetings. We also call your attention to the record of Proposed Standard 24 and 24A where the discount offers were removed from the categories to be downloaded in tab delimited ASCII format. We believe that discount offers should be a part of that standard.

These seven items represent a minority viewpoint based on participation in the meetings but do not in our opinion represent a lack of broad segment support. The proposals presented to you in the IL&F report will standardize the Headers and Titles for Notices and Tariffs. However, no similar standardization occurred for Affiliated Marketer Information, Operationally Available & Unsubscribed Capacity postings and Index of Customers. These topics should receive the same degree of standardization as the aforementioned two categories in order to complete the task force's assignment. At a minimum, the task force should reconvene to further discuss standard nomenclature for

titles and column headings within the categories of postings mentioned above. In addition, the task force requested the Future Technology Task Force to issue rules for the download of information in the tab delimited ASCII file format. This is an area of particular interest in the standardization process across multiple pipelines and should be reviewed by the IL&F task force. The minority companies recommend that the Executive Committee return the March 19 report to the task force with specific instructions to finish the work in these areas.

We also call your attention to the last two segment checks taken before the task force concluded its last meeting. We ask that the Executive Committee make it clear that all segment checks as well as tabled and minority positions be furnished to the Executive Committee. This will insure that the Executive Committee has a complete record of the decisions of the task force and can give advisory comments to the task forces as needed. This is consistent with previous treatment of contentious issues.

In addition and of subsequent concern is the use of a “motion to table” to end discussion of a topic without thorough investigation and “drilldown” of ideas and planned processes to reach ultimate resolution of a stated objective given a task force or subcommittee. This procedure is useful when companies want to check with internal departments before further discussion of the topic continues. We believe “tabled motions” should be taken from the table at the next meeting and resolved. When a majority present can use such a tactic, we are limiting the open forum of the GISB standardization process thus creating a further deterrent to participation.

Internet Look and Feel Task Force Meeting
Excerpts from Minutes

Statement of Objectives for the Meeting - August 27, 1997

*Be it resolved that the GISB Board of Directors requests the GISB Executive Committee to further evaluate such standards as are necessary to ensure that the five postings in GISB Standard 4.3.6 version 1.1 are implemented by **Transportation Service Providers in a consistent and user friendly manner including the development of common Web page structures, viewing formats, nomenclature, logon procedures, and download capabilities.***

And GISB Standard 4.3.6 is as follows:

By August 1, 1997 Transportation Service Providers should establish a HTML page(s) accessible via the Internet's World Wide Web. The information that is currently provided should be posted is as follows:

- 1) Notices (critical notices, operation notices, system wide notices, etc.)*
- 2) FERC Order No 566 affiliated marketer information. (affiliate allocation log, 24 hr. Discount postings, etc.)*
- 3) Operationally available and unsubscribed capacity*
- 4) Index of Customers*
- 5) Transportation Service Provider's tariff (Terms, conditions and rates), or general terms and conditions.*

and

Transportation Service Providers should make all pertinent EBB functions and information available via the Internet or via the technology recommended by GISB within a reasonable amount of time after each such function or information has become standardized as appropriate by GISB.

and

Within a reasonable amount of time, all EBB information, functions and transactions should be achieved via one mode of communications. Information and functions should remain available through existing systems until one mode of communication is available. Implementation timelines for this activity would be determined during the 1997 annual planning activities held in 1996.

Framework For Internet "Look and Feel" Standardization

F. Establish standard nomenclature for titles and column headings displayed above tabular lists of documents within categories and subcategories.

Minutes from February 24, 1998

Motion Proposed Standard 16:

The column headings for the "Operationally Available Capacity" document and "Unsubscribed Capacity" document should be displayed as follows:

<i>Super Header</i>	<i>Header</i>
<i>Gas Transaction Point</i>	<i>Point Common Code</i>
<i>Gas Transaction Point</i>	<i>Point Description</i>
<i>Gas Transaction Point</i>	<i>Segment/Zone Name</i>
<i>Details</i>	<i>Location/Quantity Type</i>
<i>Details</i>	<i>Quantity Available (Measurement Basis*)</i>
<i>Details</i>	<i>Available Capacity Effective Date/Time</i>
<i>Details</i>	<i>Available Capacity End Date/Time</i>
<i>Details</i>	<i>Posting Date/Time</i>

**Measurement Basis should be shown in the heading as MMBTU, GJ or MCF.*

The column headings should appear in this order, from left to right. The population of data in these columns should be consistent with the corresponding data element usage in Standard 5.4.13. The data should be sorted by the "Gas Transaction Point". Where Gas Transaction Point 2 is used, it is grouped with the associated Gas Transaction Point 1.

Discussion:

Mr. Whatley offered that other headings were allowed but should appear to the right in order to be consistent. Ms. Hess stated the pieces of information had an EDI usage attached to them in Standard 5.4.16. Mr. Tsucalas explained these were the required headings but the content was consistent. Mr. Ehinger offered it would be helpful if the standard recognized an optional column which would be added under the super-headings and called optional. Ms. Hess suggested that this issue was best given to another group for guidance and perhaps should be put on hold.

Action:

As discussion continued Mr. Tsucalas withdrew the motion on the floor to be brought back at a later time.

Mr. Whatley made a motion to adopt Standard 16 as previously amended:

Motion:

The column headings for the "Operationally Available Capacity" document and "Unsubscribed Capacity" document should be displayed as follows:

Super Header

Gas Transaction Point

Gas Transaction Point

Gas Transaction Point

Details

Details

Details

Details

Details

Header

Point Common Code

Point Description

Segment/Zone Name

Location/Quantity Type

Quantity Available (Measurement Basis*)

Available Capacity Effective Date/Time

Available Capacity End Date/Time

Posting Date/Time

*Measurement Basis should be shown in the heading as MMBTU, GJ or MCF.

The column headings should appear in this order, from left to right. The population of data in these columns should be consistent with the corresponding data element usage in Standard 5.4.13. The data should be sorted by the "Gas Transaction Point". Where Gas Transaction Point 2 is used, it is grouped with the associated Gas Transaction Point 1.

Discussion:

Mr. Heal moved to table this motion.

Action:

Voting results were:

24 in favor, 11 opposed, 1 abstained. Motion carried

A segment check produced the following voting:

Pipelines	in favor 15	opposed 3	abstained 1
Producers	in favor 0	opposed 3	abstained 0
Services	in favor 8	opposed 4	abstained 0
LDCs	in favor 1	opposed 1	abstained 0
End Users	in favor 0	opposed 0	abstained 0

Mr. Wallenhorst made a motion for Standard 17:

The following abbreviations may be used when displaying columns and field names:

Available	Avail
Capacity	Cap
Date/Time	D/T
Description	Desc
Effective	Eff
Location	Loc
Quantity	Qty
Maximum Daily Quantity	MDQ
Maximum Storage Quantity	MSQ

Discussion:

Ms. Munson moved to table this motion until after the Internet Transition Team meeting.

Action:

Voting resulted in:

21 in favor, 9 opposed, 3 abstained. Motion was tabled.

Segment Check resulted in:

Pipelines	in favor 15	opposed 2	abstained 2
Producers	in favor 0	opposed 3*	abstained 0
LDCs	in favor 1*	opposed 0	abstained 0
Services	in favor 6	opposed 5	abstained 1
End Users	in favor 0	opposed 0	abstained 0

*out of the room when the first vote was taken so the segment check does not equal original vote count

Mr. Hartmann offered a motion for Standard 18:

The required column headings for the "Index of Customers" list are:

Header

Customer

Rate Schedule

Contract Effective Date

Contract Termination Date

Maximum Daily Quantity

Maximum Storage Quantity

Footnotes (when applicable)

These columns will appear in this order, from left to right. The data will be sorted in ascending order by customer name.

Discussion:

Ms. Scott reminded the group that it should be in the same format as that of the FERC. Ms. Davis also reminded the group that request R97120 talked about the download format and was related but not as this motion. Ms. McQuade agreed that R97120 submitted by TransCapacity was in regard to the download format. Ms. Ford moved that the motion on the floor be tabled.

Action:

Voting results were:

21 in favor, 11 opposed, 4 abstained. Motion carried.

A segment check showed the following results:

Pipelines	in favor 13	opposed 3	abstained 3
Producers	in favor 0	opposed 3	abstained 0
Services	in favor 7	opposed 4	abstained 1
LDCs	in favor 1	opposed 1	abstained 0
End Users	in favor 0	opposed 0	abstained 0

Mr. Hartmann moved to adopt as Standard 21:

The column headings for the posting of Affiliate Discount Information should be displayed as follows:

Shipper (Affiliated Marketer)

Posting Date

Delivery Point

Quantity

Discount Rate

Maximum Rate

Effective Begin Date

Effective End Date

Notes

The columns should appear in this order, from left to right. The data should be sorted by Posting Date in reverse chronological order.

Discussion:

Mr. Cochran moved to table the motion.

Action:

Voting results were:

24 in favor, 11 opposed, 1 abstained. Motion carried

A segment check resulted in:

Pipelines	in favor 15	opposed 3	abstained 1
Producers	in favor 0	opposed 3	abstained 0
Services	in favor 8	opposed 4	abstained 0
LDCs	in favor 1	opposed 1	abstained 0
End Users	in favor 0	opposed 0	abstained 0

Mr. Hartmann then moved to adopt for Standard 22:

The column headings for the posting of the "Capacity Allocation Log" are Shipper (Affiliated Marketer)

Contract Number

Relevant Date

Notes

The columns should appear in this order, from left to right. The data should be sorted by Relevant Date in chronological order.

Discussion:

Ms. Munson moved to table the motion.

Action:

Voting resulted in:

24 in favor, 11 opposed 11, 1 abstained. Motion carried.

A segment check resulted in:

Pipelines	in favor 15	opposed 3	abstained 1
Producers	in favor 0	opposed 3	abstained 0
Services	in favor 8	opposed 4	abstained 0
LDCs	in favor 1	opposed 1	abstained 0
End Users	in favor 0	opposed 0	abstained 0

Ms. Munson then offered the following motion for Standard 23:

There should be no standards that effect the display format or appearance of the content area of a Web page.

Discussion:

Discussion led to Ms. Munson stating she was willing to accept modifications, she did not intend to modify those things that had already been accepted and passed. Mr. Walker pointed out that this was addressing Standards 5.16, 5.17, 5.18, 5.21, and 5.22. Ms. Hess suggested that these issues were best given to another group for guidance and perhaps should be put on hold.

Action:

Ms. Munson withdrew her motion in favor of letting each item to be brought up individually.

Minutes from February 25, 1998

Mr. Whatley made a motion to adopt Standard 24:

Motion:

The following categories and subcategories should be downloadable in tab-delimited ASCII format:

- Capacity Allocation Log*
- Discount Offers*
- Operationally Available Capacity*
- Unsubscribed Capacity*
- Index of Customers*

Discussion:

Mr. Lehn stated that Discount Offers does not have a standard X12 formation which would present a problem. Ms. McQuade agreed it does not, it is in the FERC format. Mr. Tsucalas stated it was hard to picture this information in a tab-delimited format. Mr. Lehn offered there were issues with this motion. For example, would the data to be downloaded to include the headers? Mr. Link stated that Standard 5.3.5 stated we must provide this information and asked if this was a modification of that standard or an additional standard. Mr. Whatley answered this would be an additional standard and was not related to the other standards. Discussion continued on the issues of downloadable formats and x12 formats available at the present time.

Action:

Voting resulted in:

13 in favor, 23 opposed, 1 abstained. Motion failed.

A segment check resulted in:

Pipelines	in favor 3	opposed 17	abstained 0
Producers	in favor 4	opposed 0	abstained 0
Services	in favor 6	opposed 5	abstained 0
LDCs	in favor 0	opposed 1	abstained 1
End Users	in favor 0	opposed 0	abstained 0

Discount Offers was removed from Proposed Standard 24 and Proposed Standard 24A passed.

Proposed Standard 24A:

The following categories and subcategories should be downloadable in tab-delimited ASCII format:

- Capacity Allocation Log**
- Operationally Available Capacity**
- Unsubscribed Capacity**
- Index of Customer**

Vote:

In Favor 14

Opposed 13

Abstain 2

Motion Passed

Framework For Internet “Look and Feel” Standardization

IV. Ability to easily download information from theTSP’s Web site

Principle 4: Information across Information Postings Web site should be easy to download.

Draft Minutes from March 9 & 10

Motion Standard 26:

The operational Available Capacity andUnsubscribed Capacity file for download should include the following columns in this order:

- Point Common Code
- Point Description
- Segment Zone Name
- Location Quantity Type
- Available Quantity
- Available Capacity Effective Date/Time
- Available Capacity End Date/Time
- Posting Date/Time

Discussion:

Mr. Walker noted this seemed to be like a motion which had been tabled. Mr. Tsucalas stated this was new motion. Mr. Walker asked if they were related. Mr. Sicignano stated there were two difference things what was seen and what was in the file. Mr. Walker asked if there was a significance to stating "in the order". Mr. Sicignano answered it was so that everything would be seen in the same order and there would be no confusion as to what was to be seen. At this point Ms. Jean Ford made a motion to table this motion.

Action:

Voting resulted in:

16 in favor, 4 opposed, 1 abstained. Motion carried.

A segment check produced:

End Users	0 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
LDCs	1 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
Pipelines	12 in favor	0 opposed	1 abstained
Producers	0 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
Services	3 in favor	4 opposed	0 abstained

Motion: Standard 27

The "Capacity Allocation Log" file for download should include the following columns in this order:

- Shipper (Affiliated Marketer)
- Contract Number
- Relevant Date

The data should be sorted by Relevant Date in chronological order.

Discussion:

Mr. Walker asked if this was the same motion which had been tabled at an earlier time. Mr. Buccigross moved to table this motion.

Action:

Voting resulted in:

18 in favor, 8 opposed, 3 abstained

A segment check produced the following votes:

End Users	0 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
LDCs	0 in favor	0 opposed	1 abstained
Pipelines	15 in favor	1 opposed	0 abstained
Producers	0 in favor	3 opposed	0 abstained
Services	3 in favor	4 opposed	2 abstained

Review of Presentation of Proposed Principles, Definitions, Standards and Visual Examples to the Executive Committee

A show of hands as to:

Do the tabled motions get put on a separate document and sent to the EC

Voting resulted in:

in favor 6 opposed 14 abstained 1. Motion failed.

A segment check was asked for late and the numbers do not add

End Users	0 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
LDCs	1 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
Pipelines	1 in favor	12 opposed	0 abstained
Producers	0 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
Services	4 in favor	2 opposed	1 abstained

A show of hands as to:

Selectively picking out the segment check items and sending them to the EC.

Voting resulted in:

in favor 5, opposed 14, abstained 3

A segment check produced:

End Users	0 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
LDCs	1 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
Pipelines	0 in favor	12 opposed	1 abstained
Producers	1 in favor	0 opposed	0 abstained
Services	3 in favor	2 opposed	2 abstained