

Publication Process Review Task Force Report to the Executive Committee

Last reviewed: 3/4526/2002
Last modified: 3/4526/2002

· Executive Summary

During the August 2001 GISB Executive Committee Meeting, concern was expressed by some members about the delay between the perceived publication date (June 18, 2001) of GISB Business Practice Standards – Version 1.5 and the actual date the publication materials became available (August 18, 2001). **The implementation of certain standards in Version 1.4 stated that it should occur** 9 months following the publication date. The June 18 date was actually the date the last ratification ballot was due and ultimately, an EC motion to declared August 18, 2001 **as** the official publication date. Two subsequent errata **notices** to Version 1.5 have also been posted since the initial publication.

Version 1.5 publication had been delayed by EC several times to include a wide variety standards including those pertaining to Order 637 related work, Title Transfer Tracking and Imbalance Netting & Trading. While well intentioned, these delays along with the overall size of the GISB standards work product that had been developed over the years made publication of Version 1.5 more challenging than some of the other previous versions.

As a means to better understand the publication process and to provide guidance for future publications, the Executive Committee passed the following motion creating the Publication Process Review Task Force at its August 23, 2001 meeting:

Create a publication process review task force charged with examining the existing publication process and suggesting improvements to the process. The task force will report its findings to the executive committee at the October 2001 EC meeting and conclude its work by no later than December 2001.

Several sets of flow charts, notes and diagrams detailing existing publication processes and proposed publication processes are included in the appendices of this report.

The task force made a conscious effort to work within the existing GISB Operating Procedures (GISBops).

The recommendations contained within this report in no way should be seen as a criticism of past publication efforts. As a continuous improvement organization, it is logical that from time to time those procedures should be reviewed and changed, if warranted. The world and technologies used on a day to day basis have changed dramatically since the publication of the first version of Business Practice Standards.

The Task Force sees publication as one of the core **responsibilities** of the NAESB office; the Standards are the organization's main work product. To implement these recommendations, it is critical that office staffing be sufficient to conduct the work at hand. Staffing, as well as the realignment of office responsibilities, are the purview of the Board and Executive Director, respectively. Absent increased staffing, given the incorporation of three additional quadrants, future publication efforts will grow more daunting, if not impossible.

Will follow along lines of prior PPRTF presentation to EC

· Recommendations from the PPRTF

Publication should occur every year.

The best date to publish each year is July 31.

Development and maintenance of Expanded Logs to track requests through the NAESB process through Publication.

Minor Clarifications and Corrections should be handled similarly to Request for Standards and Interpretations (i.e., forms & logs)

Enhancements to Request Numbering system to identify status of a given Request within the standards development process.

Appending the 'As Approved' Recommendation Forms to the EC meeting minutes.

Expedited Preparation of Meeting Minutes

Starting with the July 31, 2002 publication, the format and availability of Contracts Standards manual more consistent with other Standards Manuals

Creation of printed Standards Manuals and CDs should be a post-publication process.

The next set of Standards Manuals should be published as NAESB - Wholesale Gas Quadrant Version 1.6

All Clarifications & Interpretations (e.g., Requests & Recommendations) should only be referred to as 'Interpretations'.

[More frequent Ratification Votes](#)

· Open Issues to be resolved in the next year

Should there be a universal request numbering system?

Should there be a universal standards/model business practices numbering system?
If so, how are quadrant(s) specific standards indicated?

Should there be a separate standards/model business practices publication for each quadrant?
If so, should all quadrant publications be issued on the same date?

Development of criteria for versioning of NAESB Standards Manuals

· Narrative containing support for each of the specific recommendations

Publication should occur every year.

Based upon past experience...

The best date to publish each year is July 31.

A July 31 publication date syncs up with ANSI...

Development and maintenance of Expanded Logs to track requests through the NAESB process through Publication.

The expanded request Logs should be developed and include ~~on~~ all existing open requests. There is no need to recast completed requests. The logs should be organized by subject matter (Requests for Standards, Requests for Interpretations, and Requests for Minor Clarifications and Corrections) and then within the subject matter, they should be organized based on the year the request is submitted.~~annual organization of logs~~

One of the issues identified by members of the task force was the need to have one place to see the status of any particular request. The logs previously posted reflected the updated status after each subcommittee meeting in which it was discussed. The recommendation is to expand that functionality by providing status codes, links to minutes and other related documents, thus making the log a dynamic document.

Minor Clarifications and Corrections should be handled similarly to Request for Standards and Interpretations (i.e., forms & logs)

Historically, Minor Clarifications and Corrections have been brought to the attention of the EC either through an e-mail to the NAESB office from a company or from a subcommittee. The task force recommend that the submission of the request for a Minor Clarification and Correction should follow the same submission procedures through the use of a Request Forms. Upon such submission to the NAESB office should assign it a comparable request number and ~~should be prepared~~ to track the request ~~and process activity should be tracked~~ through use of the Request for Minor Clarifications and Corrections Logs. In so doing, there is a consistent tracking system for both the NAESB membership as well as ~~This is a matter of consistency designed to ensure that Minor Clarifications and Corrections are presented to those~~ preparing the publication. ~~in the same format as other Recommendations.~~ In no way does this imply that a more rigorous "17-2" type process as is used for handling Standards and Interpretations Requests.

Enhancements to Request Numbering system to identify status of a given Request within the standards development process.

One of the premises to the Expanded Requests Logs is the ability to easily identify the status of the request during the processing of it from the time it is submitted to the point at which it is published in a version of the standards. Prior to a recommendation on a request being acted upon by the EC, the status is reflected through an indicator of the subcommittee in which it is being processed. Once the request recommendation is acted upon by the EC, a system is being recommended to add a moniker at the end of the request that tracks the status thereafter which will indicate if the recommendation has been approved by the EC (as possibly modified by the EC), declined, or failed. After that, the moniker will change to reflect the status in the publication process.

Appending the 'As Approved' Recommendation Forms to the EC meeting minutes.

At various times, the EC has made modifications to the recommendation that is presented. In order to ensure agreement as to the final outcome of the EC action, it is recommended that the final results are attachments to the draft / final minutes for the subject EC meeting. As a part of the approval of the draft minutes, the attachments would be approved. In no way is this an opportunity to change the standards but merely to make administrative corrections to the final results. Subsequent to such approval, the member ratification would occur.

Expedited Preparation of Meeting Minutes

In order to expedite member ratifications and eliminate time delays, especially towards publication deadline, it is necessary for the above process to be handled expeditiously. It is important for the draft minutes and attachments for each Executive Committee meeting to be issued with 10 business days after the EC meeting. This will provide sufficient time for those review the documentation.

Starting with the July 31, 2002 publication, the format and availability of Contracts Standards manual more consistent with other Standards Manuals

Consistency & Higher Visibility

Creation of printed Standards Manuals and CDs should be a post-publication process.

20 days time saving

The next set of Standards Manuals should be published as NAESB - Wholesale Gas Quadrant Version 1.6

Since other quadrants will not have had a chance to ratify standards or model business practices, ~~this the version to be published July 31, 2002 will be is still essentially a~~ NAESB - Wholesale Gas Quadrant ~~GISB~~ publication. While the PPRTF has discussed whether a change in format or a significant event should be the catalyst for moving to a new version, i.e. Version 2.0, it has not reached any conclusions. At this point, the general consensus is that the versioning questioned should be deferred until other Quadrants have ratified Standards and/or Model Business Practices and their input can be incorporated.

All Clarifications & Interpretations (e.g., Requests & Recommendations) should only be referred to as 'Interpretations'.

To alleviate confusion, All Clarifications & Interpretations (e.g., Requests & Recommendations) should only be referred to as 'Interpretations'. This is; already used this way in Standards Manuals.

More frequent Ratification Votes

The general past practice of the GISB office has been to send ratification ballots to the membership after every other EC meeting. When the EC met every month, this meant more frequent ballots. In more recent years, the EC has met every other month. Further, standards votes did not take place at every meeting so what appeared to be more erratic timing of ratification votes resulted. The ratification vote is the last key event to occur prior to incorporation of changes to the standards manuals. Historically, ratification ballots have never resulted in a rejected standards so there is some validity to beginning publication work prior to completion of the vote but there is always the risk that work effort could be wasted on a rejected standard.

Past publication efforts have been more "batch" oriented, i.e., the entire batch of standards ratified since the last publication has been handed off to the publication team as one of the initial steps in preparation of the standards manuals. This has lessened the impact of infrequent ratification votes. The PPRTF recommends that publication preparation becomes a "continuous" process with the general thought that work broken into smaller batches is less prone to minor errors. Further, the work papers supporting more frequent ratification ballots are likely to be voluminous meaning that a more thorough review of publication input materials could occur. This should theoretically catch any upstream errors that would not be caught during the publication process.

· **Appendicesx**

Appendix A) Publication References contained within the GISBOPs

Procedures for Communications with the FERC dated August 18, 1997.

4.0 PUBLICATION SCHEDULE FOR STANDARDS

a. The standards manuals and standards booklets shall be updated and new versions published no more than twice per year.

b. In the interim period between publication of standards manuals, it is recognized that, the following documents will be sent to the Secretary of the FERC no more than six times per year:

- 1) Final Standards Actions and member ratified voting record
- 2) Final Interpretations and member ratified voting record
- 3) Standards Request Log
- 4) Clarifications Log

Procedures for Standards Development and Maintenance dated August 18, 1997.

4.0 RESULTS – (last two sentences at the bottom of page 3)

Member ratified actions will be posted on the Final Action page of the GISB Home Page. Two times per year these actions will be incorporated into the implementation manuals.

Procedures for Adopting Standards dated August 18, 1997.

4.0 PUBLICATION OF STANDARDS

Following approval of a standards proposal by GISB Members, the Executive Director shall publish and issue it as either a new standard, an amendment to an existing standard or a new edition of an existing standard, as appropriate.

- Appendix ~~AB~~) Existing Recommendation Processing
Flowchart and Accompanying Notes
- Appendix ~~BC~~) NAESB Request Logs
Examples and Accompanying Notes
- Appendix ~~CD~~) Minor Clarifications and Corrections Processing
Flowchart and Accompanying Notes
- Appendix ~~DE~~) Proposed Recommendation Processing
Flowchart and Accompanying Notes
- Appendix ~~EF~~) Proposed Publication Process
Flowchart and Accompanying Notes
Timeline & Schedule