

## **PAST COMMENTARY REGARDING STANDARDS NUMERING**

### **RxQ – 6/24/03 Final Minutes - Model Business Practices Format**

Mr. Minneman stated significant discussions regarding format for model business practices began at the Orlando subcommittee meetings. As a result of those discussions, Mr. Newbold prepared a formatting proposal, based largely on the historic practices used by GISB. Mr. Minneman stated it would be appropriate to agree on a format and numbering scheme to be applied to the model business practices. Two proposals, prepared by Mr. Newbold, were presented for discussion in the meeting materials. Mr. Newbold focused discussion on his revised proposal, as found in the supplemental material to the Executive Committee Book. Key elements of this proposal include use of the historical numbering scheme, the addition of elements to describe the applicable quadrant, and definitions that are not numbered.

Participants extensively discussed the proposal. Participants favored utilizing a four-digit numbering scheme. Participants agreed the definitions would be arranged alphabetically instead of numbered. Agreement could not be reached on the placement and numbering of principles. Mr. Behr suggested the Executive Committee focus its efforts on determining the numbering format for the proposed standards, not the whole layout of the document. Ms. Kiselewich agreed and stated Mr. Newbold's was a workable solution. Accordingly, Ms. Kiselewich moved, seconded by Mr. Behr, to approve the format of Mr. Newbold's revised proposal as drafted.

Participants discussed the motion. Mr. Young commented a common format for NAESB standards was a good idea, but approval of a specific proposal by the REQ and RGQ was premature. Mr. Young suggested sending the issue to a joint-quadrant committee to develop a plan that would be acceptable to all affected groups. Mr. Buccigross noted a joint committee does not exist, but reminded participants a decision by the REQ and RGQ on format is not binding on the wholesale quadrants. Accordingly, he suggested the issue would likely be revisited. Notwithstanding, Ms. Kiselewich stated the subject motion would be appropriate as an interim measure to allow the retail subcommittees to complete work on the pending model business practices.

Ms. Kiselewich amended the proposed motion to read as follows: to approve the format Mr. Newbold proposed as it stands, with the removal of reference to wholesale in column 'a' and changing the title to 'Proposed REQ/RGQ Numbering.' Mr. Behr accepted the amendment. [Attachment A reflects the modifications to Mr. Newbold's proposal, as identified in the motion.]

The motion passed with one vote in opposition.

## A Proposal for Numbering NAESB Standards (Revised 6/3/03)

### A Proposal for Numbering NAESB Standards:

Keeps benefits of GISB "x,y,z", but allows more detailed specification of subject matter and enables standardized numbering across Quadrants by inserting appropriate front-end codes..

| NAESB WGQ Numbering (Today)   |   |  |                    |
|---|---|--|--------------------|
| (x)<br>Subject  | Topic Areas (Flowing Gas)<br>(Not used for Numbering)   | (y)<br>Type  | (z)<br>Seq #       |
| <i>0 = General Standards</i><br><i>1 = Nominations Related Standards</i><br><i>2 = Flowing Gas Related Standards</i><br><i>3 = Invoicing Related Standards</i><br><i>4 = Electronic Delivery Mechanism Standards</i><br><i>5 = Capacity Release Related Standards</i><br><i>6 = Contracts</i><br><i>7 = Interpretations</i> | <i>1 = Pre-determined Allocation</i><br><i>2 = Allocation</i><br><i>3 = Shipper Imbalance</i><br><i>4 = Imbalance Netting and Trading</i><br><i>5 = Measurement Information</i><br><i>6 = Measured Volume Audit Statement</i> | 1 = Principles<br>2 = Definitions<br>3 = Standards<br>4 = Datasets - Data Dictionary<br>5 = Models | z = A sequential # |

| Front-end ID                |                                       | Proposed REQ Numbering   |  |   |                    |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------|
| (a)<br>Market               | (b)<br>Fuel                           | (w)<br>Subject   | (x)<br>Sub-Subject   | (y)<br>Type   | (z)<br>Seq #       |
| W = Wholesale<br>R = Retail | E = Electric<br>G = Gas<br>E/G = Both | <b>0 = Overall/General</b><br><b>1 = Creditworthiness</b><br><b>2 = etc.</b> | <b>A. Overview (Not Numbered)</b><br>Principles<br>Definitions<br><br><b>B. Model Business Practices</b><br><i>(Creditworthiness Sub-Subjects)</i><br><i>1 = Overall</i><br><i>2 - Determination of Risk Exposure</i><br><i>3 = Determination of Initial Unsecured Credit Limit</i><br><i>4 = Reconsideration</i><br><i>5 = Disqualification/Remedies</i><br><i>6 = Security Instruments</i><br><i>7 = Calling on Security</i><br><i>8 = Confidentiality</i> | 1 = Standards (MBP's)<br>2 = Datasets - Data Dictionary<br>3 = Models | z = A sequential # |

### How Established

| Front-end ID  |             | Proposed REQ Numbering                             |  |               |              |
|---------------|-------------|--|--|---------------|--------------|
| (a)<br>Market | (b)<br>Fuel | (w)<br>Subject                                     | (x)<br>Sub-Subject   | (y)<br>Type   | (z)<br>Seq # |
| Combined EC   | Combined EC | Combined EC<br>(Quad EC/Sub.can request additions) | <i>Set by first EC/Subcommittee to address subject</i><br><i>(Subsequent can ask for more)</i> | Use NAESB WGQ | Simple Seq # |

## **PAST COMMENTARY REGARDING STANDARDS NUMERING**

### **WEQ – 8/24/04 Draft Minutes - Standards Numbering**

The standards numbering proposal submitted by Mr. Dison was discussed. While not critical, Mr. Oberski stated the decision on standards numbering was important, especially with the possibility that NERC Standards could refer to NAESB Standards specifically. Ms. McQuade added that using a numbering system would make it easier to research a standard's history. Mr. Ingraham noted the proposal is very similar to the numbering system used for Nuclear Standards. It was noted that the proposal provides both order and flexibility. Mr. Dison explained the proposal would have a class, number and version (which would increment according to ratification). Ms. McQuade clarified that version and version date relate to when the standards are filed with the FERC, since the FERC will likely incorporate a version by reference.

Mr. Norris moved, seconded by Mr. Dison to accept the three-part numbering framework consisting of class, number and version. The motion passed unanimously. The NAESB Office will modify the framework to include specific elements for prefix, version and date.