



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

TO: Executive Committee
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Executive Committee Meeting - July 15 & 16, 1999

DATE: September 20, 1999

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MGM Grand Hotel, Las Vegas, Nevada
July 15, 1999
FINAL MINUTES

I. Administrative

Mr. Buccigross welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Las Vegas. Because of the full agenda, he urged the group to try to keep to the agenda times as otherwise, we may go late on Thursday to address all issues. Ms. Corcoran, as acting general counsel, gave the antitrust advice. Ms. McQuade read the roll. The agenda was adopted with modifications to add two minor corrections and clarification items and to change the order of agenda item no. 9 to follow agenda item no. 11. With modifications made during the meeting, the redlined minutes for May 20 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

R99035 From: Submitted by Group 8760

 Request: Review and recommend changes to the existing body of EDM standards to support standards convergence across other standards setting groups, such as AIAG, UIG, and EDI-INT. The recommendations would be guided by a principle of backward compatibility with the existing GISB standards. The recommended standards that would result from a review of the existing EDM standards in light of developments by other standards setting groups such as AIAG, UIG, and EDI-INT among others, would be implemented and used as the current EDM standards are used - namely, to promote electronic commerce and standard business practices in the natural gas industry.

 Discussion: Mr. Caldwell is the current chair of the EDM BPS subcommittee.

 Disposition: Send to EDM BPS subcommittee.

 Priority: High Priority.

 Vote: The Executive Committee found unanimously that this item was within scope and after discussion, unanimously adopted the disposition and priority.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

-
- R99036 From: Submitted by Group 8760
- Request: Review and recommend changes to the existing EDM Standards Manual, version 1.3, to ensure that the text of the manual is supported by existing standards and recommend incorporation of changes in the EDM manual to streamline the manual consistent with existing standards.
- Discussion: The request will be modified to eliminate reference to version 1.4 and the reference to August 1999.
- Disposition: This request should be sent to the Future Technology Task Force. Recommended changes should reference the appropriate GISB standard or final action, which caused the change.
- Priority: Immediately.
- Vote: The Executive Committee found unanimously that this item was within scope and after discussion, unanimously adopted the disposition and priority.
- R99037 From: Submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline
- Request: Add a new data element "Confirmation Level" ("Conf Lvl") to the Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response, and Scheduled Quantity for Operators. This data element differentiates between the roles of the confirming parties on a TSP that supports multi-level confirmations. When a Request for Confirmation is sent, the confirming party will know for which role (operator, producer, etc.) they are being asked to confirm.
- Disposition: Send to Confirmations and Cross Contracts Ranking.
- Priority: To be placed on the agenda at an appropriate time as determined by the chairs.
- Vote: The Executive Committee found unanimously that this item was within scope and after discussion, unanimously adopted the disposition and priority.
- R99040 From: Submitted by Enron Gas Pipelines on June 20, 1999
- Request: Add a Reduction Reason code value to the Confirmation Response (1.4.4), Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5) and Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6) data sets. The Reduction Reason "Processing Affidavit Non-Compliance" will be used to communicate a reduction in nominated quantities as a result of non-compliance with the processing affidavit requirements that are outlined in our tariff. The addition of this code value will allow us to provide shippers and operators with a specific Reduction Reason code when a reduction of a nominated quantity is the result of non-compliance with our tariff requirements. KN Gas Gathering has volunteered to test with Enron.
- Disposition: Send Request No. R99040 to Information Requirements Subcommittee.
- Priority: To be addressed in the normal course of business for that subcommittee.
-



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Vote: The Executive Committee found unanimously that this item was within scope and after discussion, unanimously adopted the disposition and priority.

EII Requests Nos. R99038, R99039, R99041, R99042, R99043, and R99044 were found within scope unanimously, through a single motion. They have been addressed by EII in its recent meetings.

III. EBB Internet Implementation Subcommittee Recommended Standards

The motion was made to adopt the recommended declines from the EII Subcommittee for Request Nos. R99015, R99025, R99026, R99027 and R99034 which passed unanimously.

A set of recommended EII standards for capacity release and contracts was discussed. Several typographical errors were identified and were corrected. It was offered that s12 should be removed from the set under consideration as it may be linked to a request on contracts that was declined. GISB has not adopted sub-categories for the "Contracts" category. It was noted that GISB Standard No. 4.3.42 covers the inclusion of the "Contracts" category in the Navigational Area. The motion was made to adopt s84 and s85 as revised in the meeting, revisions to GISB Standard No. 1.3.54 (s46), revisions to GISB Standard No. 1.3.60 (s68), revisions to GISB Standard No. 1.3.61 (s69), revisions to GISB Standard No. 2.3.35 (s81), revisions to GISB Standard No. 2.3.34 (s80), revisions to GISB Standard No. 4.3.28, and s11. The data element "Contract Level Tracking ID" was deleted from s46. The motion to adopt the standards passed unanimously. The revision to the Invoice Related Data Model was adopted unanimously.

Ms. Hess presented a set of data sets supporting the EII standards, and she described the new format used. She reviewed the changes made to the data sets to support the EII standards. The motion was made to adopt the modifications to GISB Standard Nos. 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5, 1.4.6, 1.4.7, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.4, 2.4.5, 2.4.6, 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, and 3.4.4 as presented in the meeting materials.

In GISB Standard Nos. 2.4.3 and 2.4.4, Mr. Lander noted that for several of the data elements, there is a discrepancy in usage depending on the media used. For GISB Standard No. 2.4.3, he highlighted "Operational Quantity," "Penalty Variance Quantity," "Service Requester Contract," and "Service Requester ID," where the usages are Sender's Option (SO) for EBB and Business Conditional (BC) for EDI and Flat Files (EDI/EDM and FF/EDM). He asked that the motion be changed to alter the usage of BC to SO for EDI/EDM and FF/EDM for those data elements for GISB Standard No. 2.4.3. Similarly, for "Adjustment Value," "Ending Imbalance Value," "Imbalance Value," "Operational Delivery Quantity," "Operational Receipt Quantity," "Scheduled Delivery Quantity," "Scheduled Receipt Quantity," and "Zone Identifier" data elements in GISB Standard No. 2.4.4, he asked that the usage be altered from BC to SO for EDI/EDM and FF/EDM.

Ms. Hess noted that the Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR) was not given the charge to alter the usage for the EDI/EDM. While no one disagreed with the need to make the changes, Ms. Van Pelt noted that these changes could be processed through the Technical Subcommittee in time for version 1.4 publication, or they could be shown as final actions which would be incorporated in version 1.5.

The action was taken on the motion without the changes discussed, and it passed unanimously. The motion was made for IR and Technical Subcommittee to review the data sets sent by Transportation Service Providers in nominations (excluding GISB Standard Nos. 1.4.3 and 1.4.4), flowing gas and invoicing areas for the data elements with BC usage for conforming changes to the EBB usage recognizing that there will be shortened periods for comment, notational EC vote and shortened ratification period to allow the changes to be



published in version 1.4. The procedural motion passed unanimously.

For the minor corrections and clarifications to the EII Related Data Dictionaries, Ms. Hess described the use of the footnotes. The motion was made to adopt these changes as minor corrections and clarifications. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Van Pelt reviewed the Technical Subcommittee proposed standard changes to support the EII standards. As a result of the discussion, there were no changes. The motion to adopt the changes passed unanimously.

IV. Miscellaneous Request Recommendations

For Request No. R97076, Mr. Lander explained that the recommendation is to close the request, as the data element "Package ID" was addressed through the resolution of Request Nos. R96077 and R97022. The motion was to adopt the recommendation, which passed unanimously.

For Request No. R97091, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation which modifies GISB Standard No. 3.3.17 for wire transfers. The motion passed unanimously.

For Request No. R97111B, Mr. Lander and Ms. Hess described the request. Ms. Patton noted that a word was missing in the text of the Technical Implementation of the Business Process. With the modification included in the motion, the recommendation was adopted unanimously.

For Request No. R97111C, the motion was made that the minor corrections and clarifications described by Ms. Hess and Mr. Lander be accepted. There were no changes made during the discussion. The minor corrections and clarifications were adopted unanimously.

For Request No. R97123, the business practice was modified to include "payment" as a clarifier to the due date and clear reference to the date by referencing it as "such". With those changes the motion to adopt the business practice standard passed unanimously.

For Request No. R98005, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation to modify GISB Standard No. 1.3.24:

1.3.24 When used, Package ID should be:

- a) supported for nominating and scheduling;
- b) mutually agreed between the applicable parties for allocations and imbalance reporting;
- c) supported for invoicing (sales and purchase); and,
- d) mutually agreed for transport invoicing.

The recommendation was not changed during discussion, and the motion passed unanimously.

For Request No. R98060, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation to give the X12 Functional Acknowledgment (997) an HTTP "transaction-set" code value. The recommendation was not changed during discussion, and the motion passed unanimously.

For Request No. R98090, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation to revise the Technical Implementation of Business Process for the Nomination data set, regarding the Service Provider's Activity Code. The recommendation was not changed during discussion, and the motion passed unanimously.

For Request No. C99001, Mr. Lander described the interpretation request and the proposed standard. The motion was made to adopt the recommendation which passed unanimously. It was noted that there was an error in the February 19, 1999 final minutes of the Interpretations Subcommittee – and the transcripts of this meeting will serve as correction



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

to those minutes. There was a sentence fragment which should be deleted -- "The "acquiring shipper" as referenced in the above." [The question on the interpretation was revised on July 16 to: "Clarify the meaning of the recall/reput option of "Recallable, Not Reputtable", which passed unanimously.]

For Request No. R98039, Ms. Hess described the recommendation to add data elements and codes. As part of this recommendation, she asked that GISB Standard Nos. 1.3.54 (s46) and 1.3.61 (s69) be revised to add the "Nomination Subsequent Cycle Indicator" to the end of the transaction specific data group. She also asked as part of this request that GISB Standard Nos. 1.3.60 (s68) and 1.3.63 (s71) be revised to add the "Confirmation Subsequent Cycle Indicator" to the end of the transaction specific data group. The motion to accept the recommendation as modified to include revisions to GISB Standard Nos. 1.3.54 (s46), 1.3.60 (s68), 1.3.61 (s69), and 1.3.63 (s71) was adopted unanimously.

For Request No. R98046, Ms. Hess reviewed the recommendation to add processing rights information to nominations and scheduled quantities transactions. Mr. Love noted that this recommended standard modification to add processing rights information to the nominations, nominations quick response and scheduled quantity is not relevant to the pathed non-threaded model. In response to a question, Ms. Hess, as the requester, noted that if the information were not provided, it would not cause the nomination to be rejected. The motion to accept the recommendation was adopted with twenty-one affirmative votes, one vote in opposition and one abstention.

For Request No. R98051, Ms. Hess described the recommendation to add Minimum Delivery Quantity and Minimum Receipt Quantity data elements to the Nomination, and revise GSB Standard No. 1.3.54 (s46). The motion was made to adopt the recommendation which passed unanimously.

For the joint recommendation for R98053 and R98054, Ms. Hess described the recommendation to add Nomination User Data 1 and Nomination User Data 2 to the Nominations and Scheduled Quantities documents and to revise to GISB Standard Nos. 1.3.54 (s46) and 1.3.61 (s69); and to add Confirmation User Data 1 and Confirmation User Data 2 to the Confirmation Response and and Scheduled Quantity For Operator documents and to revise to GISB Standard Nos. 1.3.60 (s68) and 1.3.63 (s69). Mr. Novak raised concern that this standard may not be needed and should be considered by the Confirmations and Cross Contract Ranking Subcommittee. Ms. Scott added that this request was denied by the BPS when it was first submitted, and then resubmitted when the EII effort began. Mr. Love observed that this information was more of a comment field, and Ms. Davis noted that the recommendation addresses customer service and comparability issues. Others noted that it supported only one pipeline's business practices and as such should not be included in the standards - which are meant to apply to an industry not one player. The motion was made to adopt the joint recommendation which passed with 19 affirmative votes, two votes in opposition, and two abstentions.

Ms. Van Pelt reviewed the Technical Subcommittee Capacity Release cleanup items which were distributed to the Executive Committee for consideration of the changes with their technical staffs. Ms. Van Pelt made a clarifying change, which will be forwarded to the GISB office in electronic format and reposted. The minor corrections and clarifications were adopted unanimously.

V. Allocation Grid Drafting Team Recommended Standards

Ms. Davis reviewed the effort that resulted in the recommended standards prepared by the Allocation Grid Drafting Team. In review of the recommendation, it was noticed that some of the data elements are using old definitions. The data elements in existence should use the current definitions. The recommendation accommodates the business practices of the



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Transportation Service Providers that participated in the process - the charge was not to create new or alter existing business practices for allocations. The recommendation outlines the 18 PDA and 23 allocation transaction types that represent all the possible types of allocations.

Ms. Hess noted that the recommendation should be modified to include changes to reflect the data groupings within the EII standards and GISB Standard No. 2.3.35 was modified in the Business Entity Data Group to add PDA Transaction Type Code. Also, for GISB Standard No. 2.3.35, in the Transaction Specific Data Group, Receipt Location was added after Direction of Flow; Delivery Location was added after Service Requester Contract; Upstream Package ID was added after Upstream Contract Identifier; Downstream Package ID was added after Downstream Contract Identifier; and Transaction Type was added at the end. Similarly, for GISB Standard No. 2.3.33 (s79), Allocation Transaction Type Code was added at the end of the Business Entity Data Group; and in the Transaction Specific Data Group: Receipt Location was added after Direction of Flow; Delivery Location was added after Service Requester Contract; Upstream Package ID was added after Upstream Contract Identifier; Downstream Package ID was added after Downstream Contract Identifier; and Transaction Type followed by Bid Transportation Rate were added at the end.

The motion was made to accept the recommendation with the changes as noted by Ms. Hess. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Notices Recommended Standards

Ms. Hess reviewed the recommended standards modifications and standards manual language related to the new business practice standards for notices, as prepared by the Information Requirements Subcommittee.

Mr. Love asked that the following language be added to the end of the recommended first paragraph of the Capacity Release Related Standards Book, Technical Implementation of Business Process for System-Wide Notices (5.4.16):

- "Although the System-Wide Notices document also can be used to communicate intraday bumps to specific bumped Service Requesters, such intraday bump notices are confidential communications between the Transportation Service Provider and its Service Requester."

The motion was amended to include the above language and also to include this information in the Executive Summary in the Capacity Release Related Standards Book as the last sentence in the section on System Wide Notices. The intraday bump language was removed from the first paragraph cited in the recommendation. The motion as amended passed unanimously.

VI. Confirmations (Flowing Gas) Recommended Standards

Mr. Lander described the effort that yielded the recommended standards for Request Nos. R98011 and R98012. The Business Practices Subcommittee recommends that once the Executive Committee adopts these business practice standards, the information will be forwarded to the Information Requirements Subcommittee and other subcommittees for full staffing before the business practices are distributed for ratification. The motion was made to adopt the proposed standards, but delay distribution for ratification until a fully staffed product can be distributed. Ms. Unruh asked for instruction 1 and instruction 2 to Information Requirements Subcommittee to be deleted as proposed standards 2.3.d.3 and 2.3.e address the scenarios addressed in the instructions. Additionally, she noted that the instructions contain terms never before used in GISB standards. It was noted that instructions 1 and 2 were intended to provide information to be included in the Technical Implementation of Business Process. Ms. Hess noted that without further clarification, the



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

instructions will likely not be clear to IR, as she as one of the chairs of IR did not understand them. The motion was not changed to delete the instructions.

Mr. Caldwell asked that changes be considered to proposed standard 2.3.H.1 to reflect that they do not apply to pro-rata, and Mr. Novak noted that changes should be considered for title transfer tracking. Ms. McVicker noted that some grammatical changes should be made to proposed standard 2.3.H.1. Mr. Scheel asked that 2.3.H.1 be taken out of the package, and that normal communications should suffice to notify Service Requesters of the risks of imbalances being assessed to them. Mr. Novak asked that 2.3.H.2 be reclassified as a principle with the last sentence dropped. Mr. Keeler noted that he wished for proposed standard 2.3.H.2 be dropped in its entirety because it is regulating communication between business trading partners which is governed by that commercial relationship. Others noted that that information is of a commercial nature and should not be governed by 2.3.H.1.

The motion was amended to modify the grammar of 2.3.H.1, delete the last sentence of 2.3.H.2 and re-characterize it as a principle - 2.1.H.2. Mr. Scheel reiterated that GISB standard 2.3.H.1 discloses commercially sensitive information, and that 2.3.H.2 can serve the intent of the standards alone. Mr. Lander described the third paragraph of 2.3.A at the request of Ms. Unruh. After further discussion, Mr. Lander offered the following language to delete 2.3.A and modify 2.3.21:

- As the first sentence of the appended paragraphs to 2.3.21:

"This standard applies to the daily provision of operational allocated quantities whether they are provided pursuant to GISB standard 2.4.3 or GISB standard 2.4.4. "

- The first paragraph of 2.3.A
- The second paragraph of 2.3.A
- As the replacement to the third paragraph:

"A TSP is not required to support requests for allocated quantities other than on a "all locations for a SR basis." Where a TSP has determined to support GISB standard no. 2.3.21 in a manner other than:

- a) providing specific allocated quantities in response to a request for same,
or
- b) providing allocated quantities on an "all locations for a SR basis,"

then the SR can rely on the absence of a line item(s) provided by a TSP as indicative that the particular line item(s)' scheduled quantities are allocated quantities."

After considerable discussion and a request to call the question that was later retracted, there was a motion made to table the motion with the understanding that it would be revisited at the next meeting, and issues would be identified and posted thirty days before the Executive Committee meeting in September.

The meeting was called to recess at 6:48 p.m.



July 16, 1999

I. Administrative

Mr. Buccigross welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Las Vegas. Ms. Corcoran, as acting general counsel, gave the antitrust advice.

VIII. Imbalance Recommended Standards

Mr. LaTour described the proposed standards and the efforts regarding those standards. Mr. LaTour corrected the grammar of one of the proposed standards (Standard No. 2.3.30 was missing an open parenthesis), noted an error in the redlined draft minutes of May 27, 1999, and corrected a spelling error in the recommendation ("dictinooonaries").

He then read the recommendation from the recommendation packet of proposed standards presented to the Executive Committee:

- Recommend the proposed imbalance trading definitions and standards to the Executive Committee. The Imbalance Subcommittee further recommends that these standards not be sent out for member ratification prior to being fully staffed. Draft data dictionaries are included to be forwarded to the Information Requirements Subcommittee and are **NOT** part of the recommendation. Similarly, a diagram is included for illustrative purposes only -it, too, is **NOT** part of the recommendation.

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the recommendation.

Mr. Love offered a modification to proposed standard S2 - adding the last sentence:

- Transportation Service Providers (TSP) should provide the ability to post and trade imbalances until at least the close of the nineteenth business day of the month. With the exception of the posting of imbalances available for trading, the TSP may employ non-electronic methods for implementing the trading process.

In discussion it was noted that there is currently no FERC requirement to implement the trading process electronically. After discussion, the above request to change S2 was withdrawn. Ms. Hopkins asked that two principles be added:

- GISB Standard Nos. [D1, D2], 2.3.30, [S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S8, S9, S10, S11, S12] were developed for trading of monthly imbalances. Additional standards may be developed to facilitate the trading of daily imbalances.
- GISB Standard Nos. [D1, D2], 2.3.30, [S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S8, S9, S10, S11, S12] were developed for the trading of shipper imbalances. Trading of other imbalances may be allowed on a mutually agreed to basis utilizing the above standards listed, as applicable.

Mr. Novak noted his support for shortening the trading window to the 15th day (S2), as he was unsure if the LDCs could implement this standard otherwise. Mr. Scheel was sympathetic to Mr. Novak's concern, but he added that shortening the window provided shippers with less time to react once they know what their imbalances are. Mr. LaTour added that they had considered a floating ten-day window, but Mr. Scheel responded that a floating window could cause confusion as shippers try to trade their imbalances. Mr. Hartmann noted that S12 should suffice for the second principle offered by Ms. Hopkins.

Mr. Novak asked that S12 be modified to add a reference "monthly" as under-lined to replace the first principle defined by Ms. Hopkins:



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

- S12 Netting, posting and trading of imbalances should be accomplished based on the Transportation Service Provider's (TSP) current method for accounting for monthly imbalances and does not require TSPs to institute daily imbalance procedures, if they are not already present on the TSP's system.

The motion makers agreed to add the first principle offered by Ms. Hopkins, and the motion was amended:

- P1 GISB Standard Nos. [D1, D2], 2.3.30, [S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S8, S9, S10, S11, S12] were developed for trading of monthly imbalances.

Several others noted that they could not support the second principle as defined by Ms. Hopkins and it was withdrawn from consideration. Ms. Patton asked that S2 be modified:

- S2 Transportation Service Providers should provide the ability to post and trade imbalances until at least the close of the seventeenth business day of the month.

Mr. Betonte noted that his company could conduct trades in five days if information is available. After a break, Ms. Davis asked that the above change to S2 be considered along with the change to noon for notification on S11:

- S11 After receipt of an Imbalance Trade Confirmation, the Transportation Service Provider should send the Imbalance Trade Notification to the initiating trader and the confirming trader no later than noon (central clock time) the next business day.

Mr. Scheel noted that he could support the changes only if S2 was changed to the eighteenth business day. After further discussion, Ms. Unruh as the motion maker accepted the change and others noted their support for the package as changed for the addition of the principle, change to S2 and change to S11. The motion passed with one vote in abstention.

X. Certification

The motion was made to create a task force to evaluate the technical aspects of the program. Ms. Hess volunteered that Ms. Corman would lead the effort. Mr. Nash of D.C. Systems noted his company's concerns with the program and presented a paper outlining such. He recommended that the certification program should not be pursued or alternatively, that self-certification should be allowed. It was noted that the Board officers would receive the paper prepared by Mr. Nash. The motion made to create a Certification Task Force to ensure that the technical aspects of the GISB Certification program are consistent with the Board's directives. Mr. Oppenheim noted that some LDCs might have concerns at the state level. The motion to create a task force passed unanimously.

Later in the meeting, after the special reports were given, Mr. Buccigross relayed the expectations of Mr. Boswell, as chair of the Board effort on certification and Mr. Templeton, as chair of the Board of Directors. They expected that the Executive Committee would not create a task force, but rather address and forward any technical implementation items to the GISB office to modify the program.

XI. Special Reports

Mr. Caldwell discussed the procedures that will be used to address new EII requests, and made the motion that the Executive Committee would support the following action:

- The EII task force would meet as required to respond to triaged requests to implement standardized business processes on Customer Activities/Informational Postings Web



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

sites.

On discussion, it was noted that questions from either the Technical Subcommittee or Information Requirements Subcommittee regarding EII requests would go to EII. For new EII requests that require immediate action, the Triage Group could make the recommendation and the Executive Committee, on a case by case basis, could determine to meet via conference call to determine the scope, disposition or priority. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. McVicker reviewed the proposed resolution, and several changes were made during discussions with the result of:

Modify the GISB Operating Practice for "Executive Committee Actions on Standards and Related Matters" to replace item 6.0 with:

- The business practices of ad hoc subcommittees and task forces, (e.g., Title Transfer Tracking, EBB Internet Implementation, Imbalances, Notices, Confirmations and Cross Contract Ranking), will be voted upon by the Executive Committee prior to being fully staffed. Upon passing by the required number of votes, the business practices will go to the Information Requirements Subcommittee and Technical Subcommittee, as appropriate, for implementation. Other committees and task forces may also elect to bring proposed business practices to the Executive Committee prior to fully staffing.

During discussion of this item, Mr. Love, Mr. Scheel and Ms. Unruh left the meeting, and Ms. Van Pelt joined the Executive Committee representing Ms. Unruh. The motion was adopted unanimously.

In discussion on the publication of version 1.4 of the standards manuals, Ms. Scott made the following motion, which was seconded by Ms. Hess:

- Delay the publication of the EDM book until September 30, 1999. The comment period prior to Executive Committee consideration will be two weeks.

After discussion, the motion passed 12 in favor, 3 opposed and 2 abstentions.

In discussion on the effort of Ms. Van Pelt who, as a GISB member, represents GISB at the DISA X12 meetings, it was noted that the X12 Committee approved actions forwarded by GISB to create a transaction for nominations. The new document is numbered 873 and is called "Commodity Movement Services", and should probably be in version 4030. Ms. Van Pelt was thanked for her representation of GISB.

XII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.