



**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**October 15, 1998 -- 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.**  
**Texaco Offices, 1111 Bagby, Houston, Texas**

**FINAL MINUTES**

**I. Introductory Items**

Mr. Bray welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Houston and made introductory remarks. Mr. Holbrook reviewed the antitrust guidelines. The agenda was adopted through a unanimous vote adding a review of request no. R96044 to the agenda. The draft minutes of August 20 were modified and adopted through a unanimous vote. Ms. McQuade and Mr. Bray thanked those volunteers and staff who helped in planning and working to bring about a successful annual meeting. Ms. McQuade, Mr. Bray and Mr. Holbrook provided an update of the Board meeting held on September 30. Ms. McQuade and Mr. Holbrook updated the group on recent meetings regarding common codes with D&B and the RFP recently issued for the DRN Number. Correspondence was sent to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the expectations that GISB should resolve D-U-N-S® Number issues for implementation by April 30, 1999, either by working with D&B or through other GISB sanctioned alternatives. An announcement of the three day class and the new contracts class was highlighted by Ms. McQuade and Mr. Holbrook. For a full accounting of the discussion from today's meeting, the transcripts should be ordered from Jane Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting.

**II. Task Force Recommended Standards**

Ms. Van Pelt represented the recommended standards changes for **Request No. R98021**, "Modify the implementation of the CTT segment within the Shipper Imbalance and the Transportation/Sales Invoice. In these transactions, the CTT should be the accumulation of the number of ITI segments." EDM error code is needed for EDI translation errors." There was no discussion. The task force recommended standards changes passed unanimously with 23 votes.

Ms. Van Pelt represented the recommended minor corrections and clarifications regarding **Request No. R96044**, an errata to GISB Standard No. 1.4.7 to insert information that was inadvertently left out. There was no discussion. The task force recommended standards changes passed unanimously with 23 votes.

A brief break was taken for the presenters of the title transfer tracking standards to prepare their materials. After the break two announcements were made. By the end of October, the version 1.3 standards including the trading partner agreement will be filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Ms. Scott was announced as the chair of the Technical Subcommittee replacing Mr. Wallenhorst. Mr. Wallenhorst was thanked for his efforts as chair of the Technical Subcommittee. Ms. McVicker was announced as the end user segment chair of the Business Practices Subcommittee and the Triage Group. Ms. Mespelli was thanked for her efforts on the Executive Committee, Business Practices Subcommittee and Triage group.

Ms. McVicker reviewed the events that led to the task force recommended standards in front of the Executive Committee for adoption. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the task force

recommended standards and standard revisions as a package, after an EC member review of the task force recommended standards. The task force recommended standards were then reviewed, beginning with the definitions. Any suggested changes to the task force recommended definition standards as a result of the discussion, supported by the motioner and seconder, are reflected below:

- D1 "Title", if not otherwise addressed in the transporter's contract or tariff, is the term used to identify the ownership of gas.
- D2 Title Transfer is the change of title to gas between parties at a location.
- D3 Title Transfer Tracking is the process of accounting for the progression of title changes from party to party that does not effect a physical transfer of the gas.
- D4 A Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider is a party conducting the title transfer tracking activity.
- D5 A Third Party Account Administrator is a Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider other than the Transportation Service Provider.
- D6 An Account Holder is the party using the services of a Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider (TTTSP) under a contract or other arrangement with that TTTSP.
- D7 A title transfer Nomination is a nomination line item requesting the service of Title Transfer Tracking and is sent by an Account Holder to a Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider.

The business practice standards designated as standards were discussed and suggested changes to the task force recommended standards as a result of the discussion, supported by the motioner and seconder, are reflected below:

- S1 The Transportation Service Providers (TSP) should be responsible for accommodating Title Transfer Tracking services at all points identified by the TSP as pooling points, where title transfer tracking services are requested.
- S2 The Title Transfer Tracking services should be supported by means of the nominations, quick responses and scheduled quantities processes. At the Transportation Service Provider's election, the confirmation process may also be utilized with Title Transfer Tracking Service Providers within the TSP's system.
- S3 deleted and combined with S4
- S4 All Third Party Account Administrators (3PADS) wishing to provide title transfer tracking services shall so notify the Transportation Service Provider (TSP). All coordination between 3PADS and a TSP should be performed under a contract between the parties. Where the TSP is a Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider on its system, tariff provisions (terms, conditions and rates) or general terms and conditions of the TSP, may take the place of a contract.
- S5 Upon reasonable request of the Third Party Account Administrator (3PAD), Transportation Service Providers should provide the 3PAD with one of the following for conducting title transfer tracking (TTT) activity:
  - 1) location code(s);
  - 2) contract identifier(s) used in the exchange of transactional data; or
  - 3) both one and two above.In any event TTT activity is always performed at or with respect to a location (physical or logical).
- S6 All Title Transfer Tracking services should be performed under a contract or other arrangement between the Account Holder and their Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider.
- P1 [Previously part of S6]  
All Title Transfer Tracking Service Providers should offer their Title Transfer Tracking services without undue discrimination.

- S7 A Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should communicate with any Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider (TTTSP) that performs according to the applicable contract between the TTTSP and the TSP, and that operates in accordance with those GISB standards applicable to Title Transfer Tracking.
- S8 Title Transfer Tracking should be conducted using existing applicable data sets.
- S9 A Transportation Service Provider (TSP) may operate in a manner such that allocated quantities will equal scheduled quantities for gas quantities into and out of a Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider (TTTSP) from or to a pool(s). If a TSP operates in such a manner, then the TSP should not be required to accept Pre-determined Allocations (PDAs) for those transactions nor separately provide, or transmit, Allocations to parties to such transactions.
- Where the allocated quantities with respect to a TTTSP are different than the scheduled quantities provided by the TSP to the TTTSP, for the same period, then the TSP should provide to the TTTSP Allocations (GISB Standard No. 2.4.3) for the quantities into the TTTSP. In addition, the TSP should either accept:
- (a) Allocations from the TTTSP, or,
  - (b) PDAs from the TTTSP.
- Such information should be delineated at the level of the nomination line items provided by the TTTSP to the TSP for the purpose of allocating quantities out of the TTTSP.
- P2 [Previously S10]
- Title transfers into and/or out of a Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider should be able to occur regardless of the service class of any related transportation.

Discussion will begin at the next meeting with:

- S11 Absent ranking information provided by the Third Party Account Administrator and absent a contrary mutual agreement to proceed otherwise, where transactions related to Third Party Account Administrator (3PAD) activities are not balanced at the end of any confirmation cycle, transactions entering the 3PAD (receipt) or leaving the 3PAD (delivery), whichever is higher, should be reduced prorata to match the total of the transactions on the other side of the 3PAD.

The remaining scheduled dates for TTT TF meetings will be released.

### **III. Triage Recommendations**

The recommendations from the Triage Group were reviewed, found within scope by the Executive Committee, and the following actions were taken through a unanimous vote unless otherwise noted:

- R98029** Submitted by: TransCapacity  
Request: Change the usage and definition of the Transaction Status Code "AE" in the 855 Quick Response transaction set.  
Send to: Send to the Business Practices Subcommittee  
Priority: To be addressed with the nominations requests in the normal schedule.
- R98030** Submitted by: Texaco  
Request: Modify the GISB Transportation/Sales Invoice Implementation Guide Standard 3.4.1 to include a sample sales invoice and X12 transaction for the sales invoice and add transaction type codes.  
Send to: Send to the Business Practices Subcommittee  
Priority: To be addressed with the invoicing requests in the normal schedule.
- R98037** Submitted by: Columbia Energy

Request: Add a non-textual data element that will tie the offers of a Not-Stand-alone Offer together. This data element is needed in the UPPD data sets and the data sets being created for Non-Prearranged Deals.

Send To: Send to the Business Practices Subcommittee

Priority: Elevated priority -- to be addressed out of sequence, following the Flowing Gas requests and Request No. R97022, but before addressing the Invoicing Requests. Should the request not be addressed by the Business Practices Subcommittee in one meeting or less, then the request should revert to the normal schedule and be addressed with the capacity release items.

Vote: 15 in favor and 4 opposed.

Ms. Scott asked that the Executive Committee at a later meeting consider procedures for handling non-controversial requests that can be addressed through committee in a short amount of time. Request Nos. **R98031** and **R98046** were found within scope by the Executive Committee and forwarded to the EBB Internet Implementation Task Force to be addressed in the normal flow of the agenda.

#### **IV. EII Task Force Plan**

Mr. Caldwell brought the committee up to date on the activities and asked if the committee would want to address standards piecemeal based on functionality. The committee is to consider grouping, global standards will go out for comment on October 16 and be considered by the EC for vote in November. The timeline will be considered by the EII task force in its meeting on October 16, as the nominations date has probably been missed if the nominations work is to bring the work to the EC fully staffed.

#### **V. Common Codes Progress Report**

The common codes discussion was covered earlier in the meeting during the introductions.

#### **VI. 1998 & 1999 Annual Plans**

[Item deferred to November.]

#### **VII. Other Business Items**

The calendar for 1999 will be finalized in October. It was recommended that the EC meet every other month for two days. Comments on suggested changes should be forwarded to the GISB office by the end of the month. Considerations will be given to cities where companies will host the meetings and where airfares and travel costs can be minimized. The officers will work with the GISB office to finalize the schedule which will be posted by October 31.

#### **VIII. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m. The EC meeting in November is scheduled for November 19 to be hosted by Questar in Salt Lake City.

Attachments: 1. Attendance  
2. Voting Record