



**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
Executive Committee Meeting  
October 16, 1997 -- 9:00 a.m. to - 5:30 p.m.**

**The Wyndham Warwick Hotel, Houston, Texas**

**FINAL MINUTES**

**I. Introductory Items**

Mr. Bray welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Houston. New EC members were welcomed. The elections and terms of EC members for 1998 were discussed. Dennis Holbrook was presented with a gavel for his term as EC chair 1994-1995. Mr. Holbrook reviewed the antitrust guidelines. For the agenda, request R97109 was withdrawn and request C96024 was withdrawn by Koch Gateway but resubmitted by TransCapacity. The agenda was adopted. Draft Executive Committee minutes from September 13, 1997 were reviewed and adopted with changes.

**II. Proposed Standards and Interpretations**

The recommendations were taken in a different order than presented in the meeting materials. A roll call of EC members was taken. To avoid confusion on the following minutes:

- The full discussions on each proposed standard and interpretation can be found in the transcripts, which may be ordered from Jane Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting (512-818-9307).
- Please note that the discussion is on the recommendation for a proposed standard or interpretation **NOT** the request. In previous minutes, the process was defined to provide the full requests and recommendations in meeting materials, rather than synthesize or otherwise editorialize them.
- For a further clarification, the title of the request is shown as appears in the request log, and is not necessarily the recommendation. Both the request and the recommendation were provided in the meeting materials and can be accessed separately on the GISB home page.
- If the recommendation is altered, it is noted in the minutes. Otherwise the recommendation on which a vote is taken is the original recommendation as provided in the meeting materials. The recommendation is available on the GISB home page.
- If the recommendation is a recommendation to decline the request, it is noted in the minutes.
- Due to the volume of the recommendations, they can be accessed separately, and are not attached to these minutes -- they were provided as meeting materials and can be accessed from the home page.

Below are the actions taken on the proposed standards and interpretations. The resulting votes are attached. A notational ballot will be sent out to EC members absent to determine the outcome of the vote. The proposed standards language as a result of the votes can be found on the GISB home page, in the Executive Committee area.

**C97014**

For request C97014, Mr. Lander reviewed the recommendation and noted a change in the language from the recommendation presented. As a result of the discussions, the interpretation was modified to:

"A Transportation Service Provider (TSP1) can not require that a Service Requester provide to that TSP1 a DRN belonging to a different Transportation Service Provider (TSP2) in a nomination for service with respect to receipts and/or deliveries on the system operated by TSP1. Nominations to TSP1 should involve TSP1's locations and thus DRNs associated with that TSP1 (as recorded in the PI Database and made available to the industry as the standard source for DRNs). There should be no case where a nomination to or from an interconnect with another Transportation Service Provider (TSP - i.e., TSP2 and/or TSP3) is rejected because that nomination did not contain a DRN for a TSP other than the TSP to whom the request for service(s) was directed.

"With respect to the location Common Code assignment process, it is each TSP, who sends the nominatable points on their system or nominatable under their contracts (i.e., their proprietary points) into PI for a DRN to be assigned. This response specifically does not address the issue of what DRN should be employed in those cases where TSP1's service requesters' contracts with TSP1 obtain rights at locations on the system of another TSP (TSP2)."

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the revised interpretation was called for vote with nineteen affirmative votes and none opposed.

### **C96027**

For request C97027, Mr. Lander presented the recommendation and as a result of the discussions, the recommendation was modified to:

"With respect to the value contained in an Ending Date/Time field of 1) a Request for Confirmation document sent by a Confirmation Requester to a Confirming Party; 2) a Confirmation Response document sent to a Confirmation Requester by a Confirming Party in response to a Request for Confirmation document; or, 3) an unsolicited confirmation response sent by one of the Confirming Parties to another, the receiver of such a document should interpret such Ending Date/Time in the following manner:

"With respect to the Ending Date/Time in a Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response or unsolicited confirmation response document, the absence of a requested or confirmed quantity (as applicable) for a date range beyond the date range received in a document does not imply a requested or confirmed quantity of zero for the future period."

While it was discussed that action on the proposed interpretation be delayed as the interpretation may rely on other recommended standards, the modifications made were sufficient to take a vote for adoption by the EC. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the amended interpretation, with resulting nineteen affirmative votes and none in opposition.

For the same request, four additional business practice standards were proposed by the BPS. On discussion, it was noted that the EC should postpone action on the four standards until after the Intraday Nominations Task Force (ITF) completes its efforts, which could affect and require modifications to these standards. After discussion, a procedural motion was made that:

Action on the four proposed standards should be postponed for EC action and returned to the BPS for streamlining and conforming changes to recent data element changes. until the ITF has completed its work, and the ITF should be made aware of these proposed standards as they may affect its work product. The proposed standards should be reviewed for EC action by the end of the year.

The procedural motion passed with 18 affirmative votes and one vote in opposition.

### **C97002**

For request C97002, Mr. Lander described the request and recommended standard, which would replace standard 1.3.3. During the discussions, several amendments were suggested, but not made. Ms. Gussow asked that a modification be considered to address changes after the end of gas day such as:

In the event that after the end of the gas day changes to the scheduled quantity are made, TSPs should provide a retransmission of the end of the gas day scheduled quantity report to the requester or shipper within one day.

Mr. Lander noted that this issue is currently being considered by the BPS as an outstanding part of request C96027, and should be addressed within three meetings, which was agreeable to Ms. Gussow. Ms. Corman raised concerns that proposed standards and interpretations may address questions other than those specifically noted in the request. The motion was made to adopt the recommended standard with the resulting vote of 18 affirmative votes and one vote in opposition.

#### **C96024**

For request C96024, the proposed standard offered, with conforming changes to replace "Request to Confirm" with "Request for Confirmation":

"In the confirmation process, where a party requesting confirmation (a Confirmation Requester) is not itself a Transportation Service Provider, the location code to be used when sending a Request for Confirmation should be the location code associated with the location where gas will be scheduled by the Transportation Service Provider; and, where a Confirmation Requester is also a Transportation Service Provider; then, as between these confirming parties (the Confirmation Requester and the Confirming Parties), and absent their mutual agreement to the contrary, the location code to be used when sending a Request for Confirmation should be the location code used by the Transportation Service Provider sending the Request for Confirmation."

Mr. Lander described the request and the recommended standard. The motion was made to adopt the recommended standard with conforming changes. The resulting votes were nineteen in favor with no opposition.

#### **R96130**

For request R96130, the recommended change to the transaction type data element to add two code values, was amended for code names and definitions during discussion to:

<u>CODE NAME</u>	<u>DEFINITION</u>
TSP Deficiency Credit	Quantity resulting from the service provider's previous inability to provide full level of contracted firm service
SR Deficiency Credit	Quantity resulting from the service requester's previous unscheduled firm quantity

The motion was made to adopted the amended modification to standard, and the vote was called with seventeen affirmative votes and one vote in opposition.

#### **R97065**

For request R97065, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation with no changes with the resulting nineteen affirmative votes and no opposition.

#### **R97066**

For request R97066, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation with no changes with the resulting nineteen affirmative votes and no opposition.

#### **R97015**

For request R97015, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation with no changes with the resulting nineteen affirmative votes and no opposition.

### **R97052, R97053**

For Requests R97052 and R97053, the motion was made to adopt the joint recommendation as amended for the conditionality of the data element 'Total Surcharges' amended to "Mandatory when Validation Codes regarding the corresponding data element in the UPPD are returned in the UPPD Validation" with the resulting nineteen affirmative votes and no opposition.

### **R97018A, R97018B**

For request R97018, which was split into two parts:

R97018A - Add error code "HPR Exceeded by Nomination" - to indicate where the historical production rate for a meter has been exceeded, and

R97018B - Add error code "Path Invalid for Receipt Nominations" - to indicate where nominators send in a nomination for receipt volume that does not have a valid pooling area path,

a motion was made and seconded to adopt R97108A and R97018B with a modification that the error message for "historical production rate exceeded by nomination" be changed to a warning message. The resulting vote on the amended recommendation failed. A motion was made to accept the original recommendation language for R97018A and R97018B and the resulting vote failed. A motion was made to adopt R97018B to add the error code for "receipt point not valid for pool nominated" with the resulting nineteen affirmative votes.

### **R97025**

For request R97025, a motion was made to adopt the recommendation with no changes, which was to decline the request. In discussion, it was noted by Mr. Hopper that while this request may be declined, further work should be done by the BPS and IR. The motion to accept the recommendation to decline the request received nineteen affirmative votes with no opposition.

### **R97026**

For request R97026, the motion was made to accept the recommendation as written. The resulting vote was nineteen affirmative votes with no opposition.

### **R97038**

For request R97038, the motion was made to adopt the amended recommendation language, deleting the phrase 'at the applicable level' in the three descriptions. The motion on the amended language was voted with nineteen affirmative votes and no opposition.

### **R97040**

For request R97040, the motion as made to adopt the original recommendation with the resulting vote of eighteen affirmative votes and no opposition.

### **R97058A**

For request R97058A, it was noted that this request has not been forwarded through the IR or the TS. The motion was made to adopt the recommendation and forward to the TS. Ms. Corman asked about the interim nature of this proposal -- "should it be placed in the standards manuals in January 1998 and then automatically removed in July 31, 1998?" -- to which she received an affirmative response. The motion was made to postpone action on this request to November EC meeting after IR and TS has reviewed the proposal for possible implications. The procedural motion to postpone for consideration in November passed with 18 votes in favor and one abstention.

### **R97069**

For request R97069, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation as written, with the resulting vote of nineteen affirmative votes and no opposition.

### **R97092**

For request R97092, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation as written, with the resulting vote of nineteen affirmative votes and no opposition.

### **R97095**

For request R97095, the motion was made to adopt the recommendation with the modification to replace the code value definition of 'N/A' for all three codes to 'no definition necessary', with the resulting vote of eighteen affirmative votes and no opposition.

### **III. New Requests**

There are two requests to be considered by the EC for scope determination and triage recommendations on priority and direction to subcommittees: R97112 and R97114.

R97112, "Create a new business practice standard for storage, make-up and pooling nominations to be regarded as stand-alone nominations", the triage recommendation was first presented at the EC meeting in September. At that time the EC determined that the request was within scope. The requester, TransCapacity, was asked to resubmit the request with clarifications that the request does not impact rates. The revised request was presented at the meeting. The original triage recommendation was to send the request to BPS to be addressed in the second round of nominations requests. A motion was made and seconded to revise the priority to immediate and send the request to BPS for immediate address. The requester asked that either the request be addressed immediately or not addressed at all. The vote on the motion was two in favor and sixteen opposed. TransCapacity withdrew request R97112.

R97114, 'Reclassify the usage of the Upload to Pipeline of Prearranged Deal (Bidder Confirmation and Bidder Confirmation Validation) data elements Bid Number and Offer Number from Mandatory to Business Conditional', the motion was made and seconded with eighteen votes in favor of the request being within GISB's scope. The motion was made to adopt the triage recommendation to send the request to BPS for address with the capacity release items. The resulting vote was eighteen in favor and no opposition.

### **IV. October 1, 1997 Board of Directors Meeting & 1998 Annual Plan**

Mr. Holbrook noted that the Board of Directors created a joint Board/Executive Committee task force on governance issues. The group will be meeting until mid November, when a draft report will be prepared to enhance the focus, prioritization, resource application, alignment of intent, and timetable for GISB efforts through the 1998 Annual Plan. One of the items that might be pursued in 1998 is a link with the NERC/EPRI Commercial Business Practices group.

### **V. Adjourn**

The next meeting will be held in November 13 in Washington. There was a motion to adjourn which was seconded and passed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Attachments: 1. Attendance  
2. Voting Record  
3. Standards & Interpretation Language Adopted by the Executive Committee

**Attendance**

	Segment	Present	Member/Alternate
Executive Committee:	END USERS:	✓	Kristine Mespelli
		✓	Diane McVicker
		✗	Lee Smith
		✓	Kelly Daly for Lynette Wilson
		✓	Dona Gussow
	LDCs:	✗	William Boswell
		✗	Darlene Buchholz
		✗	Kirt Kleinman
		✗	Mike Novak
		✓	Gary Beland
	PIPELINES:	✓	Mike Bray
		✓	Dale Davis for Max Feldman
		✓	Paul Love for vacancy
		✓	Shelley Corman for vacancy
		✓	Norm Walker
	PRODUCERS:	✓	Wade Hopper for Jerry Hahn
		✓	Tom Ehinger
		✗	Hugh Roberts
		✓	Paul Keeler
		✓	Bob Wallenhorst
SERVICES:	✓	Carl Caldwell	
	✓	Dave Pfeifer	
	✓	Cheryl Loewen	
	✓	Mark Scheel	
	✓	Keith Sappenfield	

		Members
Observers:	Sandra Barnett	Koch Gateway ✓
	Denise Breeden	El Paso Energy ✓
	Jim Buccigross	TransCapacity ✓
	Julie Dennis	Koch Gateway ✓
	Nancy Fitzgerald	Shell Gas Pipeline ✓
	Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline ✓
	Theresa Hess	Enron - Northern Natural ✓
	Greg Lander	TransCapacity ✓
	Sylvia Munson	Altra Energy Technologies ✓
	Gary Payne	Enron Capital & Trade ✓
	Joyce Phillips	Texas Eastern Transmission ✓
	Lanyard Sledge	East Tennessee Gas Pipeline ✗
	Leigh Spangler	Latitude Technologies ✓
	Kim Van Pelt	Panhandle Eastern Pipelines ✓
	Randall Young	Koch Gateway ✓

Administrative:	Rae McQuade	- Executive Director
	Veronica Thomason	- GISB Staff
	JoAnn Garcia	- GISB Staff - Enron
	Dennis Holbrook	- General Counsel
	Jane Copeland	- Ak/Ret Reporting

Executive Committee Voting Record -- October 16, 1997

PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS <sup>1</sup>	C97 014	C96 027 (1)	C96 027 (2)	C97 002	C96 024	R96 130	R97 065	R97 066	R97 015	R97 052 & R97 053	R97 018 (1)	R97 018 (2)	R97 018 (3)	R97 025	R97 026	R97 038	R97 040	R97 058 A	R97 069	R97 092	R97 095	
MEMBERS																						
EU Kristine Mespelli	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Diane McVicker	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kelly Daly	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dona Gussow	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lee Smith																						
LDC Gary Beland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bill Boswell <sup>2</sup>	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Vacancy																						
Kirt Kleinman																						
Mike Novak																						
PL Mike Bray	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dale Davis	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Paul Love	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Shelley Corman	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Norm Walker	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Wade Hopper	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
PR Tom Ehinger	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Paul Keeler	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bob Wallenhorst	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hugh Roberts																						
SV Carl Caldwell	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dave Pfeifer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cheryl Loewen	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mark Scheel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Keith Sappenfield	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
PASSED (P)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	F	F	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
FAILED (F)																						
UNDETERMINED (U)																						

<sup>1</sup> The recommendations that were amended prior to vote were: C97014, C96027(1), R96130, R97052 and R97053, R97018(1) -- both parts a and b, R97038, R97095  
 The recommendations that were voted on in original form were: C97002, C96024, R97065, R97066, R97015, R97018(2) -- both parts a and b, R97018(3) -- part b only, R97026, R97040, R97069, R97092  
 The recommendation that was voted on as a vote to decline the request was: R97025  
 The recommendations on which a procedural vote was taken were: C96027(2), R97058A

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Boswell provided a notational ballot received after the meeting, the results of which are recorded in this voting tally, although he was not present at the meeting.