



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, EMAIL - gisb@aol.com
HOME PAGE www.gisb.org

PROPOSED INTERPRETATION FOR REQUEST C97015

Request:

Do GISB Standards 1.2.1, 1.3.5, 1.3.7, and 1.3.27 mean that a pipeline can require a service requester to place into one GISB standard EDI document (ST to SE loop) (GISB Standard 1.4.1 Implementation Guide version 1.0, 1.1, and/or 1.2) nominations with only the identical beginning and ending dates, which nominations are balanced with respect to receipts and deliveries over the identical beginning and ending date range; and impose a practice where if the shipper does not provide their nominations in this fashion, reject, as unbalanced, all such nominations even though the total of nominations present in the database (for that contract or shipper; or in the case of pathed pipelines, the paths as applicable) at the time of a processing deadline is/are balanced?

Can a pipeline require that a shipper using GISB standard EDI nominations datasets (GISB standard 1.4.1) submit transactions other than the changed (i.e., re-nominate non-changed individual nominations) nomination(s)?

Can a pipeline require a shipper to submit more than one line item in a GISB standard nomination document (GISB Standard 1.4.1)?

When a service requester is seeking to submit a changed nomination, can a pipeline employing the non-pathed or pathed non-threaded models require a that a shipper submit transactions other than the changed nomination (i.e., re-nominate non-changed individual

Restated Request:

1. "Do GISB Standards 1.2.1, 1.3.5, 1.3.7, and 1.3.27 mean that a pipeline can require a service requester to place into one GISB standard EDI document (ST to SE loop) (GISB Standard 1.4.1 Implementation Guide version 1.0, 1.1, and/or 1.2) nominations with only the identical beginning and ending dates and impose a practice where if the shipper does not provide their nominations in this fashion, reject such nominations?"
2. "Can a pipeline require that a shipper using GISB standard EDI nominations datasets (GISB standard 1.4.1) submit transactions other than the changed (i.e., re-nominate non-changed individual nominations) nomination(s)?"
3. "Can a pipeline require a shipper to submit more than one line item in a GISB standard nomination document (GISB Standard 1.4.1)?"
4. "When a service requester is seeking to submit a changed nomination, can a pipeline employing the non-pathed or pathed non-threaded models require a that a shipper submit transactions other than the changed nomination (i.e., re-nominate non-changed individual nominations)?"

Proposed Standard:

1. The listed standards do not require that nomination line items transmitted within a single EDI document have identical beginning and ending dates. The listed standards should not be interpreted as permitting a practice where the Transportation Service Provider would reject nominations solely on the basis of their not having identical beginning and ending dates, (i.e. subject to possible balancing requirements with respect to the nomination instructions).
-



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, EMAIL - gisb@aol.com

HOME PAGE www.gisb.org

2. A Transportation Service Provider (without regard to which nomination Model Type is employed) can not require that a shipper using GISB standard EDI nominations datasets (GISB standard 1.4.1) submit transactions other than the changed (i.e., re-nominate non-changed individual nominations) nomination(s).

3. A pipeline can not require a shipper to submit more than one line item in a GISB standard EDI document when the single line item conveys a complete instruction that can stand alone. There are situations among the model types where multiple line items may be required to be in place before an instruction is complete.

For instance, for balancing requirements, a business practice might require that a line item nomination, for a non-pathed model, that reduces the receipt quantity should be accompanied by one or more line items, for the same model, that reduce the corresponding delivery quantity, to bring the contract into balance. In another scenario, a service requester may want to change the scheduling priority for a single line item. This change of priority would not require any other line items to be submitted in order for the instruction to be complete.

4. Transportation Service Provider (without regard to which nomination Model Type is employed) can not require that a shipper using GISB standard EDI nominations datasets (GISB Standard 1.4.1) submit transactions other than the changed (i.e., re-nominate non-changed individual nominations) nomination(s).

(Excerpted from the Interpretations Subcommittee Minutes of October 3, 1997)