



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting
July 16, 1998 -- 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

The Marriott Long Wharf, Boston, Massachusetts

FINAL MINUTES

I. Introductory Items

Mr. Bray welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Boston and made introductory remarks. Mr. Holbrook reviewed the antitrust guidelines. Roll was called (24 members or alternates present) and members and alternates were welcomed to the committee meeting. The attendees introduced themselves. Mr. Maudlin was welcomed to the meeting. Ms. McQuade updated the attendees on the Year 2000 meeting held on July 14 with the committee on natural gas reporting to the President's Commission on Y2K. Each segment was asked if they would like to offer one representative to work with Ms. McQuade and Mr. Bray regarding Y2K issues. The revised agenda was unanimously adopted with changes to ordering the items, and an addition of an item for minor corrections and clarifications. The draft minutes of June 11 were unanimously adopted with changes. For a full accounting of the discussion from today's meeting, the transcripts should be ordered from Jane Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting.

II. Scope Determination and Triage Actions on New Requests

Request Nos. R98023, R98024 and R98025 were found in scope through a unanimous vote of the Executive Committee. For Request No. R98023, "Add Reduction Reason code value descriptions and definitions to the Scheduled Quantity (GISB Standard No. 1.4.5) and Scheduled Quantity for Operator (GISB Standard No. 1.4.6) documents", the Executive Committee agreed through a unanimous vote to send the request to Information Requirements Subcommittee with a priority of immediate. It was noted that this request would not be implemented for version 1.3 but an acceleration of the Triage recommended priority was supported due to the implementation of intraday nominations. The motion was made to:

- ✓ Send the request to Information Requirements Subcommittee.
- ✓ Accelerate the address of this item.
- ✓ Limit the comment period for this item to 15 days.
- ✓ Address the item through a special conference call of both the Information Requirements and Technical Subcommittee.
- ✓ Slip the version 1.3 completion date to September to accommodate the results of this request. Any other modifications to version 1.3 that were not previously processed in June will require specific action from the Executive Committee.
- ✓ Bring the proposed modified GISB standards before the Executive Committee in August for vote.

The motion was adopted unanimously. [This vote was overturned later in the meeting.]

For request No. R98024, "Add a validation code description to the Validation Code data element in the Nomination Quick Response (GISB Standard No. 1.4.2), applicable at the sub-detail level", the

recommendation of the Triage Subcommittee to send the request to the Information Requirements Subcommittee, with priority of as their agenda permits, was approved unanimously. For request No. R98025, "Add a code value description and definition for the Charge Type data element in the Transportation/Sales Invoice document (GISB Standard No. 3.4.1)", the recommendation of the Triage Subcommittee to send the request to the Information Requirements Subcommittee, with priority of as their agenda permits, was approved unanimously.

Request No. R98022, "Develop standards for interactive web sites.", submitted by Providence Energy, found to be in scope in July, will be further addressed in the EBB/Internet discussion.

III. Model Operational Balancing Agreement

Mr. Buccigross reviewed the model. Three wording changes were considered for the last sentence in clause 11 of the agreement from:

"If at any time, it should be determined that such balancing activities **do** result in such regulation, then this Agreement **shall** immediately **terminate**, and any remaining Operational Imbalance shall be resolved by the Parties within _____ after termination of this Agreement."

to:

"If at any time, it should be determined that such balancing activities **were to** result in such regulation, then this Agreement **may be** immediately **terminated by either Party**, and any remaining Operational Imbalance shall be resolved by the Parties within _____ after termination of this Agreement."

However, the position was taken that the original language was carefully crafted and the language should not be changed. The motion to adopt the amended language failed with 3 in favor and 17 opposed. The motion to adopt the original language as the model OBA passed with 22 votes in favor and 2 votes opposed.

IV. Common Codes and D-U-N-S® Number

This item was taken out of order on the agenda while materials were printed and copied for "Voting Rules for and Review of Executive Committee Subcommittees and Task Forces." Mr. Hahn updated the committee on the efforts undertaken by GISB Executive Committee officers and Ms. McQuade with Dun & Bradstreet (D&B). He noted that discussions are going well toward crafting an agreement between GISB and D&B for creation of a GISB central repository which would also address limited intellectual property rights of the information and the clean-up of the data used to link a D-U-N-S® Number with a company name. Mr. Hahn requested additional volunteers to submit data for D&B review. D&B is using the data to determine the level of effort for data clean-up. There are no requirement documents to D&B as described by Mr. Lander to address multiple common codes for a given company. Mr. Hahn noted that the multiple common codes for a given company would be a Common Codes Subcommittee issue. On the cost issues raised by Mr. Lander, the discussions have not progressed far enough to have alternatives defined. It is clearly the intent that GISB members should not be required to pay for this information. Non-members may be required to pay for access to this information to cover the GISB costs but this issue would be addressed by the officers of the Board of Directors and the officers of the Executive Committee with the Executive Director.

The outstanding request regarding common codes, Request No. R98020, was delayed for action by the Executive Committee regarding triage recommendation to forward the request to the Common Codes Subcommittee. The motion was made to transfer the request to the Common Codes Subcommittee and the Common Codes Subcommittee will transfer portions of the request to the Contracts Subcommittee where agency agreements are an issue. The motion passed unanimously. It was noted that D&B has opened discussions with both the FERC and EIA on this issue.

V. Voting Rules for and Review of Executive Committee Subcommittees and Task Forces

Mr. Bray opened the discussion by reviewing the guideline adopted by the Executive Committee in June:

We as an Executive Committee adopt a principle of balanced voting in Executive Committee Subcommittees or Task Forces with the number of votes per segment to be determined by the Executive Committee for both current subcommittees and task forces and newly created subcommittees and task forces from one vote per segment to unlimited votes per segment. The votes, or fractions of votes would be totaled across segments to determine the outcome of the motion under consideration. No notational or proxy votes would be permitted except for subcommittees or task forces with named members. Without Executive Committee action, newly formed subcommittees and task forces would have unlimited votes per segment. No member of a subcommittee or task force in attendance would have more than one vote. The Executive Committee through a simple majority vote would have the discretion to modify the voting procedures for its subcommittees and task forces.

The below language was considered by the committee as an amendment to the GISB Operating Practice "Executive Committee Subcommittee Procedures":

- IX. Standard Alternative Subcommittee Procedures
 - A. Pursuant to Section VII.E, above, the EC is authorized to establish alternative voting procedures for subcommittees when it deems such to be appropriate.
 - B. As stated in Section VII.E, voting in subcommittees and task forces shall proceed on a consensus basis unless otherwise determined by the EC to use one of the alternatives set forth below ("balanced voting" or "named members")
 - 1) "Balanced Voting" means each segment has maximum of three (3) countable votes, regardless of the number of members present from a segment. If there are three or more members from a segment in attendance, countable votes are determined by dividing the total number of votes cast by members of a segment by the total number of that segment's voters present and voting, and multiplying the result by three. Where there are two or fewer segment members present, each vote counts as one countable vote. A simple majority is required to decide issues and abstentions are not counted. The chair shall be selected from among the members of the group, or appointed by the EC, as the EC may determine.
 - 2) "Named Members" means individual GISB members are specifically assigned by the EC to the subcommittee or task force. There will be an equal number of members from each segment, and each member shall have one vote. No substitutes shall be authorized, but notational voting is permitted. A simple majority is required to decide issues and abstentions are not counted. The chair shall be selected from among the members of the group, or appointed by the EC, as the EC may determine.

The motion was made to adopt the proposed language. In discussions, alternatives to proposed clause IX.B.1 were identified as:

- 1. two countable votes,
 - 2. four countable votes,
 - 3. countable votes to be determined by the Executive Committee on a case-by-case basis,
- or
- 4. countable votes to be determined by the Executive Committee on a case-by-case basis with a default specified if agreement cannot be reached, to replace three countable votes. Concerns were raised that the proposed amendment does not address existing written procedures for subcommittees and task forces nor does it address Executive Committee review of voting rules for subcommittees and task forces, without which the existing voting rules would stand. The need to specify decimal places was raised as well as the alternatives (bolded italicized language above was added to address these concerns).

On the "named members" proposed section IX.B.2, it was recommended that alternates be permitted. The motion to adopt the original language shown above failed with six in favor and eighteen opposed.

[Break taken for lunch]

The below alternative language was considered by the committee as an amendment to the GISB Operating Practice "Executive Committee Subcommittee Procedures" through a motion: (changes are noted in bolded italicized text)

- IX. Standard Alternative Subcommittee Procedures
 - A. Pursuant to Section VII.E, above, the EC is authorized to establish alternative voting procedures for subcommittees when it deems such to be appropriate.
 - B. As stated in Section VII.E, voting in subcommittees and task forces shall proceed on a consensus basis ***unless specific written subcommittee or task force voting procedures are currently in place or*** unless otherwise determined by the EC to use one of the alternatives set forth below ("balanced voting" or "named members")
 - 1) "Balanced Voting" means each segment has maximum of three (3) countable votes, regardless of the number of members present from a segment. If there are three or more members from a segment in attendance, countable votes are determined by dividing the total number of votes cast by members of a segment by the total number of ***that segment's*** voters present and voting, and multiplying the result by three. Where there are two or fewer segment members present, each vote counts as one countable vote. A simple majority is required to decide issues and abstentions are not counted. The chair shall be selected from among the members of the group, or appointed by the EC, as the EC may determine.
 - 2) "Named Members" means individual GISB members are specifically assigned by the EC to the subcommittee or task force. There will be an equal number of members from each segment, and each member shall have one vote. ***One designated alternate is allowed to represent a named segment member in the event that one of the named segment members does not attend a subcommittee or task force meeting, and*** notational voting is ***not*** permitted. A simple majority is required to decide issues and abstentions are not counted. The chair shall be selected from among the members of the group, or appointed by the EC, as the EC may determine.

Mr. Hahn and Mr. Holbrook explained the changes. Mr. Buccigross offered to provide examples of how the voting procedures for balanced voting would work for the next meeting. The motion failed with nine votes in favor and fourteen votes opposed.

As further alternative language, the below alternative was considered by the committee as an amendment to the GISB Operating Practice "Executive Committee Subcommittee Procedures" through a motion: (changes are noted in bolded italicized text)

- IX. Standard Alternative Subcommittee Procedures
 - A. Pursuant to Section VII.E, above, the EC is authorized to establish alternative voting procedures for subcommittees when it deems such to be appropriate.
 - B. As stated in Section VII.E, voting in subcommittees and task forces shall proceed on a consensus basis ***unless specific written subcommittee or task force voting procedures are currently in place or*** unless otherwise determined by the EC to use one of the alternatives set forth below ("balanced voting" or "named members")
 - 1) "Balanced Voting" means each segment has maximum of ***two (2)*** countable votes, regardless of the number of members present from a segment. If there are ***two*** or more members from a segment in attendance, countable votes are determined by dividing the total number of votes cast by members of a segment by the total number of ***that segment's*** voters present and voting, and multiplying the result by

two. Where there are **two** or fewer segment members present, each vote counts as one countable vote. A simple majority is required to decide issues and abstentions are not counted. The chair shall be selected from among the members of the group, or appointed by the EC, as the EC may determine.

- 2) "Named Members" means individual GISB members are specifically assigned by the EC to the subcommittee or task force. There will be an equal number of members from each segment, and each member shall have one vote. **One designated alternate is allowed to represent a named segment member in the event that one of the named segment members does not attend a subcommittee or task force meeting, and** notational voting is **not** permitted. A simple majority is required to decide issues and abstentions are not counted. The chair shall be selected from among the members of the group, or appointed by the EC, as the EC may determine.

The motion passed with eighteen votes in favor and five votes in opposition.

The chairs of the various subcommittees and task forces will be asked to fill out a chart on their recommendations on the type of voting to be used. It will be considered at the next EC meeting. Ms. McVicker requested that balanced voting be put in place now for Title Transfer Tracking Task Force, as progress could be impeded without balanced voting. Others noted that the urgency for balanced voting was not needed as it has not been demonstrated that consensus voting for that task force would not work. Mr. Holbrook noted that both the "consensus" voting of one vote per company and the "balanced" voting of section IX.B.1 are both considered types of consensus voting. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Board Meeting Activities -- June 18, 1998

The Board of Directors on June 18 adopted a certificate change to extend the sunset vote to December 31, 2001. They also adopted three minor changes to the 1998 Annual Plan. They did not at that meeting adopt changes to reflect items cited in FERC Order No. 587-G. The Board thanked the EC for the work done on the models for the EBB-Internet Transition, and recommended that the EC complete its work and develop the needed standards.

The motion was made to create a task force with balanced voting, named the EBB Internet Implementation Task Force, reporting to the Executive Committee. The task force would develop standards relating to conducting transactions on the Internet including any standards needed to ensure that the EDI and internet models are comparable and would also include the minority issues and the CAMEL model. There would be one chair from each segment. Within one week the chairs will be identified to the GISB office. The motion passed unanimously.

The motion was made to abolish the Internet "Look and Feel" task force. The motion was passed unanimously. All remaining work will be transferred to the new EBB Internet Implementation Task Force. The motion passed unanimously.

VII. EDI Survey and Responses: Preliminary Plan

The motion was made that the EBB Internet Implementation Task Force review the preliminary report of the EDI Survey. TransCapacity has also prepared its own analysis based on the list of the responses and has e-mailed it to the EC members. Mr. Hahn asked that the chairs follow a dual path of the development of transactional web sites and a review of the items submitted for EDI development. It was emphasized that these items submitted are not requests, they are items resulting from an informal GISB survey. The motion was adopted unanimously.

VIII. XML Report from the Future Technology Task Force

The recommendation from the task force regarding XML was that it bore watching but the technology was still immature. If GISB determines to define standards at this level, the threshold questions are (1) is there a business need to use this technology; and (2) what would it take to implement the technology? Currently, there are no commercially available products that support an XML

development direction. Mr. Sappenfield requested that the task force provide a progress report in six months. Ms. Van Pelt noted that when she attended the quarterly DISA meetings, she attended a session on XML, which was a widely attended and contentious session. Ms. Ford requested that we continue to investigate XML. Ms. Croley agreed that a progress report would be forthcoming in January 1999.

VIIIA. Minor Corrections and Clarifications

A motion was made consider Request No. R98023 as a minor correction and clarification. The Information Requirements Subcommittee would provide the code to the GISB office and the GISB Standards Action Bulletin will carry a notice that the correction will be implemented for version 1.3 of the standards manuals. As such, there is no need to delay the publication of version 1.3 past July 31. The motion was adopted unanimously. The minor corrections and clarifications addressed in the supplemental material identified by the Technical Subcommittee (two documents), and the two documents describing minor corrections and clarifications submitted from the Information Requirements Subcommittee and Future Technology Task Force distributed during the meeting were adopted unanimously by the committee. The four documents will be referenced in the GISB Standards Action Bulletin, and should be published as part of version 1.3.

IX. Annual Plan

The efforts of the Model Trading Partner Agreement Task Force have concluded with a proposed Trading Partner Agreement to be sent out for comment this month and considered by the Executive Committee in August as a standard. The Business Practices Subcommittee expects to conclude its work on flowing gas issues and start the invoicing requests on August 6.

X. New Task Forces

Ms. Davis noted that there is no need for a separate task force for multi-tiered allocations -- the Allocation Grid Task Force is in the process of defining data elements needed for multi-tiered allocations, to work for the existing standards. After that and after the Title Transfer Tracking Task Force has completed its work, it would be determined if there were any outstanding issues. She expects that a recommendation will be drafted by the Allocation Grid Task Force in September, after which it will be forwarded to the Information Requirements Subcommittee. As such a year-end deadline is achievable.

The motion was made to create a task force reporting to the Executive Committee regarding standards development for cross contract ranking, that the task force will be chaired by Ms Munson and based on the GIB calendar and the resources needed, she will present a plan to the EC in September and it will have balanced voting. The task force will be chaired by Ms. Munson. [After the meeting, the GISB office was notified that Ms. Scott will co-chair.] The motion passed with one abstention.

XI. Other Business Items

Ms. Van Pelt notified the committee that the modifications submitted by GISB to the X12 committee regarding version 4010 of the Payment Remittance were approved.

XII. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m., July 16, 1998.

- Attachments:
1. Attendance
 2. Voting Record
 3. Minor Corrections and Clarifications - Technical Subcommittee (1)
 4. Minor Corrections and Clarifications - Technical Subcommittee (2)
 5. Minor Corrections and Clarifications - Future Technology Task Force
 6. Minor Corrections and Clarifications - Information Requirements Subcommittee
 7. Minor Corrections and Clarifications - Request No. R98023