



# 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:** EBB Internet Implementation (EII) Task Force Chairs: Carl Caldwell (absent), Dona Gussow (absent), Paul Keeler (absent), Tammy Hopkins, Mike Novak  
 Posting for Interested Industry Participants

**FROM:** Rae McQuade, Executive Director

**RE:** Final Minutes from the EII Task Force Meeting – June 22, 1999

**DATE:** June 24, 1999

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**  
**GISB EBB INTERNET IMPLEMENTATION MEETING**  
**El Paso Energy Offices, Travis Place, Houston, Texas**  
**June 22, 1999**  
**FINAL MINUTES**

## I. Administrative

Mr. Novak and Ms. Hopkins chaired the meeting and welcomed participants. Mr. Buccigross gave the anti-trust advice. Attendees introduced themselves. The format of the sign-in sheet has changed to reflect GISB's privacy policy. On the discussion of the agenda, Request No. R99041 and the Dynegy work paper received today will be addressed after the existing work papers and requests. The inclusion on the agenda of a specific work paper from Dynegy as provided during the meeting was contested. Its inclusion on the agenda required a balanced vote to adopt the agenda. The agenda was adopted through the following balanced vote:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipelines	Totals
For	0	0	7	1	1	9
Against	0	0	0	0	6	6
Total	0	0	7	1	7	15
Wtg. For	0.000	0	2.000	1.000	0.286	3.286
Wtg. Against	0.000	0	0	0	1.714	1.714

The minutes of April 6 and June 4 were adopted as final with changes identified during the meeting. Transcripts are taken for this meeting, and they can be ordered from Ak/Ret Reporting (361) 882-9037.

## II. Dynegy Work Paper

The work paper was described by Mr. Scheel, after which he motioned that the following proposed standard be adopted by GISB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Whatley:

Motion: Adopt as a standard:  
 The Content Area of the nominations browser display should provide access to the GISB Entity Common Code Cross Reference Table, in order to populate this data during the transaction entry or selection.



# 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

Discussion: Mr. Young observed that there might be several code/name pairs that are identical but may not represent the same company because the addresses are different. This difference would not be reflected in the cross-reference. In discussion, Mr. Scheel noted that for it to be more useful as a lookup table, it should also be sorted by name alphabetically. Mr. Bianchi noted that the cross-reference could impede efficiency and look-up tables may already be present and provided by the TSP. After discussion, Ms. Munson offered a revision to the motion, which was accepted by Mr. Scheel and Mr. Whatley:

Rev. Motion: Adopt as a standard:

Transportation Service Providers should provide a lookup list of GISB Entity Common Codes available from the nominations browser display in order to populate this data during transaction entry or selection. This lookup list may be part of the display or it may link to another location containing the list.

Discussion: Ms. Davis noted that this could be easily accomplished through a bookmark to the appropriate GISB page, which holds the cross-reference. Mr. Bianchi noted that there might be security issues and technical issues on the products which can be used as described in both the original motion and the revised motion. Ms. Munson added that for the upstream and downstream entities that are not typically validated, the cross-reference might not provide the information needed. Ms. Van Pelt further noted that it is premature for the EII task force to support proposed standards that have not been tested to see if implementation is technically feasible. Mr. Keisler asked that the motion be amended to remove unclear information, which was further amended during the discussion, which was accepted by Mr. Scheel and Mr. Whatley:

Rev. Motion: Adopt as a standard:

Transportation Service Providers (TSP) should provide a lookup list of that TSP's subset of GISB Entity Common Codes available from the nominations browser. This lookup list may be part of the display or it may link to another location containing the list.

Discussion: Mr. Bianchi noted that only those common codes used by the TSP should be provided in the lookup. He noted that "GISB" in the motion is too broad. Ms. Van Pelt agreed.

A point was made the seconder, Mr. Whatley was that this proposal was intend to ensure EDM/EBB users that there would be a minimum requirement for TSPs to provide an entity lookup capability from their web pages. A number of the TSPs present assured the motion maker that they were already providing an entity lookup.

Action: The motion failed as a standard through the following vote:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipelines	Totals
For	0	0	4	1	0	5
Against	0	0	2	0	8	10
Total	0	0	6	1	8	15
Wtg. For	0.000	0	1.333	1.000	0.000	2.333
Wtg. Against	0.000	0	.667	0	2.000	2.667

The second part of the work paper was described by Mr. Scheel, which is related to back-ups. He motioned that the following proposed standard be adopted by GISB. The motion



# 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

was seconded by Mr. Whatley:

**Motion:** Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should allow telephone or facsimile communications in the event of a failure of electronic communication equipment, Internet connections, or other similar emergency event.

**Discussion:** In discussion, it was noted that the procedure of pipelines accepting telephone or faxes as a backup procedure would apply regardless of whose failure. Comments were made that this proposed standard is too broad, and is more appropriate within a tariff. A related principle passed by this task force is:

p15 Trading partners should maintain redundant connections to the public Internet for GISB EDM Web sites. These redundant connections should be topographically diverse (duality of) paths to minimize the probability of a single point of failure. [Ratified January 23, 1999]

Several examples were given where the Internet may have delays in response, which could be interpreted as a failure in Internet connection. Ms. Davis noted that this issue would not be reflected in version 1.4 - so, it is an issue that will be addressed in each pipeline's tariff. Mr. Young noted that the four nomination cycles provide flexibility so that this standard may not be required, and reduced staff may not be sufficient to support manual activities for phoned in nominations or faxed nominations. Ms. Hopkins related experience with the Enron pipelines where the Internet has proved to be a reliable communication mechanism for nominations. As such, Mr. Whatley and Mr. Hartmann suggested changes to the motion which were supported by Mr. Scheel:

**Rev. Motion:** Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should allow an alternate means of communication in the event of a failure of GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism or other similar emergency event.

**Discussion:** It was observed by Ms. Unruh that this language is very similar to the language in tariffs, so some noted that a standard is not needed. Mr. Bianchi added that the language could be interpreted such that the pipelines would be in an adverse position regarding meeting the deadlines specified in the nomination timelines. He added that manual processing of the nominations would present a serious problem in the nominations deadline, and it is unclear why the pipeline be held responsible for backups for all electronic communication failures, regardless of who was at fault. Mr. Aschbrenner added "the devil in the details" provides most of the problems in implementing a standard represented in the motion. In response to comments about the lack of timing specifications in the language, Mr. Hartmann noted that it was never his intent that this emergency would occur after the deadline. Mr. Spangler summarized the discussion as "use common sense" and did not see a need for the standard. Mr. Scheel responded that it would be more efficient for the industry to create a standard rather than have to address the issue on a tariff by tariff basis.

**Action:** The motion failed as a standard through the following vote:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipelines	Totals
For	0	0	3	1	0	3
Against	0	0	2	0	11	14
Total	0	0	8	1	11	19
Wtg. For	0.000	0	1.200	1.000	0.000	2.200



## 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

---

Wtg. Against    0.000            0            .800            0            2.000    2.800

---

### III. Requests

**R98034**        Submitted by ANR.

Request:        Proposed Standard:

Data Dictionary data elements should accommodate Entity maintenance. If a Transportation Service Provider chooses to support Entity Maintenance, the GISB standard datasets should accommodate it.

Initiate standards, data elements, code values and implementation guides to allow customer access to directly add, change and delete various entity information including addresses, contacts, phone numbers and business uses. In addition, entity requests for new accounts and security access changes should be included. However, entity name and common code change requests must be coordinated with the Transportation Service Provider and should not directly update the Transportation Service Provider system.

The dataset(s) for this standard should be mutually agreed to and should be available for EDI/EDM, EBB/EDM and/or FF/EDM. The use of proposed standard or enhancement is to accommodate ANR's survey item No. 28 for Entity and account maintenance. This standard will allow entities, or their agents, to update their own Entity information on the Transportation Service Provider's system. The data elements that could be updated include address, contacts, phone numbers, E-mail addresses, business uses and request new accounts, security access changes, etc.

The Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement are to allow customers to update specified entity information without intervention from the Transportation Service Provider. ANR has found that allowing the customer to update the nomination, invoices, capacity release and contract addresses/contacts leaves the responsibility with the customer to maintain the communication path. It has been very successful in the last year.

Motion:        Ms. LeCureaux made the motion that a sense of the room vote be taken on:

Entity maintenance (the updating of addresses, contacts, phone numbers, etc., as described in Request No. R98034) is not well suited for EDI/EDM or FF/EDM processing. Transportation Service Providers (TSP) should be able to provide this process via EBB/EDM in a manner that is most appropriate for the TSP's business practices.

Discussion:    Ms. Munson and Mr. Buccigross supported the motion although they noted that it was because this is an unusual occurrence.

Action:        The sense of the room vote was taken and passed unanimously. As such the action of this group is to decline request no. R98034.

Motion:        Delete Information Requirements Subcommittee instruction no. IR23, and proposed standard S72, which has not been adopted by the Executive Committee, in conjunction with the previous motion.

Action:        The motion passed unanimously.



# 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

**R99038:** Submitted by Koch Gateway

**Description:**

Koch Gateway Pipeline Company requests that a data element of "Maximum Rate Indicator" be added to the Nomination dataset with a usage of BC. This field would be added at the same level as the Bid Transportation Rate.

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Maximum Rate Indicator (Max Rate Ind)	Indicates that the Service Requester has determined that the requested transportation will be billed at the max. rate or at a lesser rate.	TSDG	BC	BC	Used where a Transportation Service Provider requires clarity on the rate for proper scheduling.

This field would be used by Service Requesters moving gas under Interruptible transportation service. Since rate may be a key component of the scheduling process, it is imperative that the TSP know within the nomination process that a Service Requestor is moving gas at the maximum rate. This indicator lets the Service Requestor provide a clear indication that the maximum rate will apply. This field is currently used within our Proprietary Nomination Product. All Service Requesters are using this product at this time.

**Motion:** Provide instructions to the Information Requirements Subcommittee to provide a maximum rate indicator on the Nominations dataset with a usage of BC.

**Discussion:** After discussion, it was noted that the Bid Up Indicator or Bid Transportation Rate might work. This element is requested to ensure clarity between the TSP and the scheduled party that they were going to pay max. rate, which was not the purpose for the Bid Up Indicator. Ms. Munson offered an alternative motion, which was not accepted at the time it was offered:

"Send this request to IR to evaluate the request including the existing rates in the nominations data set and the bid up indicator to see if other data elements are available to accommodate the business practice."

Four scenarios were described by Ms. Munson that could result from an investigation of this request: bump by increments to max rate, bump directly to max rate, bump by increments to a negotiated rate, bump directly to a negotiated rate.

**Rev Motion:** After discussion, Ms. Unruh modified her motion to:

**IR54:** Instruct the Information Requirements Subcommittee to modify the nominations data set to accommodate the business practice of a Service Requester indicating to a TSP whether the maximum rate will apply. This business practice would be business conditional.

**Discussion:** There was further discussion on the need to include this information in other nominations related data sets. Also, there was other discussion on whether the information could be defaulted to a negative response, when a value is not supplied.



## 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

---

Action: The motion passed through the following vote:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipelines	Totals
For	0	0	3	0	9	12
Against	1	0	2	0	0	3
Total	1	0	5	0	9	15
Wtg. For	0.000	0	1.200	0	2.000	3.200
Wtg. Against	1.000	0	.800	0	0.000	1.800

#### IV. Next Meeting

The remaining requests, the calendar for the rest of the year for the EII meetings, the remaining work papers, and requests expected from Williams Gas Pipeline will be placed on the agenda in Las Vegas on July 14.

#### V. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 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

## VII. Attendees

Name	Company	Address	Voting Attendee	GISB Member
<b>PIPELINES:</b>				
S. LeCureaux	ANR	stephanie.lecureaux@coastalcorp.com	No	Yes
Joe Bianchi	ANR	joseph.bianchi#coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes
C. Aschbrenner	CIG	clancy.aschbrenner@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes
Michael Ng	Columbia Gas	mng@columbiaenergygroup.com	Yes	Yes
Michael Hansen	Columbia Gulf	mrhansen@columbiaenergygroup.com	Yes	Yes
Charlie Bass	El Paso Energy - Midwestern	bassc@epenergy.com	Yes	NO
Mark Gracey	El Paso Energy - Tennessee Gas	graceym@epenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Theresa Hess	Enron - Transwestern	thess@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway	unruhj@kochind.com	Yes	Yes
Sandra Barnett	Koch Gateway	barnetts@kochind.com	No	Yes
Gene Fava	Great Lakes Gas Transmission	efava@glgt.com	Yes	Yes
Jim Keisler	Transco		Yes	NO
Kim Van Pelt	CMS - Trunkline	kvanpelt@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes	Yes
Kelly Wachter	Williston Basin	wachkw@wbip.com	Yes	Yes
<b>LDCs:</b>				
Mike Shahan	Peoples Natural Gas	mshahan@cngt.cng.com	Yes	Yes
Mike Novak	National Fuel Gas Distribution	novakm@natfuel.com	Yes	Yes
<b>PRODUCERS:</b>				
T. Hartmann	Exxon		Yes	Yes
<b>SERVICES:</b>				
Randy Young	Koch Midstream	young0r@kochind.com	Yes	Yes
Sylvia Munson	Altra Energy	sylviam@altranet.com	Yes	Yes
Pete Whatley	Dynegy Marketing & Trade	pcwh@dynegy.com	Yes	Yes
Mark Scheel	Dynegy Inc	masc@dynegy.com	Yes	Yes
Gary Payne	Enron Capital and Trade	gpayne@ect.enron.com	Yes	Yes
Leigh Spangler	Latitude Technology	lspangler@latitudetech.net	Yes	Yes
Jim Buccigross	National Registry	legaljb@tcapserv.com	Yes	Yes
Rick Santerre	TransEnergy	rsanterre@transenergy.com	Yes	Yes
George Heal	Proxicom	gheal@proxicom.com	Yes	Yes