



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

November 2, 1998

TO: GISB Members, Posting on the Web Page for Interested Industry Participants
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director
RE: Final EBB Internet Implementation Task Force Meeting Minutes - November 2 - 4, 1998

November 2, 1998

I. Administrative

The meeting opened at 8:30 a.m. Mr. Caldwell opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees. He thanked the host, Duke Energy, and Ms. Yarbrough covered housekeeping items. Mr. Hahn gave the antitrust advice. Attendees introduced themselves. The agenda was adopted with the following changes: the item regarding "Processing Function Abbreviations" was moved after the Future Technology Task Force, two requests were added as submitted by TransCanada (R98051 and R98052) and four requests were added as submitted by TransCapacity (R98046 to R98050) for those requests specific to nominations. On November 4 two items were added which will be addressed by the end of the day: presentation to the EC on November 19 and adoption of clean-up language changes to recommended standards. The draft red-lined minutes were adopted with no further changes.

II. Processing Function Abbreviations

Ms. Langston reviewed the following proposed standard and Mr. Tsucalas explained how some of the processing functions should work.

75 With regard to processing functions on Customer Activities Web sites, the following standard nomenclature should be used when the associated function is supported by the Transportation SP. Service Provider (TSP). TSPs may also support additional processing functions.

Processing Function	Nomenclature
Create a new line item for data entry in the Matrix	New
Copy existing data on a screen or window	Copy
Delete the current line item from the Matrix, the screen or the window prior to Submit	Delete
Back out of a screen or window without executing the process which would cause the loss of all updates since the last Submit	Cancel
Print application data	Print
Send record/records from the matrix to TSP for processing	Submit
Sort displayed records based on specified criteria	Sort
Retrieve information from the TSP based on specified criteria	Retrieve
Post a line item from the form to the Matrix as a change to the current line item in the matrix prior to Submit	Change
Clear fields on the Form	Clear
Post a line item from the Form to the Matrix as a new record	Add
Provide information regarding current page or function	Help



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

Processing Function	Nomenclature
Filter displayed records based on specified criteria	Filter

Vote: The motion to adopt item no. 75 as a standard passed unanimously.

III. Future Technology Task Force Recommendations

Ms. Croley reviewed the proposed standards for Client Firewall Requirements for Service Provider EDM Implementations:

76 Principle:

Transportation Service Provider EDM implementations should minimize the number of outbound ports required to be opened on the client-side firewall.

77 Standard:

Transportation Service Providers should be limited to the GISB approved list of available TCP ports and UDP ports for EDM implementations included in the appendix in the Electronic Delivery Mechanism Related Standards manual under Client Firewall Requirements for Service Provider EDM Implementations.

78 To be placed in the Electronic Delivery Mechanism Related Standards manual as implementation guidelines:

Client Firewall Requirements for Service Provider EDM Implementations

FTTF recommendations include the potential modifications needed in the client-side firewall to allow for communications with the various service providers' EDM implementations.

The following is a list of allowable TCP ports available for use by a Service Provider. Upon request, the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should indicate to their trading partners which specific ports they will require to be opened to conduct electronic communication.

Allowable TCP Ports (not UDP ports):

HTTP	80, 5713, 6112, 6304, 8674, 7403
SSL	443
ICA	1494
RMI(Java)	1099-1100
Java Telnet	31415
TCP Optional	8001-8020**

Allowable UDP Ports (not TCP ports):

Secure ICA	1604
------------	------

There are other technologies available that will require additional ports to be opened, such as FTP, Telnet, and SMTP. If and when GISB approves such technologies, FTTF will modify this list of allowable ports accordingly.

The client-side firewall implementation and client browser settings should permit the downloading and installation of GISB approved plug-ins and modules. Please refer to the GISB defined Minimum Technical Characteristics for Accessing Customer Activities Web Sites for the listing of plug-ins and modules.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

These guidelines will be reviewed and updated by the Future Technology Task Force, at a minimum, by the spring of each year and presented to the GISB Executive Committee for adoption by the June meeting of that group.

** The reservation of 20 optional ports was to provide room for implementations such as DCE, IOP, and load balancing implementations. TSPs should endeavor to minimize the usage of these ports.

Ms. Scott asked that the following proposed standard also be considered, and amendments were made:

79. Standard

TSP EDM implementations should not require any inbound ports to be opened on the client-side firewall.

Vote: The above standards (item nos. 77 and 79), principle (item no. 76) and implementation guide text (item no. 78) were adopted unanimously.

Ms. Croley reviewed the proposed standards from the Future Technology Task Force regarding the Flat File/EDM model, both for batch processing and interactive processing. She recommended two definitions (item nos. 80 and 81), two new standards (item nos. 82 and 83) and a change to existing EII recommendation (recommended standard S34) for security, one new standard for protocol (item no. 84), and three clean-up items (GISB Standard Nos. 4.3.8, 4.3.2 and 4.3.9). Further changes may be needed to other standards as outlined in the Future Technology Task Force work paper and Ms. Van Pelt, Mr. Tsucalas and Ms. Croley will work on suggestions to the GISB standards language off-line. The proposed standards from the Future Technology Task Force are:

80. Definition

"Batch Flat File" is the term used within GISB FF/EDM to describe the automated computer to computer transfer of flat files.

81. Definition

"Interactive Flat File" is the term used within GISB FF/EDM to describe the transfer of flat files using an interactive browser.

82. Standard

For Interactive Flat File EDM, 40-bit Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) encryption should be used. Where possible, 128-bit SSL encryption is strongly recommended.

83. Standard

For Interactive Flat File EDM, access should be protected by HTTP Basic Authentication.

S34 Revised Recommended Standard:

In the course of our review of potential conflicts with existing EII standards on security with what we would consider for Interactive Flat File EDM, we recommend that EII Standard S34 be changed to remove the words "using 40-bit encryption", so that the revised standard would read: "Access to the customer Activities Web Site should be protected by HTTP Basic Authentication or similar logon/password mechanism(s). A Customer Activities Web site should typically require a single logon/password pair for each user session."

4.3.8 Revised GISB Standard:



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

Correct standard 4.3.8 to insert the word "be" before the word "HTTP" in the first sentence, so that the revised standard would read: "The minimum acceptable protocol should be HTTP. All sending and receiving parties should be capable of sending and receiving using HTTP."

4.3.2 Revised GISB Standard:

Correct standard 4.3.2 to replace the word "designed" with "designated", so that the revised standard would read: "On time stamping, data leaves control of the originator by the same time (deadline), regardless of mechanism (3rd party service provider time stamp is acceptable) and 15 minutes of communication time should be available to allow accumulation of all transactions to the pipeline. A standard network protocol (TCP/IP) should be in service for direct connect to the pipeline designated site by 4/1/97."

4.3.9 Revised GISB Standard:

Lead the standard with the phrase with "For EDI/EDM and FF/EDM, ...", so that the revised standard would read: "For EDI/EDM and FF/EDM, there is a time stamp (HTTP Time-stamp) that designates the time that a file is received at the designated site. The receiving party should generate a time-stamp upon successful receipt of the complete file and send as an immediate response to the sending party. The time-stamp should be generated by the Common Gateway Interface (CGI) of the receiving party, prior to further processing by the CGI."

Vote: The above standards (item nos. 82 and 83), definitions (item nos. 80 and 81) and revisions (item no. S34, GISB Standard Nos. 4.3.8, 4.3.2 and 4.3.9) were adopted unanimously.

Ms. Croley then requested that the following clean-up item be addressed:

D4 Revised Recommended Definition:

Eliminate the phrase "computer-to-computer" so that the revised recommended definition would read: "'GISB FF/EDM' is the term used to describe a standardized flat file electronic data interchange of information in files as mapped from the x.4.z GISB standards. GISB FF/EDM is communicated between trading partners over the Internet using the GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism."

Vote: The above revision to recommended definition D4 was adopted unanimously.

IV. Data Groupings

Ms. Hess reviewed the recommended changes to the information requirement standards (1.4.x) from the Information Requirements Subcommittee regarding nomination related GISB standards. The data sets are not included in these meeting minutes due to their size. Any changes to the submitted work papers regarding the data sets are noted.

84 Nomination Quick Response (1.4.2)

Vote: The above Information Requirements Subcommittee recommended changes to GISB Standard 1.4.2 for groupings and usage inclusions for EBB, EDI and FF were adopted unanimously. (12)

85 Request for Confirmation (1.4.3)

In the materials provided, for the data element Transaction Identifier - the grouping was changed from SLDG to BEDG for all model types.

In the materials provided, for the data element Confirmation Tracking Identifier - the grouping was changed from N/A to TSDG for all model types.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

-
- The business process and practices in the implementation guide should be updated for the use of Confirmation Tracking Identifier.
- Vote: The above Information Requirements Subcommittee recommended changes to GISB Standard 1.4.3 for groupings and usage inclusions for EBB, EDI and FF were adopted unanimously. (13)
- 86 Confirmation Response (1.4.4)
- In the materials provided, for the data element Transaction Identifier - the grouping was changed from SLDG to BEDG for all model types.
- In the materials provided, for the data element Confirmation Tracking Identifier - the grouping was changed from N/A to TSDG for all model types.
- Vote: The above Information Requirements Subcommittee recommended changes to GISB Standard 1.4.4 for groupings and usage inclusions for EBB, EDI and FF were adopted unanimously. (14)
- 87 Confirmation Response Quick Response (1.4.7)
- In the materials provided, for the data element Transaction Identifier - the grouping was changed from SLDG to BEDG for all model types.
- In the materials provided, for the data element Transaction Status Data - the grouping was changed from SLDG to BEDG for all model types.
- In the materials provided, for the data element Confirmation Tracking Identifier - the grouping was changed from N/A to TSDG for all model types.
- Vote: The above Information Requirements Subcommittee recommended changes to GISB Standard 1.4.7 for groupings and usage inclusions for EBB, EDI and FF were adopted unanimously. (17)
- 88 Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5)
- The data grouping RecDG should be changed to TSDG on all elements in this data set.
- The data grouping DeIDG should be changed to TSDG on all elements in this data set.
- In the materials provided for the data element Nominator's Tracking ID, the grouping was changed from NA to TSDG.
- In the materials provided for the data element Statement Date Time, the grouping was changed from SLDG to BEDG.
- Vote: In two separate votes, the above Information Requirements Subcommittee recommended changes to GISB Standard 1.4.5 for groupings and usage inclusions for EBB, EDI and FF were adopted unanimously. (15)
- 89 Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6)
- In the materials provided, for the data element Confirmation Tracking Identifier - the grouping was changed from N/A to TSDG for all model types.
- In the materials provided, for the data element Statement Date Time the grouping was changed from SLDG to BEDG.
- Vote: The above Information Requirements Subcommittee recommended changes to GISB Standard 1.4.6 for groupings and usage inclusions for EBB, EDI and FF were adopted unanimously. (16)
- 90 Nominator's Tracking ID in 1.4.1 to be changed with conforming change to TSDG.
- 91 Nominator's Tracking ID in 1.4.2 to be changed with conforming change to TSDG.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

Vote: Passes unanimously.

- 92 Transaction Status Data in 1.4.2 changed to BEDG.

Vote: Passes unanimously.

After discussion, the task force offered the following which carried unanimously. The Information Requirements Subcommittee is undertaking the definition of usages for EBBs and Flat Files:

- IR1 EII requested that Information Requirements Subcommittee give consideration to the usage codes of the Tracking ID data elements in the nominations related data sets such that they can be used but not mandated on EBBs.

V. Additional Data Grouping Recommendations

Mr. Hahn read a statement from the GISB producer segment regarding the need for ordering because the level of standardization in the Form area is not enough to achieve the goal of "common look and feel." Mr. Hahn noted that the producer group could not support the general standards without further standards being presented to address ordering and "common look and feel." The statement will be posted as it is received electronically.

Mr. Shahan reviewed his posted work paper on alternate and basic views. The motion was made and seconded to adopt the following standard, which was changed during the discussion:

- 93 Providers of Customer Activities Web sites, at their discretion, may provide alternate views to data and transactions in addition to the GISB basic views. The alternate views should not replace GISB basic views and should be offered as separate views if available. If alternate views are offered, the GISB basic views should be the default views 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.

Vote: The proposed standard passed with the following vote:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	2	2	0	0
Services	4	1	4	1
Producers	0	0	2	2
Pipelines	17	1.62	4	0.38
TOTAL	24	5.62	10	3.38

Mr. Scheel reviewed his work papers, including the following proposed standards which may have been modified during the discussion:

- 94 The content area of the nominations browser display should provide access to a list or query of receipt and delivery point location names/common codes from which to pick in order to populate this data during transaction entry or selection.

Vote: The motion carried as a standard.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

- 95 The non-standardized data that is to be entered for the nomination transaction should be ordered last after all the standardized data that is to be entered for the nomination transaction in the Form.
Vote: Withdrawn
- 96 Validation messages for nominations submitted should contain at least the same level of detail for EBB/EDM as EDI/EDM.
Vote: The motion carried unanimously as a standard.
Ms. Eckels reviewed her work paper and proposed the following standard:
97. Data fields used to populate or control population of other fields can be placed before the files to be populated. If these data elements apply to the entire content area they can appear in the heading.
Vote: Deferred until after survey items.

VI. Other Items

Mr. Hahn asked that existing recommendations be reviewed in light of the recommended standard that was adopted today -- item no. 93. After discussion, it was noted that all recommended standards apply to the basic view, no standards are applicable to the enhanced view, and special clean-up should not be necessary.

VII Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The agenda items not addressed will be carried forward to the next meeting agenda on November 3 and 4 in Houston.

November 3, 1998

I. **Administrative**

The meeting opened at 8:30 a.m. Mr. Caldwell opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees. He thanked the host, Duke Energy. Ms. McQuade gave the antitrust advice. Attendees introduced themselves.

II. **Additional Data Grouping Recommendations**

Ms. Tupper began her review of her work paper which was delayed at the request of Mr. Hahn so that the proposed ordering standard no. 72 could be reviewed, (excerpted from the October 1 & 2 meeting minutes). Mr. Hahn reviewed the ordering standards and the producer segment's need for it. He motioned that the following standards language, which incorporated any agreed upon changes, be adopted:

72C. Standard



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

Fields in the groups on the Form in the Customer Activities Web sites should appear in the following order:

Receipt Group:

1. Receipt Location
2. Upstream Contract Identifier
3. Upstream Identifier Code
4. Receipt Quantity
5. Receipt Rank (Priority)
6. Upstream Rank (Priority)
7. Upstream Package ID

Vote: The motion passed through the following vote:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	2	2	0	0
Services	4	2	0	0
Producers	2	2	0	0
Pipelines	9	0.86	12	1.14
TOTAL	18	7.86	12	1.14

72D Standard

Fields in the groups on the Form in the Customer Activities Web sites should appear in the following order:

Delivery Group:

1. Delivery Location
2. Downstream Contract Identifier
3. Downstream Identifier Code
4. Delivered Quantity
5. Delivery Rank (Priority)
6. Downstream Rank (Priority)
7. Downstream Package ID

Vote: The motion passed through the following vote:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	2	2	0	0
Services	3	2	0	0
Producers	2	2	0	0
Pipelines	7	0.82	10	1.18
TOTAL	15	7.82	10	1.18

72E Standard

Fields in the groups on the Form in the Customer Activities Web sites should appear in the following order:



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
 PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
 HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

Transaction Specific Group:

1. Service Provider's Activity Code
2. Transaction Type
3. Package ID
4. Associated Contract
5. Bid Transportation Rate
6. Capacity Type Indicator
7. Deal Type
8. Nominator's Tracking ID

Vote: The motion passed through the following vote:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	2	2	0	0
Services	3	2	0	0
Producers	2	2	0	0
Pipelines	8	0.84	11	1.16
TOTAL	16	7.84	11	1.16

98. Each data element which has been submitted for standardization in the GISB process should follow the GISB ordered data elements in the Form within a data group selected by the Transportation Service Provider.

Vote: The motion passed through the following vote:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	2	2	0	0
Services	5	2	0	0
Producers	2	2	0	0
Pipelines	7	0.78	11	1.22
TOTAL	17	7.78	11	1.22

Ms. Tupper returned to her work paper following Mr. Hahn's proposed standards. She reviewed the set of proposed standards following, and motioned that they be adopted as standards. The language voted upon is shown following:

99 Standard

On the confirmation data entry screen, the data groups should be organized in logical groupings as defined in the Data Dictionary. The initial data element should be:

Data Group	Initial Element
Business Entity	Confirmation Requester
Contracts	Confirmation Service Contract
Dates	Beginning Date
Location	Location



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
 PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
 HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

For the Transaction Specific data group, either the Service Requester information or Upstream/Downstream information will be the initial elements, based on the business practices of the Confirmation Requester.

Vote: The motion passed through the following vote:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	2	2	0	0
Services	9	2	0	0
Producers	0	0	2	2
Pipelines	22	2	0	0
TOTAL	34	7	2	2

100 Standard

On the confirmation data entry screen, one of the following confirmation views should be supported:

- Location View
- Contract View

On the confirmation data entry screen for the location view, the data groups should appear in the following order:

- Business Entity
- Dates
- Location
- Contracts
- Transaction Specific

On the confirmation data entry screen for the contract view, the data groups should appear in the following order:

- Business Entity
- Contracts
- Dates
- Location
- Transaction Specific

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

101 Modification to Proposed Standard S8

The sub-categories and the labels for the category of Nominations should appear, if applicable, in the Navigational Area as follows:

- Nomination
- Confirmation
- Scheduled Quantity

Links supporting additional sub-categories will follow these links. This does not preclude a further breakdown within each sub-category from being listed in the Navigational Area.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

102 Standard



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

On the Scheduled Quantity Web page, data should be organized in logical groupings. The logical groupings of data are specified in the scheduled quantity data dictionary.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Eckels reviewed the proposed standard deferred from yesterday's meeting and made a motion that it be adopted as a standard:

97. Standard

Data fields used to populate or control population of other fields can be placed before the fields to be populated. If these data elements apply to the entire content area they can appear in the header.

Vote: The motion passed through the following vote:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	3	2	0	0
Services	3	1.5	1	0.5
Producers	0	0	0	0
Pipelines	19	2	0	0
TOTAL	26	6.5	1	0.5

Mr. Spangler motioned that recommended standard no. 40 be changed to modify the initial data element for the Transaction Specific Data Group to be the Service Provider's Activity Code:

S40 On the nominations data entry screen, data should be organized in logical groupings as defined in the Data Dictionary. The initial data element should be:

<u>DATA GROUP</u>	<u>INITIAL ELEMENT</u>
Business Entity	Transportation Service Provider
Contracts	Service Requester Contract
Date	Beginning Date
Receipt	Receipt Location
Delivery	Delivery Location
Transaction Specific	Service Provider's Activity Code

If the initial element is not present, the next supported data element becomes the initial element for that data group.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

After discussion and several changes, Mr. Hahn proposed the following standard and made a motion that it be accepted.

103 Transportation Service Providers should provide a clear visual cue between data fields that differentiate fields which are used to populate or control population of other fields and those that do not.

Vote: Withdrawn



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

Mr. Hahn and Mr. Shahan suggested an amendment to recommended standard no. 97:

- 97 Data fields used to populate or control population of other fields can be placed before the fields to be populated. If these data elements apply to the entire content area they can appear in the header. If the TSP elects to place such data fields in an order outside of the standardized order then the labels for these data fields should be distinguishable through visual cues from labels of data elements in the standardized order.

Vote: The motion passed through the following vote:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	3	2	0	0
Services	7	2	0	0
Producers	2	2	0	0
Pipelines	7	1	7	1
TOTAL	20	8	7	1

Ms. Scott motioned that the following standard be adopted, which would add a data element to the nomination data set:

- 72F On the Customer Activities Web site, the fuel quantity should be displayed on the Form between the Receipt Data Group and the Delivery Data Group.

Action: The motion was withdrawn after discussion of standard nos. 32, 47 and 52 -- where derivable fields can be displayed on the EBB screen.

III Requests

R98032 R98032 was withdrawn by ANR but it may be resubmitted at a future date.

R98035 R98035 was revised and distributed during the meeting. Ms. LeCureaux reviewed the request, which asks for a new data element "Pre-limit Quantity" to be added to the confirmation transactions. She explained how pre-limit quantities would be used and made the motion that the following standard be adopted:

Parties that exchange Prelimit Quantity information electronically should use the GISB standard format.

Action:

After extended discussion, the submitter requested that action be postponed until the pipelines had time to review further. It was noted that a data set was probably called for rather than a data element. This will be addressed on November 20.

R98036 The request addresses implementation of a mechanism to allow Producer to request ranking of market contracts by location where the upstream entity is the Producer. The response to this request should include an acknowledgment that the ranking was approved by the TSP. The mechanism provides for the ability for the Producer to indicate which quantities are preferred to be cut first.

Action:

The submitter requested that action be postponed until the pipelines had time to review further. This will be addressed on November 20.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

R98038

Request:

Koch Gateway Pipeline Company requests that an ANSI ASC X12 document be created to allow the Transportation Service Provider to send out a "Lesser of Rule" Confirmation Warning transaction prior to the end of the confirmation process. This information would also be displayed on the Transportation Service Provider's EBB/EDM for a given scheduling period for a particular Service Requester.

Action:

Ms. Barnett reviewed the request and described how the information is fully derivable. As such, she noted that recommended standards S13 and S29 apply.

Recommended standard nos. S13 and S29 address this request and no further action is required as the information is derivable. The action was endorsed unanimously.

R98039

REI Paso Natural Gas requests that a 'Move to Cycle' mutually agreeable data item be added to both nomination and confirmation transactions which will enable customers to automatically re-nominate or reconfirm the quantity on a transaction in subsequent intraday cycles that was reduced during processing in the previous cycle.

Ms. Royal described the request that her shippers have requested and responded to questions. The flag should be date sensitive and roll with the dates specified for the nomination if the nomination is a date range nomination --however it would only affect the intraday nomination.

Action:

Instruct IR to add mutually agreeable field "Move to Cycle" in the nominations and confirmations transactions as described in the request and in the above description. Business process should be described in the technical implementation of the business process. The action was endorsed with one in opposition.

VII Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The agenda items not addressed will be carried forward to the next meeting agenda on November 4 in Houston.

November 4, 1998

I. **Administrative**

The meeting opened at 8:30 a.m. Mr. Caldwell opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees. He thanked the host, Duke Energy. Ms. McQuade gave the antitrust advice. Attendees introduced themselves.

II **Requests**

R98040

Mr. Ing described the request relating to storage services. The request asks that a flowing gas dataset and data elements should be created to accommodate storage reporting. The request is more appropriately in the flowing gas area and should be addressed by EII at that time. In the interim, it could be handled through recommended standard S21. The information is not derivable -- it has storage information that is not



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

present in other EDI data sets. The request asks for an EDI solution for making available storage services.

Action:

This request will addressed as the first flowing gas request through EII.

R98041

Mr. Hansen described the request regarding the EDI transactions to support super-nominations. The process should be mutually agreeable. Data elements should accommodate super-nominations. If a transportation service provider chooses to support super-nominations, the data elements should accommodate it. A related principle to this request is GISB Standard No. 1.1.3. The looping mechanism in the nominations EDI data set may not support super-nominations because interim stops from the originating receipt to the ultimate delivery through several pipelines may not be known by the shipper. Three interim stops are assumed in the request. There is an unbundling implication to this request which would support services currently supported by LDCs as transporters.

The request contained information to add contract data elements and bid rate data elements to allow the nomination of a "Super-Nom." These data elements need to be repeating data elements that would allow any number of contracts and bid rates to be included on the nomination. These data elements should be mutually agreed. A bid rate must have a corresponding contract. However, it is not necessary to supply a bid rate with every contract. The example explained in "11. Abstract" uses four additional contracts and comes from functionality currently offered by Columbia Gas Transmission and Columbia Gulf Transmission. The four contracts are offshore, onshore, mainline, and distribution. These data elements are needed in the Nomination and Scheduled Quantity. The new standard would allow a Service Requester to create one nomination for transporting gas from the wellhead to the city-gate. Columbia Gas Transmission and Columbia Gulf Transmission would use the new data elements to reduce the number of nominations that a service requester needs to transport gas from the Gulf of Mexico to market. The data elements will provide a level of service that has been a part of Columbia's nomination process since the implementation of Order 436. The "Super-Nom" will reduce the number of nominations required to transport gas. The "Super-Nom" was a feature allowed when Gas*Flow maintained the EDI implementation guides. At that time, the trading partners were Columbia Gas Transmission, Columbia Gulf Transmission, Enron, and Gaslantic.

The nomination screen on Columbia's EBB contains Service Requester Contract, Associated Contract, and four other contracts with associated bid rates. By using these contracts/bid rates, a Service Requester can submit a single nomination that defines the path to transport gas from the Gulf of Mexico to a market in the northeast. When using the current GISB nomination data elements, a Service Requester must submit four nominations. With the additional contracts/bid rates on Columbia's EBB, only one nomination is required.

The four Columbia contracts/bid rates are:

1. Offshore - Used to transport gas from offshore locations to onshore locations.
2. Onshore - Used to transport gas from onshore locations to Rayne, Louisiana.
3. Mainline - Used to transport gas from Rayne, Louisiana to Leach, Kentucky.
4. Distribution - Used to transport gas from Leach, Kentucky to market.

The elimination of these four contracts/bid rates would require a Service Requester to submit four nominations.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

Action:

The following motion was made and seconded as a standard:

- 104 The data elements should accommodate super-nominations. If a Transportation Service Provider chooses to support super-nominations, the GISB standard data sets should accommodate it.

Vote:

The proposed standard carried unanimously.

- IR2 The request was transferred to Information Requirements Subcommittee for implementation.

- R98042 Ms. Barnum described the request which asked that two data elements, Delivery Location Confirmation Status and Receipt Location Confirmation Status, both with sender's option usage, be added to the Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5).

The addition of these data elements to the EDI transaction set is required so that users of the Duke Energy pipelines' Internet Web site will have access to the same information as users of EDI transactions. The Duke Energy pipelines are in the process of creating their interactive Web site and request that this be processed as expeditiously as possible in order to facilitate electronic commerce via the Internet. These data elements, although requested by the Duke Energy pipelines, could be applicable across the pipeline segment. The data dictionary entries would be:

Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5)

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Delivery Location Confirmation Status	Indicates whether confirmation at the detail level for the delivery location has occurred.	SO	
Receipt Location Confirmation Status	Indicates whether confirmation at the detail level for the receipt location has occurred.	SO	

This request is related to a request submitted by NGPL (Request No. R96009) related to preliminary scheduled quantity. Placement with confirmations may not be appropriate because the EBB screen and EI data set is used by point operators rather than shippers, and the information could be considered confidential.

Action:

- IR3 Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to make the changes to accomplish the actions described in the request which asked that two data elements, Delivery Location Confirmation Status and Receipt Location Confirmation Status, both with sender's option usage, be added to the Scheduled Quantity document (1.4.5), with necessary changes such that if a transportation service provider chooses to provide such information, a method is available to indicate that the scheduled quantity is preliminary.

The action carried unanimously.

- R98043 Ms. Barnum described the request to add data elements to the Request for Confirmation (1.4.3) and the Confirmation Response (1.4.4).

The addition of these data elements to the EDI transaction set is required so that users of the Duke Energy pipelines' Internet Web site will have access to the same information as users of EDI transactions.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

After discussion, there were no data dictionary entries to GISB Standard No. 1.4.3.

From the original request, several data elements were removed. Previous Day Scheduled Quantity and Change Indicator data elements are derivable and as such were removed from the request for additions to EDI data set. State Abbreviation, County, Physical Direction of Flow and Location Operator data elements were removed as it related to recommended standard s49. Ms. Munson noted that she would provide proposed modifications to s49 before the next meeting. State Abbreviation and County are also derivable from other location information and Physical Direction of Flow is also derivable from a combination of other data elements. Preliminary Allocation Method was removed as it can be displayed through GISB Standard S13. Confirmation Status is displayed as a sender's option field and is a display only field, so it is covered through GISB Standard S13.

The data dictionary entries for GISB Standard No. 1.4.4 would be:

Confirmation Response (1.4.4)

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Transaction Code	Status Status of entire transaction set.	M	

As a result of recommended standard S29, Location Operator was removed from the request to modify the data dictionary.

Action:

- IR4 Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a status code to Confirmation Response document (GISB Standard 1.4.4) to indicate the status of the entire transaction set to correspond to the similar ANSI X12 business purpose. Additional codes may be needed to address the unsolicited case.

The action carried unanimously.

- R98044 Ms. Barnum presented the request. Several of the data elements on the original request were removed based on the reasons presented in the previous request R98042 and R98043. The addition of this data element to the EDI transaction set is required so that users of the Duke Energy pipelines' Internet Web site will have access to the same information as users of EDI transactions. The data dictionary addition is:

Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6)

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Estimated Btu	Estimated heating value for the location.	SO	

The estimated Btu could be considered derivable if the Measurement Information data sets is functionally related to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator data set. Some noted that these data sets are not necessarily related. In the majority of the cases the estimated Btu is from the most recent statement from the pipeline.

Action:

- IR5 Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a data element, Estimated Btu, with the usage of sender's option, to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator, GISB Standard No. 1.4.6.

The action carried with one vote in opposition.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
 PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

R98045 Ms. Barnum described the request to add a new mutually agreeable transaction data set to accommodate the transfer storage imbalances from one storage account to another account.

In-Field Storage Transfer

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Accounting Period	The month and year the information was recorded.	M	
Destination Contract	The contract to which the transfer quantity is requested to be moved.	M	
Destination Status	Indicates whether the destination contract holder has confirmed the transfer.	M	
Origin Contract	The contract from which the transfer quantity is requested to be moved.	M	
Origin Status	Indicates whether the origin contract holder has confirmed the transfer.	M	
Requested Quantity	The quantity requested to be transferred.	M	
Requester Company Code*	The requesting company.	M	
Service Requester*	Identifies the party requesting the service.	M	
Service Requester Contract	This is the contract under which service is being requested.	M	
Transfer Date	The requested date for the transfer to occur.	M	
Transfer Quantity	The quantity which the two parties have agreed to transfer.	M	
Transfer Status	Indicates the status of the transfer transaction.	M	
Transportation Service Provider*	A code which uniquely identifies the transportation service provider.	M	
Zone	The geographic location with which the storage contract is associated.	M	

After discussion it was noted that the request would more appropriately be addressed in the Imbalance Subcommittee.

Action:

IM1 The request was transferred to the Imbalance Subcommittee. The action carried unanimously.

R98031 Ms. Langston described the request, and asked that the confirmation by exception function ("CBE") be supported both through EBB/EDM and EDI/EDM. Pipelines may implement this function differently.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

The request described the development of an EDI dataset to allow Confirming Parties to elect to "Confirm by Exception" as provided for in GISB Standard No. 1.2.11 and 1.3.22. This would be classified as a "new transaction." The purpose of this data set is to provide the Confirming Parties using EDI the ability to agree to Confirmation by Exception. As stated in 1.2.11, "Confirmation by Exception (CBE) means that the Confirming Parties agree that one party deems that all requests at a location are confirmed by the other party (the CBE party) without response communication from that party. The CBE party can take exception to the request by so informing the other party within a mutually agreed upon time frame." When the Confirming Parties submit the Confirmation by Exception dataset, they are advising the Confirmation Requester of their desire to be confirmed for all quantities requested. Some of the data elements for request from confirming party:

Confirming Party	(M)	
Begin Date	(M)	
End Date	(MA)	
Location		(MA)
All locations	(MA)	
Chart-time	(MA)	
Cycle 1 Intraday		(MA)
Cycle 2 Intraday		(MA)
Evening Cycle	(MA)	
Hourlies		(MA)
All Times	(MA)	
Service Requester	(MA)	

The above data elements allow the confirming party to specify the date the CBE is to start and they can submit an ending date if desired. If none is submitted, the CBE will remain in effect until they change it. The other data elements allow the Confirming Party to submit a CBE for a specific meter(s) for a specific time (chart-time, intraday, hourly) or combination of times as well as for a specific service requester. Should they want to submit a CBE for all locations and all times, that possibility is also included. The CBE's will be submitted for the next gas day; they cannot be submitted for an intraday for that gas day. Overlapping CBE's are allowed. Choosing CBE does not prevent the Confirming Party from submitting a Confirmation Response. The quick response back to the Confirming Party would be validation error messages: retroactive CBE's not allowed and Invalid location.

Action:

- 105 The data elements should accommodate confirmation by exception. If a Transportation Service Provider chooses to support confirmation by exception, the GISB standard data sets should accommodate it.
The motion carried unanimously.
- IR6 The request was transferred to Information Requirements Subcommittee for implementation.
- R98046 Ms. Hopkins described the request to add data elements for processing rights. There is not expected to be any validation. The submitter noted that the indicator is at the contract level. Only one pipeline currently needs this indicator as a result of a settlement. If not completed, the nomination would still be accepted.
Action:



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

-
- IR7 Instruct Information Requirements to add a Processing Rights Indicator data element with usage code of mutually agreeable to the Nominations and Scheduled Quantity data sets (GISB Standard Nos. 1.4.1 and 1.4.5).
The action carried unanimously.
- R98047 Mr. Buccigross reviewed the request to add a new data set and new code value in the Upload of Request for Download (and response) data sets. This request would effectuate recommended standard no. S22. These additions would be used to facilitate the transfer of valid code value information to and from trading partners, that is, a downloaded file containing those code values supported by the Transportation Service Provider.
The new dataset would be called "Supported Code Value Information," and the code value addition to the Data Sets Requested data element in the Upload of Request for Download dataset (and Response to Upload of Request dataset) could be called "Supported Code Values."
The additional code value added to the "Data Sets Requested" data element would be used so that data requesters could request the downloadable list of code values supported by the TSP. The same code value added to the "Response to Upload of Request" dataset would be used so that TSP's could respond correctly to the Upload of Request for Download for this dataset. The Supported Code Values dataset would be the substantive dataset downloaded in response to the request for supported code values information.
This would allow a mechanism for Service Requesters to request, and TSP's to provide, supported code value lists to their trading partners. The addition of a code value to the Data Sets Requested data element has a very small one-time cost only of mapping the new code value. No new data elements or other changes to these data sets are required. The Supported Code Values dataset is a new dataset. As such, it would require a one-time mapping by sending and receiving parties. It should be noted that the data used to populate this dataset in effect, must already exist somewhere in a TSP's back end system(s).
Concern was raised that the data set used is a capacity release data set, but it is being used for another purpose. Ms. Munson noted that this upload of request for download and its response documents could be used generically to ask for several types of information.
Action:
- IR8 Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a new data set and new code value in the Upload of Request for Download (and response) data sets. This request would effectuate recommended standard no. S22.
The action carried unanimously.
- R98048 Mr. Buccigross reviewed the request to add a new dataset plus a new code value in the Upload of Request for Download (and response) datasets. These additions would be used to facilitate the transfer of fuel matrix information to and from trading partners, that is, a downloaded file containing the valid fuel matrix for transportation on the subject Transportation Service Provider. The new dataset would be called "Fuel Matrix Information" and the code value addition to the Data Sets Requested data element in the Upload of Request for Download dataset (and Response to Upload of Request dataset) could be called "Fuel Matrix."



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

The additional code value added to the "Data Sets Requested" data element would be used so that Service Requesters could request the fuel matrix for the TSP. The same code value added to the "Response to Upload of Request" dataset would be used so that TSP's could respond correctly to the Upload of Request for Download for this dataset. The Fuel Matrix Information dataset would be the substantive dataset downloaded in response to the request for fuel matrix information. Related standards are: GISB Standard No. 1.1.5 "The fuel process should be simpler", and GISB Standard No. 1.3.30

"For in-kind fuel reimbursement methods, Service Providers should provide, if applicable, a fuel matrix for receipt and delivery point combinations. The Service Requester should not be responsible for calculating and totaling fuel based on each zone or facility traversed." In addition to supporting the above standards, this request would allow a mechanism for Service Requesters to request, and TSP's to provide, the referenced fuel matrix.

The addition of a code value to the Data Sets Requested data element has a very small one-time cost only of mapping the new code value. No new data elements or other changes to these data sets are required. The Fuel Matrix Information dataset is a new dataset. As such, it would require a one-time mapping by sending and receiving parties. It should be noted however, that the data used to populate this dataset generally exists somewhere on a TSP's EBB already given the above standards.

Some parties note that fuel percents are extracted from tariff sheets today, and with a standardized file for download, the procedure would be facilitated. The information is made available on EBBs today and without a mechanism for downloading information electronically, there could be a comparability issue. This procedure is not intended to address fuel discounts.

For a definition of fuel matrices, it addresses postage stamp and zone fuel rates.

Action:

IR9 Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a new data set and new code value in the Upload of Request for Download (and response) data set to accommodate the transfer of fuel matrix information so as to reflect information pursuant to GISB Standard No. 1.3.30.

The action carried unanimously.

For all Information Requirements Subcommittee instructions from the EII requests, the Information Requirements Subcommittee is urged to use flexibility in addressing the requests.

R98049 This request was deferred until the capacity release issues are addressed by EII.

R98050 Mr. Buccigross reviewed the request to add a new dataset plus a new code value in the Upload of Request for Download (and response) datasets.

Request:

These additions would be used to facilitate the transfer of Storage and Park/Loan balance information to Service Requesters. In other words, a Service Requester would be able to request, and receive a downloaded file, that contains that Service Requester's storage and/or park and loan balances, as applicable, on their contracts with the TSP.

The new dataset would be called "Storage/Park and Loan Balance Information" dataset, and the code value addition to the Data Sets Requested data element in the Upload of Request for Download dataset (and Response to Upload of Request dataset) could be called "Storage/Park and Loan Balances." The additional code value added to the "Data



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

Sets Requested" data element would be used so that Service Requesters could request their storage and/or park and loan balances on contracts on the TSP. The same code value added to the "Response to Upload of Request" dataset would be used so that TSP's could respond correctly to the Upload of Request for Download for this dataset. The "Storage/Park and Loan Balance Information" dataset would be the informational dataset downloaded in response to the request for parties' credit status and/or approved bidder status.

This request would allow a mechanism for Service Requesters to request, and TSP's to provide, the service requester's balance(s) on relevant storage and park and loan contracts on the TSP. It would allow these service requesters the ability to maintain this information in their own database(s). This information is currently available on some pipeline EBBs. This mechanism would allow one mode of communications with the pipelines and allow service the requesters the ability to request, download, and maintain their contracts on these types of services. The addition of a code value to the Data Sets Requested data element has a very small one-time cost only of mapping the new code value. No new data elements or other changes to these data sets are required. As a new data sets, the Storage/Park and Loan Balance Information file would require a one-time mapping by sending and receiving parties. It should be noted however, that this data in general must exist somewhere in a TSP's computer system. This reduces implementation costs, as the data must only be formatted differently.

Concern was raised that storage requests should be addressed comprehensively rather than request by request.

Action:

This request will addressed as the second flowing gas request through EII.

The action carried unanimously.

R98051

Mr. Schubert reviewed the request to add a data element for minimum quantity with the usage of mutually agreeable to the Nomination data set (GISB Standard No. 1.4.1).

Request:

When provided, the Transportation Service Provider would not schedule a quantity less than the minimum quantity (other than zero), and it is a component of the submitter's interruptible service. The original request specified a usage of business conditional, but after discussion the usage was changed to mutually agreeable. The original request specified that this element should also be added to the Scheduled Quantity document, but that requirement was removed after discussion.

Action:

IR10

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a data element for minimum quantity with the usage of mutually agreeable to the Nomination data set (GISB Standard No. 1.4.1).

The action carried unanimously.

R98053

Ms. Royal reviewed the request to add a data element "Accounting Data 1" with the usage of mutually agreeable to the Nomination, Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity and the Scheduled Quantity for Operator data sets (GISB Standard Nos. 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5 and 1.4.6). The field is a five character alphanumeric, not part of the key of the nomination or the confirmation, and is supplied by the customer to carry whatever information he may want to associate with the nomination. They have used it to carry additional information such as names of third



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

parties involved in the transaction, gas prices involved in the transaction, fuel rates, data to assist in calculations when reporting scheduled quantity data to a spreadsheet, or accounting or financial information related to the transaction. For information provided by a shipper in the nomination process, that information is passed through the scheduled quantity. For information provided through the confirmation process, the operator provides the information and it is passed through confirmation response and scheduled quantity for operators documents. After discussion the name of the element was changed to "User Data 1".

Action:

- IR11 Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a data element "User Data 1" with the usage of mutually agreeable to the Nomination and Request for Confirmation data sets, and added with the appropriate usage defined thereafter for the Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity and the Scheduled Quantity for Operator data sets (GISB Standard Nos. 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5 and 1.4.6).

The action carried unanimously.

- R98054 Ms. Royal reviewed the request to add a data element "Accounting Data 2" with the usage of mutually agreeable to the Nomination, Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity and the Scheduled Quantity for Operator data sets (GISB Standard Nos. 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5 and 1.4.6). The field is a five character alphanumeric, not part of the key of the nomination or the confirmation, and is supplied by the customer to carry whatever information he may want to associate with the nomination. They have used it to carry additional information such as names of third parties involved in the transaction, gas prices involved in the transaction, fuel rates, data to assist in calculations when reporting scheduled quantity data to a spreadsheet, or accounting or financial information related to the transaction. For information provided by a shipper in the nomination process, that information is passed through the scheduled quantity. For information provided through the confirmation process, the operator provides the information and it is passed through confirmation response and scheduled quantity for operators documents. After discussion the name of the element was changed to "User Data 2".

Action:

- IR12 Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a data element "User Data 2" with the usage of mutually agreeable to the Nomination and Request for Confirmation data sets, and added with the appropriate usage defined thereafter for the Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity and the Scheduled Quantity for Operator data sets (GISB Standard Nos. 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5 and 1.4.6).

The action carried unanimously.

III. Preparation for Executive Committee Meeting and Standards to be sent out for comment and action by the Executive Committee

The following proposed standards should be sent out for industry comment: d9, d10, i1, s8, s39, s40, s41, s44, s45, s46 and s47. Also to be sent out for industry comment are those recommended standards passed in this meeting excluding those items that require additional work by other subcommittees. There were none in opposition to this action. The recommended standards will be sent out for comment after the November 20 meeting and will be considered by the EC at its December meeting. For recommended standards currently out for comment that have been changed as a result of



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

subsequent meetings, Mr. Caldwell will inform the EC of such changes prior to EC consideration in November. These recommended standards are d4 and s34.

IV Review of Clean-up

Clean up changes were accepted with minor changes to recommended standard p15, s23 and s39. It was noted that recommended standards s21 and s48 may require rewording but no changes were entertained at this time.

V Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next meeting will be held on November 20 in Salt Lake City.