



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Page 7: All of the changes suggested by Ms. Davis and Mr. Bartholomot for page 7 were accepted. Ms. McCain suggested that the term “regulating entity” be replaced with “regulatory body” in the second full paragraph on page 7. In addition a sentence was added to the last paragraph of Section 9: “There was no discussion to address Ms. Van Pelt’s concerns.”

Mr. Godding’s attendance was recorded on page 8.

Ms. Van Pelt moved, seconded by Mr. Young, to adopt the minutes as revised. The motion passed without objection. The final minutes are posted on the NAESB website: <http://www.naesb.org/pdf2/etariff020107fm.doc>.¹

2. Presentation by Jim Buccigross on NAESB Process

Next, Mr. Buccigross made a presentation on the NAESB Standards Development Process using the presentation posted as a work paper for this meeting: [NAESB Standards Development Process](#).

Mr. Love noted that participants who represent the oil pipeline industry do not have a place to vote within NAESB’s process. Ms. McQuade stated that the oil pipeline participants would need to designate a Quadrant and Segment in order to participate in the balanced voting process. If the oil pipeline participants choose not to designate a Quadrant and Segment, they are free to represent their positions during the meeting and in the form of comments.

3. Presentation and Discussion of FERC Work Paper and FERC Requirements

Mr. Goldenberg stated that the views expressed by the FERC Staff during this meeting were not necessarily the views of the FERC or any FERC Commissioner. Mr. Goldenberg referenced the document submitted by FERC Staff: [FERC Working Document](#) which is a proposed e-Tariff framework drafted by FERC staff. Mr. Goldenberg stated that after the February 1, 2007 meeting the FERC Staff determined that none of the affected industries preferred a solution where FERC would provide tariff software. The document posted as a work paper for this meeting is FERC Staff’s proposal of the data needed in addition to the actual tariff filings, transmittal letters, etc. Mr. Goldenberg stated that standards are needed to set forth what information will be transmitted to the FERC and how that information will be transmitted. He noted that under certain conditions FERC Staff was willing to accept an entire document option: a single data base record with a .pdf file as one of the record’s fields. Under this option, the company would need to refile the entire agreement as a single record for every proposed revision. FERC Staff is also willing to accept a sheet based filing pursuant to standards developed that describe what information will be included as metadata and how the information will be transmitted.

Mr. Novak, identifying himself as one who would use eTariff to analyze tariff changes, asked if the expectations for eTariff system functionality that have been identified throughout RM01-5 are still in play even if section based filings are not required. Mr. Goldenberg encouraged parties with such concerns to comment within the process. Mr. Novak then asked if filing section based tariffs would still be acceptable. Mr. Goldenberg stated that the FERC Staff would be willing to accept section based filings. Mr. Hairston asked if FERC staff would be willing to consider an alternative approach the FERC Distributed Software. Mr. Goldenberg stated that FERC Staff was participating in this process in order to consider alternatives to the Distributed Software.

¹ Please note that to the extent that there were conflicts in the adopted changes best attempts were made to reconcile the language.