



**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
Executive Committee Meeting  
May 20, 1999-- 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.**

**Boeing Offices, Seattle, Washington**

**FINAL MINUTES**

**I. Introductory Items**

Mr. Buccigross welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Washington, and thanked Boeing and Ms. Patton for hosting today's meeting. Ms. Patton made introductory remarks. Ms. McQuade read the roll. The agenda was adopted. With modifications made during the meeting, the revised red-lined minutes were adopted. For a full accounting of the discussion from today's meeting, the transcripts should be ordered from Ms. Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting (361-882-9037).

**II. New Requests**

Request Nos. R99032 and R99034 assigned to EII were found within scope unanimously. Request Nos. R99031 and R99033 were also found within scope unanimously. For the disposition of Request Nos. R99031 and R99033, discussion follows:

**R99031**      From:            Submitted by TransCapacity and ANR  
Request:      TransCapacity Limited Partnership and ANR Pipeline request that a new data element "Confirmation Intra-day Indicator" be added to the Detail DTM data segments of the Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response (solicited and unsolicited), Confirmation Response Quick Response and Scheduled Quantity for Operator datasets as Mutually Agreed data elements.

The addition of this data element to the noted datasets would aid in allowing Transportation Service Providers to more easily associate confirmation information to applicable nomination information, and to allow confirming parties to send, in advance, their transmittals of confirmation information to confirming parties wishing to support receiving such advance transmittals.

The new data element would be used as follows:

- Confirmation Cycle Indicator: Will be present in the DTM data segment within the detail segment. ANR and TransCapacity have agreed to exchange this data element in the DTM04 position, with the following ANSI code values, and suggest to the Information Requirements Sub-committee the assignment of "01" for Intra-day 1 cycle confirmations, "02" for Intra-day 2 cycle confirmations, "03" for Timely cycle confirmations, and "04" for Evening cycle confirmations. Additionally, the Scheduled Quantity for Operator dataset will contain exclusive assigned values of "05" representing end of gas day Scheduled Quantity,

and a value of "06" to be used as a Curtailment Indicator representing a revised Scheduled Quantity.

- The usage of this data element in the Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response (solicited and unsolicited), Confirmation Response Quick Response and Scheduled Quantity for Operator are proposed to be Mutually Agreeable. The usage of this data element is proposed to be Mutually Agreeable regardless of the DTM format (i.e., RD8 or RDT).

This modification allows Transportation Service Providers to accept and send confirmations more than one confirmation period in advance, and to more easily associate to tie back confirmation information to applicable nomination information.

TransCapacity LP and ANR Pipeline have agreed to exchange this data element between them, and are certainly willing and able to undertake testing with any party regarding this proposal.

Triage: Send to BPS to be addressed within the normal schedule for nominations.

EC Action: Unanimous support for the triage recommendation.

**R99033**

From: Submitted by Dynegy

Request: Request to add the name and definition of the following data elements to the data set 5.4.13 Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity:

Business Name	Definition	U	Condition
Scheduled Quantity	The scheduled amount expressed in quantity per gas day at a location.	C	Mandatory only for Operationally Available Capacity.
Design Capacity	The design capacity expressed in quantity per gas day at a location.	M	

This will increase the amount of information made available by pipelines to service requesters for both competitive and monitoring purposes. It will also assist service requesters in planning for their future transportation needs and will promote efficiencies in the market place.

This will increase the amount of information made available by pipelines to service requesters for both competitive and monitoring purposes. It will also assist service requesters in planning for their future transportation needs and will promote efficiencies in the market place.

The portion of the Dynegy work paper presented to EII related to this request follows:

4.3.X: For the subcategories of Capacity, the first column headings in the Content Area should be Effective Date/Time, Location, Location Name or Location Zone, when applicable, Location Purpose, Design Capacity, Scheduled Quantity, when applicable, Quantity Available and IT Indicator, when applicable.

Triage: It was suggested that the EC should review the charge of EII and respond to the following questions:

- Can EII recommend standards that include new data elements that are mandatory for comparability purposes?
- Should EII define new business practices operationally available and unsubscribed capacity?

- Should EII address business practices for operationally available and unsubscribed capacity for comparability purposes?
- Should EII define standards for common "look and feel" postings for operationally available capacity?

On the basis of these responses, the EC will determine the disposition of the request.

Priority: The questions will be answered on May 20 in the EC meeting in Seattle.

EC Discussion: Mr. Walker presented the request and recommended against the Triage Subcommittee recommendation that the request disposition be resolved at the EC through the response to the above questions. He made the motion that the request be sent to the BPS. Mr. Scheel disagreed and noted that the request has been on the EII agenda since February. Ms. Hess noted that because the request is asking for mandatory data elements across all web sites, it more properly belongs in the BPS Subcommittee as it is setting a business practice. Others agreed with Ms. Hess. Ms. Scott reviewed the history of the "Look and Feel" group and noted that operationally available and unsubscribed capacity does belong in EII; so therefore, the request belongs in EII, as does an outstanding request she had submitted. Mr. Keeler noted that since EII is already looking at the request, it would be duplicative to send it to BPS, and EII can determine if the data should be mandatory. Mr. Bray noted if it is clearly a business practice it belongs in BPS. Mr. Hartmann proposed a solution to ask EII to invite the BPS to the EII meeting when the request is addressed. After further discussion, Mr. Walker agreed with Mr. Hartmann's suggestion and modified his motion.

EC Action: (Revised Motion, see discussion above) This request will be addressed through a joint meeting of the BPS and EII. This disposition was supported unanimously. The chairs of the BPS and EII will determine when is the most appropriate time to place it on the agenda, which will determine its priority.

### III. Recommended Standards and Modifications

Mr. Walker made the motion, which was seconded by Mr. Keeler and Ms. Unruh, that the recommendations for Request Nos. R97064B, R97064C, R97124, R98023, R98027 and R98028 be adopted as set forth in the GISB meeting materials. Mr. Scheel asked that all recommended standards and standard modifications be adopted except Requests No. R97124 which needs further discussion. The motion was amended to remove Request No. R97124. The motion passed unanimously.

The motion was then made to send Request No. R97124 back to Information Requirements Subcommittee for further work. Ms. Van Pelt noted that if the recommendation is forwarded to Information Requirements Subcommittee, it will not be published in version 1.4. Mr. Walker reviewed the voting record for Request No. R97124, which was unanimous in its support of the recommendation, and asked why the EC was overruling the subcommittee's efforts. He added that those who had objections should have been present in the meetings when the recommendation was formed. Ms. Hess noted that if the request is sent back to Information Requirements Subcommittee and the companies that have objections to the recommendation are not present, the recommendation would not change. The procedural motion to return the request to Information Requirements Subcommittee passed with twelve in favor, five opposed and one abstention.

Ms. Van Pelt reviewed the technical clean up items presented as minor corrections. There was a concern that one of the cleanup items to add a code was not presented with enough time for some of the EC members to review such as change with their staffs. The motion was made for a notational ballot to be sent to the EC members to be returned on June 1 excluding the portion that was debated regarding

addition of a code. The Technical Subcommittee will prepare a separate request for a minor correction and clarification for the addition of the code. Once that document is made available, a separate notational ballot will be sent out for the Executive Committee vote. To implement the corrections, a "17/2" vote is required. The motion passed unanimously.

#### IV. Notices Recommended Standards

Mr. Hansen described the notices recommendation for Request No. R98086, which included one definition and nine standards and a modification to GISB Std. 4.3.29. There was a replacement to S6 as noted in filed comments. S7 was changed in discussions to improve readability.

- D1 "Electronic Notice Delivery" is the term used to describe the delivery of notices via Internet E-mail and/or EDI/EDM.
- S1 Transportation Service Providers should provide affected parties with notification of intraday bumps, operational flow orders and other critical notices through the affected party's choice of Electronic Notice Delivery mechanism(s).
- S2 Unless the affected party and the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) have agreed to exclusive notification via EDI/EDM, the affected party should provide the TSP with at least one Internet E-mail address to be used for Electronic Notice Delivery of intraday bumps, operational flow orders and other critical notices. The obligation of the TSP to provide notification is waived until the above requirement has been met.
- S3 Transportation Service Providers should support the concurrent sending of electronic notification of intraday bumps, operational flow orders and other critical notices to two Internet E-mail addresses for each affected party.
- S4 Affected parties should manage internal distribution of notices received by Electronic Notice Delivery.
- S5 When sending Internet E-mail notifications for intraday bumps, operational flow orders and other critical notices, the subject line of the E-mail should include the following information separated by commas in the following order: (1) "Critical", (2) Notice Type label (per GISB standard 4.3.29), (3) the Notice Effective Date in YYYYMMDD format, (4) the name or abbreviation of the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) (excluding commas), and (5) the TSP's D-U-N-S® number.
- S6 Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) may offer notification mechanisms in addition to those references in GISB Standard [S1] (e.g., EBB/EDM, FF/EDM). TSPs should include at least the same level of information for notification of an intraday bump, operational flow order or other critical notice regardless of the method of notification.
- S7 Intraday bump notices should indicate whether daily penalties will apply for the gas day for which quantities are reduced.
- S8 On the Scheduled Quantity Web page, a mechanism should exist to allow the display of those line items that result in nomination reductions due to intraday bumps before all other line items are displayed, or to allow the selection of only those line items that have been reduced due to intraday bumps.
- S9 Intraday bump notices should contain at least the affected Service Requester Contract, Receipt and/or Delivery Location, and Receipt and/or Delivery Point Quantity from the Scheduled Quantity (GISB standard 1.4.5).
- 4.3.29 The words or labels that should appear in the "Notice Type" column in Standard 4.3.28 should be:

Words	Labels
Capacity Constraint	Cap Constraint
Capacity Discount	Cap. Discount
Curtailment	Curtailment
Force Majeure	Force Majeure

Intraday Bump  
Maintenance  
Operational Flow Order  
Phone List  
Press Release, Company News  
Other

Bump  
Maintenance  
OFO  
Phone List  
News  
Other

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the above standards, which passed unanimously. The Information Requirements Subcommittee is currently working on the proposed changes to the data dictionaries, which should be presented at the July EC meeting.

## V. Common Codes Standards

Ms. Unruh reviewed the recommendation and amended the recommendation to have it titled R97058B and drop the last sentence of the recommendation. The recommendation, as amended, through the discussion is:

R97058B The Common Code Subcommittee recommends two principles and two standards [below] to the Executive Committee. In addition, the Subcommittee recommends a new category, "General Standards," be added to the front of the GISB Standards booklet and to each of the GISB Implementation Guides. This category includes common codes standards and any other global standards. The Common Code Subcommittee further recommends that the proposed standards not go out for ratification until they are fully staffed.

- P1: An entity is a person or organization with sufficient legal standing to enter into a contract or arrangement with another such person or organization (as such legal standing may be determined by those parties) for the purpose of conducting and/or coordinating natural gas transactions.
- P2: For GISB purposes, there should be a unique entity common code for each entity name and there should be a unique entity name for each entity common code.
- S2: Entity common codes should be "legal entities", that is, Ultimate Location, Headquarters Location, and/or Single Location (in Dun & Bradstreet Corporation ("D&B") terms). However, in the following situations, a Branch Location (in D&B terms) can also be an entity common code:
1. when the contracting party provides a D-U-N-S® Number at the Branch Location level; or
  2. to accommodate accounting for an entity that is identified at the Branch Location level.
- S4: Parties should mutually agree to use the Transportation Service Provider's proprietary entity code when the D-U-N-S® Number is not available.

### Related Standards Text:

A decision made in 1993 by a FERC-established standards development group (EBB Working Group 5) resulted in a location coding system which cross-references proprietary point codes to a common industry-supported location code. This common location code, called the GRID Code, was developed based on the American Petroleum Institute (API) well code model. The FERC, in Order 563-A, directed the industry to establish any necessary relationships and to proceed with the implementation of the GRID Code. To achieve this implementation, in August 1994 trade associations representing three segments of the natural gas industry entered into an agreement with Petroleum Information Corporation (PI) to develop and maintain the PI GRID™ Common Code database. As GISB prepared standards for capacity release (July 1995) and nominations (September 1995), GISB fully endorsed the use of the PI GRID™ common codes.

However, after extensive consideration by GISB's Common Code Subcommittee, GISB adopted, on September 30, 1996, a new Common Code for Gas Transaction Points, the GISB/PI Data Reference Number (generally referred to as "DRN"). The DRN is a one-to-nine digit, non-intelligent number also assigned by IHS (successor to PI), which has a one-to-one relationship with the PI GRID™ Code. For more information, access the GISB Web Page at [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org).

In keeping with the trends in other industries involved with EDI, EBB Working Group 5 recommended the acceptance of the D-U-N-S® Number as a common company identifier. This recommendation was also adopted in FERC Order 563-A. The D-U-N-S® Number is assigned to companies by the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation (D&B). Similarly, as GISB prepared standards for capacity release (July 1995) and nominations (September 1995), GISB fully endorsed the use of the D-U-N-S® Number common code.

For GISB Common Code purposes, an entity will use one and only one D-U-N-S® Number. Entity common codes should be "legal entities," that is, Ultimate Location, Headquarters Location, and/or Single Location (in Dun & Bradstreet Corporation ("D&B") terms). However, in the following situations, a Branch Location (in D&B terms) can also be an entity common code: 1. when the contracting party provides a D-U-N-S® Number at the Branch Location level; or 2. to accommodate accounting for an entity that is identified at the Branch Location level. Since D&B offers customers the option of carrying more than one D-U-N-S® Number per entity, please refer to GISB's Web Page at [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org) for directions on determining the one and only one D-U-N-S® Number constituting the GISB Entity Common Code.

[There will be a footnote added later for the Registered Trademark for D&B once it is drafted and approved by GISB General Counsel.]

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the following standards. They will not be ratified until all work has been done on the data dictionaries. After ratification they will be published, at the earliest in version 1.5. After discussion a revised motion was made and passed unanimously to adopt and publish P1, P2, S2 and the related standards text into version 1.4 and hold S4 for ratification until all staff work is complete. Staff work will not be complete for publication in version 1.4.

## **VI. 1999 Annual Plan and Subcommittee Updates**

Ms. Davis updated the EC that the recommendations from the Allocation Grid Drafting Team will be distributed on June 7 for the industry comment period and considered by the EC in July with the expectation that the standards would be published in version 1.4. Ms. Scott and Ms. Munson noted that the Confirmations and Cross Contract Ranking Subcommittee timeframe for deliverables is being revised to include confirmations issues. The schedule will be presented at the July EC meeting. Ms. Hopkins noted that for the EII Subcommittee, contracts issues should be next to be addressed. This committee is significantly ahead of schedule. Its next meeting is scheduled for June 4. Ms. Unruh noted that the Common Codes Subcommittee has a meeting scheduled for June 18, with one request, Request No. R98056, outstanding. Request No. R97058B is considered complete by the Common Codes Subcommittee, and now resides in the Information Requirements Subcommittee where necessary changes to the data dictionaries to reflect common code usage is needed. These changes will not be ready for version 1.4 publication. The repository issues addressed in the Annual Plan for Common Codes are considered complete. The Imbalances Subcommittee is nearing completion on monthly imbalance standards for trading along with proposed data dictionaries to be forwarded to the Information Requirements Subcommittee. Standards will be sent out for industry comment on June 7. The subcommittee recommends that they not be published in version 1.4, as staff work on these standards will not be complete. The Information Requirements Subcommittee has a considerable backlog of items. It is working on the changes to the EII data sets --its current efforts are directed to the nominations related requests. Technical Subcommittee is also working on the EII changes to be presented at July EC meeting. The ANSI Subcommittee is preparing for the quarterly ANSI X12 meeting to be held in June. GISB will present needed changes for the nominations related standards. It was noted that the Future

Technology Task Force (FTTF) is working on the EDM implementation guide changes, which will come before the EC. In addition, the FTTF will propose changes to the minimum requirements guidelines for GISB standards.

#### **VII. Special Reports**

The issue of fully staffed work, and the two work papers prepared, will be addressed in July and the issue of balanced voting will be addressed in July. For preparation, it was requested that a work paper be prepared in advance of the July meeting regarding balanced voting. On the certification program update, Ms. McQuade and Mr. Holbrook noted that they have been working on the insurance and liability issues. Ms. Munson gave an update on the publication of the version 1.4 standards manuals -- everything passed by the EC on July 15 and subsequently ratified by the membership will be included in the manuals. Code value tables will be added to the documentation. EDM books will include sections on flat files and EBBs. The over-riding goal is consistency across all GISB standards manuals, to improve the usability. Those that attend GISB classes often comment on the need for this. She also noted that more description on the ANSI X12 enveloping will be incorporated into the related standards section.

#### **VIII. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned. The EC meeting on July 15 and 16 is scheduled to be held in Las Vegas at the MGM Grand.

- Attachments:
1. Attendance
  2. Voting Record
  3. 1999 Annual Plan as of March 18, 1999

**Attendance**

Executive Committee	Segment	Present	Member
	End Users	✓	Mike Bray
		✗	Kelly Daly
		✓	Dona Gussow
		✗	Diane McVicker (notational ballot provided)
		✓	Tina Patton
	LDCs	✓	Bob Betonte
		✓	Chris Maturo
		✗	Mike Novak (notational ballot provided)
		✓	Robert McAnally for Bill Oppenheim
	Pipelines	✓	Steve Sullivan
		✓	Theresa Hess for Shelley Corman
		✓	Dale Davis
		✓	Bill Griffith for Paul Love
		✓	Julie Unruh
	Producers	✓	Norm Walker
		✓	Paul Keeler
		✗	Richard Smith
		✓	Tommie Hartmann for Bob Wallenhorst
	Services	✓	Joe Wiley
			Vacancy (Terry McRae)
		✓	Jim Buccigross
		✗	Carl Caldwell (notational ballot provided)
		✓	Keith Sappenfield
		✓	Mark Scheel
		✓	Donna Scott

Administrative:	Rae McQuade	- Executive Director
	Veronica Thomason	- GISB Staff
	Dennis Holbrook	- General Counsel
	Jane Copeland	- Ak/Ret Reporting

Attendance

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Member</b>
Corcoran, Cynthia	Attorney at Law	cynthiacorcoran@corcoran-law.com	✕
Fitzgerald, Nancy	Tejas Offshore Pipelines	njfitzgerald@shellus.com	✓
Ford, Jean	Pepco Gas Services/Gaslantic	mmbtu@ibm.net	✓
Fyock, Les	American Gas Association	lfyock@aga.com	✕
Gracey, Mark	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	graceym@epenergy.com	✓
Grygar, Bill	CMS - Panhandle Eastern	wwgrygar@cmsenergy.com	✓
Hansen, Michael	Columbia Gulf Transmission	mrhansen@columbiaenergygroup.com	✓
Hopkins, Tammy	Enron Gas Pipelines	thopins@enron.com	✓
McCain, Marcy	Texas Eastern Transmissiom	mlmccain@duke-energy.com	✓
Munson, Sylvia	Altra Energy	sylviam@altranet.com	✓
Shahan, Mike	Peoples Natural Gas	mshahan@cng.cngt.com	✓
Spangler, Leigh	Latitude Technologies	lspangler@latitudetech.net	✓
Van Pelt, Kim	CMS - Trunkline	kvanpelt@cmsenergy.com	✓
Winters, Dick	Avista Corp.	dwinters@avistacorp.com	✕
Young, Randy	Koch Midstream	young0r@kochind.com	✓

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE VOTING RECORD - MAY 20, 1999**  
**RECOMMENDED STANDARDS AND INTERPRETATIONS**

INDUSTRY SEGMENT	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER OR ALTERNATE	R97064B et al	R97124	Tech. clean-up	Notices Stds	Common Codes 1	Common Codes 2
End User	Mike Bray	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Kelly Daly (absent, no ballot)						
	Dona Gussow	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Diane McVicker (ballot)	✓					
	Tina Patton	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
LDCs	Bob Betonte	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Chris Maturo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Mike Novak (ballot)	✓					
	Robert McAnally	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Steve Sullivan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pipeline	Theresa Hess	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Dale Davis	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Bill Griffith	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Julie Unruh	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Norm Walker	✓	✗	✓	✓		
Producers	Paul Keeler	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Richard Smith (absent. no ballot)						
	Tommie Hartmann	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Joe Wiley	✓	A	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Vacancy						
Services	Jim Buccigross	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Carl Caldwell (ballot)	✓					
	Keith Sappenfield	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Mark Scheel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Donna Scott	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Total	Votes For	22	12	19	19	18	18
	Votes Against	0	5	0	0	0	0
	Votes Abstaining	0	1	0	0	0	0
Results	Pass/Fail	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	Replaced	PASS
	Type of Vote	17/2	SIMPLE	SIMPLE	17/2	by later	17/2
	Member Ratification?	YES	NO	NO	YES	vote	YES

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**  
**1999 ANNUAL PLAN AS OF MAY 20, 1999**

	<b><u>ITEM DESCRIPTION</u></b>	<b><u>STATUS</u></b>	<b><u>SCHEDULED COMPLETION DATE<sup>1</sup></u></b>
<b>Web Page Standards and Transition of EBBs to Internet</b>			
1	Nominations Related Standards - EDI, Web Sites, Flat Files	Completed (1) January 23, 1999	First Qtr 1999
2	Flowing Gas Related Standards - EDI, Web Sites, Flat Files	Completed (1) March 1, 1999	First Qtr 1999
3	Invoicing Related Standards - EDI, Web Sites, Flat Files	Completed (1) May 16, 1999	Second Qtr 1999
4	Capacity Release Related Standards - EDI, Web Sites, Flat Files	On Schedule (1)	Third Qtr 1999
5	Contracts Related Standards - EDI, Web Sites, Flat Files	On Schedule (1)	First Quarter 2000
<b>Common Codes</b>			
6	Common Codes Reference for Business Parties & Locations	On Schedule (2)	Second Qtr 1999
<b>Finish Work of Open Issues -- Carry over Projects from 1998</b>			
7	Imbalance netting standards	Behind Schedule (3) August 1999	First Quarter 1999
8	Ranking Across Contracts	On Schedule (4)	Fourth Quarter 1999
9	Critical Notices (Request No. R98086)	Behind Schedule (5) June 1999	First Quarter 1999
10	Multi-tiered Allocations -- Allocation Grid	Behind Schedule (6) August 1999	Second Quarter 1999
<b>Program of Standards Maintenance</b>			
	Nominations & Capacity Release	On Schedule	Fourth Quarter 1999
	Ongoing Interpretations for Clarifying Language Ambiguities	On Schedule	Ongoing
	Ongoing work on Code Values and Other Technical Matters	On Schedule	Ongoing

<sup>1</sup> Dates in the completion column are by end of the quarter for member ratification. If one item is completed earlier than planned, another item can begin earlier and possibly complete earlier than planned. There are no begin dates on the plan.

**POTENTIAL PROJECTS FOR CONSIDERATION FOR THE 2000 ANNUAL PLAN**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

- 1 Contracts Request No. R98019 -- Development of a Standard Long Term Base Contract for Purchase and Sales of Natural Gas
- 2 Others may be added for consideration for 2000.

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD****1999 ANNUAL PLAN -- EBB INTERNET IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE**

Function	EII *	EC	Member Approval	Implementation Following Member Approval **
General	11/04/1998	12/17/1998	01/1999	
Nominations	11/20/1998	12/17/1998	01/1999	8 months
Flowing Gas	12/18/1998	01/22/1999	02/1999	9 months
Invoicing	03/1999	05/21/1999	06/1999	10 months
Capacity Release	05/1999	07/16/1999	08/1999	11 months
Contracts	11/1999	12/1999	01/2000	9 months

**NOTES:**

However, no implementation should be between November 2, 1999 and March 31, 2000 for Y2K and seasonal considerations. If the date falls within this range, implementation would occur in April 2000.

\* The dates represent the completion of standards related to existing datasets. The dates do not include the completion of requests submitted for additional data elements, code values or new transaction sets necessary to complete the full transition to the Internet of the functions listed. Those items not standardized by the completion date should be implemented as an interim using proposed standard [S21]. This a change from what had been previously included in the dates for completion on the original EII plan.

\*\* The effective date for starting the calculation on implementation following member approval would occur at the beginning of the month of the ratification. An example would be for nominations, ratification would conclude January 17, 1999 and implementation would occur September 1, 1999.

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD****1999 ANNUAL PLAN -- STATUS NOTES AS OF MAY 20, 1999**

- | <b>NOTE</b> | <b>STATUS</b>   |
|-------------|---|
| 1.          | The Web Page Standards and the transition of the EBBs to the Internet effort is assigned to the EBB Internet Implementation Task Force and is under the leadership of Carl Caldwell of Deloitte and Touche, Mike Novak of National Fuel Gas Distribution, Tammy Hopkins of Enron Gas Pipeline Group, Dona Gussow of Florida Power and Light and Paul Keeler of Burlington Resources. The lead chair is Carl Caldwell. The group is ahead of schedule. Efforts on the capacity release sets of standards are complete other than operationally available and unsubscribed capacity and calls for work papers on contracts have been made. Several requests on contracts have been received. The next meeting is scheduled for June 4.  |
| 2.          | The standards and procedures needed for the use of common codes within the GISB standards is assigned to the Common Codes Subcommittee under the leadership of Donna Scott of Enron Administrative Corp, Julie Unruh of Koch Gateway and Tammy Hopkins of Enron Pipeline Group. The subcommittee proposed several standards on the use of the D-U-N-S® Number as the entity common code which were adopted by the Executive Committee (EC) on May 20. The GISB office, along with the general counsel and GISB officers worked with D&B to create both a central repository of information and a downloadable file. Several companies have sent in information to populate the downloadable file as they work with D&B to validate their data. The contract with IHS for the common gas transaction point codes should be finalized shortly, after which it will be posted on the GISB home page. IHS is late on providing the central repository of codes and associated names for gas transaction point common codes. It should be available in June. The standards will be ratified in June, after which this action item will be considered complete. |
| 3.          | The imbalance trading and netting standards and procedures are assigned to the Imbalances Subcommittee under the leadership of Jim Buccigross of National Registry for Capacity Rights and Dennis LaTour of ANR Pipeline. The subcommittee has drafted the standards language for the business practices of trading or netting imbalances on a monthly basis and are completing the data sets for the new transactions. Daily imbalance trading and netting is outstanding. The proposed standards were brought forward to the Executive Committee (EC) in May but delayed for voting until the July EC meeting. The group is behind by one quarter. The standards will be presented in July for EC vote and ratified in August.  |
| 4.          | The standards and procedures for ranking across contracts is assigned to the Cross Contract Ranking Subcommittee chaired by Sylvia Munson of Altra Energy and Donna Scott of Enron Administrative Corp. While the group is considered on schedule for fourth quarter 1999, the scope of the subcommittee was expanded on March 18, 1999 to include issues on the level of confirmations. The name of the subcommittee was changed to Confirmations & Cross Contract Ranking Subcommittee. At the July EC meeting, a new implementation schedule will be presented incorporating the confirmation activities.  |
| 5.          | The standards and procedures for critical notices is assigned to the Notices Task Force chaired by Michael Hansen of Columbia Gas Transmission and Shelley Corman of Enron Gas Pipeline Group. The task force completed its efforts and forwarded the standards on to the Information Requirements Subcommittee to make the necessary changes to the data dictionaries. The business practices standards were adopted by the EC on May 20. The task force is behind by one quarter. The standards will be ratified in June.   |

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**

**1999 ANNUAL PLAN -- STATUS NOTES AS OF MAY 20, 1999**

**NOTE      STATUS**

6.      The standards and procedures for effecting multi-tiered allocations is assigned to the Allocation Grid Drafting Team chaired by Dale Davis of Williams Gas Pipelines. The group has passed its work on to the Information Requirements and Technical Subcommittee for work on the GISB data sets, and ultimate inclusion in the GISB standards. Outstanding questions have been forwarded to the Business Practices Subcommittee. The standards will be presented to the Executive Committee in July for vote and will be incorporated in version 1.4 of the standards. The group is behind schedule by one quarter. The standards should be ratified in August.

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD OPERATING PRACTICE  
ANNUAL PLAN PROCESS, CHARACTERISTICS, IMPLEMENTATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

**PLAN CHARACTERISTICS**

The Annual Plan has the following characteristics and any changes to the Annual Plan will maintain these characteristics:

1. Focus and prioritization of GISB activities : The annual plan provides a clear focus on specific activities with a prioritization defined. The activities defined should have high expectation of implementation. The annual plan will be focused on the standards development and maintenance, and interpretations development efforts of the organization.
2. Resource application to GISB efforts : The annual plan recognizes that the member company resources to work on GISB efforts are limited. The efforts defined for activity by GISB should not exceed those limits by spreading the resources so thin that the assurance of success is affected.
3. Alignment of efforts to assure coordination of intent : It is the intent of the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee that their objectives activities coincide. The Board of Directors and the Executive Committee will direct GISB work through the annual plan so that those intents are aligned and the annual plan efforts are realized.
4. Timetable for efforts : The work of GISB is defined with a specific timetable during which consensus can be reached. If consensus is not reached within that timetable, avenues other than GISB can be pursued.

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PLAN**

1. Recognition of time constraints of development efforts -- the plan provides focus with no more than 5 to 10 major efforts identified, with deadlines for completion which serve as prioritization. The development efforts, deadlines, and priorities are identified in the Annual Plan. If one of the approved efforts is completed during a year, a new effort could be added if approved by the Board of Directors in consultation with the officers of the Executive Committee.
2. Empowerment of the chairs at subcommittee and task force meetings -- chairs are empowered to limit discussions when necessary, call items out of order when applicable, follow agendas closely, and in general exert more control so that the time participants spend in meetings is more effective.
3. Efforts are "implementable" -- each effort should have a reasonable expectation that consensus can be reached, with clear deadlines established for completion. The deadlines provide an incentive to all industry participants to reach closure. For each Board meeting, these deadlines will be reviewed with the progress made to date by the subcommittees. The deadlines, as with any other parameter established in the Annual Plan, cannot be changed without Board approval. If a deadline is missed, the Board, in consultation with the officers of the Executive Committee, will determine whether the work should be continued, put on hold or transferred to another venue.
4. Modifications to existing standards and new standards that are requested which come through the request process should reflect a broad industry need. As prioritization occurs, a primary parameter should be how many companies or segments need this standard or standard change. Industry efforts to implement standards that affect only a few companies should be severely limited.

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE PLAN**

1. Progress toward completion of the plan will be reviewed by the Board quarterly with the officers of the Executive Committee.
2. The deadlines in the Annual Plan, as with any other parameter established in the Annual Plan, cannot be changed without Board approval. When a deadline is reached before the item is completed, the Board, in consultation with the officers of the Executive Committee, will determine whether the work should continue, be postponed or transferred to another venue.
3. Any changes or additions to the annual plan items, including those requested by government agencies or commissions, must first be presented to the Board for its consideration, prioritization and approval.
4. The Board will review monthly progress reports on the Annual Plan to determine if any changes are necessary.
5. The Chairman of the Board of Directors will request that each segment by September name one Board member and one EC member to a task force to develop the subsequent year's annual plan.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE PLAN**

1. The Executive Committee should strive to complete the items set forth in the Annual Plan in the times specified. When a deadline is reached before the item has completed, the Executive Committee will recommend to the Board for the Board's determination of whether the work should continue, be postponed or transferred to another venue.
2. The officers of the Executive Committee will brief the Board at each Board meeting on the progress made towards completing each item on the Annual Plan.
3. There will be boundaries on the time spent in modifying standards, which will be controlled by the Executive Committee through its setting of meeting dates for the subcommittees addressing maintenance issues.
4. A key element in determining priority for maintenance issues is the number of companies or segments needing the modifications requested. The Triage Group recommendations to the Executive Committee will include priorities/dates and possible changes to other priorities such that the workload in maintenance is reasonable considering the other items included in the plan.

**GISB OFFICE RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE PLAN**

1. The GISB office will prepare the monthly progress report to the Board of Directors in consultation with the officers of the Executive Committee and other subcommittee chairs as appropriate.
2. The Executive Director will be an active participant in subcommittee and task force meetings that he or she attends, acting as a liaison to the Board of Directors.

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD OPERATING PRACTICE  
POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE CHAIRS**

Chairs of committees, subcommittees and task forces undertake responsibilities in assuming their roles as presiding officers. The GISB organization is appreciative of the significant leadership efforts that are assumed when individuals agree to serve as chairs.

Chairs act as representatives of the Executive Committee in discharging its responsibilities with respect to the organization's purposes. The annual plan adopted by the Board of Directors sets forth GISB's priorities for the year in question, and the chairs are strictly charged by the Board and the Executive Committee to ensure that the subcommittees and task forces are directed to the end of accomplishing the annual plan. As such, chairs are empowered to take any actions necessary to ensure that the discussion is timely, effective, and focused on matters consistent with the plan, including, but not limited to setting and enforcing deadlines for debate, ruling items out of order, and otherwise supervising the progress of the meetings for which they are responsible.

The principles below are in full accordance with normal rules of order for groups following the democratic principles of parliamentary procedure.

1. The chair's role is that of serving the assembly, striving for fair play among the participants, trying to ascertain the participants' and the organization's intent, and providing guidance for the fulfillment of the intent of the organization as a whole. The organization's intent is reflected in the annual plan.
2. Presiding officers of a meeting should remain impartial and objective. If a motion is made, and the chair wishes to advocate a particular position, he or she should ask another officer to act as chair during the discussion. After the discussion, the chair should resume his or her role as the presiding officer.
3. The chair should not permit participants to speak at will, offer alternative main motions when a main motion is already under consideration, interrupt speakers or claim the floor without first being recognized by the chair.
4. The chair should refuse to allow participants to claim the floor several times before others have had their first opportunity to speak.
5. The chair is empowered to limit discussions when necessary and call items out of order if not on the agenda of the meeting.
6. The chair is to guide the participants to follow the agenda and to meet the goals established for that agenda and to realize the organization's intent. The organization's intent is reflected in the annual plan.
7. It is the responsibility of the chair to guide the participants so that the time spent in the meeting is effective, meets the goals of the organization, and addresses the items on the agenda.
8. The chair should ensure that the agenda for the meeting is in agreement with the intent of the organization as a whole.
9. The chairs are empowered to limit discussion to the named members of the committee, task force or group. They are also empowered to name members of subgroups to act on specific issues. While all GISB meetings are open, chairs can restrict discussion in the meetings to the named members of the groups.
10. The chairs should ensure that draft minutes of the meetings and any exhibits (including any work papers and alternative proposals) are prepared as soon as reasonably possible as provided in the GISB Operating Practices.