



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting
December 17, 1998 -- 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

ConEd Offices, New York, New York

FINAL MINUTES

I. Introductory Items

Mr. Bray welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to New York and thanked ConEd for hosting today's meeting and made introductory remarks. Mr. Holbrook reviewed the antitrust guidelines. An additional topic was added to the agenda regarding transferral of requests to other subcommittees (as part of item 6) and a discussion on versioning (after the first administrative item). Scope determinations for new request nos. R98061 through R98088 will be addressed notationally. EII (item 4) proposed standards and Title Transfer Tracking (item 2) will be addressed in reverse order. The modified agenda was adopted unanimously. The calendar for 1999 which was published in the meeting materials erroneously reported the dates for the November 1999 meeting, which is scheduled for November 11 and 12. The minutes of November 19 were modified and unanimously adopted. Roll was called.

Regarding versioning, version 1.4 should be published on July 31, 1999. Y2K issues and recommendations from the Technical Subcommittee should come forward at the next EC meeting, specifically addressing invoicing data sets for Statement of Account and Payment Remittance. The EC will determine whether to publish the Invoicing Standards Manual out of sequence for these data sets (published prior to July 31, all others published on July 31), or determine some other way to make the data sets available. GISB files final versions of ratified standards with the FERC, that are published on July 31 within a version. To help with referencing, it will be made clear in such reports that the final actions will appear in a specific version (version 1.4) by a specific publication date (July 31, 1999).

For a full accounting of the discussion from today's meeting, the transcripts should be ordered from Jane Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting.

II. EII General and Nominations Standards

Mr. Caldwell introduced the standards. The motion was made and seconded to adopt the standards offered both at the EC meeting on November 19 and presented for industry comment due December 14. Mr. Scheel noted his opposition to standard no. s55 regarding alternate views, which would not however detract from his support of the package. Supporting Mr. Scheel's comments, Ms. Scott offered language changes regarding "basic" views and "enhanced" views. After further discussion, the language was amended to:

- s55 Providers of Customer Activities Web sites, at their discretion, may provide alternate views to data and transactions in addition to the GISB basic views (industry common views). The alternate views should not replace GISB basic views and should be offered as separate views, if available. If an alternate view is offered, the GISB basic view

should be the default view and clearly labeled as the GISB basic view. Any alternate ~~or enhanced~~ views must offer the same business result as the basic view and be accessible to all applicable users. The basic views must offer the same business result as the alternate ~~or enhanced~~ views and be accessible to all applicable users.

Ms. Scott also noted her concern with standard no. s57. After discussion the language was modified to:

s57 Validation Messages for nominations submitted should contain ~~at least the same a~~ comparable level of detail for GISB EBB/EDM ~~ands~~ EDI/EDM.

With the above changes, and changes to standard s71 to reflect the minutes of November 20 from the EII task force and the insertion of "on the Form", the motion was adopted unanimously. [Later during the meeting, the motion was made to remove "on the Form" from standard s71.]

III. Request Nos. R97086, R97093, R97108B and R98010

The recommended standard modifications as a result of request no. R97086 were adopted unanimously without change from the language sent out for comment. Mr. Gracey joined the table voting for Mr. Walker. The recommended standard modifications as a result of request no. R97093 were adopted unanimously without change from the language sent out for comment. The recommended standard modifications as a result of request no. R97108B were adopted unanimously without change from the language sent out for comment. The recommended standard modifications as a result of request no. R98010 were adopted unanimously without change from the language sent out for comment.

IV. Title Transfer Standards

As a carry-over of the motions made to adopt the title transfer tracking recommended standards as a package in previous EC meetings, Ms. McVicker gave a brief summary and began the discussion with proposed standard s15:

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.

Ms. Chezar voiced concern that this item was outside GISB's scope because of its impact on rates and a FERC proceeding currently underway. Mr. Keeler commented that rate impacts were not direct and many standards undertaken by GISB have indirect impact on rates. Mr. Lander noted that s15 does not specifically address pooling and the mechanism for implementation is not defined, so it may not involve concerns raised by Ms. Chezar. Mr. Novak noted concerns with these standards as they may apply to GISB Standard No. 1.3.17. After discussion, the language was changed to:

s15 In addition to pooling points, a 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.

After a lunch break and a prolonged break for discussions among segments on language the following was proposed:

s1 At a minimum, the Transportation Service Providers (TSP) should be responsible for accommodating Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) services at all points identified by the TSP as pooling points, where TTT services are requested. In absence of existing pooling points or in addition to existing pooling points where access to TTT activity is not reasonably accessible for supply receipt locations, TSPs should be responsible for accommodating TTT at no less than one location.

with the deletion of s15.

For modifications to existing standard no. 1.3.2, the following language changes were considered:

1.3.2 All Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should support the following standard nomination cycles:

- (i) The Timely Nomination Cycle: 11:30 am for nominations leaving control of the nominating party; 11:45 am for receipt of nominations by the transporter (including from Title Transfer Tracking Service Providers (TTTSPs)); noon to send Quick Response; 3:30 pm for receipt of completed confirmations by transporter from upstream and downstream connected parties; 4:30 pm for receipt of scheduled quantities by shipper and point operator (central clock time on the day prior to flow).
- (ii) The Evening Nomination Cycle: 6:00 pm for nominations leaving control of the nominating party; 6:15 pm for receipt of nominations by the transporter (including from TTTSPs); 6:30 pm to send Quick Response; 9:00 pm for receipt of completed confirmations by transporter from upstream and downstream connected parties; 10:00 pm for Transportation Service Provider to provide scheduled quantities to affected shippers and point operators, and to provide scheduled quantities to bumped parties (notice to bumped parties), (central clock time on the day prior to flow).

Scheduled quantities resulting from an Evening Nomination that does not cause another Service Requester on the subject Transportation Service Provider to receive notice that it is being bumped should be effective at 9:00 a.m. on gas day; and when an Evening Nomination causes another Service Requester on the subject Transportation Service Provider to receive notice that it is being bumped, the scheduled quantities should be effective at 9:00 a.m. on gas day.
- (iii) The Intraday 1 Nomination Cycle: 10:00 am for nominations leaving control of the nominating party; 10:15 am for receipt of nominations by the transporter (including from TTTSPs); 10:30 am to send Quick Response; 1:00 pm for receipt of completed confirmations by transporter from upstream and downstream connected parties; 2:00 pm for Transportation Service Provider to provide scheduled quantities to affected shippers and point operators, and to provide scheduled quantities to bumped parties (notice to bumped parties), (central clock time on the gas day). Scheduled quantities resulting from Intraday 1 Nominations should be effective at 5:00 pm on gas day.
- (iv) The Intraday 2 Nomination Cycle: 5:00 pm for nominations leaving control of the nominating party; 5:15 pm for receipt of nominations by the transporter (including from TTTSPs); 5:30 pm to send Quick Response; 8:00 pm for receipt of completed confirmations by transporter from upstream and downstream connected parties; 9:00 pm for Transportation Service Provider to provide scheduled quantities to affected shippers and point operators (central clock time on the gas day). Scheduled quantities resulting from Intraday 2 Nominations should be effective at 9:00 pm. on gas day. Bumping is not allowed during the Intraday 2 Nomination Cycle.
- (v) For purposes of 1.3.2 ii, iii, and iv, "provide" shall mean, for transmittals pursuant to standards 1.4.x, receipt at the designated site, and for purposes of other forms of transmittal, it shall mean send or post.
- (vi) Model: [As it appears in GISB Standard No. 1.3.2, version 1.3]

Mr. Buccigross reviewed the Information Requirements Subcommittee instructions to be used as guidelines in the development of the instructions for the Technical Implementation portion of the nominations related standards manual for the Title Transfer Tracking standards:

- 1 Where a transaction involves the transfer between an Account Holder (AH) in one Third Party Account Administrator (3PAD) and an AH in another 3PAD, each 3PAD should send a nomination to its respective Transportation Service Provider (TSP) or Welded Operator (WOPR), with whom the 3PAD has a contract, on behalf of the 3PAD(s)' respective AHs, identifying the AH's transaction(s) and delineating it/them at a level of detail no less detailed than the 3PAD1 - AH1 to 3PAD2 - AH2 level. Where a transaction involves the transfer between an AH in a 3PAD and an AH or Service Requester (SR) on that TSP/WOPR with which the 3PAD has a contract, the 3PAD should send a nomination to the TSPs/WOPR on behalf of their AH identifying the AH's transaction(s)

and delineating it/them at a level of detail no less detailed than the 3PAD - AH to TSP/WOPR - AH/SR level.

- 2 When determining the extent to which those quantities nominated by (or on behalf of) one Account Holder1/Service Requester1's (AH1/SR1's) to an Account Holder2/Service Requester2 (AH2/SR2) out of a pooling point match those quantities nominated by (or on behalf of) such AH2/SR2 out of the same point from AH1/SR1, the Transportation Service Provider should compare quantities aggregated at the AH1/SR1 - AH2/SR2 level. When the quantities do not match at this level and this results in a reduction in: a) such AH1/SR1's delivery quantity to AH2/SR2 (because their AH2/SR2 counterparty nominated less receipts), then: 1) the lowest ranked delivery(ies) for such AH1/SR1 to AH2/SR2 should be reduced, and, 2) AH1/SR1's corresponding receipt quantity(ies) should also be reduced commensurably; and when, b) such activity results in a reduction in an AH1/SR1's receipt quantity from AH2/SR2 (because their AH2/SR2 counterparty nominated less deliveries), then: 1) the lowest ranked receipt(s) of such AH1/SR1 from AH2/SR2 should be reduced, and, 2) AH1/SR1's corresponding delivery quantity(ies) should also be reduced commensurably.

To address concerns on the confirmation model, Mr. Walker suggested that instruction 2 be deleted and s2 be modified:

- 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.~~

and s17 be deleted:

- 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.

After discussion it was determined to add an instruction 3 to address the confirmation concerns and not make the changes to s2, not delete s17 and not delete instruction 2:

- 3 The confirmation process should not be addressed in the development of the instructions for the Technical Implementation portion of the nominations related standards manual for the Title Transfer Tracking standards.

A break was taken for segments to caucus. After the break, Ms. Corman highlighted suggestions from the majority of the pipelines: (1) delete s17 and delete the second sentence of s2, (2) do not provide instruction nos. 1 and 2 to the Information Requirements Subcommittee, (3) do not modify GISB Standard No. 1.3.2, (4) modify s1 as shown below, and (5) reach an understanding on implementation timing including not voting on the standards until the Information Requirements Subcommittee has completed its work and provided a fully staffed work product:

- s1 At a minimum, the Transportation Service Providers (TSP) should be responsible for accommodating Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) services at all points identified by the TSP as pooling points, where TTT services are requested. In absence of existing pooling points or an addition to existing pooling points where access to TTT activity is not reasonably accessible for supply ~~receipt locations covered by an OBA receipt locations~~, TSPs should be responsible for accommodating TTT at no less than one location.

After discussion, it was determined to (1) do not modify s2 and s17, (2) maintain instruction nos. 1 and 2 to the Information Requirements Subcommittee, (3) leave the modifications to the language for GISB Standard No. 1.3.2, (4) modify s1 as shown below, and (5) vote the standards today and then send the language to Information Requirements Subcommittee for fully staffed work:

- s1 At a minimum, the Transportation Service Providers (TSP) should be responsible for accommodating Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) services at all points identified by the TSP

as pooling points, where TTT services are requested. In absence of existing pooling points or in addition to existing pooling points where access to TTT activity is not reasonably accessible for supply receipt locations covered by an OBA, TSPs should be responsible for accomodating TTT at no less than one location.

The motion failed by 14 votes in favor, 5 opposed and 3 abstentions.

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the standards with the following changes:

- (1) s18 The effective date for implementation of the TTT standards is the later of June 2000 or eight months following the publication of the TTT standards within the applicable GISB standards manual.
- (2) Delete instructions 1 and 2.

The motion passed with eighteen votes in favor, three abstentions and one vote in opposition.

V. Election of Officers for 1999

Mr. Buccigross and Mr. Novak were elected unanimously to the positions of chair and vice chair respectively of the EC for 1999.

VI. Other Business

Ms. Hess reviewed a list of requests transferred from EII to BPS, Common Codes Subcommittee, Imbalances Subcommittee ad Information Requirements Subcommittee. The motion was made to give these items a normal priority (to be addressed in the normal flow of the agenda). The motion passed unanimously.

At the Board meeting on December 3, Request No. R98086 was highlighted. The Notifications Task Force will be co-chaired by Mr. Hansen and Ms. Corman. The co-chairs will work with the GISB office to schedule the first meeting.

Mr. Walker summarized the BPS/EII chairs call. If it is unanimous that outstanding requests in BPS for nominations and flowing gas topics could be transferred from BPS to EII Task Force should no business practice issues exist. BPS will determine the transfer of requests by a full consensus of the BPS. It will be noticed in the BPS agenda.

VII. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m. The EC meeting on January 21 and 22 is scheduled to be hosted by Colorado Interstate Gas in Colorado Springs. [The meeting date was reduced to January 21 only after the meeting.]

- Attachments:
1. Attendance
 2. Voting Record
 3. EII Standards Language Adopted by the Executive Committee
 4. TTT Standards Language Adopted by the Executive Committee