



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting
November 19, 1998 -- 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Questar Offices, Salt Lake City, Utah

FINAL MINUTES

I. Introductory Items

Mr. Bray welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Salt Lake City and thanked Questar for hosting a week of GISB meetings, and made introductory remarks. The attendees introduced themselves. Mr. Holbrook reviewed the antitrust guidelines. The announcement of elections for EC members for terms beginning January 31, 1999 and ending December 31, 2001 was made. Mr. Bray read a letter provided by Mr. Hahn regarding his resignation from Texaco and GISB and thanked Mr. Hahn for his leadership. Mr. Bray also noted that it is his intention not to run as chair for 1999. He asked that tickets be formed of chairs and vice-chairs, and Ms. McQuade will send out notice of request for candidate teams shortly. The election will be held at the December EC meeting. Mr. Bray also noted that during December, after both the Board and EC meetings, an Order No. 587-I progress report will be sent to the FERC.

The agenda was adopted unanimously with changes to revise item nos. 5 and 6, and to add an item to shorten the recommended standards industry comment window for those items to be sent out for comment in November for EC vote in December. The calendar for the EC for 1999 and the proposed three month calendar of EC subcommittee and task force meetings was reviewed. It was noted that if the EC only used one of the two days scheduled, it would use Thursday and Friday would be a "free" day, not to be used for further scheduling of meetings. Chairs of the subcommittees and task forces were asked to contact the GISB office in the next few days if the calendar required changes. The EC meeting in November was changed to November 11/12, and the EII meetings were moved to Tuesdays/Wednesdays from the Mondays/Tuesdays noted on the calendars. The minutes were 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. Proposed Interpretations and EII General Standards

For Request No. **C98008**, after minor corrections, the recommended interpretation was adopted unanimously:

C98008 Request

When a Transportation Service Provider has posted a particular Offer, Bid, or Award (as identified by its "number") and then any one or more of the values, contained within: a) the quantity(ies) data elements, b) rate data elements, c) any of the date/time elements (i.e., effective begin/end dates, award dates, bidding period dates, etc.), d) location data elements, or e) data elements containing codes for the parties to that Offer, Bid or Award, is different in a subsequent posting of information on that Offer, Bid, or Award,

shouldn't the value of the ANSI ASC X12 transaction set purpose code data element be the code associated with "change" (Offer) or "re-submission" (Award)?

Interpretation Text:

It is misleading and unclear to communicate information that was previously posted, and has been subsequently revised and re-posted, with a code value that states that the information is "original". Once a capacity release transaction has been posted, where there is a change to any value contained in particular offer, bid, or award, and the revised transaction has been posted, the value of the ANSI ASC X12 transaction set purpose code data element should denote that the data set contains a revision(s).

In the GISB Capacity Release Related Implementation Guides, the following values are available to populate the ANSI ASC X12 transaction set purpose code data element :

Data Set	Segment	ANSI ASC X12 Code Value	Description
Offer (5.4.1)	BQT	00	Original
Offer (5.4.1)	BQT	04	Change
Bid (5.4.2)	BQR	00	Original
Bid (5.4.2)	BQR	04	Change
Award (5.4.3)	BQR	06	Confirmation
Award (5.4.3)	BQR	15	Re-submission

For Request No. **C98009** after discussion the recommended interpretation was adopted unanimously with no changes:

C98009 Request

Request clarification related to the use of only central clock time values in the date/time data elements for all Capacity Release related datasets (e.g. Offers, Bids, Awards, Upload to Pipeline of Prearranged Deal, UPPD Validation, Bidder Confirmation, Final Disposition, Operational Available, Unsubscribed FT, and Critical Notices). Should all time values be provided as central clock time?

Interpretation Text:

Yes, all values contained within date/time data elements should be central clock time values. GISB Standards version 1.2 et. seq. removed the time zone qualifier for all date/time data elements. GISB Standard No. 5.3.2 expresses that the time deadlines in Capacity Release data sets should be in central clock time. GISB business standards universally express that central clock time should be used. There are no longer any time zone qualifiers within the datasets and therefore only time values which are central clock time should be present. In addition, GISB Standard No. 1.3.1 expresses that the standard time for gas day should be expressed in central clock time (i.e., 9 a.m. - 9 a.m. Central Clock Time).

Mr. Caldwell described the process used and the reasons for bringing forward the **EII general standards** as recommended by the EII Task Force (EII) at this time. No comments were filed as a result of the industry comment period. Mr. Hartmann made the motion which was seconded to discuss these general or foundational standards in today's meeting but postpone any vote to adopt until the December meeting when they can be voted as a package along with the nominations related standards. There were comments made by several members both to the benefits of delaying the vote to December versus the disadvantages of delaying the vote. The standards were characterized as basic infrastructure. The motion failed through a simple majority vote of 7 to 14.

The motion was made to adopt the EII recommended standards with changes as requested both during the meeting and through a work paper presented. After discussion, the motion to adopt the standards failed through a "17/2" vote of 17 to 5 -- the motion failed to get at least two affirmative votes from the producer segment. After a break, a straw vote was taken to note support for the general

standards as modified today, but the standards will be voted officially in conjunction with the nominations standards in December. The straw vote passed unanimously.

The timeline modifications were discussed by Mr. Caldwell, as shown below with modifications (excerpted from the 10/16/98 EII minutes and modified during the discussion):

Function	EII *	EC	Member Approval	Implementation Following Member Approval **
General	11/04/1998	12/17/1998	01/1999	
Nominations	11/20/1998	12/17/1998	01/1999	8 months
Flowing Gas	12/18/1998	01/22/1999	02/1999	9 months
Invoicing	03/1999	05/21/1999	06/1999	10 months
Capacity Release	05/1999	07/16/1999	08/1999	11 months
Contracts	11/1999	12/1999	01/2000	9 months

However no implementation should be between November 2, 1999 and March 31, 2000 for Y2K and seasonal considerations. If the date falls within this range, implementation would occur in April 2000.

* The dates represent the completion of standards related to existing datasets. The dates do not include the completion of requests submitted for additional data elements, code values or new transaction sets necessary to complete the full transition to the Internet of the functions listed. Those items not standardized by the completion date should be implemented as an interim using proposed standard [S21]. This a change from what had been previously included in the dates for completion on the original EII plan.

** The effective date for starting the calculation on implementation following member approval would occur at the beginning of the month of the ratification. An example would be for nominations, ratification would conclude January 17, 1999 and implementation would occur September 1, 1999.

The motion was made to adopt the above timeline and passed unanimously as a procedural vote. The motion was made to adopt a shortened comment window of three weeks. The procedural motion was adopted unanimously. Ms. Hess noted that the Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR) has 13 requests through the normal triage process and 16 EII requests on their agenda. She asked if the EC would prefer prioritizing these requests or would they rely on IR to define the priority in which the requests are addressed. Outstanding back log of items not from EII should be acted upon first, and EII requests to IR should be reviewed for priority at the December 1999 EC meeting. A motion was made and adopted unanimously through a procedural vote for comprehensive list of outstanding items in IR, both the original 13 items and the EII items to be prepared and forwarded to the EC prior to the December meeting. The IR chairs will provide some estimate of time for the original 13 items. During the December meeting, the EC will determine if priorities should be defined.

III. New Requests

The motion was made to find Request Nos. R98047 to R98062 within scope. In response to questions, it was noted that pre-approved bidder list should be reflected in Request No. R98049, and TransCapacity will resubmit the request. For Request No. R98058, regarding voluntary GRI payments, the direction of flow of the information seems to be backward and to place the information only on the invoice is limiting -- it should reflect the payment remittance as the shipper decides the amount. Discussion returned to Request No. R98049. Concern was raised on the credit status of the requester as specified in Request No. R98049. After discussion, the submitter withdrew Request No. R98049. Due to lack for time to review the Request No. R98061 to R98062 will be considered at a later time. The motion was modified to find Request Nos. R98047 to R98060 within scope, excluding R98058. R98058 was voted on separately as follows and R98049 was withdrawn as shown above. The motion passed

unanimously. The motion was made to forward Request No. R98058 to IR with normal priority, which passed unanimously.

IV. Common Codes

For the common location code, Board members Ms. McCartney and Ms. Laird are reviewing the six proposals for Common Code Assignor for common location codes that were forwarded as a result of the RFP distributed. A set of questions were forwarded to some of the proposal submitters to put all of the proposals on a comparative basis and the proposals will be reviewed again by them on November 20. The decision should be made shortly.

For the common business entity code, Board members Mr. Lander and Mr. Mucci are working to resolve the issues surrounding the D&B association of codes with names through a central repository. There are several short term solutions available and all are being considered. The group is also pursuing long term solutions. The complication is the negotiation with D&B regarding the costs to be assessed to either the data providers for data cleanup or to the data users for access. This is considered a very high priority for resolution by the Board. A letter was sent to the FERC regarding information on the status of our work with Dun & Bradstreet, which was considered by the FERC as they reviewed and extended several waivers. GISB will be filing an update status report with the FERC in January regarding this matter, at the FERC's request.

VI. Cross Contracts Ranking

Ms. Scott reviewed the plan and answered questions. The Cross Contracts Ranking Subcommittee (XKR) expects to bring standards forward to the EC in May. After EC adoption of business practice standards, work will progress through IR and the Technical Subcommittee for technical implementation of the standards. XKR will not disband in May, but will be available for questions as work progress through these subcommittees. XKR should be fully addressed through all committees by the end of 1999. The EC voted unanimously to support the plan as presented and discussed.

V. 1999 Annual Plan

Several suggested changes were made to the 1999 Annual Plan which will be forwarded to the Board of Directors (see attached). The changes reflect completion date changes for EII as addressed previously in the minutes, XKR as addressed above, and inclusion of two items that will not be completed as envisioned by the end of 1998 (Allocation Grid and Critical Notices). The suggested changes and the plan were endorsed unanimously by the EC as a recommendation to the Board.

VIII. Title Transfer Tracking

Ms. McVicker and Mr. Buccigross continued the discussion from the previous meeting on title transfer tracking recommendations. Below is the language discussed and amended at the meeting. The previous meeting minutes note the standards language for recommended definitions D1 through D7, principles P1 and P2, and standards S1 through S9.

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 pro rata to match the total of the transactions on the other side of the 3PAD.

S12 Where a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) has decided to offer Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) service by means of an arrangement (including an agreement) with a party which will act as the TSP's designated party, and regardless of communication methodology between Account Holders and such designated party, the TSP should, upon request, identify the Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider(s) (TTTSPs) at a location which have established active TTT arrangements with the TSP. The relevant information to be provided should include the name of each TTTSP, the ID code for each

TTTSP used by the TSP, the contract number for each TTTSP assigned by the TSP (where applicable), the location code(s) for each TTTSP assigned by the TSP (where applicable), and the location code(s) nominatable to the TSP for transportation service to or from the location associated with each TTTSP. If, in the future, the common code for locations central repository includes listing of TTTSPs by location, the requirements of this standard may be met.

S13 A party to a transaction should nominate, or otherwise communicate in a mutually agreeable manner, the identity of their transaction counterparty along with the applicable, associated nominations-related information to the appropriate Confirming Party or Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider (TTTSP). Failure to so act can result in the failure of the subject transaction to be communicated to the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) and scheduled by the TSP. A Confirming Party may communicate with its party and/or the immediate counterparty as to the existence and nature of a failure to communicate a transaction on the part of the applicable party. A TTTSP may communicate with its Account Holder(s) (AHs) and/or its AH(s)' immediate counterparty(ies) as to the existence and nature of a failure to communicate a transaction on the part of the applicable party.

S14 All references to the sending or receiving of transmittals by a party are intended to include the sending or receiving of such transmittals by such party's authorized agent.

Several language alternatives were identified but not considered final language for S15. Discussion on S15 was tabled as a result of the inability of the committee to support any single set of language. The alternatives considered were:

- At locations where OBAs exist, but where Service Requesters do not have commercially reasonable access to Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) activity with respect to that location, Transportation Service Providers should, upon request, enable TTT activity.
- Where pre-existing pooling points or locations which support Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) activity do not exist or are not accessible, Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should, upon request, establish pooling points (logical or physical) where OBAs exist, or establish accounts, for the purpose of enabling TTT activity.
- At locations (logical or physical) where an OBA is in effect and where Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) services do not exist, Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should upon request, establish these locations for the purpose of enabling TTT activity.
- At locations (logical or physical) where an OBA is in effect and where Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) services do not exist, Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should upon request, establish pooling points at, or with respect to, these locations for the purpose of enabling TTT activity.
- Where pre-existing pooling points supporting Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) activity do not exist or are not accessible, Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should, upon request establish pooling locations at or with respect to these locations (logical or physical) for the purpose of enabling TTT activity. At locations (logical or physical) where an OBA is in effect and where Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) services do not exist, Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should upon request, enable TTT activity at these locations.
- Where pre-existing pooling points supporting Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) activity do not exist or are not accessible, Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should, upon request establish pooling locations at or with respect to these locations for the purpose of enabling TTT activity. TSPs may restrict availability of such pooling points to those points where an OBA is in effect. Further, TSPs may non-discriminatorily restrict such pooling points to system receipt points/zones or system delivery points/zones so long as transportation access to such pooling points is generally equivalent.

Discussion then returned to the recommendations and modifications to the language:

S16 With respect to Title Transfer Tracking activity, when a reduction on a party's delivery side occurs at a location, and the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) does not keep

the party whole, the TSP should pass the reduction to the appropriately ranked receipt transaction. When a reduction on a party's receipt side occurs at a location, and the TSP does not keep the party whole, the TSP should pass the reduction to the appropriately ranked delivery transaction.

S17 Where a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) determines to employ the confirmation process in its interactions with a Title Transfer Tracking Service Provider (TTTSP) including a TTTSP acting as the TSP's agent, if any, then the TSP should also offer to employ with similarly situated TTTSPs, and may at its discretion require that other TTTSPs employ, the confirmation process in addition to the nomination on behalf of process for the purpose of coordinating activities at the TSP's locations with respect to Title Transfer Tracking.

1.3.2 The changes in the timeline were withdrawn as part of the package of standards.

S15 A Transportation Service Provider should, upon request, enable TTT activity at a location where an OBA exists, unless access to TTT activity is reasonably available at a relatively proximate alternate location.

The recommended standards will be discussed and voted on at the December EC meeting. They will be placed first on the agenda after normal administrative items.

VIII. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m. The EC meeting in December is scheduled for December 17 to be hosted by ConEd in New York.

Attachments: 1. Attendance
2. Voting Record
3. Title Transfer Tracking Recommended Standards Language as of October 16, 1998
4. Recommended 1999 Annual Plan
5. Recommended Standards Reviewed by the EC from the EII Task Force