



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting
May 20 & 21, 1998 -- 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

The Doubletree Hotel, Houston, Texas

FINAL MINUTES

I. Introductory Items

Mr. Bray welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Houston and made introductory remarks. Mr. Holbrook reviewed the antitrust guidelines. Roll was called (23 members or alternates present) and members and alternates were welcomed to the committee meeting. There were revisions to the agenda with a reordering of item nos. 2 and 4 to May 21, and item nos. 9 and 7 to May 20. The revised agenda was adopted unanimously. The draft minutes from April 16 with modifications were adopted unanimously.

II. Proposed Standards and Interpretations

Request No. R96121A6, A7, A9, A10, A11, A12, A13, A14, A15, A16 and A17, regarding code value cleanup was discussed and no business practice issues were raised. The task force recommendations do not recommend usage changes, rather they may change definitions, add codes or consolidate existing codes. The code values changes were reviewed by Ms. Hess for Request No, R96121A6. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A6. The code values changes were reviewed by Ms. Hess for Request No, R96121A7. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A7. The code values changes were reviewed by Ms. Hess for Request No, R96121A9. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A9.

The code values changes were reviewed by Ms. Hess for Request No, R96121A10. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A10. The code values changes were reviewed by Ms. Hess for Request No, R96121A11. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A11. The code values changes were reviewed by Ms. Hess for Request No, R96121A12. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A12. The code values changes were reviewed by Mr. Buccigross for Request No, R96121A13. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A13.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

The code values changes were reviewed by Mr. Buccigross for Request No, R96121A14. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A14. The code values changes were reviewed by Mr. Buccigross for Request No, R96121A15. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A15. The code values changes were reviewed by Mr. Buccigross for Request No, R96121A16. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A16.

The code values changes were reviewed by Mr. Buccigross for Request No, R96121A17. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the standard modification indicated by the recommendation for R96121A17.

For Request No. R97080, Mr. Lander reviewed the business practices issues of the recommendation. After discussion, modifications were made to the Technical Change Log provided in the recommendation. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the revised recommendation for R97080, with Mr. Novak absent from the voting.

For Request No. R97022A, this request was considered in February and the Executive Committee voted to adopt the recommendation provisionally, based on conforming changes from both the Information Requirements Subcommittee and the Technical Subcommittee. After discussion, the motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the recommendation for R97022A, with Mr. Novak absent from the voting. Mr. Buccigross made a motion to revise the recommendation to include request no. R97022B, to add a mandatory data element "Service Requester" to the Request For Confirmation, Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity for Operator documents. The motion was seconded and discussion ensued. The motion was withdrawn after discussion and another motion was made to expedite addressing Request No. R97022 through the Business Practices Subcommittee to be addressed after the flowing gas issues. The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

For Request No. C98001, a clerical error should be corrected in the recommendation. The first instance of "TSP" should be "Transportation Service Provider (TSP)". Mr. Lander reviewed the request. Mr. Keeler noted that he favored a more expansive interpretation. Ms. Van Pelt raised the concern that it may not be technically feasible to implement the interpretation. Ms. Corman motioned that the EC adopt C98001, with instructions to the Information Requirements Subcommittee to review the need for additional codes. The motion was seconded and passed with one vote cast in opposition. The GISB office will inform the chairs of the Information Requirements Subcommittee of this decision.

III. EBB-Internet Transition Team Models and Report to the Board of Directors

Mr. Buccigross Described the model ("model 1") entitled the "Combined Service Competitor's" model. Some of the key points of his presentation of model 1 were:

- 1 TSPs are free to build and maintain EBBs or transactional web sites, but the cost of doing so is not in the TSPs' cost of service.
- 2 TSPs may or may not choose to bill for the service for the EBB or transactional web site.
- 3 Irrespective of the method of communication chosen to input transactional information electronically, the information input is converted to EDI, for comparability of methods.
- 4 If an alternate mechanism exists to receive or deliver information in addition to the EBB or transactional web site, (i.e. phone call, fax, or email), then EDI data sets do not need to be developed.
- 5 Every pipeline need not provide a transactional web site.

Mr. Buccigross then reviewed the proposed standards outlined for model 1. Mr. Novak then described the CAMEL model ("model 2"). Some of the key points of model 2 are:



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

- 1 EBBs or transactional web sites provide a tremendous value to the industry.
- 2 For functions present on EBBs but not standardized, there is an area to present those transactions until the determination on standardization is made.
- 3 Every pipeline with an EBB should offer a standardized transactional web site as they transition their EBBs to the Internet. As new functions are added to the web site, if a standardized procedure exists, it should be used. The deadline of June 1, 1999 is not feasible for a full transition.
- 4 Not every transaction communicated electronically should have an EDI counterpart.
- 5 Navigation should be controlled by ordering towards the top the most frequently used transactions.
- 6 Innovation is protected.

Ms. Yarborough presented an on-line presentation of a fictional pipeline which had been built using Java.

For an accounting of the full discussion, the transcripts should be used -- which can be ordered from Jane Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting. For comparability at a data level, model 2 transactions on the transactional web sites are based on the EDI data sets. For comparability at a performance level in model 2, the providers and customers have a choice of EDI or transactional web sites for whichever communication method makes the most business sense. An issue was raised with model 2 that users of EDI may be penalized vis-a-vis transactional web sites. It was noted that it would be helpful if in the comparison chart, both models would be noted with which of their specific standards addresses each of the comments.

The comment was made that GISB should carefully consider comparability and the restrictions necessary for transactional web sites and EDI comparability. For small numbers of transactions, EDI may not be a financially reasonable choice. In response to a question on the 15 minute window for timing comparability, model 1 does support the 15 minute window to level the playing field. Once transactions reach the designated site, they are processed in the same manner. Several business functions that are available currently on the EBBs but do not have EDI corresponding data sets and may not be reasonable for EDI were identified such as real-time operational flow data or capacity bidding. For model 1, regarding real-time operational flow data, that may be considered informational rather than transactional.

Mr. Ishikawa noted that the electric industry developed specifications and the system was co-funded by the industry and built. Neither model specifically addresses this approach and it is a different approach than normally used. Concerns were raised that development of transactional web based systems may be as difficult as developing EDI -- linking of Internet based systems to legacy systems and ensuring the Internet based systems work across several servers can be difficult. XML as an on-line tool to link to EDI is also being investigated which could alleviate some of the concerns with EDI. However, other comments were made that GISB should not specify tools to be used as better tools could be on the marketplace shortly. Another comment was that linking legacy systems as to Internet based systems is difficult is as linking legacy systems to EDI.

A procedural motion was made to report both models to the Board of Directors. The motion was seconded and adopted with twenty-one votes in favor and two votes in opposition. There was a motion for a sense of the room for support of model 1 as discussed and presented. The motion was seconded and received two votes in support and twenty-one votes in abstention. There was a motion for a sense of the room for support of model 2 as discussed and presented. The motion was seconded and received nineteen votes in support and four votes in abstention. These motions and results will be reflected in the report to the Board.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

IV. Internet Look and Feel Standards

The proposed Internet standards as reflected in the recommendation for request no. R97102 will be voted by the Executive Committee as a block. There is a minority report to be considered and two sets of written comments submitted by Mr. Love of NGPL and KN Energy, and Ms. Ford of Andersen Consulting.

Mr. Love reviewed his comments regarding the proposed Internet standards. For proposed standard no. 8, after discussion, he recommended deleting the sub-categories -- currently effective rates, rate schedules, general terms and conditions, form of service agreement -- as they are part of the table of contents and are duplicative with proposed standard no. 19. For proposed standard no. 19, after discussion, he determined that changes were not necessary. Motion was made to modify proposed standard 8 to remove currently effective rates, rate schedules, general terms and conditions, form of service agreement and for standard 19, the term "sub-categories" would be replaced with the term "headings". The resulting vote was one in favor, fifteen opposed and five abstaining. The motion to change proposed standard nos. 8 and 19 failed. The change to proposed standard 14d was withdrawn. The motion was made to re-characterize proposed standard no. 29 as a replacement for existing GISB Standard No. 4.3.16. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Ford reviewed her comments regarding the proposed Internet standards. For pages 15 and 16, the motion was made to change the word "minimal" to "suggested" as a header and in the title. There were eight votes in favor of the motion, eleven opposed and four voted as abstentions. The motion failed and the change was not made. For pages 15 and 16, the motion was made to delete the "optimal" columns and the reference to "optimal" in the titles. There were three votes in favor of the motion, fourteen opposed and four voted as abstentions. The motion failed and the change was not made. An alternative motion was made to change the column headers "optimal" on pages 15 - 16 and title "optimal" in the title of page 15 to "suggested (7/31/98)" on pages 15 and 16. The motion passed with eighteen votes in favor and two abstentions. The recommendation will be changed. The motion was made to remove hardware specifications from pages 15 and 16. The motion failed. The motion was made to delete standard 15. The motion failed.

The motion was made to adopt the Internet package of standards represented by Request No. R97102 with the two changes stated in the prior two paragraphs. The motion passed with twenty-two in favor, zero opposed, and zero abstentions.

The motion was made to adopt the recommended standards in the minority report as a package, and the motion failed. The motion failed with 13 votes in favor, five opposed and five abstentions.

The motion was made to adopt minority report proposed standard 16. The resulting vote on the package failed with 17 votes in favor, 6 votes opposed.. The motion was made to adopt minority report proposed standard 18 from the minority report. The resulting vote on the package failed with 18 votes in favor, two opposed and three abstentions. The motion was made to adopt minority report proposed standard 21. The motion was withdrawn for address on May 21 with the remainder of the minority report items. Proposed standard 16 and 18 of the minority report may be reconsidered at that time.

V. Intraday Nominations

Mr. Bray introduced the topic. Mr. Hahn made a motion to modify standard 1.3.2ii and 1.3.2vi to include 9:00 a.m. It was noted that some companies have requests for rehearing which would affect their votes and could affect the potential outcome of their rehearings if it were perceived that GISB supported a 9:00 a.m. value for the evening nominations. The motion passes with 21 in favor and two in opposition.

VI. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m. and will reconvene at 9:00 a.m. May 21.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

May 21, 1998

I. Introduction

Mr. Bray made opening remarks and noted that the agenda item for ANSI would be delayed to later in the day. Mr. Holbrook reminded the participants of the antitrust guidelines. Mr. Bray summarized issues from yesterday. Mr. Wiley joined the Executive Committee meeting replacing Mr. Smith, and Mr. Gracey joined the Executive Committee replacing Mr. Walker.

II. Internet Standards -- Minority Report (continued from May 20, topic IV)

The motion was made that proposed standard 18 from the minority report be adopted as a standard with the following changes:

The header information should be displayed at the top before the columnar information.

The column headings for the posting of "Index of Customers" should be displayed as follows:

Rate Schedule, Customer, Contract Effective Date, Contract Termination Date, Maximum Daily Quantity, Maximum Storage Quantity, Rollover period, Footnotes (when applicable)

These columns should appear in this order from left to right. The data should be sorted in ascending order by rate schedule and by customer within rate schedule. Footnote text should be displayed below the columnar information.

The motion passed unanimously. The motion was made to move the remaining proposed standards outlined in the minority report to be considered with the development of standards for the transactional web sites. The motion was adopted unanimously.

III. New Requests

The motion was made to find Request Nos. R98018, R98019, and R98020 in scope. The motion was withdrawn, and the motion was made to find Request No. R98018 within scope. The request:

"Add a method to the Scheduled Quantity by Contract (865SQTS) and the Scheduled Quantity for Operator (865SQOP) to send multiple (up to ten) Reduction Reason Codes (additional Reduction Reason Codes are MA) and add a new data element Reduction Quantity (MA) multiple times (up to 10). Definition of Reduction Quantity - Quantity associated with Reduction Reason Code."

was submitted by El Paso Natural Gas and Southern California Gas. The motion was made to adopt the recommendation of the Triage Group to direct the request to the Business Practices Subcommittee to be addressed with the nominations issues. The Business Practices Subcommittee should address the following questions: (1) Are these Reduction Quantities the difference between the old requested quantities and the new ones?, (2) Are the Reduction Quantities supposed to sum?, and (3) How should the codes and quantities be used in the data sets? The motion passed unanimously.

The motion was made to find Request No. R98019, 'Develop a long term master purchase and sales contract for natural gas', submitted by PG&E Energy Trading, within scope. There was discussion on the merits of the request which can be accessed from the transcripts. The motion passed with 15 in favor, 4 opposed, and 4 abstaining. The motion was made to support the Triage Group recommendation to direct the request to the Contracts Subcommittee, to be placed on a Contracts Subcommittee agenda after existing work is completed, and as the 1998 Annual Plan permits. The task force chairs will be asked to provide a road map of development to the Executive Committee before significant effort is undertaken. The motion passed with 20 in favor, 3 opposed.

The motion was made to find Request No. R98020,



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

'Develop a standard Agency Agreement and associated business practice standards whereby transportation service providers (TSPs) or their agents provide TSP's business parties an Agency Agreement whereby the business parties would appoint the TSP or the TSP's agency to act as agent for the business coordination purpose of collecting and disseminating business party identification codes. These business parties would include but not be limited to service requesters, interconnected service providers, information service providers, end-use customers, marketers and producers.",

submitted by TransCapacity Limited Partnership, within scope. The motion passed unanimously. The motion was made to support the Triage Group recommendation to direct the request to the Business Practices Subcommittee, to be addressed immediately after Flowing Gas issues. In the discussion that ensued, it was recommended that the Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS) deal with the threshold issues and business practice standards, and if it moves forward to send it to the Contracts Subcommittee for development of an agency agreement, and to other subcommittees or task forces as appropriate. It is noted that request no. R98020 has a priority over request no. R98019. Mr. Hahn asked that the Executive Committee hold direction of this request until further discussions of the Executive Committee Officers and the GISB office with D&B have concluded. He asked that the Executive Committee review this request in June. The motioner amended his motion to review the direction of request R98020 in June. The motion passed unanimously.

IV ANSI Compliance

Mr. Wallenhorst introduced the subject. Ms. Van Pelt described the migration plan timeline. The timeline will be affected by the workload on the Technical Subcommittee. Until DISA publishes the new versions of the X12 manuals, the task force will work using the current versions available from DISA. The team will map to existing X12 documents. Ms. Breeden reviewed specific items of the plan and the interactions with the X12 committee to ensure that GISB changes are processed for adoption by DISA. The adopted changes would be reflected in the December 1998 release by DISA of version 4020 of the X12 standards manuals. The team recommended an out of cycle publication in January 1999 for the GISB invoicing standards manuals to reflect the ANSI Y2K changes, linked to the schedule from DISA for their publication. The schedule outlined links the publication of DISA to the GISB publication. They recommended a change in our publication schedule for 1999 and forward, possibly to the first quarter rather than in July.

Mr. Hahn made the motion to adopt the ANSI Compliance schedule. Ms. Van Pelt answered questions. Regarding different version numbers, translators are specific to ANSI X12 versions, so as GISB supports multiple versions -- for example Invoicing in version 4010 and Payment Remittance in version 3040, the translator functions for those versions should be maintained. The GISB implementation guides will contain all necessary information. GISB members should be able to implement from the guides without purchasing X12 guides from DISA. The plan was adopted unanimously.

V. Board and Executive Committee Special Meetings

Mr. Bray reviewed the special meetings held to discuss the effect of Order No. 587-G and its effect on our 1998 Annual Plan. The Board has determined at this time not to change the annual plan, and a letter has been distributed to pipeline members, associations and posted on the GISB home page requesting identification of electronic standards development needs. The requests should be forwarded to the GISB office by June 1, 1999. The Board may deem it appropriate to modify the annual plan once more information is known.

VI. Meetings with the Department of Energy and Sandia Labs

Ms. McQuade, Mr. Hahn, Mr. Buccigross and Mr. Caldwell reviewed meetings to which GISB was invited to discuss the President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection. The recommendations have been prepared, and the Clinton Administration should act on them shortly, issuing



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

a Presidential Decision Directive. A Sandia Labs representative visited the GISB office and reviewed the GISB direction on the Internet and proposed standards, and offered suggestions which were reviewed during the meeting. Both relationships are valuable to GISB for receipt of information and services that could support and guide the direction of standards development using the Internet.

VII. Annual Plan

Ms. McQuade asked subcommittee chairs to review the maintenance plan for accuracy. She thanked Ms. Ford for her efforts to maintain the log and the statistics. The subcommittee chairs reviewed the progress made to date on their respective development efforts.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Attachments: 1. Attendance
2. Voting Record