



# 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

---

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**  
**Interpretations Subcommittee Meeting -- Telephone Conference**  
**10:00 a.m. to Noon, May 1, 1998**

**FINAL MINUTES**

**I. Introductory Items**

Greg Lander welcomed the attendees and the antitrust advice was given. The roll was called. The agenda was adopted with no changes. The minutes of April 24 were adopted with changes.

**II. Interpretations**

**C98002** Clarify the intention of the "AE" Transaction Status Code in the Header Level of the Nomination Quick Response.

**Request:**

Nomination Quick Response Transaction Status Code in the Header Level has 3 codes.

Two of the codes identify specifically whether or not the nomination has been accepted (AT) or rejected with detail (RD).

However, the status code of AE - Acknowledge with exception detail only, does not give the recipient a clear idea, if those line item nominations returned with warnings and/or errors were accepted or rejected.

Clarification Request

Please clarify the intention of the "AE" Transaction Status Code in the Header Level of the Nomination Quick Response.

Possible interpretations or clarifications, if known:

- (1) AE - all nominations were accepted but there is some detail information that should be corrected.
- (2) AE - some of the nominations were accepted and some were rejected depending on the code provided, warnings were accepted, errors were rejected.

**Work Paper:**

Request for Clarification:

"Please clarify the intention of the "AE" Transaction Status Code in the Header Level of the Nomination Quick Response."

Response:

"AE' is a code value which *may* can be sent in a Transaction Status Code field within a Quick Response. When sent, it is sent at the Header level which means that the code refers to the whole document sent *by the party* by the Service Requester to which this Quick Response (from the Service Provider) responds. Sending the ' AE' code means that some of the line items in the document being responded to were accepted, and



# 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

those line items which were accepted were accepted either with or without warnings. The 'AE' code can also mean that some of the line items may have been rejected. A party receiving the Quick Response with an 'AE' code looks to the detail (i.e., the line item) level to determine which line items were accepted, which were accepted with a warning, and which were rejected (if any were rejected). The use of the "AE" code value would have the same meaning in any quick response document where its use is appropriate.

As a general matter, Where a line item carries a warning, it has nonetheless been accepted for processing purposes; and Where a line item carries an error, it has been rejected, has not been accepted for processing, and should be corrected or otherwise adjusted and resubmitted in order to be processed.

## **Discussion:**

Mr. Lander described the the red-lined work paper. Ms. Hess noted that the "AE" code is used in other quick response documents and the draft interpretation should be more generic. The changes to make the draft interpretation more generic are shown above in red-line form.

## **Action:**

The above interpretation shown by the red-lined work paper was adopted unanimously. A ballot will be sent to the absent members for recording their votes. The ballot results will not change the outcome, as the recommended interpretation has a majority of support from the members.

**C98003**

Can an invoice Statement "Beginning Transaction Date" and "Ending Transaction Date" be defaulted in each transaction to the first day of the month without accurately reflecting the correct dates associated with the beginning and ending of a transaction?

## **Request:**

GISB Standard Number: 3.4.1: The Invoice Statement standard states that the "Beginning Transaction Date" is a mandatory data element defined as "Where the transaction began during the invoice period, the Month, Day, and Year. Where the transaction began during a prior invoice period, the beginning of the subject invoice period. The "Ending Transaction Date" is a mandatory data element defined as "Where the transaction ended during the invoice period, the Month, Day, Year. Where the transaction is continuing as of the end of the invoice period, the end of the subject invoice

## Clarification Request

Can an Invoice Statement "Beginning Transaction Date" and "Ending Transaction Date" be defaulted in each transaction to the first day of the month and the last day of the month without accurately reflecting the correct dates associated with the beginning and ending of a transaction?

## Possible interpretations or clarifications, if known:

No. The standard states clearly that the Month, Day, and Year should be reflected for the beginning and ending of a transaction. Many transactions occur for portions of a month and should be reflected as such on the Invoice Statement. This enables the two parties to reconcile any differences efficiently. When a transaction spans from one month to the next, the ending transaction date for the period ending should be the last day of the month and the beginning transaction date should be the first day of the subsequent month.



# 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

---

## **Work Paper:**

Request for Clarification:

“Can an Invoice Statement “Beginning Transaction Date” and “Ending Transaction Date” be defaulted in each transaction to the first day of the month and the last day of the month without accurately reflecting the correct dates associated with the beginning and ending of a transaction?”

Response:

“No, in GISB Standard 3.4.1 (the invoice data dictionary) the definition of the data element “Beginning Transaction Date” states “Where the transaction began during the invoice period, the Month, Day, Year. Where the transaction began during a prior invoice period, the beginning of the subject invoice period.” This means that the party sending the invoice can default the invoice's Beginning Transaction Date to the beginning date of an invoicing period only when the underlying transaction began before the beginning date of the invoice period. When the transaction's Beginning Transaction Date occurs within the date range set by the invoice period's beginning and ending date, then the date (at least gas day if no time detail is sent) during which the transaction began should be present in the invoice's Beginning Transaction Date field.

“Likewise, elsewhere in GISB Standard 3.4.1 (the invoice data dictionary) the definition of the data element “Ending Transaction Date” states “Where the transaction ended during the invoice period, the Month, Day, Year. Where the transaction is continuing as of the end of the invoice period, the end of the subject invoice period.” This means that the party sending the invoice can default the invoice's Ending Transaction Date to the ending date of an invoicing period only when the underlying transaction was continuing as of the passage of the ending date of the subject invoice period. When the transaction's Ending Transaction Date occurs within the date range set by the invoice period's beginning and ending date, then the date (at least gas day if no time detail is sent) during which the transaction ended should be present in the invoice's Ending Transaction Date field.”

## **Discussion:**

Mr. Lander described the work paper. Ms. Scott agreed that the work paper addressed her concerns.

## **Action:**

The above interpretation shown in the work paper was adopted unanimously. A ballot will be sent to the absent members for recording their votes. The ballot results will not change the outcome, as the recommended interpretation has a majority of support from the members.

### **III. Further Questions from the Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR) Regarding Intraday Nominations**

Current Standard Nos. 1.3.10 and 1.3.12, which were deleted as part of the intraday nominations package, both have a written interpretation concerning them, Interpretation No. 7.3.4. IR's issue regards the status of this interpretation vis-à-vis the Standards Manuals. Should it be removed from the Standards Book? Labeled as superseded? Still applicable to the other standards it affects? Etc.



# 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

---

## Discussion:

Mr. Lander noted that he supported deleting the interpretation. Mr. Scheel thought that GISB Interpretation No. 7.3.4 added that it provided clarification on GISB Standard No. 1.3.3. Both Mr. Lander and Mr. Scheel reached agreement that another interpretation could be submitted if clarification of GISB Standard No. 1.3.3 is needed. Mr. Scheel further added though that GISB Interpretation No. 7.3.4 provides value for GISB Standard No. 1.3.3 as it is applicable to a current standard and he did not support its deletion.

Mr. Lander raised a procedural issue -- Can the Interpretations Subcommittee initiate clean-up actions which could result in the deletion or modification of an interpretation without first receiving a request for interpretation from a party? Mr. Scheel supported the Interpretations Subcommittee action to clean-up interpretations and specifically to change the standards book cross-reference to show the linkage of GISB Interpretation No. 7.3.4 to GISB Standard No. 1.3.3. A request will be submitted to address the above procedural issue. Mr. Wallenhorst stated that the As a request to the Process subcommittee, Should the Interpretations Subcommittee, absent a request for interpretation, as a matter of course review interpretations for modifications as standards are modified or deleted. This question will be sent to the Process Subcommittee.

## Action:

The motion was made and seconded to delete GISB Interpretation No. 7.3.4. The motion was withdrawn and a request will be submitted by Mr. Lander and Mr. Scheel to modify GISB Interpretation 7.3.4 to refer to GISB Standard No. 1.3.3. The Process Subcommittee will be requested to act on the following question: "Should the Interpretations Subcommittee, absent a request for interpretation, as a matter of course review interpretations for modifications as standards are modified or deleted?"

## IV. New Interpretations

**C98005** With regard to GISB Standard 1.3.22ii, Version 1.3, for start of Day should the previously scheduled quantity be the previous Start of Day scheduled quantity or the last previous scheduled Intra-Day quantity?

### Request:

GISB Standard Number: 1.3.22i

Clarification or interpretation request:

With respect to the timely Nomination Confirmation Process: "If there is no response to a request for Confirmation or an unsolicited Confirmation Response, the lesser of the confirmation quantity or the previously scheduled quantity should be the confirmation quantity."

Possible interpretations or clarifications, if known:

For start of Day should the previously scheduled quantity be the previous Start of Day scheduled quantity or the last previous scheduled Intra-Day quantity . The last scheduled Intra-Day quantity would be the 10 am Intra-Day. Would using the 10 am Intra-Day scheduled quantities be confusing since there is still one more Intra-Day cycle for the Day. Also, standard 1.2.4 indicated that a Intra-Day nom is for one day only. Standard 1.3.13 indicated that a Intra-Day nom does not rollover and does not replace a standing nom. Therefore, is there a conflict in using a previously scheduled Intra-Day quantity for a start of day lesser of comparison.

Suggested changes to GISB Standard No. 1.3.22i/1.3.22ii



# 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

---

Add to the last sentence in 1.3.22i: If there is no response to a Request For Confirmation or an unsolicited Confirmation Response, the lesser of the confirmation quantity or previously *scheduled Timely Nomination* quantity should be the new confirmed quantity.

Add to the last sentence in 1.3.22ii: If there is no response to a Request For Confirmation or an unsolicited Confirmation Response, the previously scheduled quantity *for that current Gas Day* should be the new confirmed quantity.

## **Discussion:**

Mr. Bianchi explained the request and several questions were raised. After discussion, Mr. Scheel noted that this request may be more appropriately a request to modify a standard rather than a request for an interpretation. Mr. Lander disagreed and noted that we could interpret the standards (GISB Standard Nos. 1.3.22i and 1.3.22ii). Ms. Scott noted that there may be further standards that could address Mr. Bianchi's concerns. No one disagreed with the conceptual formulation of the interpretation as stated by Mr. Bianchi in his request. However, Mr. Scheel noted that all scenarios should be reviewed before determining the interpretation to be adopted.

## **Action:**

Further research will be performed before the next meeting. This request will be placed on the May 8 agenda.

## **C98006**

Current Standard No. 1.3.9 states in part, "Intra-day nominations should include an effective date and time." Intraday Standard No. 1.3.e states in part, "Where Transportation Service Providers support the processing of beginning effective time . . .". Are these two standards in conflict in so much as in 1.3.9 Beginning Time is sender's option, but 1.3.e [GISB Standard No. 1.3.43, Version 1.3] says that the TSPs may or may not support Beginning Time? How can a data element be Sender's Option and Business Conditional at the same time?

## **Standards:**

1.3.9 All nominations, including intra-day nominations, should be based on a daily quantity; thus, an intra-day nominator need not submit an hourly nomination. Intra-day nominations should include an effective date and time. The interconnected parties should agree on the hourly flows of the intra-day nomination, if not otherwise addressed in the transporter's contract or tariff.

1.3.43 Transportation Service Providers should determine the applicable nomination processing cycle based upon the receipt time and beginning effective day of the nomination. Where Transportation Service Providers support the processing of beginning effective time, the Transportation Service Provider should also use the beginning effective date and time in determining the applicable nomination processing cycle in lieu of using the nomination's receipt date and time to determine the processing cycle.

## **Request:**

GISB Standard Number 1.3.9 Version 1.2 and Related Standard 1.3.e ( 1.3.43) Version 1.3:

The current Standard 1.3.9 states, "All nominations, including intra-day nominations, should be based on a daily quantity; thus, an intra-day nominator need not submit an hourly nomination. Intra-day nominations should include an effective date and time. The



# 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

---

interconnected parties should agree on the hourly flows of the intra-day nominations, if not otherwise addressed in transporter's contract or tariff."

In the current standard 1.4.1, Nominations, Beginning Time has the following definition and is sender's option:

Beginning Time - This is the time that a transaction is to be initiated. If the Beginning Time is not sent, the time defaults to the beginning of the gas day.

The Intra-day Standard 1.3.e states, "TSPs should determine the applicable nomination processing cycle based upon the receipt time and beginning effective day of the nomination. Where TSPs support the processing of beginning effective time, the TSP should also use the beginning effective date and time in determining the applicable nomination processing cycle in lieu of using the nomination's receipt date and time to determine the processing cycle.

Clarification or interpretation request:

Are these two standards in conflict in so much as in 1.3.9 Beginning Time is sender's option, but 1.3.e [GISB Standard No. 1.3.43, Version 1.3] says that the TSPs may or may not support Beginning Time? How can a data element be Sender's Option and Business Conditional at the same time?

**Discussion:**

Ms. Scott described the request. Because the actions taken to address the request could require changes to GISB standards, questions should be phrased for the Executive Committee. Mr. Lander noted that the questions could be framed for the EC for its resolution -- did you intend to supersede the usage conditions by adoption of GISB Standard 1.3.43? Should GISB Standard Nos. 1.3.9 and 1.3.43 be combined? Ms. Hess noted that the data sets for implementation of the intraday nominations standards propose the usage condition of "Business Conditional" for the effective time.

**Action:**

A work paper will be drafted to address these two questions and any possible interpretations. This will be placed on the May 8 agenda.

## V. Adjourn

The meeting concluded at 11:45 a.m. The next meeting for Interpretations is Friday, May 8, from 10:00 a.m. to noon central. An agenda and meeting announcement will be made available prior to the meeting and will address Request Nos. C98005, C98006 and C98007 to be submitted by Mr. Lander and Mr. Scheel regarding GISB Standard No. 7.3.4.



# 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

## VI. Attendees

| <b>Committee Members Present at Meeting</b> |                            | <b>Votes on Requests:</b> |               |                          |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
|   |                            | <b>C98002</b>             | <b>C98003</b> | <b>7.3.4<sup>1</sup></b> |
| Greg Lander                                 | TransCapacity              | ✓                         | ✓             | ✓                        |
| Kristine Mespelli                           | New England Power          | ✓                         | ✓             | ✓                        |
| Laverne Tillson                             | Defense Fuel Supply Center | ✓                         | ✓             | ✓                        |
| Mark Scheel                                 | NGC Corp.                  | ✓                         | ✓             | ✓                        |
| Bob Wallenhorst                             | Exxon                      | ✓                         | ✓             | ✓                        |

### **Committee Members Absent - Notational Votes Received After the Meeting**

|                  |                                    |   |   |  |
|------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Shelley Corman   | Enron Pipelines - Northern Natural | ✓ | ✓ |  |
| Paul Love        | NGPL                               | ✓ | ✓ |  |
| Producer Vacancy |                                    |   |   |  |
| LDC Vacancy      |                                    |   |   |  |
| LDC Vacancy      |                                    |   |   |  |

### **Participants:**

|               |                                    | <b>Members</b> |
|---------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Donna Scott   | Enron Administrative Corp.         | ✓              |
| Theresa Hess  | Enron Pipelines - Northern Natural | ✓              |
| Dale Davis    | Williams Gas Pipelines             | ✓              |
| Kim Van Pelt  | Panhandle Eastern Pipeline         | ✓              |
| Joe Bianchi   | ANR Pipeline                       | ✓              |
| Mike Schisler | NPGL                               | ✓              |
| Betty Barnum  | Texas Eastern                      | ✓              |

### **GISB OFFICE**

|             |      | <b>Members</b> |
|-------------|------|----------------|
| Rae McQuade | GISB | ✓              |

<sup>1</sup> The vote taken on GISB Standard No. 7.3.4 was procedural to outline a course of action. It did not include a draft interpretation and will not be present on the ballot sent to the absent members of the Interpretations Subcommittee.