



**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting
July 10, 1997 -- 10:00 a.m. to - 5:00 p.m.**

**Doubletree Hotel, 400 Dallas, Houston, TX
FINAL MINUTES**

I. Introductory Items

Jerry Hahn welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee members to Houston. Dennis Holbrook reviewed the antitrust guidelines. Housekeeping items and materials distributed were covered. The roll call was announced. The agenda was modified to add two items -- (1) a review of minor corrections and clarifications needed for the publication of the July 31 standards manuals and booklet, and (2) a discussion by Greg Lander of technical matters on June 12. Draft Executive Committee minutes from June 11 and June 12, 1997 were reviewed and adopted with changes.

II. Recommended Standards and Interpretations

Comments were received from Great Lakes and were considered in the deliberations. For each proposed standard or clarification, the discussion is listed below (please see attachment for statements of adopted standards and interpretations):

For request R96083, Kim Van Pelt described the request and recommended standard modification to the Statement of Account. Changes were made to the explanatory verbiage for the data element "invoice date" which is: "For GISB, this element is Sender's Option. The value is Invoice Date, if applicable, or if not applicable, repeat the value of data element Due Date." The motion was made to adopt the recommended standard. The Executive Committee supported the proposed standard unanimously, with two votes from each segment, and a total of seventeen affirmative votes cast. One member was absent from the vote. The motion passed unanimously. (Please see the attachment for the standards and interpretations adopted by the Executive Committee).

For the recommended interpretation for request C97003, after discussion, a motion was made to adopt the interpretation with no changes. The motion was seconded and the vote taken. The Executive Committee supported the proposed interpretation unanimously, with two votes from each segment, and a total of seventeen affirmative votes cast. One member was absent from the vote. The motion passed unanimously. (Please see the attachment for the standards and interpretations adopted by the Executive Committee).

For the recommended interpretation for request C97005, after discussion, a motion was made to adopt the interpretation with no changes. The motion was seconded and the vote taken. The Executive Committee supported the proposed interpretation unanimously, with two votes from each segment, and a total of seventeen affirmative votes cast. One member was absent from the vote. The motion passed unanimously. (Please see the attachment for the standards and interpretations adopted by the Executive Committee).

For the recommended interpretation for request C97006, after discussion, a motion was made to adopt the interpretation with no changes. The motion was seconded and the vote taken. The Executive Committee supported the proposed interpretation unanimously, with two votes from each segment, and a total of seventeen affirmative votes cast. One member was absent from the vote. The motion passed

unanimously. (Please see the attachment for the standards and interpretations adopted by the Executive Committee).

For the recommended interpretation for request C97007, after discussion, a motion was made to adopt the interpretation with no changes. The motion was seconded and the vote taken. The Executive Committee supported the proposed interpretation unanimously, with two votes from each segment, and a total of seventeen affirmative votes cast. One member was absent from the vote. The motion passed unanimously. (Please see the attachment for the standards and interpretations adopted by the Executive Committee).

IIA Minor Corrections

Sylvia Munson described the minor corrections which were also described as oversights. In the process of updating the Standards Booklet with the items approved by the Executive Committee and ratified by members on February 28, 1997, it has come to the GISB office's attention that three standards required corrections -- GISB Standards 2.4.6, 2.4.4, and 1.4.1. The corrected language for these standards is described in an attachment to the minutes. The Executive Committee adopted the corrections under the GISB Operating Practice for Minor Corrections and Clarifications. They will be posted in the Standards Action Bulletin as notification of the change and the industry is offered the opportunity to comment. With no adverse comments supplied, the corrections will be published in the July 31 release of the Standards Manuals and Standards Booklet.

III. New Requests

Request R97096 was found within scope and the triage action to forward the request to the newly formed Contracts Subcommittee Task Force on Day Trading was approved. The chairs of the newly formed task force are Bill Hebenstreit of El Paso Energy and Mike Wallace of NorAm. There will be an end of the year report on the task force's progress. Please see the attachment for a summary description of the request and further information.

Request R97102 did not require action from the Executive Committee as action had already been taken during the June 11 and 12 meeting of the Executive Committee. It was presented to the Executive Committee in order to finalize the administrative process for this request and further information.

Request R97103 was found within scope and the triage action to forward the request to the Business Practices Subcommittee was approved. If BPS determines that GISB should specify versions and revision numbers in its technology standards, the request would then be forwarded to Future Technology Task Force for determination of recommended versions for each technology standard (such as PGP, RTF, HTTP, and HTML). The activity on request R97103 should begin in September and conclude by year end. Please see the attachment for a summary description of the request and further information.

Request R97104 was found within scope and the triage action to forward the request to the Business Practices Subcommittee was approved. If the BPS determines that a new standard or modification of an existing standard is necessary, then the request with BPS instructions and BPS work products should be transferred to the Future Technology Task Force. Please see the attachment for a summary description of the request and further information.

Request R97105 was a duplicate of R97051, and was withdrawn by the requester. As such no action was needed.

Request R97106 was found within scope and the triage action to forward the request to the Information Requirements Subcommittee was approved. The activity of R97106 would begin in September and there will be an end of the year report on the task force's progress. Please see the attachment for a summary description of the request and further information.

Request R97107 was found within scope and the triage action to forward the request to the Business Practices Subcommittee was approved. The action on the request should begin in July and conclude by year end. Please see the attachment for a summary description of the request and further information.

V. Process Subcommittee Update

The fifth agenda item was moved before the fourth at the request of an Executive Committee member. Bill Boswell highlighted the Process Subcommittee meeting held directly prior to the Executive Committee meeting. The recommended GISB Operating Practice for the Interpretation Subcommittee Mission and Procedures was reviewed and modified, (please see attachment). The motion was made and seconded to adopt the amended GISB Operating Practice for the Interpretation Subcommittee Mission and Procedures. The procedural motion passed unanimously with 17 votes in favor. Bill Boswell noted that a letter was sent in support of the use of parliamentarians Bill Boswell and Dennis Holbrook when task forces or subcommittees require it. Other missions and procedures were available, but will be discussed in August, (see attachments).

IV Gas Day

Jean Ford of KN Energy presented information regarding request R97083, which requested that GISB standard 1.3.1 be modified for standard time instead of clock time for gas day. She had several questions in reviewing the transcripts relevant to gas day. KN Energy uses the standards for its interstate, intrastate and gathering facilities, but in the case of standard 1.3.1, it is only used for the interstate pipelines. She conducted a poll of interstate pipelines and the results were inconclusive on the question of "Should this gas day issue of clock versus standard time be reopened?". The results prior to the Executive Committee meeting were four in favor and five opposed, but results are still being received. Brian White has put out a similar survey but the results are not yet available.

Comments were made that the issue may be premature and could be postponed to consideration in either 1998 or 1999. Jean Ford responded that KN Energy would prefer that this issue be resolved prior to the October 1997 to avoid incurring a \$100,000 expense to physically make the changes to reflect the daylight savings changes. Others noted that this change could be addressed through software rather than physical changes. Jean Ford responded that there were concerns on how the software changes could be implemented in the back office. Comments were made regarding the need for a time sync up in the nominations process but added that in the future the syncup time might change as electric industry requirements become more important to the gas industry. Others observed that the membership does not have any new consensus on the change to standard 1.3.1 and it should be reviewed as the marketplace evolves further.

The motion was made to table the request for an indefinite time, and the motion was seconded. As a procedure to reactivate the request, any Executive Committee member could make the motion at an Executive Committee meeting with a simple majority requirement for approval. The vote was taken on the procedural motion and it passed with fourteen out of sixteen possible votes in favor. Lee Smith and Norm Walker absent, and Mark Scheel and Mike Novak were in opposition.

Jean Ford requested that when the request is reactivated, that it be viewed from an industry rather than an interstate pipeline perspective. Bill Boswell asked that a proposal be drafted before it is discussed again. The tabling vote does not indicate opposition to changing standard 1.3.1, it does indicate opposition to changing standard 1.3.1 at the time of the receipt of the request. Tabling an agenda item indefinitely is to be viewed as "at this point in time, a change is not required, but in the future, there may be a need for a change."

VI. Discussion Groups

Jim VanderNoot reviewed the update on the use of discussion groups. Cheryl Loewen had several questions, some of which were answered in Jim Vander Noot's update, and others would be presented in the Future Technology Task Force's upcoming telephone conference. Cheryl Loewen volunteered that she would invite the task forces of the Contracts Subcommittee for involvement in the testing. The first stage of testing however should have a limited number of participants, for control and administration of the test -- and currently is limited to twelve. The first stage of testing should be completed in September. After September, both Cheryl Loewen and Carl Caldwell volunteered to participate in the second round of testing. The Future Technology Task Force conference call is scheduled on July 25 starting 1:30 p.m. central.

VII. Electronic Commerce Usage Matrix

The draft matrix, which replaces the EDI survey used by Gas*Flow, was discussed with Sylvia Munson leading the discussion. Recommendations to draft directions, user information, and indications for testing/production on the survey were made during the meeting. Written suggestions should be forwarded to Sylvia Munson for consideration before the next meeting. It was noted that the survey itself, will be made available to all interested parties, including those who are not members. No discussion was held on how and to whom the survey results would be made available.

VIII. FERC Conversations

There have been no conference calls with FERC staff since the last Executive Committee meeting. A call is scheduled for July 11 to informally update staff on GISB activities. From GISB, the participants are the GISB Officers, Rae McQuade and Dennis Holbrook. There was an hour long conference call with the NARUC Gas Subcommittee members, chaired by Henry Einhorn. The topic of the call was a highly summarized report on the Advisory Committee meeting held earlier this year.

X. ANSI Update - Codes & Accreditation

Don Loesch of Texaco updated the Executive Committee on the need to obtain X12 acceptance of codes and code values that GISB specifies for use but are not currently reflected in the X12 standards. A level of urgency is needed because some of the codes specified by GISB could be taken by other groups if GISB does not submit those changes through the X12 process. On October 5, there is a meeting in Los Angeles where the code requests will be discussed. To prepare for that meeting, the X12 request forms should be completed for the requested codes. Concerns were raised on when the codes would be available if approved by X12. The earliest date for approval is February 1998. Further complications were highlighted with regard to the version of the X12 EDI transactions -- X12 includes newly approved codes in the most recent version of the transactions -- which could require structural changes to the EDI Implementation Guides portion of the GISB standards, and as a result require structural changes to the implementations of companies that are GISB compliant. GISB would not be able to reflect the version accurately until January 1999 at the earliest depending on the types of structural changes made.

On accreditation as an SDO, we have responded to ANSI, with the changes discussed by the Executive Committee for the "Procedures to Adopt Standards" and with further communications to X12 members regarding their concerns about GISB becoming an ANSI Accredited Standards Development Organization. Dennis Holbrook expects that GISB accreditation should be discussed by ANSI in September, possibly resolved by the Board meeting on October 1.

IX. Reports

Sylvia Munson reviewed the draft forms that could streamline the information flow require for standards and interpretations. Several task force and subcommittee chairs noted that more testing is required before these forms can be posted on the home page for industry use. The testing should conclude in September. The forms and their usage will be discussed on July 28 in a chairs conference call.

XI. Subcommittee Updates

An Intraday Nominations Task Force meeting will be held on July 11 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. On the MTPA task force, the next meeting will review several sets of draft minutes, and is scheduled for July 15, from 10:30 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. An OBA Contracts Task Force meeting is scheduled for early August, and the Contracts Funds Transfer Agreement Task Force is scheduled for Washington on July 22. Keith Sappenfield updated the group on the progress made toward the 1997 Annual Meeting. The speakers confirmations are close to conclusion, and arrangements for a golf tournament are underway.

For the Technical Subcommittee, Kim Van Pelt noted that while many requests have been transferred to the Technical Subcommittee through observations of other groups' minutes, no formal requests and work papers have been forwarded to the Technical Subcommittee, so work on these "transferred" requests have not started. She requested that the Information Requirements Subcommittee please forward all information needed to the Technical Subcommittee to avoid delays in addressing requests.

On the request log, interpretation log, and sorted report on assignments and completion dates, Rae McQuade asked that all task force and subcommittee chairs carefully review those requests that have been assigned to them to ensure that the logs are correct. Any corrections should be forwarded to the GISB office in writing.

The Interpretations Subcommittee is meeting on July 11 from 10:00 a.m. to noon, although it is expected that the conference call will not take the full time allotted. Mark Gracey will provide phone conferencing ability at Travis Place, for those at the Intraday Task Force meeting that want to participate in the Interpretations Subcommittee call. While not specifically a GISB topic, Norm Walker was asked by Tom Ehinger to update the group on the El Paso technical conference held in Washington on July 9. A very brief introduction was noted by Norm Walker, with indications that this topic was not a GISB agenda item nor related to a GISB activity.

XII. Adjourn

There was a motion to adjourn. The next meeting will be one day in duration on Wednesday August 13 in Washington, from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Process Subcommittee meeting will directly precede the Executive Committee Meeting from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

XII. Attendance

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEGMENT	ATTENDING	MEMBERS/ALTERNATES	VOTING RECORD					Correct ¹
			R96083	C97003	C97005	C97006	C97007	
END USERS:	✓	Kristine Mespelli	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✗	Rita Conway						
		Notational vote for Rita Conway	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Lee Smith ✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Lynnette Wilson	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LDCs:		Vacancy						
	✓	William Boswell	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✗	Darlene Buchholz						
		Notational Vote for Darlene Buchholz	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✗	Kirt Kleinman						
		Notational Vote for Kirt Kleinman	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Mike Novak	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
PIPELINES:	✗	Gary Beland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Notational Vote for Gary Beland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Mark Gracey for Mike Bray	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Theresa Hess for Max Feldman	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Dale Davis for vacancy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Joyce Phillips for Fred Wolgel ✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
PRODUCERS:		Norm Walker ²	A	A	A	A	A	A
		Notational vote for Norm Walker	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Jerry Hahn	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Tom Ehinger	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✗	Hugh Roberts						
SERVICES:		No notational ballot was submitted by Hugh Roberts						
	✓	Bob Wallenhorst	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Vacancy						
	✓	Carl Caldwell	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Steve Kretsch for Dave Pfeifer ✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Cheryl Loewen	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Mark Scheel for the vacancy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Keith Sappenfield	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Administrative: Rae McQuade, - Executive Director
Dennis Holbrook - General Counsel
Sylvia Munson - GISB Staff
Dalia Alejos - GISB Staff
Jane Copeland - Ak/Ret Reporting

Observers: 1. Sandra Barnett Koch Gateway
2. Denise Breeden El Paso Energy
3. Catherine Calpotura Pacific Gas & Electric
4. Cynthia Corcoran Duke Energy
5. Julie Dennis Koch Gateway
6. Sharon Eady NorAm
7. Jean Ford KN Energy

¹ The minor corrections voted on were to GISB standards 2.4.6, 1.4.4 and 3.4.1. They were voted on separately but are shown here as one vote.

² Norm Walker was absent for a portion of the meeting.

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 8. | Theresa Hess | Enron |
| 9. | Greg Lander | TransCapacity |
| 10. | Gary Payne | Enron Capital and Trade |
| 11. | Lanyard Sledge | El Paso Energy |
| 12. | Leigh Spangler | Latitude Technologies |
| 13. | Kim Van Pelt | Duke Energy Corp |
| 14. | Jim Vander Noot | El Paso Energy |

- Attachments:
1. Standards and Interpretations Adopted by the Executive Committee
 2. Minor Corrections and Clarifications Adopted by the Executive Committee
 3. Executive Committee Adoption of Triage Group Recommendations
 4. GISB Operating Practice -- Interpretations Subcommittee Mission and Procedures
 5. Draft procedures for the Triage Group
 6. Draft procedures for the Business Practices Subcommittee
 7. Draft procedures for the Affiliated Groups



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

July 10, 1997

TO: Executive Committee, Posting on the GISB Home Page
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director
RE: Standards and Interpretations Adopted by the Executive Committee on July 10, 1997

R96083 For the Statement of Account, the Technical Subcommittee recommends maintaining the current mapping of the *Invoice Date* data element to the ANSI mandatory field ADJ05. However, the explanatory verbiage for the invoice date data element would be modified to: "For GISB, this element is Sender's Option. The value is Invoice Date, if applicable, or if not applicable, repeat the value of data element Due Date."

Proposed Mapping -- ADJ Segment

<u>GISB Usage</u>	<u>ANSI Field</u>	<u>GISB Field or Value</u>	<u>ANSI Usage</u>
Must Use	ADJ01	'L'	Mandatory
Must Use	ADJ02	Amount Due	Mandatory
Must Use	ADJ03	Invoiced Amount - For GISB, this element is Sender's Option. Send zero if not applicable.	Mandatory
Must Use	ADJ04	Due Date	Mandatory
Must Use	ADJ05	Invoice Date - For GISB, this element is Sender's Option. The value is Invoice Date, if applicable, or if not applicable, repeat the value of the data element Due Date.	Mandatory
	ADJ10	Paid Amount - For GISB, this element is Sender's Option.	Optional

C97003 "Do these standards taken together mean that all allocated quantities and imbalance statements will at least provide daily quantity detail, even when the quantities are estimates? Do these standards taken together mean that all allocated quantities and imbalance statements will also provide monthly quantity detail even if the quantities are estimates?"

Interpretation:

"Standard 2.3.27 states: "Allocated quantities and imbalances should be expressed in the same units as the nominated quantities." Standard 2.3.15 states: "There are two types of allocations: daily and monthly." Standard 2.3.24 states "Delivery point allocations should be provided at the lowest level of detail provided by nominations." And in relevant part, standard 1.2.14 states: "The standard quantity for nominations, confirmations and scheduling is Dekatherms per gas day in the United States...."

"That standard 2.3.15 refers to both daily and monthly allocations does not mean that transportation service providers must perform both daily and monthly allocations, but rather that there are both daily and monthly types of allocations. In essence this means

Attachment 1 to the Executive Committee Minutes of July 10, 1997

Executive Committee Adoption of Standards on July 10, 1997



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

that any given allocation is either daily or monthly. Just as there are three model types for transportation, but a transportation service provider may choose to support just one, so too are there two types (models) of allocations: daily and monthly and a transportation service provider may also choose to support just one."

"This means that it is possible to have an allocated quantity and an imbalance statement that does not provide daily quantity detail."

C97005 Is the definition of previously released indicator clear?

Interpretation:

"This means that the Offer is comprised of capacity made up in whole or in part of capacity which was acquired by the releasing shipper on a non-permanent basis. A releasing shipper which acquires capacity through a permanent release is not considered to have acquired that capacity via a non-permanent release; and, any offers of that capacity (acquired via permanent release) by that shipper would not be considered a release to which the subject indicator would be applicable. This indicator does not communicate to parties employing the Capacity Release Offer dataset that this capacity may have been released by this releasing shipper before this time, but rather it is intended to communicate that the releasing shipper acquired the now offered capacity via a previous non-permanent release."

C97006 In the "Request for Confirmation" document, should the sender indicate the quantity that a shipper requested, or should the quantity indicate only the positive or negative change requested?

Interpretation:

"For nominating and confirming purposes, the way to express quantities is as a zero or positive quantity. This applies to the request to confirm document and also to the confirmation response document."

"It is difficult to understand what the expected business result would be as to the confirmed quantity the confirmation requester would receive in the confirmation response if a 'change only' quantity were to be sent and responded to. It would be ambiguous and misleading to receive back a confirmation for -20 units, rather than the 80 units that is going to flow. The reverse is also true. By operation of standard 1.3.22, where a service requester 'changed' its nomination from 100 units to 120 units, requesting a confirmation of 20, (the change) would result in the confirming party's overwriting of the original 100 units with a requested confirmation of 20 units. Changes should mean the resulting total quantity per gas day for the nominated period and not the numeric value of the change from a previously scheduled quantity."

"Furthermore, application of a change only or negative quantity to the portion of standard 1.3.22, relating to the 'lesser of' rule, is difficult at best if the confirmed quantity is the numeric value of the 'change'."

C97007 It should be clarified that the "Nomination Quick Response" document due at noon as required by GISB standard 1.3.2 is used to validate the nomination request in implementing the X.12 nomination related data sets and is not required for the other forms of electronic delivery of Faxes and EBB on-line systems.

Interpretation:

"As the references to datasets within the nominations process timelines portion of the GISB standards (specifically Standard 1.3.2) are references to the datasets in the 1.4.x



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

series and not to non-standard formats (as would be the case with non-standard delivery mechanisms such as deliveries via faxes or deliveries via EBBs), it is not intended that the 'quick response' (a standard response to a standard request) be required as a response to a non-standard request."

"In relevant portion, GISB Standard 1.3.2 references a 'quick response by noon'. This reference to the 'quick response' is specifically to the GISB EDI X12 Nomination Quick Response document. The Nomination Quick Response is a defined document within the 1.4.x portion of the nomination related standards and is used to validate the nomination (or provide relevant and applicable errors and warnings) in implementing the nomination process via the EDI X12 data sets (the GISB Standards contained in the 1.4.x series and the associated implementation guides)."



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

July 10, 1997

TO: Executive Committee, Posting on the GISB Home Page

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Minor Corrections and Clarifications Adopted by the Executive Committee on July 10, 1997

The Executive Committee was adopted the minor corrections to the February 28, 1997 standards and they will be included in the July 31, 1997 version of the standards manuals and booklet, assuming no adverse comments are received through the posting and request for comments through the Standards Action Bulletin.

1 Standard 2.4.6 -- Measured Volume Audit Statement (Requests R96005, R96092)

The Measured Volume Audit Statement, GISB standard 2.4.6, was added as a standard as a result of request R96005, and includes two data elements: "Beginning Flow Date/Time" and "Ending Flow Date/Time". GISB standard 2.4.6 was modified with the ratification of request R96092 to split the two data elements "Beginning Flow Date/Time" and "Ending Flow Date/Time" to four data elements: "Beginning Flow Date", "Beginning Flow Time", "Ending Flow Date", "Ending Flow Time". The adoption of the modification to a standard represented in request R96092 modified all flowing gas data sets, including GISB Standard 2.4.6. The modification to GISB Standard 2.4.6 was inadvertently omitted from the Final Action document prepared for the February 28 ratification, but the final action document did include the modifications to the other flowing gas data sets.

Minor Correction:

Correct GISB Standard 2.4.6 data elements from "Beginning Flow Date/Time" and "Ending Flow Date/Time" to "Beginning Flow Date", "Beginning Flow Time", "Ending Flow Date", and "Ending Flow Time".

2 Standard 1.4.4 -- Confirmation, (Request R96054)

GISB standard 1.4.4 was modified as a result of request R96054. The modification was the addition of the "Service Requester" data element to the Confirmation data set (1.4.4) with a usage code of "C". The corresponding condition was inadvertently omitted from the final action document and the ballot. The condition that should have been stated was "Mandatory when present in the request for confirmation". All data elements with a condition of 'C' are required to have a corresponding condition statement in all GISB data sets.

Minor Correction:

Correct GISB Standard 1.4.4 to add the condition of "Mandatory when present in the request for confirmation" to the "Service Requester" data element.

3 Standard 3.4.1 -- Transportation/Sales Invoice, (Request R96063)

This request addressed standard abbreviation definitions for all Invoice Related data sets. The standard supporting request R96063 included a list of all existing data elements and their associated abbreviations. The data elements "Associated Contract", "Charge Type", "End



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

Transaction Date" and "End Transaction Time" were added to the data sets after the modification to the invoice related data set standards was approved. As a result, there are no approved abbreviations for the elements listed above. The modifications to standards which added the four data elements did not include standard abbreviations for them.

Minor Correction:

Correct GISB Standard 3.4.1 to include the following abbreviations:

Associated Contract	Assoc K
Charge Type	Chrg Type
End Transaction Date	End Tran Date
End Transaction Time	End Tran Time

note: that these abbreviations use abbreviations from the approved list to comprise the proposed abbreviation (e.g. "K" = Contract)



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

July 10, 1997

TO: Executive Committee, Posting on the GISB Home Page
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director
RE: Executive Committee Adoption of Triage Group Recommendations on July 10, 1997

The Executive Committee met on July 10, 1997 and approved the following actions for new requests for standards.

- R97096 Create a standard contract for day trades.
From: El Paso Energy
Summary: Please see the request posted on the home page. It is a series of e-mail messages.
Triage: Send to Contracts Subcommittee Task Force on Day Trading.
Priority: End of year report on progress.
EC Action: Found within scope. All 17 members voted unanimously to support Triage.
- R97102 Develop standards to implement the five postings on the Internet as described in GISB standard 4.3.6, version 1.1, in a consistent and user-friendly manner.
From: Natural Gas Clearinghouse
Summary: GISB should 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.
Triage: The Executive Committee has already addressed this item in the meeting on June 11. The request was filed to complete the necessary paperwork. The assignment was made to the Internet "Look and Feel" group of the joint BPS, Future Technology Task Force, and IR subcommittees.
Priority: As soon as possible, with a high priority.
EC Action: Found within scope. Previously determined by the EC as in scope and direction stated by Triage group.
- R97103 Develop version and revision level of technology standards.
From : Future Technology Task Force
Summary: The version and revision level of technology standards adopted by GISB and referenced in GISB standards should be clearly stated in the applicable standard(s). Any implementation of GISB standards should, at a minimum, be compatible with this version. Changes to the version and revision level of open standards should be made only through the

Attachment 3 to the Executive Committee Minutes of July 10, 1997



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

GISB standards process. Note: This refers only to technology standards formulated by other standards organizations such as the Internet Engineering Task Force and the World-Wide Web Consortium. As with other GISB standards, the referenced version and revision is considered a minimum level that must be matched in order to remain compliant. Other versions may be implemented as long as they are fully compatible with the specified version. This means that they must support all functions and features included in the version designated in the standard. Because technology and open standards are evolving quickly, there is some concern that inclusion of version information in a standard may be too restrictive. If the published version is considered a minimum as described above, this issue is mitigated. Furthermore, it will ensure that changes to the published version will only be made when that version level no longer serves the industry, either because new functionality is needed or because commercially available products are no longer functionally compatible. Such changes have industry-wide impact and may affect other standards. Therefore it is important for them to be coordinated through the standards process.

A concern has arisen over what version of an open standard (e.g., HTTP, HTML) should be used in order to be compliant with GISB standards. This principle defines a mechanism for publishing version information. Specifying this information within the applicable standards conveys important details that the industry needs for successful and compatible implementations. In addition, it ensures that the GISB standards process will be applied to determining if and when that version should be changed. These standards will not result in incremental cost. Rather they will control costs by helping companies to implement technical standards in a more efficient and uniform fashion. Furthermore, they will ensure that versioning of open standards occupies GISB task force time only when there is a material reason to consider a change. Although technologies are evolving rapidly, there is ordinarily a period of several months during which new technologies are incorporated into commercial products, tested and deployed. It is expected that this cycle will allow sufficient time for GISB to accommodate those changes in an orderly fashion. However, circumstances could arise that might require GISB to accelerate its adoption of technology changes.

- Triage: Send to BPS. If BPS determines that GISB should specify versions and revision numbers in its technology standards, then forward to Future Technology Task Force for determination of recommended versions for each technology standard (such as PGP, RTF, HTTP, and HTML).
- Priority: September to be completed by end of year.
- EC Action: Found within scope. All 17 members voted unanimously to support Triage. It was noted that the version numbers apply to third party software referenced in GISB standards.

R97104 Add a new standard to the current GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards to address testing.



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

From : TransCapacity

Summary: The request is to add a new standard to the current GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards. This proposed standard deals with testing, and as such can and should be read in conjunction with existing GISB Standard No. 4.3.14 that reads in part: "The industry should use standard policies and guidelines for testing new data sets."

Proposed Standard:

"Testing of new data sets includes testing of the current and/or future electronic delivery mechanisms including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). Standard policies and guidelines should be developed to test these aspects."

While standard 4.3.14 indicates that the industry uses standard testing methodology for testing of the GISB standardized datasets, this is only a piece of the overall testing that must take place. TransCapacity believes that this standardized testing methodology should be applied to the underlying communication methodology (Electronic Delivery Mechanisms), security features, and EDI enveloping, as well as to the datasets themselves. This new standard would apply to testing of the electronic delivery mechanisms and communication procedures. Mere testing of datasets, without the surrounding methods of communication, accomplishes neither the purpose or spirit of the existing standards.

Standardized testing methodologies are clearly beneficial to the goal of a seamless electronic marketplace for natural gas. Participants in the GISB standards initiation and adoption process recognized this in enacting the existing GISB standard No. 4.3.14. However, this standard - as written - is arguably applicable only to the datasets themselves. (Though this is not TransCapacity's view, it can rationalize a reading of the standard in this manner.) The proposed additional standard language will clarify the issue that standardized testing also applies to the electronic delivery mechanism including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). This will ease implementation for all parties involved and will identify any potential obstacles earlier in the process. Certainly testing has a cost associated with it. However, this testing must be undertaken, and currently is. The only difference is the standardization aspect that this language would add. Therefore, the true *incremental* cost is marginal, and we believe it will be recovered through a less labor intensive (and smoother) implementation down the line.

Triage: Send to BPS for consideration. After BPS consideration, if the BPS determines that a new standard or modification to existing standard is necessary, the request should be forwarded with BPS instructions and BPS work products to the Future Technology Task Force. It was recognized that Future Technology Task Force has valuable knowledge in this area and should develop the catalog and necessary testing procedures for each item in the catalog.

Priority: To begin is September complete by end of year with other Future Technology Task Force items.



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

-
- EC Action: Found within scope. All 17 members voted unanimously to support Triage.
- R97105 Modify standard 1.3.27 to remove the data element "service provider activity code" from the set of data elements which defines the key of the nomination.
- From : TransCapacity
- Triage: Duplicate of R97051 -- Withdrawn by requester during the Triage Group discussion on July 2, 1997.
- Priority: Not applicable.
- EC Action: Not required.
- R97106 Add two code values (one warning and one error) for the validation code element in the nomination Quick Response transaction.
- From : Enron
- Summary: The codes to be added are:
- Warning - Rounding difference due to a fuel calculation -- within tolerance
- Error - Rounding difference due to a fuel calculation -- not within tolerance
- GISB Standard 1.3.29 states "For in-kind fuel reimbursement methods, Service Providers should not reject a nomination for reasons of rounding differences due to fuel calculation of less than 5 Dth." The additional Validation Code values will be used in the Nomination Quick Response to notify the Service Requester that their Nomination contains a rounding difference(s) due to a fuel calculation.
- Service Requesters will benefit from receiving notification that a Nomination contains differences due to a fuel calculation. Currently NGC, Utilicorp, Cibola, U.S. Energy, Northern States Power, Tenaska, and ECT are willing to test the standard modification.
- Triage: Send to Information Requirements.
- Priority: To begin in September with a progress report by year-end.
- EC Action: Found within scope. All 17 members voted unanimously to support Triage.
- R97107 Add an optional ASC X12 name segment, N1, to send/receive meters in the GISB Measurement Information Report.
- From : Texaco and El Paso Natural Gas
- Summary: This enhancement could provide a further breakdown of the volumes associated with a PI Data Reference Number, which will continue to be included as a required data element. This enhancement will include the functionality for sending/receiving parties to transmit the volumes at the PI Data Reference Number and meter number level on an optional basis.
- Triage: Send to BPS.
- Priority: To begin in July and conclude by year-end.



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

EC Action: Found within scope. All 17 members voted unanimously to support Triage.



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

July 10, 1997

GISB OPERATING PRACTICE INTERPRETATION SUBCOMMITTEE MISSION AND PROCEDURES

Interpretations Subcommittee Mission

The Interpretations Subcommittee is a segment balanced subcommittee of GISB whose mission is to receive Requests for Interpretation or Clarification of GISB Standards; to solicit input as to the source and nature of the circumstances giving rise to the Request for Clarification or Interpretation; and, working in conjunction with other subcommittees within GISB, to develop clarifications; or, other recommendations with respect to the processing of a Request for Clarification or Interpretation, in response to such requests; for review and determination by the GISB Executive Committee.

Composition of the Interpretations Subcommittee

The Interpretations Subcommittee is comprised of two members of each of the five GISB Segments. These members are selected by the EC Members for each respective segment, which segment's representative(s) are communicated to the GISB office are communicated time to time. The Interpretations Subcommittee members are GISB members with dues paid and serve on the Interpretations Subcommittee at the pleasure of the GISB segment EC Members for their respective segment. The Interpretations Subcommittee shall be chaired by a member of the Subcommittee chosen by the EC from time to time. The Interpretations Subcommittee shall have a Vice-chair also chosen by the EC from time to time.

Interpretations Subcommittee Procedures

Meetings and Voting:

The Interpretations Subcommittee will meet on a regularly scheduled basis, if outstanding requests merit meeting, with a preference for telephone conferences. The schedule of meetings will be noticed on the GISB home page and will be open to any participant. When votes are taken, the members of the Interpretations Subcommittee are the voting members of the subcommittee. Votes with respect to interpretations and recommendations are to be recorded by polling each member of the Interpretations Subcommittee. Members not present at the time of a vote will be polled notationally to ascertain their voting position upon all interpretations and recommendations.

Processing Requests for Interpretation/Clarification:

1. A Request for Clarification or Interpretation shall be submitted to the GISB Office, given a designation number (beginning with a "C" and the last two digits of the year and then beginning with 001, 002 etc.) and forwarded to the voting members of the Interpretations Subcommittee for review.
2. Each Request for Clarification or Interpretation shall be noticed by posting on the GISB home page and will be discussed during at least one meeting. During the first meeting to discuss a Request for Clarification or Interpretation the subcommittee members and participants will discuss the matter under consideration and seek from the requester and other interested parties



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

their views on the matter and the circumstances giving rise to the request. Issues and potential resolutions will be discussed and recorded in the minutes of the subcommittee.

3. During this first meeting in which a request is discussed, the subcommittee, in conjunction with the requester, may determine that:
 - 3.1 The request has been satisfied through the discussion and the requester determines to withdraw the request pursuant to paragraph 5.5 below;
 - 3.2 A proposed interpretation be drafted and posted for discussion at the next scheduled meeting of the Interpretations Subcommittee;
 - 3.3 Additional information, research, or input is needed from the requester or other knowledgeable parties including other GISB subcommittees or task forces before proceeding with processing the Request for Clarification or Interpretation; or
 - 3.4 The Request for Clarification or Interpretation is better handled as a request for standard.

In the event of a determination under 3.4 above, the Interpretations Subcommittee will draft a suggestion to the EC that the EC can refer the request to another GISB Subcommittee or task force with passage of the appropriate minutes and any appropriate work papers.

In the event of a determination under 3.3 above, a) the Interpretations Subcommittee member(s) seeking additional information may solicit material from sources of their choosing (including but not limited to GISB meeting minutes and transcripts); and/or b) the Chair may request of the GISB office that a formal request for information be forwarded to the chair(s) of the applicable GISB Subcommittee or task force.

Processing Draft Interpretations:

4. In the event of a determination under 3.2 above, the draft interpretation will be generated and posted sufficiently in advance of the next scheduled meeting of the Interpretations Subcommittee so that interested parties may have an opportunity to review the draft interpretation and provide comment (written or verbal) at the next scheduled meeting of the Interpretations Subcommittee. Meeting minutes will close with the agenda of proposed items for discussion at the next scheduled meeting.
 - 4.1 Proposed interpretations will be discussed during at least one meeting of the Interpretations Subcommittee. If the Interpretations Subcommittee determines at that time that a draft (including the first draft) of an interpretation is ready for EC review and determination, a vote will be taken. If the matter passes by simple majority (including a count of notational votes), the interpretation shall be posted for industry comment and the matter forwarded to the EC to be added to the next EC agenda following the close of the comment period (which comment period, absent an EC determination to shorten, would not be less than two weeks).
 - 4.2 If there are changes to a draft (including the first draft) of an interpretation which changes are agreed to by the members of the Interpretations Subcommittee, another draft will be done, posted with the minutes of the meeting and discussion upon the second (or subsequent) draft scheduled for the next meeting of the Interpretations Subcommittee.
 - 4.3 The Interpretations Subcommittee may, upon review of a draft interpretation, determine that the matter under review should be handled pursuant to 3.3 or 3.4 above. In which case the draft interpretation will be "held" in its draft state until: a) resolution (or lack



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

thereof) under 3.4, or b) the receipt of additional material; and, c) further review and vote by the Interpretations Subcommittee.

- 4.4 All draft interpretations which are being "held" in their draft state under Section 4.3 are open for discussion during an Interpretations Subcommittee meeting but may not move to final draft without a determination during one meeting that the matter will be placed on the Agenda for the next scheduled meeting at which time the Interpretations Subcommittee will address the drafting (and potential resolution by vote) of the "held" interpretation request.

Completion of the Interpretations Process:

5. Action by the EC determines whether or not a Request for Clarification or Interpretation has been processed to completion by the Interpretation Subcommittee.
 - 5.1 The EC, at any scheduled EC meeting may, by a majority vote, discharge a draft interpretation from the Interpretations Subcommittee. Upon such vote to discharge, the EC may place the matter on its next agenda for review and a determination by the EC. The matter so discharged pursuant to this section 5.1 will be posted for industry comment in advance of the EC meeting at which it will be discussed.
 - 5.2 The EC, upon receipt of a matter from the Interpretations Subcommittee pursuant to section 3.4 may accept or modify the suggestion; and if so, the matter shall be deemed to have been processed to completion.
 - 5.3 The EC, upon receipt of a matter from the Interpretations Subcommittee pursuant to section(s) 4.1 or 5.1 may determine to accept, modify or reject the draft interpretation; and if so, the matter shall be deemed to have been processed to completion.
 - 5.4 The EC, upon receipt of a matter from the Interpretations Subcommittee pursuant to section 4.1 or 3.4 may determine to refer the matter back to the Interpretations Subcommittee with instructions; and if so, the matter shall be deemed to be an open matter requiring further processing by the Interpretations Subcommittee.
 - 5.5 The requester of an interpretation may withdraw their Request for Clarification or Interpretation. Upon withdrawal, work upon that numbered request shall cease without prejudice to subsequent action on a request pertaining to the same or related subject matter. Notice of withdrawal should be made a) in writing at or following the meeting of the interpretations subcommittee (and included in the minutes thereof); b) at a meeting of the EC where it is scheduled for resolution or discussion (and included in the minutes thereof); or c) in writing to the GISB Office which shall forward such notice to the Interpretations Subcommittee and/or EC as applicable. Requests for Clarification or Interpretation may not be withdrawn after a final vote of the EC upon the matter.
 - 5.6 A Request for Clarification or Interpretation shall be deemed to have been processed to completion upon the occurrence of a) a vote of the EC pursuant to section(s) 5.2 or 5.3; or b) the receipt and recording of a notice of withdrawal pursuant to section 5.5.