



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com

Home Page: www.naesb.org

via email and posting

TO: NAESB WGQ Interpretations Subcommittee: Sylvia Munson, Keith Sappenfield, Sheri Heslington, Paul Keeler, Paul Love, Shelley Corman, Tina Burnett, Diane McVicker, Mike Novak, Steve Sullivan, and Posting for Interested Parties

FROM: Todd Oncken, NAESB Staff

RE: Wholesale Gas Quadrant Interpretations Subcommittee Meeting Minutes - May 9, 2003

DATE: May 12, 2003

**NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
WGQ INTERPRETATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL
May 9, 2003, noon to 2:00 p.m. Central**

1. Welcome & Administrative Items

Ms. Munson welcomed meeting participants. Mr. Oncken gave the antitrust advice. Ms. Munson reviewed the agenda. With the modification to adopt the minutes from the April 22, 2003 meeting, Mr. Love moved, seconded by Mr. Novak, to adopt the agenda. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Novak moved, seconded by Mr. Love, to adopt the minutes of the April 22, 2003 WGQ Interpretations Subcommittee meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Discussion and potential vote on requests C03002, C03003, C03004 & C03005

Request C03002: Mr. Buccigross requested the subcommittee defer discussion on Request C03002 anticipating its withdrawal within the next 30 days. Mr. Buccigross noted the request was closely tied with Request C03001, disposed of during the April 22 meeting. Mr. Novak moved, seconded by Mr. Love, to suspend discussion on Request C03002. The motion passed unanimously.

Request C03003: Request C03003, submitted by Dynegey, raises the implications of the obsolescence of Internet Engineering Taskforce (IETF) "HTTP Transport for secure EDI" (referred to as the EDIINT standard AS2) version 11 with regard to its inclusion in the NAESB EDM Standards. Mr. Whatley commented on recent events regarding the issues surrounding Request C03003. Mr. Whatley stated the IETF has decided to retain EDIINT AS2 draft v11 for at least three months. Mr. Whatley said the anticipation is that a representative from NAESB will attend an IETF meeting to advocate the maintenance of version 11, being that NAESB has incorporated that version into its EDM standards. Mr. Whatley suggested referring the request to the Electronic Delivery Mechanism (EDM) Subcommittee for further appropriate action.

Mr. Novak moved, seconded by Mr. Love, to refer Request C03003 to the EDM Subcommittee with the instruction to take any action deemed appropriate. The motion passed unanimously.

Request C03004: Mr. Love reviewed the draft interpretation he submitted for Request C03004. In short, Mr. Love stated the issue has come before NAESB on several occasions, NAESB has reviewed those requests for modification, and has declined to modify the standard.

Mr. Novak moved, seconded by Ms. Corman, to adopt the following clarification for Request C03004, as submitted by Mr. Love:



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com

Home Page: www.naesb.org

The Mandatory usage of Upstream and Downstream Identifiers (Entities) in the Confirmation process, specifically as used in documents G855RRFC and G850RQCF, dates back to GISB version 1.0. In requesting that NAESB “justify” its position in requiring these data elements, C03004 states: “At a pipeline Interconnect the usual confirmation process is by Up/Dn contract identifier”. The discussions for crafting version 1.0 and subsequent versions have repeatedly revealed that this assumption is incorrect. The industry as a whole has agreed that the Confirmation process requires, at a minimum, the use of Upstream and Downstream Identifiers. These discussions and the resulting votes have promulgated the Industry’s wishes to specify thru NAESB a single method of confirmation for all facilities, whether a wellhead, interconnect, etc, as opposed to creating separate processes based on facility type. Subsequent standards have been adopted for other processes that rely on the mandatory usage of these identifiers.

With respect to interconnected parties coming to agreement not to use the Upstream and Downstream Identifier elements in their joint Confirmation process, NAESB recognizes the right for such parties to so agree to the extent that other standards, processes and agreements are not adversely affected, as is the case in any question of usage. Should one of the parties not agree to exclude the Upstream and Downstream Identifier elements in the Confirmation process, the standards will govern specifying mandatory usage of these elements.

During discussion on the motion it was noted the clarification did not need to be submitted for action of the Information Requirements (IR) Subcommittee, as there was no change proposed. The motion passed unanimously.

Request C03005: Mr. Novak reviewed the draft interpretation he submitted for Request C03005. In Request C03005, MIGC, Inc. requested clarification on the definition of prepared in standard 3.3.14.

Mr. Love moved, seconded by Mr. Novak, to adopt the following clarification for Request C03005, as submitted by Mr. Novak:

Prepared means “made ready”. The intent of the standard is that the invoice be rendered or “made available” to the Service Requester(“SR”) on or before the 9th business day of the month. Some examples of rendering the invoice to the SR include, but are not limited to: 1) mailing the invoice, or 2) making the invoice available on the transportation service provider’s customer activities website, or 3) sending the invoice via EDI. ~~Mailing the invoice is one form of rendering the invoice to the SR.~~ It is implied that the invoice be prepared prior to it being rendered. The invoiced could be prepared the same day it is rendered but preparation must take place prior to it being rendered.

The date the invoice is rendered is more significant than the date it is prepared. For example, an invoice prepared on the 8th business day but not rendered until after the 9th business day is late with respect to WGQ Standard 3.3.14. That the invoice was prepared in advance of the 9th would be of no consequence to the SR.

During discussion, Ms. Corman sought confirmation that the proposed interpretation does not impose additional requirements the current standard does not contain. Specifically, she expressed concern the interpretation would advance the date an organization must issue its invoice. Ms. Corman suggested the request for clarification stemmed from the original language of the standard. Ms. McCain noted the language of standard 3.3.14 has not changed since GISB version 1.1. It was noted any interpretation must be submitted to the WGQ Executive Committee for approval by a super-majority vote.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Mr. Gwilliam suggested a modification to the motion to list additional mechanisms for rendering the invoice, as noted in the redline above. Mr. Love and Mr. Novak accepted the modification. The amended motion passed unanimously.

3. Other Business

As the subcommittee took action on all pending requests for clarification, a subsequent meeting was not scheduled.

4. Adjourn

Ms. Munson adjourned the call at 12:45 p.m. Central.

5. Meeting Attendees:

Name	Company	Notes
Dick Brooks	Independent Consultant	
Jim Buccigross	Group 8760	
Christopher Burden	Williams Gas Pipeline	
Cynthia Corcoran	Enbridge Energy	
Shelly Corman	Transwestern Pipeline	Member
Barry Green	Ontario Power Generation	
Tom Gwilliam	Iroquois Gas Transmission	
Teresa Hess	Reliant Energy Retail Services	
Paul Love	NGPL	Member
Marcy McCain	Duke Energy Gas Transmission	
Rae McQuade	NAESB Executive Director	Administrative
Michael Novak	National Fuel	Member
Sylvia Munson	Ecom	Member
Todd Oncken	NAESB	Administrative
Keith Sappenfield	EnCana	Member
Pete Whatley	Dynegy	