



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 (EC) Members
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Executive Committee Meeting – August 24, 2000

DATE: August 24, 2000

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Palace Hotel, San Francisco, California
August 24, 2000
FINAL MINUTES

1. Administrative

Mr. Buccigross opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees. Ms McQuade thanked Proxicom for hosting this meeting and specifically thanked Mr. Fred Stow and Mr. George Heal for their efforts and continued support of GISB. Mr. Jay Harbidge was introduced from San Francisco Reporting service as transcription service for the meeting. Ms. Jane Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting was unable to attend today's meeting. An announcement was made that Ms. Munson is now representing the PanCanadian Energy Services, Inc., a marketing company. PanCanadian Energy Services is a member of GISB in the services segment. Ms. Munson notified the GISB office that she would be retaining her seat on the Executive Committee.

Ms. McQuade read the roll call. There were 22 members or alternates in attendance and 3 ballots had been received in the office. Mr. Costan gave the antitrust charge. The amended agenda was accepted with a discussion of the standards for request no. R99033 to be included under the agenda item for "Other Business." With modifications made during the meeting, the redlined minutes for June 15 were adopted. With modifications made during the meeting, the minutes for August 2 were adopted. For a full accounting of the discussion from today's meeting, the transcripts should be ordered from Mr. Jay Harbidge, San Francisco Reporting Service, (415-777-2111).

2. Special Reports

Order 637:

On the Order 637 Efforts, Ms. Kim Van Pelt noted that all BPS work was completed through a series of expedited meetings and a significant amount of industry effort. Mr. Novak questioned Ms. Van Pelt about a number of issues including the absence of sign-in sheets for several of the BPS meetings and the absence of reasons in the BPS minutes as to why certain Order No. 637 items were determined to require no GISB action. Specifically, he was curious regarding partial day releases –the BPS recommended modifications only apply to pre-arranged non-biddable deals. As firm capacity holders were not present at the meetings, even though they had been notified and invited, the resulting proposals from BPS may not reflect their concerns on partial day releases and partial day recalls.

At this time in the meeting, a break was taken to address concerns raised by Mr. Harbidge from the transcription service, San Francisco Reporting Service. He noted that he was unable to prepare transcripts as Ak/Ret Reporting has done in the past, so it was determined to tape the meeting. They would prepare the transcripts from the tape. To assist



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

in preparing the transcripts from the tapes, Mr. Buccigross urged all speakers to clearly identify themselves before addressing the group.

The meeting returned to the topic of Order 637. Mr. Novak continued to identify some of his concerns including a question on the timeline for scheduling equality for biddable deals. Ms. Van Pelt noted that the BPS determined to await further direction from the FERC on this issue, which was supported by Mr. Scheel.

Ms. Hess questioned the process by which Mr. Novak was questioning the BPS on its findings. She asked that a motion be made to have a recommendation regarding Order 637 be prepared by the BPS, sent out for comment, and discussed at the next EC meeting. Mr. Novak noted that it was the prerogative of the EC to question the progress of various subcommittees. He added that this discussion was not a debate on the merits of Order No. 637. Moreover, he added that he did not think a two month delay on this discussion was reasonable given that delay would place the standards determination on Order 637 items that much closer to the peak of the winter heating cycle. He offered that the EC could have an out of cycle meeting in September.

Ms. Chezdar highlighted several questions on Order No. 637 and specifically identified capacity release issues. It was noted that BPS addressed each of its assigned issues on the 637 work plan, including capacity release. It was pointed out that the instructions were to review each item to determine if standards are needed, and if so, then to develop them. The instructions did not direct the BPS to develop standards for each item. Mr. Novak agreed with this assessment of the instructions.

Mr. Novak added that the action of a subcommittee determining that a standard was not needed has the same effect on an industry as developing a standard. He asked for revised minutes that included attendance lists and additional information on why the BPS determined that some of the items did not require any action. He specifically identified the need for additional information that led the BPS to the conclusion that no changes were needed to GISB Standard Nos. 5.3.6 and 5.3.7. He noted that there could be several interpretations of why these standards require no change. Two such interpretations are: (1) there is no need for a partial day recall or (2) partial day recall was not needed because a full day recall would be provided given that intraday 1 and intraday 2 nominations were nominations on the "nomination day" per Standard 5.3.6.

After further discussion, it was determined that the BPS would prepare a report of their recommendations regarding each Order 637 work plan item assigned to them, and where the BPS determined no action was required, a report would be prepared. The report would go out for a shortened comment period and be addressed by the EC in an out-of-cycle meeting to be held in conjunction with the annual meeting.

Ms. Van Pelt noted that all BPS determinations were reached via balanced voting where the decisions were not unanimous. To address all assigned items, they followed an aggressive schedule and held 12 meetings in 36 days. She offered an alternative that instead of revising the final minutes, the BPS could provide subcommittee findings. She emphasized that the BPS was following EC instructions as it prepared recommendations on the Order 637 work plan.

Mr. Novak was amenable to Ms. Van Pelt's suggestion and asked that the report include information regarding any discussion held that recognized that after Order 637, most if not all releases are biddable. He also asked that the report should include an explanation for GISB standards recognizing partial day releases but not partial day recalls. He noted that the report should explain the reasons for items where the BPS determined that work plan items required no action.

After further discussion, Ms. Hess made the motion that the EC instructs the BPS to draft a recommendation and report for the Order 637 items. The recommendation and report



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

will be sent out for comment and addressed at the next EC meeting. The Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR) will not act on the BPS work product until it is addressed by the EC. Mr. Griffith seconded the motion.

In discussion on the motion, a concern was raised that IR would stop work on the items forwarded to it from BPS. Mr. Novak reiterated that he supported that the Order 637 work transferred from BPS to IR be stopped to prevent lost work. The report would go out for a shortened comment period and be addressed by the EC in an out-of-cycle meeting to be held in conjunction with the annual meeting.

The EC voted on the procedural motion and it carried unanimously. A follow-up motion was made by Ms. McVicker and seconded by Ms. Chezar to shorten the comment period on the BPS recommendations and report. The EC voted on the procedural motion and it passed unanimously.

In continuing the update on the progress made toward the Order 637 work plan, Mr. Caldwell reported that a request had gone out for work papers to address the Order 637 items assigned to the EDM Subcommittee. Once the work papers are received, the EDM Subcommittee will hold a meeting in which a response will be prepared for the Order 637 items. Mr. Keisler updated the EC on the progress made by the IR. Items 1 and 2 are complete and item 3 is substantially complete. For the assignments to the Imbalances Subcommittee, Mr. LaTour noted that a conference call is scheduled for August 31. He also noted that they have responded to related questions from various other subcommittees. Ms. Hess provided an update of the activities of the Expedited Data Development (EDD) Subcommittee. She reported that the activities for imbalance netting and trading have concluded. Mr. Buccigross and Ms. McQuade noted that the plan item identified for the Common Code Subcommittee is scheduled to be addressed in a conference call scheduled on August 28.

Mr. Buccigross, on behalf of GISB and the EC, thanked each of the subcommittees and their chairs for all the significant effort and resources spent to address the Order 637 work plan in such an expeditious manner.

EDD Subcommittee and R00025:

On the efforts of the EDD Subcommittee, a progress report was provided which responded to the EC's directive of August 7, 2000. The directive to EDD for this report had been formulated as a result of the request submitted by Altra Energy Technologies, Request No. R00025. Ms. Hess reviewed the report. Mr. LaTour noted that the Imbalance Subcommittee recommended that existing flowing gas standards to be sent out for comment and voted on at the same time as the BPS report.

As such, Mr. Scheel made a motion, seconded by Ms. Phillips that the EC instruct the EDD to draft a recommendation and report for the consideration and vote at the next EC meeting. This would entail a shortened comment period. In discussion, it was noted that to have the EC vote on only the EBB implementation is an exception to the normal procedure and is due to FERC's November 1 implementation date for imbalance netting and trading services. It is not the intention that EDI be ignored, it is more of an issue of full staffing and voting for ratification. The EC voted on the procedural motion and it passed unanimously.

Contracts Subcommittee:

The Contracts Subcommittee efforts to modify the base contract for short-term sales and purchases of natural gas, GISB Standard No. 6.3.1, are well underway and they are currently reviewing section §10.

XML Subcommittee:

The XML Subcommittee provided a white paper for the consideration of the Executive



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

Committee. Review and discussion of this white paper with a possible procedural vote to endorse the direction of the paper will be addressed in October. It was distributed at this meeting to give the EC participants adequate time to review the report with the appropriate staff in their companies. It was noted that the Utility Industry Group is also preparing a white paper on XML use, and it was highlighted that the North American Electric Reliability Council has endorsed the use of XML.

3. Update on 2000 Annual Plan & Subcommittee Reports

For the Common Codes Subcommittee, the progress was reported above under the Order 637 issues. For the Imbalances Subcommittee, the progress was reported above under the Order 637 issues. Mr. LaTour advised that the Imbalance Subcommittee is meeting as needed to respond to questions from other subcommittees. They have answered queries from the EDD Subcommittee and expect to address the Order No. 637 issue assigned to it at its August 31 meeting. For the EDM Subcommittee, the progress was reported above under the Order No. 637 issues. The interoperability survey has been distributed and is due to be returned to the GISB office by September 8. The EDM Subcommittee will work with the GISB Office and the FTTF Subcommittee to compile the data. It was also noted that a workshop has been scheduled for September 12 to discuss the Sandia National Labs surety assessment report. It was noted that the standard for AS2 has been completed and ratified. For the FTTF Subcommittee, Mr. Shahan noted that the interoperability survey has been sent out via email, and they haven't met since the June EC meeting. For the Business Practices Subcommittee, Order No. 637 items have been the single focus of effort. They will be back on the regular schedule next week addressing nominations requests. Similar to BPS, the Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR) has only worked on Order No. 637 items as reported earlier. For the Technical Subcommittee, they are addressing items as forwarded to them from IR, and they have no existing backlog. For the ANSI Compliance Team, they are working on data sets according to the previously endorsed timeline, and are on schedule.

4. New Requests

Ms. Van Pelt presented the new request. For request no. R00024, the Triage Group recommended that the EC find the request in scope and to send the request to the Information Requirements Subcommittee to be addressed in its normal course of business. A motion was made Ms. Davis, seconded by Mr. Caldwell, and adopted unanimously that the request was in scope. The disposition of the request as determined by the EC was:

R00024 Request Summary:

Submitted by Enron Gas Pipeline Group to add Charge Type codes and definitions to further describe the charges on an invoice for Firm Storage Capacity Charge, Storage Account Balance Overrun, Storage Account Balance Underrun, and Storage Unmet Monthly Minimum.

Disposition:

Motion made by Ms. Davis and seconded by Mr. Caldwell to adopt the recommendation of the Triage Subcommittee. The motion was adopted unanimously.

5. Recommendations for Proposed Standards

C99003 Submitted by NGPL



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

Interpretation Request Summary:

GISB standard 5.3.2 states “offers should be tendered by 1:00 p.m. the day before nominations for short term releases”. It further states that the “open season ends no later than 2:00 p.m. on the day before nominations are due...” GISB standard 5.3.24 states, “Capacity Release facilitator should post offers and bids, including prearranged deals, upon receipt, unless releasing shipper requests otherwise”. These standards seem to imply that the open season could begin at either the time of posting or the next subsequent 1:00 p.m. after posting and in either case, remain open until the requested end of posting. Clarification is requested for the situation where the offer is tendered after the 1:00 p.m. deadline on business day one, but before 1:00 p.m. on business day 2 and the releasor requests that the offer be posted immediately.

Proposed Interpretation Response:

A Service Requester may have its offer posted for review either immediately or at another specified time and if not specified then, at the Transportation Service Provider's option, the offer can be posted for review either immediately or at the next occurrence of 1:00 p.m. on a business day. GISB has no requirement that bidding upon such posting be available prior to the next occurrence of 1:00 p.m. on a business day. Neither is there any prohibition on bidding occurring upon a posting provided that bidding upon such posting continue to be available through at least the next occurrence of 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. on a business day or the longer period where such offer is a long term offer.

Modified GISB Standard No. 5.3.33:

When a Transportation Service Provider (*TSP*) receives an upload of an offer or a bid in association with a deadline, it should process such offer or bid (as applicable) and post valid offers or bids (as applicable) for review within fifteen minutes and, in the event such document is not valid, respond with the applicable validation document to the applicable submitting party within fifteen minutes. When a ~~Transportation Service Provider~~ *TSP* receives an upload of an offer or a bid not in association with a deadline, it should process and post for review valid offer(s) or bid(s) (as applicable) which are received prior to one quarter hour period by the end of the next succeeding quarter hour period and, in the event such document is not valid, respond with the applicable validation document to the applicable submitting party by the end of the next succeeding quarter hour period. The quarter hour periods are on the hour, fifteen minutes after, thirty minutes after and forty-five minutes after an hour.

The releasing shipper may request a later posting time for posting of such offer insofar as such request comports with the standard Capacity Release timeline specified in GISB Standard No. 5.3.2.

~~Transportation Service Provider's~~ *TSP's* nightly processing and routine maintenance occurring outside of normal business hours are apt to interrupt the normal schedule of applicable validation documents. Such delays should be kept to a minimum. The normal schedule should be resumed at the earliest opportunity and no later than the start of the next business day.

Modified GISB Standard No. 5.3.24:

Capacity release facilitator should post offers and bids, including prearranged deals, upon receipt, ~~unless releasing shipper requests otherwise. If a releasing shipper requests a posting time~~ *A releasing shipper may request a later posting time for posting of such offer, and* the capacity release service facilitator should



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

support such request insofar as it comports with the standard *Capacity Release* timeline ~~set forth~~ specified in ~~standard~~ *GISB Standard No. 5.3.2*.

Discussion: No discussion.

Motion: The motion was made by Mr. Novak and seconded by Mr. Scheel to adopt the interpretation and standards modifications as provided on the recommendation.

Vote: Passes unanimously.

C00001 Submitted by Hatch and Associates

Interpretation Request Summary:

Using the Pathed Non-Threaded model, should fuel be calculated on the total delivery quantity to all delivery points, or based upon each transportation line item? The problem arises when fuel quantities are rounded to the nearest Dth.

Proposed Interpretation response:

“The fuel percentage should be applied at the line item level. This applies regardless of the Model Type that is used in the Nomination. GISB Standard 1.2.1 identifies that a nomination is at the line item level. GISB Standard 1.3.15 states in relevant part that “the results of the fuel reimbursement calculations for the nominations process should be rounded to the nearest dekatherm.” In addition, GISB Standard 1.3.29 states in relevant part “Service Providers should not reject a nomination for reasons of rounding differences due to fuel calculations of less than 5 Dth.” These three standards taken together mean that fuel reimbursement calculations and the rounding of the results thereof should occur at the line item level.”

Motion: The motion was made by Ms. Hess and seconded by Mr. Caldwell to adopt the interpretation as provided on the recommendation.

Vote: Passes unanimously.

C00002 Submitted by Boeing

Interpretation Request Summary:

“When the calculation of in-kind fuel reimbursement generates an amount less than 0.500 Dth, does the TSP round down to zero or up to 1? The effect of rounding up to 1 would be to create a one Dth minimum fuel-in-kind charge while the effect of rounding down would be to have a zero Dth reimbursement and possibly encourage gaming. Is zero a Dth?”

Proposed Interpretation response:

“The mathematical effect of GISB Standard 1.3.15, the rounding standard, can generate a zero Dth result for any particular line item.”

Motion: The motion was made by Ms. Patton and seconded by Mr. Caldwell to adopt the interpretation as presented in the recommendation.

Vote: Passes unanimously.

C00003 Submitted by BPS and Columbia Gas Transmission



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

Interpretation Request Summary:

“Please interpret the meaning and intent of what a ‘super-nomination’ is. Also, please clarify whether a Transportation Service Provider permitting (and not requiring) a shipper to nominate across pipelines in the same family is exceeding the GISB standard”.

Proposed Interpretation response:

“The infrastructure exists within, and using, the GISB standards for a Service Requester to move gas from wellhead to burner-tip. In particular, the last sentence of GISB Standard 1.1.3 which states:

‘A super-nomination is a nomination that contains all the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burner-tip.’

should be interpreted to mean:

‘A super-nomination is a transmittal that contains all the line items describing the path from the receipt point to the delivery point.’

Discussion: There was discussion on whether this interpretation was complete or if there was other text to be included.

Motion: The motion was made by Mr. Scheel and seconded by Mr. Caldwell to adopt the interpretation as provided on the recommendation.

Vote: Passes unanimously.

Discussion: In further discussion, it was noted that due to a clerical error the proposed interpretation reflected on the recommendation form was incomplete. Ms. Phillips provided the missing language.

Proposed Corrected Interpretation Response (with red-lines indicating inserted language) :

“The infrastructure exists within, and using, the GISB standards for a Service Requester to move gas from wellhead to burner-tip. In particular, the last sentence of GISB Standard 1.1.3 which states:

‘A super-nomination is a nomination that contains all the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burner-tip.’

should be interpreted to mean:

‘A super-nomination is a transmittal that contains all the line items describing the path from the receipt point to the delivery point.’

Given this interpretation of the last sentence of GISB Standard 1.1.3, the infrastructure does exist for a Service Requester to send multiple Transportation Service Provider (TSP) nominations to a party receiving multiple TSP nominations for retransmission to the applicable TSPs.

Lastly, a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) which permits (but does not require) a Service Requester to submit a nomination or nominations **(line item or line items)** which traverse multiple TSPs (including those TSPs in the same corporate family) is exceeding the GISB standard.”

Motion: The motion was made by Ms. Phillips and seconded by Ms. Davis to adopt the complete text of the proposed interpretation as reflected..

Discussion: In response to concerns voiced by Ms. Hess, Ms. Davis noted that this interpretation was crafted to describe the original intent of 1.1.3, that a super-nomination is a transmittal containing multiple line items, which describe



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

all parts for the originating receipt point to the ultimate delivery point. If only the originating receipt point to the ultimate delivery point are given, then it is exceeding the standard.

Vote: Passes unanimously.

Note: This second vote will supercede the previous vote on the proposed interpretation.

R97011

Submitted by Panenergy (Now Duke Energy – Texas Eastern)

Recommendation Summary:

- Add GISB Standard No. 5.3.x:

There should be no communication of the identity of non-winning, non-prearranged bidders in the Offer Upload Final Disposition.

The identity of the winning bidder(s) should be sent to the releasing shipper in the Offer Upload Final Disposition.

In the case of multiple bids upon one offer, the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should have the choice of either sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to the winning bidder(s) identifying all winning bidders, or sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to each winning bidder identifying only that party as a winning bidder.

In the case of a non-winning pre-arranged bidder, the TSP should have the choice of either sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to the non-winning prearranged bidder identifying all winning bidders and identifying the pre-arranged bidder as a non-winning bidder, or sending an Offer Upload Final Disposition to the non-winning pre-arranged bidder identifying only the pre-arranged bidder as a non-winning bidder.

- Move the data element 'Bidder Company Code' to the detail level of the Offer Upload Final Disposition.
- Add a code value description to the Disposition Response Code in the Offer Upload Final Disposition.

Discussion: Ms. Van Pelt described the recommendation. Information Requirements Subcommittee asked that the recommendation be withdrawn due to the comments provided by Enron. It was noted that on the final disposition, identities of the non-winning non-pre-arranged bidders will not be listed. This information is available for three years, but not on the final disposition.

Motion: A procedural motion was made by Ms. Davis and seconded by Ms. Phillips to send the recommendation to Information Requirements Subcommittee and the Technical Subcommittee to address concerns raised in Enron's comments.

Mr. Novak noted that the revised recommendation should include a clarification that the identities of the non-winning non-pre-arranged bidders should continue to be available. The change is only directed to the Final Disposition data set.

Vote: Passes.

R97104

Submitted by TransCapacity (now CapacityCenter.com)

Recommendation Summary:

Add two EDM standards to address testing:



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

Proposed Standard 4.2.x

Testing data sets between trading partners includes testing of:

- a) intended business results,
- b) proposed electronic delivery mechanisms, and
- c) related EDI/EDM and, where supported, FF/EDM implementation issues.

Testing should include enveloping, security, data validity, and standards compliance (e.g. ANSI X12 and GISB EDM Related Standards).

Proposed Standard 4.3.x

When the receiver of:

- 1) a Nomination,
- 2) a Pre-determined Allocation, or,
- 3) a Request for Confirmation,

has determined to change the business rule(s) it will apply to the processing of (and/or response to) one or more of these documents; or, when the sender of:

- 1) a Confirmation Response (solicited and unsolicited),
- 2) a Scheduled Quantity,
- 3) a Scheduled Quantity for Operator,
- 4) an Allocation,
- 5) a Shipper Imbalance, or,
- 6) an Invoice

has determined to change the business rule(s) it will apply to the generating of (and/or content within) one or more of these documents, then it should notify its trading partners of same at least two weeks in advance of the change(s). The notification should include identification of the data element(s) that are changing (or whose content is changing), the intended business result of such change(s) in the business rule(s), and the effective date of such change(s).

For the purposes of this standard, a business rule change is any change in:

- a) the presence and/or the acceptable content of a data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice;
- b) a new business response to an accepted data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice;
- c) a new business response to the acceptable content of a data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice; or,
- d) a new intended business result to be communicated to a receiver by the trading partner sending notice;

Absent mutual agreement between the affected trading partners to the contrary, trading partners notifying their sending or receiving trading partners of a change(s) under this standard should provide the means to test such change(s) during at least a two week time period prior to the effective date of the change(s).

Trading partners receiving notice of such change(s) from their trading partner should be prepared not to implement such change(s) even after testing has been completed, as the notifying trading partner is permitted to cancel or postpone such change(s). Notifying trading partners canceling or postponing the effective date of change(s) should provide affected trading partners with notice of cancellation or postponement at least one business day prior to the applicable effective date.



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

Motion: The motion was made by Ms. Davis and seconded by Ms. Hess to adopt the standards as provided on the recommendation.

Discussion: Mr. Spangler noted that the last paragraph of proposed standard 4.3.x appeared to endorse bad behavior. Mr. Caldwell responded that it was recognizing known behavior and as such provided boundaries for it.

Vote: Passes.

R98035A Submitted by ANR Pipeline

Recommendation Summary:

Decline the request to add a pre-limit quantity code value to the transaction identifier data element in the Request for Confirmation (G850RQCF) and the Confirmation Response (G855RRFC) datasets.

Discussion: Mr. Novak disagreed with the recommendation to decline the request, stating that the standard would be used in the industry to support existing business practices. Others responded that because pre-limit quantities in the confirmation would be used infrequently, and use of prelimit quantities in the confirmation process would require the development of a new data set rather than amending an existing data set, the effort required would not be commensurate with benefit. Ms. Phillips supported Mr. Novak's statement and added that it the normal course of business, this practice would be more frequently used when the standard is created.

Motion: Ms. Davis made the motion, seconded by Ms. Van Pelt to approve the recommendation to decline.

Vote: Procedural vote failed with 6 votes in favor, 12 votes opposed, and 3 abstentions.

Motion: Ms. Phillips made the motion seconded by Mr. Novak to instruct the BPS to reconsider request no. R98035A during normal course of business.

Discussion: Ms. Van Pelt urged those in support of this action to attend and participate in the BPS meetings when this request is considered.

Vote: Procedural vote passed with 17 votes in favor, 5 votes opposed and no abstentions.

R98061 Submitted by Colorado Interstate Gas

Recommendation Summary:

Decline the request to accommodate a mutually agreeable nominations related business practice to allow No Notice Transportation (NNT) shippers to request authorization for overrun deliveries under their NNT contracts by the addition of new data elements:

- contract number
- overrun quantity requested
- date range for the overrun quantity requested

or through the addition of new nominations related data sets and to accommodate the respective response documents.

Discussion: Mr. Novak noted that his comments are similar to the ones made in the above recommendation to decline. This is very usable – with EDI gaining more acceptance for LDC firm shippers. They would rather have no notice



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

service available via EDI and implemented prior to the winter season 2002, when EDI should be widely accepted. Mr. Griffith noted that this was infrequently used, but Ms. Chezar noted that in several filings pipelines are beginning to use this as a request for pre-authorization for over-run. Mr. Novak added that he would support the development of standards or principles along the lines of the request with a modification for where nominations are required.

Motion: Mr. Griffith made the motion, seconded by Ms. Van Pelt to accept the recommendation to decline.

Vote: Procedural vote failed with 11 in favor and 13 opposed.

Motion: Mr. Novak made the motion, seconded by Ms. Phillips, that BPS reconsiders this request as a principle.

Discussion: Ms. Davis noted that the process of overturning subcommittee efforts is inefficient, and if members have concerns, they should participate in the meetings. She added that many of these meetings were held over the phone. Mr. Novak noted that he would withdraw the motion and resubmit as a request.

Motion: After further discussion, Ms. Phillips made the amended motion, seconded by Mr. Novak, to instruct BPS to accommodate the practice of communicating requests for authorized overrun for no notice service, to be addressed in the normal course of business.

Discussion: Mr. Novak described that this request would lead to fewer billing disputes, particularly where there are no flow controls. After additional conversation, it was noted that this would be best handled through withdrawal of the motion and submittal of a new request.

Motion: The motion was made by Mr. Scheel and seconded by Ms. Chezar to send the request back to BPS for reconsideration to be addressed in the normal course of business.

Discussion: Mr. Scheel explained that this will be reviewed in light of the new information that the LDCs expect a wider use of EDI, which might impact the recommendation. Ms. Phillips added that there is now additional information, which highlights that in some cases, the data sets do not accommodate communicating the request for authorized overruns when nominations for that service are not required. This can be accommodated through a new request, and Mr. Novak will prepare it.

Vote: Procedural vote passed with 18 in favor, zero opposed and five abstaining.

R98062

Submitted by Colorado Interstate Gas

Recommendation Summary:

Decline the request to accommodate a mutually agreeable nominations related business practice to allow a Park and Loan shipper to submit a request for a specific Park/Loan deal by the addition of new data elements or code values for:

- Park/Loan Contract
- Request for "Park" or "Loan"
- Park/Loan Location
- Maximum Park/Loan Quantity
- Park/Loan Deal Term
- Park/Loan Deal Rate



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

or through the addition of new nominations related data sets or instructions and to accommodate the respective response documents.

Discussion: Mr. Keisler described the request.

Motion: Ms. McVicker made the motion, seconded by Mr. Novak to send the request back to BPS for reconsideration with additional participation, to be addressed in the normal course of business.

Discussion: In response to a question from Ms. Davis, Mr. Novak noted that when this was first considered very few pipelines offered park and loan services. He noted that now more pipelines offer these services and more will continue to do so as reliance on penalties to manage pipeline capacity decreases.

Vote: The procedural vote passed with 13 in favor, 5 opposed and 4 abstaining.

R98068 Submitted by Panhandle Eastern (now CMS Energy)

Recommendation Summary:

- Add the data elements 'Meter ID' and 'Meter ID Relationship' to the Measurement Information dataset (2.4.5).
- Add two (2) code value descriptions to the data element Meter ID Relationship in the Measurement Information dataset.
- Change the Technical Implementation of Business Process for the Measurement Information dataset.

Discussion: Mr. Keisler described the recommendation.

Motion: The motion was made by Mr. Caldwell and seconded by Ms. Davis to adopt the standard modifications and documentation as presented in the recommendation.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

6. Other Business

Ms. Davis raised the issue of request no. R99033, and the standards related to the request that were recently ratified. She noted that when the standards were approved, they were not fully staffed. She added that they went out for ratification because the EC did not specify that they should not be ratified until the request had been processed through IR and Technical Subcommittees. As such she requested that the standards not be published until the implementation standards (IR and Technical) are completed. She noted that this was the intent of the BPS.

Motion: The motion was made by Ms. Davis and seconded by Ms. Hess that the ratified business practices standards related to request no. R99033 should not be published until the implementation standards are complete and the recommendation is considered fully staffed, approved by the EC and ratified.

Discussion: Mr. Novak noted that it is important that the full staffing should happen quickly so that this practice of delaying publication is not abused, so that operationally available capacity is not implemented until this is published. Mr. Griffith responded that 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

requirement to post this information is a FERC requirement. The date to publish will be discussed at the next meeting.

Vote: The procedural motion passed unanimously.

There was no additional business discussed.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.



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

8. Executive Committee Attendance

Executive Committee	Segment	Present	Member
	End Users	✓	Bill Hebenstreit
		✓	Kelly Daly
		Ballot	Dona Gussow (ballot)
		✓	Diane McVicker
		✓	Tina Patton
	LDCs	✓	Dolores Chezar
		✓	Chris Maturo
		✓	Mike Novak
		✓	Bob Betonte
		✓	Steve Sullivan
	Pipelines	✓	Bill Griffith
		✓	Dale Davis
		✓	Theresa Hess for Paul Love
		✓	Kim Van Pelt
		✓	Mark Gracey
	Producers	Ballot	Paul Keeler (ballot)
		✓	Joyce Phillips
		✓	Mike Johnson
		Ballot	Richard Smith (ballot)
		✓	Scott Brown
	Services	✓	Jim Buccigross
		✓	Carl Caldwell
		✓	Keith Sappenfield
		✓	Mark Scheel
		✓	Leigh Spangler for Sylvia Munson
Administrative:	Rae McQuade		- Executive Director
	JoAnn Garcia		- GISB Staff
	Veronica Thomason		- GISB Staff
	Jay Costan		- GISB General Counsel (by phone)
	Laurie Paulson		- Hoffman-Paulson Associates
	Cheryl Hoffman		- Hoffman-Paulson Associates
	S.F. Reporting Services		- Transcription Service



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

9. Voting Record

Member	C99003	C00001	C00002	C00003-1 ¹	C00003-2	R97011	R97104
Kim Van Pelt	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mark Gracey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bill Griffith	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Theresa Hess	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dale Davis	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chris Maturo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dolores Chezar	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	abstain	✓
Steve Sullivan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bob Betonte	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mike Novak	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Keith Sappenfield	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Carl Caldwell	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Leigh Spangler	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	abstain
Mark Scheel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Jim Buccigross	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Scott Brown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Joyce Phillips	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Paul Keeler (ballot)	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Richard Smith (ballot)	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Mike Johnson	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bill Hebenstreit	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kelly Daly	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Diane McVicker	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tina Patton	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dona Gussow (ballot)	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Change from Recommendation?	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Type of Vote? ²	17/2	17/2	17/2	17/2	17/2	Proc.	17/2
Total Votes For	25	25	25	25	22	21	24
Total Votes Against	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratification?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Pass/Fail	Passes	Passes	Passes	Passes	Passes	Passes	Passes

¹ For C00003, the second vote replaces the first vote, so only the language supported in the second vote will be ratified.

² Two types of votes are taken: 17/2 and procedural. For motions that create, change or delete standards or interpretations, the threshold to pass is 17 affirmative votes with at least 2 affirmatives per segment ("17/2"). All other motions are procedural and simple majority is the threshold for passage ("proc").



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

9. Voting Record (continued)

Member	R98035A-1	R98035A-2	R98061-1	R98061-2	R98062	R98068
Kim Van Pelt	✓	✗	✓	Abstain	✗	✓
Richard Kruse	✓	✗	✓	Abstain	✗	✓
Bill Griffith	✓	✗	✓	Abstain	✗	✓
Theresa Hess	✓	✗	✓	Abstain	✗	✓
Dale Davis	✓	✗	✓	Abstain	✗	✓
Chris Maturro	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Dolores Chezar	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Steve Sullivan	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Bob Betonte	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Mike Novak	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Keith Sappenfield	Abstain	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Carl Caldwell	Abstain	✓	✓	✓	Abstain	✓
Leigh Spangler	Abstain	✓	✓	✓	Abstain	✓
Mark Scheel	✗	✓	✓	✓	Abstain	✓
Jim Buccigross	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Scott Brown	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Joyce Phillips	✗	✓	✗	✓	Abstain	✓
Paul Keeler (ballot)	✓		✓			✓
Richard Smith (ballot)	✓		✗			✓
Mike Johnson	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Bill Hebenstreit	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Kelly Daly		✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Diane McVicker	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	
Tina Patton	✗	✓		✓	✓	✓
Dona Gussow (ballot)	✓		✓			✓
Change from Recommendation?	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Type of Vote?	Proc	Proc	Proc	Proc	Proc	17/2
Total Votes For	9	17	11	17	13	24
Total Votes Against	12	5	13	0	5	0
Ratification?	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Pass/Fail	Fails	Passes	Fails	Passes	Passes	Passes



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

10. Observers to the Meeting – August 24, 2000:

Name	Company	GISB Member
PIPELINES:		
Bianchi, Joe	ANR Pipeline	✓
Latour, Dennis	ANR Pipeline	✓
Fitzgerald, Nancy	Coral Gas Transmission	✓
King, Iris	Dominion Transmission	✓
Burch, Kathryn	Duke Energy – Texas Eastern	✓
Stender, Mike	El Paso Natural Gas	✓
Gwilliam, Tom	Iroquois	✓
Gossett, Karen	Koch Gateway	✓
Grygar, Bill	Panhandle Eastern	✓
Bass, Charlie	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	✓
Breeden, Denise	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	✓
Keisler, Jim	Williams Gas Pipeline	✓
END USERS:		
Duede, Gary	Arizona Public Service	✓
LDCs:		
Shahan, Mike	Dominion Resources - Peoples Natural Gas	✓
SERVICES:		
Corcoran, Cynthia	BTUWatch.com	✓
Whatley, Pete	Dynegy Marketing and Trade	✓
Young, Randy	Koch Midstream	✓
Heal, George	Proxicom	✓
Stow, Fred	Proxicom	✓
Van Nostrand, Mara	Proxicom	✓
ASSOCIATIONS:		
Miriam Arnaut	AGA	