



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, Dona Gussow (absent), Paul Keeler (absent), Tammy Hopkins (absent), Mike Novak
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Draft Minutes from the EII Task Force Meeting - July 14, 1999

DATE: July 14, 1999

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
GISB EBB INTERNET IMPLEMENTATION MEETING
MGM Grand Hotel, Las Vegas, Nevada
July 14, 1999
DRAFT MINUTES

I. Administrative

Mr. Caldwell chaired the meeting and welcomed participants. Mr. Buccigross gave the anti-trust advice. Attendees introduced themselves. On the discussion of the agenda, additional requests were added to the agenda - they were posted in advance of the meeting - Request Nos. R99042, R99043 and R99044. There was discussion on if agenda item no. 4 should be addressed first which could cause all active items to be transferred to another venue, possibly the Business Practices Subcommittee. It was determined not to reorder the agenda. The agenda was adopted as revised. The minutes of June 22 were adopted as final with changes identified during the meeting. Transcripts are taken for this meeting, and they can be ordered from Ms. Jane Copeland, Ak/Ret Reporting (361) 882-9037.

II. Requests

R99039 Rev. Submitted by Columbia Gas Transmission

Request: Add additional transaction codes. The additional transaction codes will facilitate and properly classify the transaction during the allocation process. This information is also available to the customers for them to reconcile with the allocation process that was done. The benefits would be the ability to at least identify the steps applied during the allocation process.

Discussion: Mr. Ng described the request and noted that several codes should be added to the Transaction Type data element to support their gas including the paper pooling for that Appalachian pool.

Motion: Transfer the request to Information Requirements Subcommittee.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

R99041 Submitted by Columbia Gas Transmission

Request: Allow multiple Reduction Reasons to be sent on the Scheduled Quantity. The additional reduction reasons should have a usage of MA. (Multiple reasons are not necessary on the Sched Qty for Op or the Confirmation Response.)



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

Currently, Columbia Gas tracks five instances where a reduction can take place. This enhancement would allow Columbia to send all five reductions to its EDI trading partners. Columbia Gas believes this is a benefit to its customers. This information will be provided on the Internet EBB. The enhancement will make EDI comparable to the Internet EBB. For those customers wanting to receive multiple Reduction Reasons, the cost would be minimal. There would be a change to the EDI translator program and to the data storage system. Both could probably be accomplished in less than a day. For those customers not wanting multiple reduction reasons, there would be no cost. The 'RR' identifier could continue to be used. This would allow the customer to receive the one Reduction Reason that they are currently receiving. Columbia Gas sends multiple Reduction Reasons. The first RR is contained in the first occurrence of the SI segment. All five RRs are contained in the second occurrence of the SI segment. This implementation allows a customer to ignore the second SI segment and still receive the first RR. Since this exists, Columbia's trading partners have developed a method for processing the multiple reduction reasons. All of the Reduction Reasons have a code qualifier of 'RR.' Since the qualifier is not unique, the trading partner is probably only receiving one RR.

Abstract

Columbia uses multiple steps in order to develop the scheduled quantity. Three of these steps may result in a reduction to the nominated quantity. The three steps are:

1. LDC Capacity - The LDC is unable to receive the quantity of gas nominated on Columbia's pipeline. The reduction takes place at Columbia's delivery location. The LDC would enter a Reduction Reason to explain the cut.
2. Capacity Allocation - The pipeline reduces quantities based on the capacity of the pipe. A reduction may occur at the receipt location and/or the delivery location. Columbia stores two Reduction Reasons for Capacity Allocation (receipt and delivery).
3. Confirmation - Quantities are reduced during the confirmation process. The reduction may occur at the receipt location and/or the delivery location. Columbia stores two Reduction Reasons for Confirmations (receipt and delivery). Columbia needs 5 Reduction Reasons in order to send this information to its trading partners.

The five types of reduction are:

1. LDC Capacity Cut
2. Capacity Allocation - Receipt
3. Capacity Allocation - Delivery
4. Confirmation - Receipt
5. Confirmation - Delivery

These five reduction types are not code values. This is a request for additional data elements or a method of sending the current data element multiple times.

Columbia would like to propose the following solutions

1. Add new data elements.

This is not a desired solution to the problem. For Columbia, five data elements would be needed. Other pipelines may need additional data elements causing the data dictionary to contain redundant data elements.



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

-
2. Have the Technical Subcommittee define and explain how multiple reduction reasons can be sent.

This is the desired solution. Technically, Reduction Reason could work similar to Validation Code. EDI users expect all Validation Codes to be provided even though there is only one data element. Reduction Reason should work the same way.

If it is necessary to give each occurrence of the Reduction Reason a unique qualifier, this could be done. Occurrence one could be 'RR,' which is the existing qualifier. The others could be 'R1,' 'R2,' etc. This could be explained without adding data elements.

Keeping 'RR' allows the current implementation to work. Therefore, no change is required by companies not wanting to use multiple Reduction Reasons. Adding R1, R2, etc. allows companies wanting to send/accept multiple Reduction Reasons a way to do it.

Discussion: In response to questions, Mr. Ng asked for time to confer with Mr. Stodola. After further discussion, he asked that the request be sent to the Information Requirements Subcommittee. It was noted that multiple reduction reason codes are helpful in understanding why volumes are cut. Ms. Davis reviewed the history of reduction reason codes and its usage as a mandatory field as a result of the intraday nominations business practices. The sending of multiple reduction reason codes, other than the one that is mandatory, should be on a mutually agreeable basis. The request does not specifically address if the reasons should be linked to specific portions of the reduction quantity, and if the intent of the request is to link portions of the reduction with separate reasons, a revised request should be submitted.

Motion: Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate the mutually agreeable business practice of sending multiple (at least five) occurrences of reduction reasons on the Scheduled Quantity document.

Action: The motion passed with one in opposition.

R99042 Submitted by Williams Gas Pipeline

Request: Williams Gas Pipeline requests that a new data element called "Bidder's Contingency Terms" be added to the Bid Upload, the Bid Download, and other Capacity Release datasets where the Bidder's Contingency Indicator is used. The new data element is defined as "a description of the contingencies applicable to the bid." The data element would be a text field that would be required whenever the Bidder's Contingency Indicator indicated that the bidder had specified a contingency with respect to the bid. When this request is satisfied, the Capacity Release datasets will allow the bidder to specify the contingencies that are a part of the bid. The bidder contingencies will then be communicated to parties who request bid downloads.

Motion: Instruct the Information Requirements Subcommittee to modify the capacity release data sets to accommodate the business practice of allowing the bidding party to indicate to the TSP what the bidder's contingency terms are and allowing the TSP to communicate this information in the bid download. This business practice would be business conditional in the Bid Upload and conditional in the Bid Download based on whether the information is present



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

and processed by the TSP in the Bid Upload.

Discussion: Mr. Keisler explained the request and responded to questions.

Action: Passed unanimously.

R99043 Submitted by Williams Gas Pipeline

Request: Williams Gas Pipeline requests that a new data element called "Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Code" be added to the Offer Upload (5.4.7) and the Offer Download (5.4.1) datasets. The new data element is defined as follows: "Indicates whether the Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage will be used in the evaluation of bids." Code values of "Yes" and "No" should be available. The field should have usage code Business Conditional (BC) in the Offer Upload and Conditional (C) in the Offer Download, with the condition of "Mandatory when present and processed in the Offer Upload." This field could be required whenever the Bid Evaluation Method Indicator indicates that the method to be used is "Net Revenue" or "Present Value." If the Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Code is "Yes," bidders should be aware that the Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage will be used in the determination of the winning bid. If the Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Code is "No," bidders should be aware that the Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage will not be used in the determination of the winning bid.

Motion: Instruct the Information Requirements Subcommittee to modify the Offer Upload, GISB Standard No. 5.4.7, and the Offer Download, GISB Standard No. 5.4.1, to accommodate the business practice of allowing the offering party to communicate to the TSP whether the minimum volumetric commitment percentage should be used in the evaluation of bids. This business practice would be business condition in the Offer Upload and condition in the Offer Download based on whether the information is present and processed in the Offer Upload.

Discussion: Mr. Keisler explained the request and responded to questions.

Action: Passed unanimously.

R99044 Submitted by Williams Gas Pipeline

Request: Williams Gas Pipeline requests that the Transaction Type "Backhaul" be added to the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, Shipper Imbalance, Transportation/Sales Invoice, and other documents where the Transaction Type appears. The "Backhaul" Transaction Type is defined as "movement of gas from a point on the pipeline to a point that is upstream on the pipeline." This Transaction Type is particularly useful on a non-pathed pipeline. Since the receipt and delivery points are not paired on a single transaction, the haul type is not identifiable from the transaction. Therefore, the requested Transaction Type is needed to tell whether to charge standard rates or backhaul rates.

Motion: Transfer Request No. R99044 to the Information Requirements Subcommittee.

Discussion: Mr. Keisler explained the request and because the request was to add codes to an existing data element and did not create a new business practice or amend an existing one, it was recommended to send the request directly to the



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

Information Requirements Subcommittee.

Action: Passed unanimously.

III. Work Paper From Dynegy

Mr. Scheel described the work paper where the proposed standard is outlined:

- 4.3.X For the subcategories of Capacity, the first column headings in the Content Area should be Effective Date/Time, Location, Location Name or Location Zone, Location Purpose, Operating Capacity, Location Scheduled Quantity, when applicable, Quantity Available and IT Indicator, when applicable.

There was discussion that this request is linked to a request from Tennessee Gas Pipeline, Request No. R99024, which currently resides in Information Requirements Subcommittee but has not yet been addressed. Further discussion centered on if this work paper should be addressed in conjunction with Request No. R99024, and the timing of the implementation of the two work efforts. If the efforts are addressed separately, it is conceivable that they could be implemented out of sync, in separate published versions of the standards. If the two efforts are worked on together by the Information Requirements Subcommittee, they would be presented on one recommendation so that the timing of implementation would be in sync. It was noted that the abbreviations used in the joint EII/BPS (June 23, 1999) meeting regarding this work paper were abbreviations during the discussion, not necessarily to be used as abbreviations in the EDM/EBB implementations.

Motion: Transfer the following standard to Information Requirements Subcommittee to be included in the recommendation on Request No. R99024:

- 4.3.X For the subcategories of Capacity, the first column headings in the Content Area should be Effective Date/Time, Location, Location Name or Location Zone, Location Purpose, Operating Capacity, Location Scheduled Quantity, when applicable, Quantity Available and IT Indicator, when applicable.

As an instruction, the data element names listed in the above standard would be subject to and worked in conjunction with Request No. R99024 so that conforming changes are made if necessary.

Action: Passed unanimously.

IV. Procedures For Handling Other EII Requests and Review of the 1999 EII Calendar

Mr. Caldwell reviewed the topic of whether the EII Subcommittee should continue or if all requests should be processed through the Triage group. Ms. Van Pelt noted that there are still outstanding items for the EII Subcommittee to evaluate what ANSI data elements exist that do not have corresponding GISB data elements. The work on this item should not come before the EII Subcommittee before September, which would require an EII meeting. Others noted that EII may continue on an as needed basis - calling meetings or conference calls as work demands. Mr. Novak and Ms. Scott noted that we should acknowledge the milestone of addressing the standards for developing web sites and recommend disbanding the EII Task Force. Others noted that EII Subcommittee can continue, but the requests would be processed through the Triage group.

Mr. Spangler made the following motion which was seconded to:

- Recommend to the Executive Committee that the EII task force meet as required to respond



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 triaged requests to implement standardized business processes on customer activities/informational postings web sites.

During discussion on the above motion, others noted that we should declare a victory and all new requests go through the normal triage process. It was also offered that the EII Subcommittee could continue with the limited purpose of supporting efforts completed so far, addressing requests that were inadvertently omitted during the original process, and to respond to questions as other groups act on the standards transferred from EII to them. A possible date for transitioning to another group such as Business Practices Subcommittee could be considered, such as the date for implementation of these standards by the industry. The above motion passed with 10 votes in support and five votes against.

V. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 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

VI. Attendees Present on the Sign In Sheet¹

Name	Company	Address	Voting Attendee	GISB Member
PIPELINES:				
Dennis LaTour	ANR	dennis.latour@coastalcorp.com	No	Yes
Marcy McCain	Texas Eastern	mlmccain@duke-energy.com	Yes	Yes
C. Aschbrenner	CIG	clancy.aschbrenner@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes
Michael Ng	Columbia Gas	mng@columbiaenergygroup.com	Yes	Yes
Brent Phelps	Panhandle Eastern	bwphelps@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Phyllis Kelly-Knight	Southern Natural Gas	phyllis_kelly-knight@sonat.com	Yes	Yes
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	graceym@epenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Theresa Hess	Enron - Transwestern	thess@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway		Yes	Yes
Jon Keeler	Great Lakes Gas	jkeeler@gigt.com	Yes	Yes
Prince McDougal	Southern Natural Gas		No	Yes
Kim Van Pelt	Trunkline		Yes	Yes
Jim Keisler	Transco		Yes	No
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes	Yes
Kurt Link	Williston Basin	linkkl@wbip.com	Yes	Yes
LDCs:				
Mike Novak	National Fuel Gas Distribution	novakm@natfuel.com	Yes	Yes
PRODUCERS:				
T. Hartmann	Exxon		Yes	Yes
Joe Wiley	Marathon Oil	jmwiley@marathonoil.com	Yes	Yes
SERVICES:				
Randy Young	Koch Midstream	young0r@kochind.com	Yes	Yes
Donna Scott	Enron Administrative Corp.	dscott2@ect.enron.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
Carl Caldwell	CGI Group	cpcaldwe@aol.com	Yes	Yes

¹ Mr. Hartmann, Mr. Scheel, Ms. Van Pelt and Mr. McDougal were present at the meeting, but did not sign in on the sign-in sheets.