

**GISB Notices Task Force**  
**Final Minutes – February 11, 1999 Meeting**  
**Columbia Gulf Offices, 2603 Augusta, Houston Texas**

Michael Hansen welcomed the attendees to Columbia Gulf for the meeting. The meeting was chaired by M. Hansen and co-chaired by Shelley Corman. Mark Sheel provided the antitrust guidelines. The agenda was adopted as posted except the discussion of EDI related standards was moved ahead of the discussion of the E-mail standards.

The minutes were approved as posted with one change to the last page to identify Enron Capital and Trade as the party submitting Workpaper 2.

The requirements for EDI notification for intraday bumps, operational flow order (OFO) and other critical notices were discussed. There was a long discussion on whether a data element to identify the intended recipient of the notice was necessary. The key issue is whether a data element is needed when a notice is sent to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party software service provider or agent that provide service for multiple parties. There was no consensus that this was required.

The following motion was passed without objection.

Instruct Information Requirements to modify the EDI data set 5.4.16 System-Wide Notices to accommodate the Notice Types of OFO, Intraday Bump and Other Critical Notices individually and to modify the TIBP for this data set to reflect these changes or to create a new data set to accommodate this business practice as they deem necessary.

There was a short discussion to clarify that notification via EDI is to be conducted using the existing GISB EDM protocol.

There was discussion concerning the inclusion of the applicable gas day in the notice. It was stated that the data elements Notice Effective Date and Notice Effective Time could be used to indicate the time that the bump becomes effective consistent with the effective times of the nomination cycles. No vote was taken concerning this issue.

There was extensive discussion on what constitutes notice. There was one point of view that it is simply an alert that an event has happened with instructions on where to look for the details. The other point of view was the notice itself needs to contain sufficient detail to take action without looking elsewhere. There was no consensus on this issue.

Dynegy stated the opinion that there is supposed to be a section on the web site under informational postings where intraday bump notices would be posted similar to OFOs

and other critical notices. Dynegy considers this is a comparability issue to the extent that if a notice is sent via EDI then a comparable posting on the web site is also necessary. There was discussion and disagreement between the participants on whether there is a FERC requirement placed upon TSPs to post intraday bump notices in the same manner as OFOs and critical notices. The chair requested Dynegy to find specific excerpts of FERC orders that would require pipes to perform in this way. There was further discussion concerning the level of information contained in an intraday bump notice and the impact of making this information available in the unprotected section of a TSPs web site as is the case with OFOs and other critical notices.

The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for February 24 from 9:00 a.m. to noon and will be hosted by Columbia Gulf with conference call facilities available.