

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting - WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

North American Energy Standards Board

Executive Committee Meeting

Wholesale Electric Quadrant
Retail Gas Quadrant
Retail Electric Quadrant
Wholesale Gas Quadrant

February 24-26, 2004

Houston, TX

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting – WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
October 7-9, 2003

Table Of Contents

	Description of Materials
Tab 1.	Welcome & Opening Remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• EC Members and Terms• Schedule of 2004 Meetings
Tab 2.	Agendas
Tab 3	Executive committee Minutes: December 10-12, 2003
Tab 4	Triage Report and Requests and EC Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Triage Report s• Executive Committee Report• Requests R03033 – R04010• Board Request for Notational Vote
Tab 5.	GECTF Issues List

Wholesale Electric Quadrant Materials

Tab 6.	WEQ Annual Plan and Subcommittee Updates
Tab 7.	Seams Catalog
Tab 8.	Transition Issues – NERC Policies 3, 5 and 9

Retail Electric and Retail Gas Quadrants Materials

Tab 9.	2004 Annual Plans for REQ and RGQ
Tab 10.	Subcommittee Mission Statements
Tab 11.	Subcommittee Reports
Tab 12.	Gas Practice Inventory Task force

Wholesale Gas Quadrant Materials

Tab 13.	WGQ 2004 Annual Plan
Tab 14.	Subcommittee Updates
Tab 15	FERC Order on creditworthiness



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

WHOLESALE ELECTRIC QUADRANT (WEQ) -- Tuesday February 24 – 10:00 am to 4:00 pm

Agenda Item	Description	Tab	Document	Action
1	Welcome	1	Antitrust Statement	Given by counsel
			List of EC members	For review and information
			List of 2004 Meetings	For review and information
2	WEQ Draft Agenda and Minutes	2	WEQ Agenda	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt
		3	WEQ Minutes – 12/10/03	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt
3	Triage Reports	4	Triage reports and requests	Review and determine assignment to subcommittees
			• Request R04005	
			• Request R04006	
			• Request R04007	
			• Request R04011	
			• Request R03035 to the WGQ	
4	Subcommittee Updates	6	WEQ 2004 Annual Plan	Determine if changes are needed
		6	Most Recent IIPTF documents	Review of most recent IIPTF documents
		6	E-tag report and TSIN Report	Review most recent Information Technology Documents
		6	OASIS Recommendation and ballot	• Vote on recommendation on OASIS standards
				• Review CIBP proposed standards currently out for comment
				• Presentation on OASIS 2 vision
		6	CIBP recommendation and supporting documents	
		6	Two ESS presentations on OASIS 2	
		6	No document	Discussion of meeting in March 5 in Houston
		6	Most recent SRS documents	Review of most recent SRS documents
7	Seams Catalog resulting for JIC meeting 2-18-04	Determination of next steps regarding Seams assignments		
5	Issues List	Review of most recent GECTF documents		



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

WHOLESALE ELECTRIC QUADRANT (WEQ) -- Tuesday February 24 – 10:00 am to 4:00 pm

Agenda Item	Description	Tab	Document	Action	
5	JIC Meeting Summary		No documents	Review Assignment of three requests	
		7	Seams Catalog with assignments	Review Seams Catalog Results	
6	Nominations and Elections		No documents	Identify BPS co-chair to serve with Bob Goss	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BPS Chair • GECTF Chair 		Identify WEQ GECTF co-chair to assume seat vacated by Gary Jackson	
7	New Business				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition Issues - NERC Policies 3, 5, 9 	8	Transition Issues – NERC Policies 3, 5, 9	Materials provided by NERC OC Committee leadership to help identify business practices in NERC Policies 3, 5 and 9
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISO/RTO WEQ representation 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future Meetings <p>Joint with NERC MC March 24 in Nashville</p> <p>NAESB Board March 18 in Houston</p> <p>Next WEQ EC meeting May 4</p>			Identify possible agenda items
8	Adjourn			Meeting should adjourn by 4:00 pm	



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

JOINT SESSION OF RETAIL GAS AND ELECTRIC QUADRANTS -- Wednesday February 25, 10:00 am to 3:00 pm

Agenda Item	Description	Tab	Document	Action
1	Welcome – Start 10:00 am	1	Antitrust Statement	Given by counsel
			List of EC members	For review and information
			List of 2004 Meetings	For review and information
2	WEQ Draft Agenda and Minutes	2	Joint REQ/RGQ Agenda	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt
		3	REQ/RGQ Minutes – 12/11/03	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt
3	Update on various NAESB activities		No documents	For information and review
			No documents	
		4	Request to the Managing Committee	
			No documents	
			No documents	
4	Review and Modification of 2004 Annual Plans, as appropriate	9	REQ Annual Plan RGQ Annual Plan	Review both plans and determine recommended changes as needed.
5	Approval of subcommittee mission statements	10	Mission Statements	Review and approve as needed
6	Subcommittee reports	11	CPS Recent Documents	For information and review
			SUIS Recent Documents	For information and review
			TEIS Recent Documents	For information and review



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

JOINT SESSION OF RETAIL GAS AND ELECTRIC QUADRANTS -- Wednesday February 25, 10:00 am to 3:00 pm

Agenda Item	Description	Tab	Document	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Gas-Electric Coordination Task Force (GECTF)	5	Issues List	Review of most recent GECTF documents
7	Discussion on need for subcommittee leadership		No documents	
8	Other Business		No documents	Identify possible agenda items
9	Adjourn			Meeting should adjourn by 3:00 pm

RETAIL GAS QUADRANT (RGQ) -- Wednesday February 25, 9:00 am to 10:00 am

Agenda Item	Description	Tab	Document	Action
1	Welcome	1	Antitrust Statement List of EC members List of 2004 Meetings	Given by counsel For review and information For review and information
	RGQ Draft Agenda and Minutes	2	RGQ Agenda	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt
		3	RGQ Minutes – 12/11/03	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt
2	Quadrant Size: Discussion and possible vote		No documents	Discuss and possible vote to adopt recommendation crafted during the meeting
3	Gas Practices Inventory Task Force	12	Most recent GPITF documents	For review and information
4	Adjourn			Meeting should adjourn by 10:00 am



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

RETAIL ELECTRIC QUADRANT (REQ) -- Wednesday, February 25, 2004 – 3:00 to 4:00 pm Central

Agenda Item	Description	Tab	Document	Action
1	Welcome	1	Antitrust Statement	Given by counsel
			List of EC members	For review and information
			List of 2004 Meetings	For review and information
	RGQ Draft Agenda and Minutes	2	REQ Agenda	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt
		3	REQ Minutes – 12/11/03	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt
2	Topics to be determined during the meeting		No documents	Discuss topics as they are identified in the meeting
3	Adjourn			Meeting should adjourn by 4:00 pm



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

WHOLESALE GAS QUADRANT (WGQ) -- Thursday February 26 – 9:00 am to 4:00 pm

Agenda Item	Description	Tab	Document	Action		
1	Welcome	1	Antitrust Statement	Given by counsel		
			List of EC members	For review and information		
			List of 2004 Meetings	For review and information		
2	WGQ Draft Agenda and Minutes	2	WGQ Agenda	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt		
			3	WGQ Minutes – 12/12/03	Simple Majority Vote to Adopt	
3	Triage Subcommittee Recommendations	4	Triage reports and requests	Review and determine assignment to subcommittees		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adoption of quadrant and subcommittee assignments for R03033, R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003, R04004, R04008, and R04010 Board of Directors action on R03035 			
4	Review of Board Approved 2004 Annual Plan and Assignments	13	WGQ 2004 Annual Plan	Determine if changes are needed		
5	Subcommittee and Task Force Updates and Review of 2004 Annual Plan	14	Business Practices Subcommittee	Most recent documents provided		
			Contracts Subcommittee	No documents provided		
			EDM Subcommittee	No documents provided – please refer to TEIS efforts in tab 11		
			Information Requirements Subcommittee	Most recent documents provided		
			Technical and ANSI X12 Subcommittee	Most recent documents provided		
			Interpretations Subcommittee	No documents provided		
			Gas Electric Coordination Task Force	5	Issues List	Review of most recent GECTF documents



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

WHOLESALE GAS QUADRANT (WGQ) -- Thursday February 26 – 9:00 am to 4:00 pm

Agenda Item	Description	Tab	Document	Action
6	New Business			
	• Discussion on recent FERC Creditworthiness NOPR in RM04-4-000	15	FERC Order	Review for possible changes to NAESB standards
	• Update on FERC Conference on Natural Gas Interchangeability		NAESB Presentation	For information and review
	• Next WGQ EC Meeting May 6		No documents	Identify possible agenda items
7	Adjourn			Meeting should adjourn by 4:00 pm

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting - WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

TAB 1

Welcome and Opening Remarks

EC Members & Terms

Schedule of 2004 Meetings

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting – WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

- The NAESB Office is hosting the February 24-26 Executive Committee meetings in downtown Houston at the Crowne Plaza (Downtown Hotel). The meeting arrangements are posted and were contained in the meeting announcement.

- For further assistance please reach:

Veronica Thomason at (713) 356 - 0060

- The officers presiding over the Executive Committee meeting are:

Jim Buccigross	- Chairman, presenting the WGQ
Steve Cobb	- WEQ Second Vice Chairman
Lou Oberski	- WEQ 2004 Vice Chairman
Mike Novak	- RGQ Vice Chairman
Ruth Kiselewich	- REQ Vice Chairman
Rae McQuade	- Executive Director and COO
Todd Oncken	- Antitrust Counsel

- Transcripts will be available and can be ordered either during the meeting, or by contacting the NAESB office after the meeting for further information, 713-356-0060.

- To participate by phone, please call the NAESB Office (713-356-0060, naesb@aol.com) for conference calling information.

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting - WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

Antitrust Guidelines

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting – WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

1. Antitrust Guidelines

- The antitrust guidelines will be covered by Mr. Todd Oncken. The points are:

Antitrust guidelines direct meeting participants to avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anticompetitive behavior including: restraint of trade and conspiracies to monopolize, unfair or deceptive business acts or practices, price discriminations, division of markets, allocation of production, imposition of boycotts, and exclusive dealing arrangements.

Any views, opinions or positions presented or discussed by meeting participants are the views of the individual meeting participants and their organizations. Any such views, opinions or positions are not the views, positions or opinions of NAESB, the NAESB Board of Directors, or any NAESB Committee or Subcommittee, unless specifically noted otherwise.

As it is not the purpose of the meeting to discuss any antitrust topics, if anyone believes we are straying into improper areas, please let us know and we will redirect the conversation.

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting - WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

EC Members & Terms



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

**NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
2003 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TERMS - Wholesale Gas Quadrant
As of December 5, 2003**

End User Segment		Term Ending
Diane McVicker	Sr. Principal Fuel Supply Analyst, Salt River Project	Dec 31, 2005
Gary Hinners	Director of Natural Gas Regulatory Issues, Reliant Energy Services, Inc.	Dec 31, 2005
Kelly Daly	Partner, Stinson, Morrison & Hecker, rep. Arizona Public Service Co.	Dec 31, 2004
Dona Gussow	Contracts Coordinator, Florida Power and Light	Dec 31, 2003
Tina Burnett	Natural Gas Operations Administrator, The Boeing Company	Dec 31, 2003
Distribution Segment		
Rodger Schwecke	Pipeline Products Projects Manager, Southern California Gas	Dec 31, 2005
Dolores Chezar	Director, Regulatory Policy, KeySpan Energy	Dec 31, 2005
Chris Maturo	Director, Operations Integration, NiSource, Inc.	Dec 31, 2004
Mike Novak	Assistant General Manager, National Fuel Gas Distribution	Dec 31, 2003
Steve Sullivan	Regulatory Manager of Gas Supply, Consolidated Edison of NY	Dec 31, 2003
Pipeline Segment		
Mark Gracey	Consultant - Transportation Services, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co.	Dec 31, 2005
Bill Griffith	Director, Transmission & Storage, Colorado Interstate Gas Co.	Dec 31, 2005
Dale Davis	Consultant, Williams Gas Pipeline	Dec 31, 2004
Randy Young	Director Regulatory Compliance, Gulf South Pipeline	Dec 31, 2003
Kim Van Pelt	NAESB Coordinator, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line	Dec 31, 2003
Producer Segment		
Jim Busch	Director of Energy Policy and Regulation, BP Energy Company	Dec 31, 2005
Paul Keeler	Managing Attorney, Marketing, Burlington Resources Trading	Dec 31, 2005
Sheri Heslington	Dominion Exploration & Production, Inc.	Dec 31, 2004
Richard Smith	Regulatory, ExxonMobil Gas & Power Marketing	Dec 31, 2003
Mike Shepard	General Counsel, Mewbourne Oil Company	Dec 31, 2003
Services Segment		
Suzanne Calcagno	Associate Director - Regulatory Compliance, UBS Warburg Energy	Dec 31, 2005
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y	Dec 31, 2005
Leigh Spangler	CEO, Latitude Technologies	Dec 31, 2004
Jim Buccigross	Vice President, 8760 Inc.	Dec 31, 2003
Keith Sappenfield	Regional Director - US Regulatory Affairs, EnCana Marketing (USA) Inc.	Dec 31, 2003

OFFICERS: Jim Buccigross is 2003 chairman of the Executive Committee, Mike Novak is 2003 RGQ vice chairman; Jim Minneman is the 2003 REQ vice chairman, and Steve Corneli is the 2003 WEQ vice chairman.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

**NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
2003 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TERMS - Retail Electric Quadrant
As of December 5, 2003**

Distribution Segment		Term Ending:
Ruth Kiselewich	Director Special Projects and Supplier Services, Baltimore Gas & Electric Company (MAAC NERC Region)	Dec 31, 2005
Terry Moran	Regulatory Issues Manager, PSEG (MAAC NERC Region)	Dec 31, 2005
William Newbold	Strategy Manager of Electric Choice Implementation Team, Detroit Edison (ECAR NERC Region)	Dec 31, 2004
Jonathan Kubler	Manager of Pricing and Rates, Georgia Power Company	Dec 31, 2004
End User Segment		Term Ending:
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2005
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2005
Barbara Alexander	Consumer Affairs Consultant, State of Maine Public Advocate	Dec 31, 2004
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2004
Services Segment		Term Ending:
Jim Minneman	Director of Business Services, PPL Solutions LLC	Dec 31, 2005
Dick Brooks	Independent Consultant	Dec 31, 2005
Rob Connell	Manager of Commercial Systems Applications, Electric Reliability Council of Texas	Dec 31, 2004
Mark S. Jarrett	Team Leader - Market Information and Analysis, Market Intelligence, Southern Company	Dec 31, 2004
Supplier Segment		Term Ending:
Bill Barkas	Manager of Retail State Government Relations, Dominion Retail, Inc.	Dec 31, 2005
Margarida Williamson	Senior Counsel, Calpine PowerAmerica, LP	Dec 31, 2005
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2004
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2004



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
2003 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TERMS - Wholesale Electric Quadrant
As of December 5, 2003

End User Segment		Term	Sub-Segment
John Hughes	Director Technical Affairs, Electricity Consumers Resource Council (ELCON)	12-31-2005	Large Industrial
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y	12-31-2004	Large Industrial
Steve Sayuk	Manager Americas Supply, Power & Gas Services Group, ExxonMobil Power & Gas Services, Inc.	12-31-2004	End Use (Self Generation)
Randy Corbin	Assistant Director Analytical Services, Ohio Consumers' Counsel	12-31-2005	Commercial/Residential
Paul Jett	Manager of Electric System Operation Customer Choice Transition, Cinergy Services Inc.	12-31-2005	End Use (In other segments as well)
Lou Ann Westerfield	Policy Strategist, Idaho Public Utilities Commission, rep. National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners	12-31-2004	Regulators
Distribution/LSE Segment		Term	Sub-Segment
Thomas Ringenbach	Manager Business Standards, American Electric Power Service Corporation	12-31-2004	IOU
Jack Leonard	Director, Transmission Management, Exelon PECO Energy	12-31-2005	IOU
Patrick W. Frazier	Vice President of Energy Operations, American Municipal Power Ohio Inc.	12-31-2004	Muni/Coop
Daniel E. Cooper	Engineering Manager, Michigan Public Power Agency	12-31-2005	Muni/Coop
Syd Berwager	Industry Restructuring Project Manager, Bonneville Power Administration/Power Business Line	12-31-2005	Other
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y	12-31-2004	Competitive Retailer
Generation Segment		Term	Sub-Segment:
Bob Goss	Deputy Assistant Administrator of Power Resources, Southeastern Power Administration	12-31-2004	Fed/State/Prov.
Louis Oberski	Transmission Manager, Dominion Energy Marketing Inc.	12-31-2004	IOU
Tony Reed	Project Manager, Southern Company Generation and Energy Marketing	12-31-2005	IOU
Barry Green	Manager US Regulatory Affairs, Ontario Power Generation	12-31-2004	Merchant
Steven B. Corneli	Director of Regulatory Affairs, NRG Power Marketing Inc.	12-31-2005	Merchant
William J. Gallagher	General Manager of Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	12-31-2005	Muni/Coop
Marketer/Broker Segment		Term	Sub-Segment:
Gary L. Jackson	Senior Manager External Markets and Policy, Tennessee Valley Authority Bulk Power Trading	12-31-2005	Fed/State/Prov
Joel Dison	Project Manager, Southern Company Generation	12-31-2005	IOU Affiliated



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

	and Energy Marketing		
Clay A. Norris	Division Director, Planning, North Carolina Municipal Power Agency #1	12-31-2004	Muni/Coop
Charles Yeung	Director of Business Standards, Reliant Resources	12-31-2004	Not IOU Affiliated
Alan Johnson	Senior Policy Analyst, Mirant	12-31-2005	Not IOU Affiliated
Michael F. Gildea	Director of Regulatory Policy, Duke Energy North America	12-31-2004	IOU Affiliated

Transmission Segment		Term	Sub-Segment:
Steven C. Cobb	Manager Grid Access and Scheduling Services, Salt River Project	12-31-2004	Fed/State/Prov.
Darrell Gerrard	Vice President Transmission Systems, PacifiCorp	12-31-2004	IOU
John E. Lucas	Manager, Transmission Services, Southern Company	12-31-2005	IOU
Mary Ellen Paravalos	Manager ITC Development, National Grid USA	12-31-2005	ITC
Dan Klempel	Director Transmission Regulatory Compliance, Basin Electric Power Cooperative	12-31-2005	Muni/Coop
Julie Voeck	Manager Strategic Policy and Planning, American Transmission Company	12-31-2004	ITC



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

**NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
2003 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TERMS - Retail Gas Quadrant
As of December 5, 2003**

DISTRIBUTORS SEGMENT		TERM END:
Nancy Cianflone	Director, Marketing Services Area, KeySpan Energy	Dec 31, 2003
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2003
Leslie H. Nishida	Gas Federal Regulatory Supervisor, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation	Dec 31, 2003
Michael Novak	Assistant General Manager, National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation	Dec 31, 2004
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2004
Steven M. Zavodnick	Senior Engineer Gas Operations, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company	Dec 31, 2003

END USERS SEGMENT		TERM END:
Bruce M. Hayes	Senior Regulatory Analyst, Ohio Consumers' Counsel	Dec 31, 2004
Tina Burnett	Chair, Northwest Industrial Gas Users Association	Dec 31, 2004
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2004
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2003
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2003
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2003

SERVICE PROVIDERS SEGMENT		TERM END:
Rod Sipe	President, New Science Partners	Dec 31, 2004
Donald L. Sytsma	Vice President, R.J. Rudden Associates, Inc.	Dec 31, 2004
George M. Behr	Director, Energy Services Group, Inc.	Dec 31, 2004
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2003
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2003
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2003

SUPPLIER SEGMENT		
Suzanne Calcagno	Associate Director, Regulatory Compliance, UBS Warburg Energy, LLC	Dec 31, 2003
Barbara A. Fatina	Vice President, Exelon Energy	Dec 31, 2004
Marcy McCain	Project Manager - Regulatory Affairs, Duke Energy Gas Transmission, LLP	Dec 31, 2003
Richard Zollars	Director, Data and Information, Dominion Retail, Inc.	Dec 31, 2004
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2004
V A C A N C Y		Dec 31, 2003



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
2003 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ALTERNATES - Wholesale Gas Quadrant
As of December 5, 2003

End User Segment

Gary Duede	Arizona Public Service Company
Curt Brechtel	Arizona Public Service Company
Joel Greene	Partner, Energy Advocates, LLP
Mike Robison	Florida Power & Light Company
Craig Chancellor	National Director - Gas Regulatory, Calpine Corp.

Distribution Segment

Craig Colombo	Dominion Resources
Jennifer Deegan	Federal Regulatory Affairs, Washington Gas
Rick Ishikawa	Transportation Contract Administrator, Southern California Gas Company
Bill Oppenheim	Manager Asset Optimization, PECO Energy
Marjorie Perlman	Director, Federal Regulatory Proceedings, Energy East Management Corporation (Rochester Gas & Electric)

Pipeline Segment

Bill Grygar	Vice President, CMS Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line
Scott Hansen	Questar Pipeline Company
Iris King	Director, Technical and Marketing Support, Dominion Transmission, Inc.
Paul Love	Director, Electronic Customer Services, Natural Gas Pipe Line Company of America

Producer Segment

Carla Johnson	Conoco, Inc.
David Ogden	Manager, Marketing Administration, Dominion E&P

Services Segment

Jim Macredie	TXU Energy Trading Company
--------------	----------------------------



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
2003 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ALTERNATES - Retail Electric Quadrant
As of December 5, 2003

Distribution Segment

Gwen Beadles	Project Manager for Customer Choice, Dominion Virginia Power
John Russom	General Manager of Power Contracts, Alabama Power Company
Keith P. Hock	Director ARES Business Center, Ameren Services
Richard Muzikar	Section Manager Retail Choice, Consolidated Edison of New York
Jean M. Mason	Supervisor, Retail Access, Ameren Services Company
William Hetherington	Director, Electric Utility Operations, Lee County Electricity Coop.
Charles Tenorio	Manager, Electric Supplier Services, Exelon Energy Delivery

End User Segment

Bruce Hayes	Senior Regulatory Analyst, Ohio Consumers' Counsel
Steve Ward	Maine Office of Public Advocate

Services Segment

Lewis Evans	Vice President, PMOLink, Inc.
-------------	-------------------------------

Supplier Segment

Gwen Mizell	Director of National Accounts, Calpine Corporation
-------------	--



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
2003 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ALTERNATES - Wholesale Electric Quadrant
As of December 5, 2003

End User Segment		Sub-Segment
		Large Industrial
		Large Industrial
		End Use (Self Generation)
		Commercial/Residential
		End Use (In other segments as well)
Bill Heinrich	New York State Dept. of Public Service	Regulators
Distribution/LSE Segment		Sub-Segment
Sherri Monteith	Sr. Policy Analyst, American Electric Power	IOU
		IOU
		Muni/Coop
		Muni/Coop
Tom McGrath	Tennessee Valley Authority	Other
Wendy Weathers	Principal Analyst, Salt River Project	Other
Jansen Pollock	Constellation New Energy, Inc.	Competitive Retailer
Generation Segment		Sub-Segment:
Francis Halpin	Bonneville Power Administration	Fed/State/Prov.
William F. Irish	Project Manager, Tennessee Valley Authority	Fed/State/Prov
Brian Evans-Mongeon	Manager, Power Supply and Marketing Services, Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	Muni/Coop
		IOU
		IOU
Barb Robertson	Ontario Power Generation	Merchant
		Merchant
Marketer/Broker Segment		Sub-Segment:
Jeff Ackerman	Manager, CRSP-Energy Mgmt., Western Area Power Administration	Fed/State/Prov
Brenda Anderson	Bonneville Power Administration	Fed/State/Prov
		IOU Affiliated
Greg Locke	Manager, Strategic Analysis, North Carolina Municipal Power Agency #1	Muni/Coop
		Not IOU Affiliated
		Not IOU Affiliated
		IOU Affiliated
Transmission Segment		Sub-Segment:
Barbara Rehman	Policy Manager, Bonneville Power Administration	Fed/State/Prov.
Mark Fidrych	Western Area Power Administration	Fed/State/Prov.
Jim Hicks	PacifiCorp	IOU
Edward Davis	Policy Consultant, Entergy Services, Inc.	IOU



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

William O. Ball	Vice President, Transmission Planning, Policy and Support Services, Southern Company Services, Inc.	IOU
Dean Ulch	Principal Engineer, Southern Company Services, Inc.	IOU ITC Muni/Coop



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
2003 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ALTERNATES - Retail Gas Quadrant
As of December 5, 2003

DISTRIBUTORS SEGMENT

Joe Stengel	Federal Regulatory Affairs Manager, Philadelphia Gas Works
Kenneth W. Yagelski	Department Head of Regulatory Affairs, Washington Gas
Paul J. Szykman	Manager, Rates & Strategic Planning, UGI Utilities, Inc.

END USERS SEGMENT

Barbara Alexander	Consumer Affairs Consultant, rep. Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor
-------------------	--

SERVICE PROVIDERS SEGMENT

SUPPLIER SEGMENT

John Dosker	General Counsel, Stand Energy
-------------	-------------------------------

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting - WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

Schedule of 2004 Meetings



North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com

February 20, 2004

TO: NAESB Executive Committee Members
FROM: Rae McQuade, NAESB Executive Director
RE: Meeting Schedule

Dear Executive Committee Members,

Below is the 2004 meeting schedule for Executive Committee meetings. All meetings will be accessible by phone, and meeting materials for each meeting will include a ballot for notational voting on any items that are not decided by simple majority. All Executive Committee meetings will be transcribed.

Date	Quadrant	Location
February 24-26	WEQ Retail WGQ	Houston
May 4-6	WEQ Retail WGQ	Palm Beach, Florida
August 24-26	WEQ Retail WGQ	Colorado Springs El Paso Western
November 16-18	WEQ Retail WGQ	Washington, D.C.

Best Regards,

Rae

Rae McQuade
NAESB Executive Director & COO

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting - WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

TAB 2

Agendas



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

February 16, 2004

TO: NAESB Executive Committee and Interested Industry Participants
FROM: Todd Oncken, NAESB Deputy Director
RE: Executive Committee Meeting Agendas

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Hosted by NAESB – Houston, Texas
February 24-26, 2004

As announced at prior Executive Committee meetings, meeting announcements and in other communications, the Executive Committee (EC) will meet in Houston, Texas hosted by NAESB on February 24-26. Below are the meeting arrangements:

Where: Crowne Plaza Houston - Downtown Hotel
1700 Smith Street
Houston, TX 77002
Phone: 713-739-8800

Contact: Veronica Thomason
713-356-0060 (main number)

WHEN: Tuesday, February 24, 2004 -- 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. C – Wholesale Electric Quadrant
Wednesday, February 25, 2004 – 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. C – Retail Gas Quadrant
Wednesday, February 25, 2004 -- 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. C – RGQ/REQ EC Joint Session
Wednesday, February 25, 2004 – 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. C – Retail Elec. Quad. (if necessary)
Thursday, February 26, 2004 -- 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. C – Wholesale Gas Quadrant

Meeting arrangements are posted on the NAESB web site (<http://www.naesb.org/pdf/ec022404ma.pdf>). If you intend to attend the EC meetings, please RSVP to the NAESB office (naesb@naesb.org) by February 20, 2004.

If you plan to participate by conference call, please contact the NAESB Office (713-356-0060 or naesb@naesb.org) to obtain the calling number and pass code. Consistent with the conference calling policy, a \$50 per line charge will apply, unless: you are a government employee, trade association staff, consumer advocate, or your organization has already paid the flat fee for 2004. The meeting is open to any interested party.

The materials for the meeting will be emailed to the participants and posted on the web site shortly. As always, the chair reserves the right to extend the time of the meeting to ensure that agenda items are addressed. The times indicated on the agenda will be followed to ensure that agenda items are allotted appropriate time slots. Should an agenda item conclude earlier than its stated time slot, the remaining time can be allotted to other agenda items at the discretion of the chair.

Please feel free to call the NAESB office should you have any questions or comments.

Best Regards,
Todd Oncken

cc: Rae McQuade, Executive Director



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

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING Hosted by NAESB – Houston, Texas

Tuesday, February 24, 2004 – 10:00 am to 4:00 pm Central

WHOLESALE ELECTRIC QUADRANT (WEQ)

DRAFT AGENDA

- 10:00 a.m.
1. Welcome
 - Antitrust Guidelines
 - Welcome to members and attendees
 - Introduction and Roll Call
 2. Wholesale Electric Quadrant Draft Agenda & Draft Minutes
 - Adoption of WEQ Agenda
 - Adoption of Draft Minutes
 3. Triage Recommendations
 - Request R04005
 - Request R04006
 - Request R04007
 - Request R04011
 - Request R03035 to the WGQ
 4. Subcommittee Updates
 - Business Practices Subcommittee
 - Inadvertent Interchange Payback Task Force
 - Information Technology Subcommittee
 - Electronic Scheduling Subcommittee
 - Glossary Subcommittee
 - Standards Review Subcommittee
 - Seams Subcommittee
 - Gas Electric Coordination Task Force
 5. JIC Meeting Summary
 6. Nominations and elections
 - BPS Chair
 - GECTF Chair
 7. New Business
 - Transition Issues - NERC Policies 3, 5, 9
 - ISO/RTO WEQ representation
 - Future Meetings
 - Joint with NERC MC March 24 in Nashville
 - NAESB Board March 18 in Houston
 - Next WEQ EC meeting May 4

4:00 p.m.

 8. Adjourn

Attire – Business Casual



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

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING Hosted by NAESB – Houston, Texas

Wednesday, February 25, 2004 – 10:00 to 3:00 pm Central

Joint Session of Retail Gas and Electric Quadrants

DRAFT AGENDA

- 10:00 am
1. Welcome
 - Antitrust guidelines
 - Welcome to members and attendees
 - Introduction and roll call
 2. Joint Retail Electric Quadrant & Retail Gas Quadrant Draft Agenda & Draft Minutes
 - Adoption of Joint Agenda
 - Adoption of Joint Draft Minutes
 3. Update on various NAESB activities
 - Other quadrant activities
 - Update on Managing Committee/Board vote on Gas Quality Standards development
 - NARUC meeting
 - Other activities
 4. Review and Modification of 2004 Annual Plans, as appropriate
 5. Approval of subcommittee mission statements
 6. Subcommittee reports
 - Customer Processes Subcommittee (CPS)
 - Supplier Utility Interface Subcommittee (SUIS)
 - Technical Electronic Interchange Subcommittee (TEIS)
 - Gas-Electric Coordination Task Force (GECTF)
 7. Discussion on need for subcommittee leadership
 8. Other Business
- 3:00 pm
9. Adjourn

Attire – Business Casual



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

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING Hosted by NAESB – Houston, Texas

Wednesday, February 25, 2004 – 9:00 to 10:00 am Central

RETAIL GAS QUADRANT (RGQ) DRAFT AGENDA

- | | | |
|----------|----|--|
| 9:00 am | 1. | Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Antitrust guidelines• Welcome to members and attendees• Introduction and roll call |
| | 2. | Quadrant Size: Discussion and possible vote |
| | 3. | Gas Practices Inventory Task Force |
| 10:00 am | 4. | Adjourn |

Wednesday, February 25, 2004 – 3:00 to 4:00 pm Central (If Necessary)

RETAIL ELECTRIC QUADRANT (REQ) DRAFT AGENDA

- | | | |
|---------|----|--|
| 3:00 pm | 1. | Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Antitrust guidelines• Welcome to members and attendees• Introduction and roll call |
| | 2. | To Be Determined |
| 4:00 pm | 3. | Adjourn |

Attire – Business Casual



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

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Hosted by NAESB – Houston, Texas

Thursday, February 26, 2004 – 9:00 to 4:00 pm Central

WHOLESALE GAS QUADRANT (WGQ)

DRAFT AGENDA

- 9:00 am
1. Welcome
 - Antitrust guidelines
 - Welcome to members and attendees
 - Introduction and roll call
 2. Wholesale Gas Quadrant Draft Agenda & Draft Minutes
 - Adoption of WGQ agenda
 - Adoption of draft minutes
 3. Triage Subcommittee Recommendations
 - Adoption of quadrant and subcommittee assignments for R03033, R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003, R04004, R04008, and R04010
 - Board of Directors action on R03035
 4. Review of Board Approved 2004 Annual Plan and Assignments
 5. Subcommittee and Task Force Updates and Review of 2004 Annual Plan
 - Business Practices Subcommittee
 - Contracts Subcommittee
 - EDM Subcommittee
 - Information Requirements Subcommittee
 - Technical and ANSI X12 Subcommittee
 - Interpretations Subcommittee
 - Gas and Electric Coordination Task Force (GECTF)
 6. New Business
 - Discussion on recent FERC Creditworthiness NOPR in RM04-4-000
 - Update on FERC Conference on Natural Gas Interchangeability
 - Next WGQ EC Meeting May 6
- 4:00 pm
7. Adjourn

Attire – Business Casual

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting – WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

TAB 3

Minutes – December 9-11, 2003



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

TO: NAESB Wholesale Electric Quadrant Executive Committee, Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Todd Oncken, NAESB Deputy Director

RE: NAESB Wholesale Electric Quadrant Executive Committee Meeting Draft Minutes – December 9, 2003

DATE: December 16, 2003

**Wholesale Electric Quadrant Executive Committee
Tuesday, December 9, 2003
10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Central
Houston, TX**

1. Welcome

Mr. Cobb called the meeting to order and welcomed attendees. Mr. Oncken gave the antitrust advice. Mr. Oncken called the roll of Executive Committee members and quorum was established.

Mr. Cobb reviewed the 2004 Executive Committee meeting schedule. The Executive Committee will meet February 24-26, May 4-6, August 24-26 and November 16-18, with the WEQ meeting on the first day of each session. It was noted that interim meetings could be called on an as needed basis. Locations are still being determined and in cases where a host is not available, the meetings will be held in Houston. Mr. Lucas moved, seconded by Mr. Norris, to accept the meeting schedule for 2004. The motion passed absent opposition.

2. Wholesale Electric Quadrant Draft Agenda & Draft Minutes

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Green, to modify the agenda to install the 2004 WEQ Executive Committee officers as agenda item 3 and adopt the modified agenda. The motion passed unanimously absent objection.

Mr. Berwager moved, seconded by Mr. Gallagher, to adopt the draft minutes of the Wholesale Electric Quadrant October 7, 2003 Executive Committee meeting as drafted. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Installation of 2004 Executive Committee Officers

Ms. McQuade announced that Mr. Oberski and Mr. Cobb were elected as chair and vice chair, respectively, of the WEQ Executive Committee for 2004. It was noted the transition usually occurs during the February meeting. Mr. Oberski made brief comments, particularly noting that 2004 will be the defining year for the WEQ based on its accomplishments.

4. Review of Board approved 2004 Annual Plan and Assignments

Mr. Oberski stated the Board of Directors approved the draft 2004 WEQ Annual Plan without modification at its December meeting. Mr. Oberski noted the November 14 letter from Chairman Wood addresses each 2004 Annual Plan item heading. Participants discussed the subcommittee assignments for all 2004 Annual Plan items, which are reflected in the attached 2004 Annual Plan.

During discussion of annual plan item assignments significant time was spent discussing the reporting relationships of task forces and procedures for reassignment of Standards Review Subcommittee (SRS) scoping task forces as standards drafting task forces under a standards drafting subcommittee, such as the Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS) or Electronic Scheduling Subcommittee (ESS). While no bright line rule was developed, it was agreed that for current SRS task forces, the SRS would have the discretion to determine when the scoping phase



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

was complete and the transition would be appropriate. For future SRS initiatives, it was agreed standards requests that were more complete prior to presentation at the Joint Interface Committee (JIC) could lead to an easier transition. It was noted that reassignment of task forces was not intended to impact the internal workings or composition of the task force, just an administrative reporting change at the Executive Committee level. Another element recognized during discussion was that the charters and scopes of the BPS, ESS and Glossary Subcommittees have not yet been defined.

Item 1 of the 2004 Annual Plan directly relates to the SRS's efforts to evaluate NERC SARs and begin the scoping process for companion NAESB standards, where appropriate. While Mr. Yeung provided an update of all current SRS initiatives and each element of item 1 was thoroughly discussed, extensive discussion surrounded the work of the Coordinate Interchange Business Practices (CIBP) Task Force (see 2004 Annual Plan Item 1(a)(ii)). Mr. Carter provided an update on the status of the CIBP, noting that the task force has attempted to move from the scoping document towards standards drafting, and in fact has begun work on a strawman. Mr. Carter stated the preliminary thought is that the NAESB standard will cover all elements through the front-end process prior to presentation to the Interchange Authority (IA). In light of that status report and other discussion, Mr. Dison moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson that Request R03013 remain assigned to the SRS until such time as the SRS determines it has been fully scoped and properly reassigned to the ESS. After limited discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Desselle expressed concern that scoping efforts after JIC review and assignment could in effect circumvent the JIC process. Executive Committee members recognized this as an issue. Participants agreed that more complete scoping of associated issues prior to drafting a NAESB standards request and presenting that request to the JIC would help address those concerns. Additionally, a preference was expressed that companion NAESB standards run on a parallel path with NERC SARs. To aid in timing, Mr. Gallagher offered to invite a NAESB SRS representative to participate when a NERC SAR drafting team starts, so scoping of any NAESB companion standard could start as the SAR scoping began.

It was noted that the other parts of Item 1 – Coordinate Operations (see 2004 Annual Plan Item 1(a)(iii)), Operate Within Limits (see 2004 Annual Plan Item 1 (a)(iv)), Balance Resources and Demand (see 2004 Annual Plan Item 1(a)(v)), and Facility Ratings (see 2004 Annual Plan Item 1(a)(vi)) – are under various stages of review by the SRS. Mr. Yeung stated it is likely a request for NAESB Standards would be developed for the OWL based on a NAESB analysis of which portions of the current NERC Policy are addressed by NERC's OWL standard. Mr. Yeung suggested that in cases where NAESB's preliminary determination is that no companion standards to NERC SARs or Standards are needed, the items remain on the SRS agenda for continued monitoring until the NERC process is complete. During discussion on NERC's Facility Ratings Standard, Mr. Norris expressed concern about NERC SARs and standards that give great discretion to the utilities. Mr. Johnson echoed Mr. Norris's concerns. Mr. Yeung suggested that any party could make a request for a NAESB standard to address issues that they identify as significant.

Additional significant discussion surrounded the assignment of Item 4, *Determine the need for and develop, if necessary, standard(s) requests for electric or gas standards required to provided additional flexibility in generation scheduling (including gas nominations.* Given the scoping nature of the task involved and general importance to the industry as evidenced by Chairman Wood's letter, it was unanimously decided to establish the Electric-Gas Coordination Task Force as an Executive Committee task force to participate in the multi-quadrant Gas-Electric Coordination Task Force. Mr. Jackson and Ms. Perlman volunteered to co-chair the WEQ task force. Mr. Desselle suggested that the WEQ task force should evaluate the issues contemplated by Item 4 and continue to work toward a resolution of the issues through the multi-quadrant task force. If however, the



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

multi-quadrant task force is not making sufficient progress, Mr. Desselle suggested the WEQ task force should continue with its activities and initiatives.

5. Subcommittee Updates and Final Update to the 2003 Annual Plan

Business Practices Subcommittee: Ms. McQuade reported Mr. Goss would co-chair the Business Practices Subcommittee. Additional co-chairs are being solicited.

Mr. Terelmes provided an update on the Inadvertent Interchange Payback Task Force (IIPTF). He stated the IIPTF has recently completed an assessment of its accomplishments to date and set goals for 2004. Of note, Mr. Terelmes stated the task force has set October 2004 as the target date for drafting completion. Mr. Terelmes reviewed the agenda for the next IIPTF meeting, which is scheduled for December 10-11, 2003 in Houston, TX. It was noted the results of the meeting will likely set the tone and basis for the task force's activities in 2004.

Electronic Scheduling Subcommittee: Mr. Dison provided an update on the ESS. He stated the ESS co-chairs – he, Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Simonelli – have met and prepared a draft mission statement in anticipation of the first ESS meeting being held December 15-16, 2003 in Washington, DC. Mr. Dison reviewed the draft mission statement. After presentation, Mr. Dison moved, seconded by Mr. Cobb, that the Executive Committee accept the draft mission statement of the ESS. A key point of discussion was the section regarding adoption of existing OASIS Business Practice Standards. Mr. Dison explained that adoption of those orders would serve as a basis for going forward and making modifications to the standards. Ms. McQuade clarified that the FERC has expressed a preference for this procedure, since it would provide a vehicle for centrally locating the standards and a mechanism for the incorporation of future enhancements by reference – a long-standing process used by the FERC in adopting wholesale gas standards. Participants debated whether it was appropriate or advisable to adopt the existing orders as NAESB standards, or if it would be better to establish the existing regulations as a base-line without adopting them as standards. Mr. Dison noted those are two distinct approaches for moving forward.

During discussion of the motion, alternate language was offered regarding adoption of those orders would serve as a basis for going forward (bullet one) and the specificity of including E-tag (bullet 3). The movant and seconder accepted both language changes. Revised language is shown as an attachment to these minutes. The Executive Committee unanimously adopted the amended mission statement of the ESS.

Mr. Dison reviewed the proposed process for expedited adoption of the FERC Orders as NAESB standards. The process is outlined in a work paper found under Tab 8 of the meeting materials. This item was discussed for informational purposes. It was noted that the Executive Committee could be asked to vote on the recommendations during its February meeting.

Glossary Subcommittee: Mr. Reed reported on the Glossary Subcommittee. He stated that although the subcommittee has not held its first meeting, the co-chairs are discussing the subcommittee's processes. He stated the subcommittee would first pool existing resources and evaluate where the definitions are similar and where they diverge. The Executive Committee discussed the subcommittee's role in the standards development process. It was decided the subcommittee would be the record keeper of terms, as well as the arbiter of definitions on contentious issues. It was noted that definitions would likely be proposed out of the standards drafting subcommittees. Additionally, the Executive Committee identified that a function of the subcommittee would be to research proposed definitions and their impacts on existing standards. Mr. Reed stated the first subcommittee meeting is planned for January 2004.

Standards Review Subcommittee: Mr. Yeung reported on the SRS and referred Executive Committee members to the previous discussion on the 2004 Annual Plan. Mr. Yeung stated the



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

SRS has scheduled its next meeting for January 8 at the NAESB Office. He stated the subcommittee will receive updates from the task forces and work on the Operate Within Limits Business Practices (OWL-BP) with the anticipation of the completion of a scope document to be incorporated into the standards request prior to its submission to the JIC.

Information Technology Subcommittee: Mr. Johnson reported on the Information Technology Subcommittee (ITS). Mr. Johnson stated the ITS has met twice since the last Executive Committee meeting. During the first meeting, Mr. Johnson stated the ITS established the OASIS 1A Issues Task Force and Registry Task Force, and developed its mission statement – which has subsequently been approved by the Executive Committee. For the OASIS 1A Issues Task Force, Mr. Johnson said the group has met numerous times to evaluate the open issues list prepared by the OSC and determine which issues the ITS should address. Mr. Landrum and Mr. Johnson, co-chairs of the ITS, prepared a letter to the Executive Committee detailing the results of the task force's work as a work paper for the meeting. In short, the task force determined five items were ripe for NAESB action, but no standards requests have been developed. Mr. Dison noted several of the items had impacts for both the ITS and ESS and the leadership of those subcommittees will meet to determine how to move forward on those items. Mr. Johnson stated the second ITS meeting was held jointly with NERC's TISWEG and the NERC/NAESB registry issues were discussed. Mr. Johnson reported that it was decided to maintain the status quo with NERC maintaining the registry at this time.

Seams Subcommittee: Mr. Cobb reported on the Seams Subcommittee. He stated the subcommittee has finalized the Seams Catalog, consisting of 134 items, and will present it today for Executive Committee approval. The affect of approval is that the catalog would be frozen to new issues and distributed to the industry for discussion and further action as necessary. Additional seams that are identified will go through a process similar to the process completed here. It is anticipated that the JIC will review the catalog and make assignments for standards development. Mr. Cobb presented an overview of the catalog, including a discussion of categories and subcategories and a work plan. Mr. Cobb explained the catalog consists of submissions by 19 participants and no independent research was done. Mr. Cobb noted that the subcommittee meetings and conference calls were very well attended, and ISO/RTO representatives were very active.

Mr. Cobb stated the Seams Subcommittee will make a recommendation to the JIC as to which items should be referred to NERC, NAESB or the ISO/RTO Council (IRC). Mr. Cobb, Mr. Tammar and Mr. Museler will work on that strawman, but the process is open. A meeting of the NAESB JIC representatives will be held prior to the JIC meeting to discuss the Seams Catalog.

Mr. Cobb stated there is an open issue as to who will be the keeper of the catalog and serve as the project manager for seams issues. There was a preference stated that NAESB not serve as a project manager, and instead focus on its mission to draft business practice standards through the established relationships and coordination protocols with NERC.

Mr. Cobb stated comments were received from Mr. Green and Mr. Rossignoli after the subcommittee voted to forward the catalog to the Executive Committee. The comments and proposed modifications were reviewed. Mr. Norris moved, seconded by Mr. Green, to accept Mr. Green's proposed modifications and take no action on Mr. Rossignoli's proposed modifications. During discussion, it was noted that Mr. Green's proposed modification related to one of his submissions, but Mr. Rossignoli's proposed modification related to an item he did not submit. Additionally, it was noted that neither Mr. Rossignoli nor the submitter was present to discuss the proposed modification. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Green moved, seconded by Mr. Johnson, to accept the Seams Catalog as complete and ready for industry distribution. After limited discussion the motion passed unanimously.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Update of 2003 Annual Plan: There were no changes to the 2003 Annual Plan.

6. Liaison Efforts

Ms. McQuade reported on liaison efforts with external organizations. Her report included information on NERC, the JIC, meetings with Western interests, the November meeting with Chairman Wood, and the December 1 FERC meeting.

NERC: Ms. McQuade reported that NERC and NAESB have good coordination on many levels. As an example, she stated NAESB representatives are included in the NERC Transition Team – an effort to evaluate current NERC Policies and transform them into reliability standards. Mr. Oberski noted that the NERC Markets Committee established an MC/SRS and Seams Task Force as a direct correlation task force to be more responsive to SRS and Seams Subcommittee needs. Mr. Oberski stated Mr. Brown will chair that task force.

Joint Interface Committee: Ms. McQuade reported that a JIC meeting, while not currently scheduled, will likely occur in the first quarter of 2004.

Outreach Meetings: Ms. McQuade reported that she and Mr. Desselle visited the Seams Steering Group – Western Interconnection (SSG-WI), Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC), California Public Utility Commission, California Energy Commission, Northwest Power Planning Council, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Western Area Power Administration, RTO West and West Connect. She explained the purpose of the visits was to provide information on NAESB and to encourage participation in the NAESB process. Further, she stated a key message communicated during the meetings was that NAESB's process can accommodate regional differences. Ms. McQuade said the visits were well received.

Meeting with Chairman Wood: Ms. McQuade reported that she, Mr. Desselle and Mr. Haynes met with Chairman Wood on November 10. She also noted Mr. Wood responded with correspondence on November 14. Please see discussion of the Annual Plan above for more detail on the meeting with Chairman Wood.

FERC meeting on 12/1: Ms. McQuade reported that several NAESB representatives attended the December 1 meeting at the FERC. She said the meeting was scheduled to discuss working under the legislation created by the Energy Bill. However, since the legislation was not finalized, the meeting became an opportunity for participants to discuss issues surrounding the blackout with the new Commissioners.

7. Board Meetings 12-04-03 Review

Mr. Oberski and Ms. McQuade reported on the NAESB Board of Directors meeting held on December 4, 2003. Mr. Oberski stated the Board approved the 2004 Annual Plans for all Quadrants and approved the 2004 Budget. Mr. Oberski reviewed the new conference calling policy where a \$50 fee will be assessed per line for conference calling attendance when the opportunity to attend in person is available. As an alternative, Mr. Oberski noted member companies can pay a one time fee of \$1000 which would cover all conference calling needs of the organization for 2004. Ms. McQuade added that for conference calls that were sponsored by organizations, the fee would not be assessed. Mr. Illian and Mr. Terelmes noted their opposition to the fee, stating the fee would hinder participation in the IIPTF.

Mr. Oberski also reported on the December 3, 2003 WEQ Board and Executive Committee Subcommittee Leadership meeting. He stated the following key points were developed: 1) the need for additional volunteer resources to prosecute the Annual Plan items; and 2) need for increased interactions with the FERC. During discussion of the report, it was suggested that increased interactions with key personnel at the FERC would provide the opportunity for clear direction at the



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

FERC level, and increased industry participation in response. It was noted the wholesale gas quadrant had that level of direction during its formation. Not all Executive Committee members shared the desire for the FERC to set a deadline for action in an order, but instead would prefer the industry work at its own pace.

8. New Business

Mr. Green reported on the establishment of the Alliance West TLR Task Force at a recent NERC Markets Committee (MC) meeting. Mr. Green stated Alliance West reported to the MC that a high number of TLRs is resulting in reliability issues. Mr. Green said the task force will propose a solution to this Alliance West specific issue to the MC in March. Mr. Green stated the task force's work could have implications for NAESB, including issues around data exchange, use of counterflows, parking and hubbing, and the threshold for TLR. Mr. Green serves as the NAESB representative on the task force.

9. Adjourn

Mr. Oberski adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m. Central.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
 Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
 Home Page: www.naesb.org

10. Executive Committee Attendance and Voting Record¹

End User Segment	Title, Organization	Attendance
John Hughes	Director Technical Affairs, Electricity Consumers Resource Council (ELCON)	Phone
V A C A N C Y	To be filled by the Large Industrials sub-segment	
Steve Sayuk	Manager Americas Supply, Power & Gas Services Group, ExxonMobil Power & Gas Services, Inc.	Absent
Randy Corbin	Assistant Director Analytical Services, Ohio Consumers' Counsel	Absent
Paul Jett	Manager of Electric System Operation Customer Choice Transition, Cinergy Services Inc.	Absent
LouAnn Westerfield	Policy Strategist, Idaho Public Utilities Commission, rep. National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners	Phone
Distribution/LSE Segment		
Thomas Ringenbach	Manager Business Standards, American Electric Power Service Corporation	In Person
Jack Leonard	Director, Transmission Management, Exelon PECO Energy	Phone
Patrick W. Frazier	Vice President of Energy Operations, American Municipal Power Ohio Inc.	Absent
Daniel E. Cooper	Engineering Manager, Michigan Public Power Agency	Phone
Syd Berwager	Industry Restructuring Project Manager, Bonneville Power Administration/Power Business Line	In Person
V A C A N C Y	To be filled by the Competitive Retailer sub-segment	
Generation Segment		
Bob Goss	Deputy Assistant Administrator of Power Resources, Southeastern Power Administration	Phone
Louis Oberski	Transmission Manager, Dominion Energy Marketing Inc.	In Person
Tony Reed	Project Manager, Southern Company Generation and Energy Marketing	In Person
Barry Green	Manager US Regulatory Affairs, Ontario Power Generation	In Person
Steven B. Corneli	Director of Regulatory Affairs, NRG Power Marketing Inc.	Absent
William J. Gallagher	General Manager of Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	In Person
Marketers/Brokers Segment		
Gary L. Jackson	Senior Manager External Markets and Policy, Tennessee Valley Authority Bulk Power Trading	In Person
Joel Dison	Project Manager, Southern Company Generation and Energy Marketing	In Person
Clay Norris	Division Director, Planning, North Carolina Municipal Power Agency #1	In Person
Charles Yeung	Director of Business Standards, Reliant Resources	In Person
Alan Johnson	Senior Policy Analyst, Mirant	In Person
Michael F. Gildea	Director of Regulatory Policy, Duke Energy North America	Absent

¹ All motions during the meeting passed by consensus of all Executive Committee members in attendance.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
 Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
 Home Page: www.naesb.org

Transmission Segment

Steven C. Cobb	Manager Transmission Services, Salt River Project	In Person
Jim Hicks, alt. for D. Gerrard	PacifiCorp	Phone
John Lucas	Manager, Transmission Services, Southern Company	In Person
Mary Ellen Paravalos	Manager ITC Development, National Grid USA	Phone
Dan Klempel	Director Transmission Regulatory Compliance, Basin Electric Power Cooperative	Absent
Julie Voeck	Manager Strategic Policy and Planning, American Transmission Company	Absent

11. Other Participation

Administrative:

Rae McQuade	-Executive Director
Veronica Thomason	-NAESB Staff
Todd Oncken	-NAESB Staff
Jim Cargas	-NAESB Staff

Observers to the Meeting:

Name	Company	In person/Phone
Robert Blohm	Consulting Economist	In Person
Scott Brown	Exelon	Phone
Yvette Camp	Southern Company	Phone
Roman Carter	Southern Company	Phone
Phil Cox	American Electric Power	In Person
Ed Davis	Entergy	In Person
Tim Gallagher	NERC	In Person
Ken Gates	Conectiv	Phone
Francis Halpin	Bonneville Power Administration	Phone
Bill Heinrich	New York Public Service Commission	Phone
Howard Illian	EnergyMark	In Person
Ruth Kiselewich	Baltimore Gas & Electric	In Person
Melissa Lauderdale	EEI	Phone
Barry Lawson	NRECA	Phone
Steve McCoy	California ISO	Phone
Lawrence Paulson	Hoffman-Paulson Associates	In Person
Marjorie Perlman	Energy East Management Corp.	Phone
Barbara Rehman	Bonneville Power Administration	Phone
Lisa Robert	Defense Energy Support Center	Phone
Marv Rosenberg	FERC	Phone
Steve Terelmes	Ameren	In Person
Phillip Wiginton	Tennessee Valley Authority	In Person
J. T. Wood	Southern Company	Phone



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

TO: NAESB Retail Electric Quadrant and Retail Gas Quadrant Executive Committee,
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Meghan McMillan, NAESB Staff

RE: Draft Minutes from the NAESB Retail Electric Quadrant and Retail Gas Quadrant
Glossary Executive Committee Meeting – December 10, 2003

DATE: December 24, 2003

**Retail Electric Quadrant/Retail Gas Quadrant
Joint Executive Committee Meeting
December 10, 2003 (9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. Central)
Draft Minutes**

1. Welcome

Mr. Minneman opened the meeting. Mr. Oncken gave the antitrust advice. Ms. McMillan called role and announced quorum. Mr. Minneman stated the Executive Committees (EC) has scheduled quarterly meetings for 2004 instead of the six meeting schedule followed in 2003, but noted conference calls may be scheduled in between the scheduled meetings as necessary. Ms. McQuade noted there are several companies checking into sponsoring next year's meetings.

2. Joint Session Draft Agenda & Draft Minutes

Mr. Nishida added a discussion of web casting options under the Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee (SUIS) update. Mr. Sytsma added the discussion and approval of the REQ/RGQ Glossary Subcommittee mission statements during the Glossary Subcommittee update. Ms. Kiselewich moved, seconded by Mr. Connell to adopt the agenda as modified. The agenda was adopted as modified absent objection.

Ms. Kiselewich moved, seconded by Mr. Connell to adopt the joint retail Executive Committee draft minutes from October 8, 2003 as written. The minutes were adopted as written absent objection.

3. General Actions, Possible Developments

Communication Plan for the New Model Business Practices (MBPs): Ms. McQuade stated a status report will be presented at the NARUC winter meeting in March. The status report will contain a high level explanation of NAESB and a general characterization of the MBPs. Ms. McQuade noted NAESB will not be making formal filings of these MBPs.

Process for publishing our soon to be approved Model Business Practices: Ms. McQuade stated as the MBPs are completed and ratified, they will be published in the form of CDs and posted on the NAESB web site. Mr. Newbold asked for an explanation of the approval process for the introductory materials drafted to accompany the MBPs. Ms. McQuade stated the approval process for these materials is identical to that of the MBPs.

There was extended discussion concerning the method of publication for these MBPs, and how they should appear on the CDs. Ms. McQuade stated the NAESB budget reflects separate costs for Wholesale Gas, Wholesale Electric and Retail, but that the quadrants can specify how they would like the MBPs to appear on the CD.

Mr. Minneman summarized the results of the discussion as follows: the retail quadrants agreed to publish one CD with separate MBPs for Gas and Electric, a table will be inserted at the front of each quadrant's MBPs which will detail differences and similarities between the two sets of MBPs, and a



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

new CD will be published as new chapters are published. He also noted there would be a standing item on the EC agendas to review the publication process.

4. Subcommittee Updates and Final Review of 2003 Annual Plans

Customer Processes Subcommittee (CPS): Ms. Davis stated she attended the last CPS meeting to give an overview of the process the Wholesale Gas Quadrant uses to develop data dictionaries, which included an explanation of code values and the movement of information from the Information Requirements Subcommittee to the Technical Subcommittee.

Mr. Precht gave the CPS update. He noted the focus of the subcommittee is the creation of the data dictionary, and this will eventually involve extended coordination with the Technical Electronic Implementation Subcommittee (TEIS). The CPS has decided to focus initially on X12 for the development of the data dictionary. In addition to the discussion concerning data dictionaries, the CPS has also made significant progress drafting models and flow diagrams and the subcommittee hopes to have a work product ready for approval in January.

Glossary Subcommittee: Mr. Sytsma, co-chair of the Glossary Subcommittee has requested the EC review and approve the subcommittee mission statements and provide input concerning their process for adopting definitions. There was extended discussion concerning the Glossary Subcommittee mission statements. Ms. Kiselewich voiced concerns about using the language “regularly scheduled” to describe the scheduling of subcommittee meetings. Mr. Novak suggested it be changed to read “periodically based on the then current workload.” It was agreed to make this change. Ms. Kiselewich moved, seconded by Mr. Newbold to approve the REQ Glossary Subcommittee Mission Statement with the modification voiced by Mr. Novak. The REQ Glossary Subcommittee Mission Statement was adopted as modified absent objection. Ms. Burnett moved, seconded by Mr. Nishida to adopt the RGQ Glossary Subcommittee Mission Statement with the same modifications made to the REQ Glossary Subcommittee Mission Statement. The RGQ Glossary Subcommittee Mission Statement was adopted as modified absent objection.

The EC discussed the Glossary Subcommittee Process for Adopting Definitions. It was agreed that the Glossary Subcommittee should confine their work to defining terms for which they have received requests (either from business practice subcommittees, Triage Subcommittee, or directly from the EC). Mr. Novak suggested any additional comments on this process should be submitted to the Glossary Subcommittee. Mr. Minneman noted the EC has agreed that in addition to processing requests for definitions received from the above listed sources, they Glossary Subcommittee should also maintain a list of definitions that have completed the approval process.

Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee (SUIS): Mr. Newbold gave the update on the SUIS. He noted the subcommittee is in the process of recruiting new leadership, and stated that any interested volunteers are welcome. The SUIS is now working on Market Participant Interactions and he noted that a redline working document has been published on the SUIS webpage. Mr. Newbold also stated that the subcommittee has discussed the input received on the Non-Disclosure agreement and has agreed not to draft a model agreement, but to draft an outline of the Non-Disclosure Agreement. The SUIS has created a sub-team to work with the technical writer from NAESB on the Introduction and Executive Summary for the Creditworthiness MBPs, and they have submitted comments to her; a discussion of these draft documents is on the agenda for the January meeting. Mr. Newbold also noted that Ms. Edwards has volunteered to research web casting options for the subcommittee.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Mr. Minneman noted the EC would like to vote on the Creditworthiness Introduction and Executive Summary at their February meeting and requested that the draft be submitted by the end of January.

Technical Electronic Implementation Subcommittee (TEIS): Mr. Burden volunteered to provide the update for the TEIS. He stated the TEIS is making excellent progress on the Internet Electronic Transport document. Issues addressed by the TEIS include: the ET book will only address transport and will provide references to the quadrant specific EDM documents; the TEIS will be using the technical worksheet to address technical transport issues; tightening up synchronization of clocks between the parties; keeping the existing WGQ standards applicable to ET; numbering of standards; making changes to testing guidelines; the TEIS has decided to leave testing instructions up to individual quadrants; and addressing the open issues log. He noted there should be some resolution to most of the open issue items during the next meeting. The TEIS is considering removing all references to AS2. Ms. McQuade volunteered to have the NAESB office draft an email asking for comments regarding the AS2 issue. The EC will then review the ultimate decision after the TEIS discusses the comments and presents them to the EC.

5. Billing & Payments Model Business Practices

Discussion/Q&A: The EC agreed to discuss each set of comments on the MBPs, make any necessary changes and then vote on the package as a whole.

Mr. Barkas reviewed his comments. The first comment addresses a typo correction. The second comment suggests the word “discount” on page 21 and in 2.8.1.1 be changed to “uncollectible.” The sentence on page 21 will now read: “Specify the level of discount (to include uncollectibles, arrearages, and the time value of money, etc.) to be reflected in the amount due for Assumption of Receivables method, if applicable.” Ms. Kiselewich moved, seconded by Mr. Nishida to accept these suggested changes. The changes were accepted without objection.

Comments Submitted by CPS Subcommittee (Rick Alston):

Ms. Kiselewich moved, seconded by Ms. Burnett to accept the change to 2.5.1.5, which would change the third bullet to read: “After the cancel/re-bill event has taken place, the Billing Party should transmit notice of restated usage and the credit, debit, or the net amount, to the Non-Billing Party so that the accounts receivable of the Customer will be properly stated.” The motion passed absent objection.

Ms. Burnett moved, seconded by Mr. Barkas to accept the changes to page 21 of the Model Business Practices. The new language will read: “Specify responsibilities for the usage cancellation or re-statement process. Specify responsibilities for the bill cancellation and re-bill process.” The motion passed absent objection.

Mr. Minneman reviewed the suggested changes for page 22. It was agreed that the first suggested change was not necessary. Ms. Kiselewich moved, seconded by Mr. Connell to accept the second two changes to page 22. The two new specifications will read: “Specify the terms and conditions a customer must satisfy to be eligible for return to Consolidated Billing. Specify the terms and conditions regarding customer dispute resolution practices.” The motion passed absent objection.

Comments Submitted by Xcel Energy (Don Basler): Ms. Alexander stated the current business practices do not preclude businesses from handling disputed payments in a different manner. Mr. Minneman noted the EC has discussed the comment and decided not to make any changes on the grounds that this issue is addressed in the way the term “In Dispute” is defined and the standards do not address the issue of customers withholding payment.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Comments submitted by American Electric Power (Thomas Ringenbach): Mr. Novak stated these comments should probably be addressed to a regulatory agency because NAESB does not advocate for any particular standard or method including Bill Ready or Rate Ready billing. Mr. Precht suggested this issue might be addressed in the Introduction or Executive Summary. It was agreed that some language could be drafted for the Introduction stating that NAESB is not recommending any particular method but is addressing solutions for different situations. Ms. Alexander asked that the minutes reflect that NAESB should not be recommending the support of any particular method or practice.

Comments Submitted by Exelon Energy Delivery (Chip Tenorio):

REQ

Definitions: The group discussed Mr. Tenorio's suggestion regarding the definition of Billing Services Agreement and decided not to add any additional language.

2.1.1.4; 2.2.1.2: No support was voiced for the changes suggested for these MBPs.

2.3.1.1: The following modification was suggested: "Either the distribution company or the Supplier should assume..."

2.3.1.4; 2.4.1.1; 2.4.1.2; 2.4.1.3; 2.6.1.4; 2.7.1.1; 2.7.1.2; 2.7.1.3: No support was voiced for the suggested modifications to these MBPs.

2.7.1.5: Mr. Novak voiced support for this change. It was decided not to make the suggested modification.

2.7.1.6: No support was voiced for this change.

2.8.1.9: Mr. Moran suggested the following language: "The process for addressing negative transactions resulting from the reversal of payments of disputed charges should be specified in the BSA." He also suggested adding the word "either" to the beginning of 2.3.1.1. Mr. Moran moved, seconded by Ms. Kiselewich to accept these changes. The motion passed absent objection.

2.9.1.5: No support was voiced for this change.

RGQ

The EC discussed the comments and decided not to make any modifications to the MBPs based on the submitted comments. It was noted that the quadrants will not be able to modify their MBPs to accommodate the practices of individual companies.

REQ Vote

Ms. Kiselewich moved, seconded by Ms. Burnett to accept proposed MBPs for Supplier Billing and Payments as modified. Upon a balanced vote, the motion passed.

RGQ Vote

It was noted that, upon voting on the above motion for the RGQ Supplier Billing and Payments MBPs, the RGQ EC did not have the necessary quorum to pass the motion. The motion will be sent out for notational vote.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

6. Review of Board Approved 2004 Annual Plans and Assignments

R03031

Mr. Novak noted every month there will be one face to face meeting for the Gas Electric Coordination Task Force, which will be addressing this request. He stated Ms. Calcagno will serve as the RGQ chair. He suggested that an annual plan item be drafted to address this task force. Ms. Kiselewich suggested they develop language for this item off line and circulate it for approval. It was agreed to do this.

7. Board Meeting 12-04-03 Review

Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.

8. Update on Wholesale Quadrants

Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.

9. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

10. Adjourn

Mr. Newbold moved, seconded by Ms. McCain to adjourn the meeting on December 10, 2003 at 3:03 p.m. Central.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
 Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
 Home Page: www.naesb.org

11. Attendees

Retail Electric Quadrant Executive Committee			
	Title, Organization	Present	Vote REQ MBPs
Distribution Segment			
Ruth Kiselewich	Director Special Projects and Supplier Services, Baltimore Gas & Electric Company (MAAC NERC Region)	In Person	Yes
Terry Moran	Regulatory Issues Manager, PSEG (MAAC NERC Region)	Phone	Yes
William Newbold	Strategy Manager of Electric Choice Implementation Team, Detroit Edison (ECAR NERC Region)	Phone	Yes
Jonathan Kubler	Manager of Pricing and Rates, Georgia Power Company	Absent	
Alt. John Russom	General Manager – Power Contracts, Alabama Power Company	Phone	Yes
End User Segment			
V A C A N C Y			
V A C A N C Y			
Barbara Alexander	Consumer Affairs Consultant, State of Maine Public Advocate	In Person	Yes
V A C A N C Y			
Services Segment			
Jim Minneman	Director of Business Services, PPL Solutions LLC	In Person	Yes
Dick Brooks	Independent Consultant	Absent	
Rob Connell	Manager of Commercial Systems Applications, Electric Reliability Council of Texas	In Person	Yes
Mark Jarrett	Team Leader – Market Information and Analysis, Market Intelligence, Southern Company	Absent	
Supplier Segment			
Bill Barkas	Manager of Retail State Government Relations, Dominion Retail, Inc.	In Person	Yes
Margarida Williamson	Senior Counsel, Calpine Power America, LP	Absent	
V A C A N C Y			
V A C A N C Y			



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
 Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
 Home Page: www.naesb.org

Retail Gas Quadrant Executive Committee

	Title, Organization	Present	Vote RGQ MBPs
Distributors Segment			
Nancy Cianflone	Director, Marketing Services Area, KeySpan Energy	Absent	
Alt. Kenneth Yagelski	Department Head of Regulatory Affairs, Washington Gas	Ballot	Yes*
Alt. Joe Stengel	Manager Federal Regulatory Affairs, Philadelphia Gas Works	Phone	
Leslie H. Nishida	Gas Federal Regulatory Supervisor, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation	In Person	Yes
Michael Novak	Assistant General Manager, National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation	In Person	Yes
V A C A N C Y			
Alt. Paul Szykman	Manager Rates and Strategic Planning, UGI Utilities, Inc.	Phone	Yes*
Steven M. Zavodnick	Senior Engineer Gas Operations, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company	Absent	Yes*
End Users Segment			
Bruce Hayes	Senior Regulatory Analyst, Ohio Consumers' Counsel	Absent	Yes*
Tina Burnett	Chair, Northwest Industrial Gas Users Association	In Person	Yes
V A C A N C Y			
V A C A N C Y			
V A C A N C Y			
V A C A N C Y			
Service Providers Segment			
Rod Sipe	President, New Science Partners	Absent	
Donald L. Sytsma	Vice President, R.J. Rudden Associates, Inc.	Absent	Yes*
George M. Behr	Director, Energy Services Group, Inc.	Absent	Yes*
V A C A N C Y			
V A C A N C Y			
V A C A N C Y			
Supplier Segment			
Suzanne Calcagno	Associate Director, Regulatory Compliance, UBS Warburg Energy, LLC	Phone	
Barbara A. Fatina	Vice President, Exelon Energy	Phone	
Marcy McCain	Project Manager – Regulatory Affairs, Duke Energy Gas Transmission, LLP	In Person	Yes
Richard Zollars	Director, Data and Information, Dominion Retail, Inc.	Absent	
Alt. John Dosker	Stand Energy Corporation	Phone	Yes
V A C A N C Y			
V A C A N C Y			

* Indicates a notational vote



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Administrative:

Rae McQuade
Todd Oncken
Meghan McMillan

-Executive Director
-NAESB Staff
-NAESB Staff

Observers to the Meeting:

Name	Company	In Person/Phone
Arnaout, Mariam	American Gas Association	Phone
Burden, Christopher	Williams Gas Pipeline	In Person
Camp, Yvette	Southern Company	Phone
Cherevka, Paul	Dominion Retail	Phone
Davis, Dale	Williams Gas Pipeline	In Person
Griffith, Bill	El Paso Western Pipelines	In Person
Gussow, Dona	Florida Power & Light	In Person
Ishida, Susan	Southern California Edison	Phone
Lane, Terry	Green Mountain Energy	In Person
Paulson, Lawrence	Hoffman-Paulson Associates	In Person
Precht, Phil	Baltimore Gas & Electric	In Person
Ringenbach, Thomas	American Electric Power	In Person
Robert, Lisa	Defense Energy Support Center	Phone



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

TO: NAESB Retail Electric Quadrant Executive Committee, Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Meghan McMillan, NAESB Staff

RE: Draft Minutes from the NAESB Retail Electric Quadrant Executive Committee Meeting – December 10, 2003

DATE: January 29, 2004

**Retail Electric Quadrant Executive Committee
December 10, 2003 (2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Central)
Draft Minutes**

1. Welcome

Mr. Minneman stated the REQ Executive Committee would have an abbreviated meeting due to time constraints.

2. REQ Draft Agenda & Draft Minutes

Mr. Minneman asked that the approval of the October 8, 2003 draft minutes be done by notational ballot.

3. Vacancies on Executive Committee

Mr. Minneman noted Ms. Kiselewich will be taking over after this meeting as chair of REQ EC and the EC members need to elect a new vice chair.

4. REQ Specific Items

Mr. Minneman stated the REQ membership is now at 39 and the quadrant needs to focus on recruiting new members for 2004.

5. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

6. Adjourn



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
 Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
 Home Page: www.naesb.org

7. Attendees

Retail Electric Quadrant Executive Committee		
	Title, Organization	Present
Distribution Segment		
Ruth Kiselewich	Director Special Projects and Supplier Services, Baltimore Gas & Electric Company (MAAC NERC Region)	In Person
Terry Moran	Regulatory Issues Manager, PSEG (MAAC NERC Region)	Phone
William Newbold	Strategy Manager of Electric Choice Implementation Team, Detroit Edison (ECAR NERC Region)	Phone
Jonathan Kubler	Manager of Pricing and Rates, Georgia Power Company	Absent
Alt. John Russom	General Manager – Power Contracts, Alabama Power Company	Phone
End User Segment		
V A C A N C Y		
V A C A N C Y		
Barbara Alexander	Consumer Affairs Consultant, State of Maine Public Advocate	In Person
V A C A N C Y		
Services Segment		
Jim Minneman	Director of Business Services, PPL Solutions LLC	In Person
Dick Brooks	Independent Consultant	Absent
Rob Connell	Manager of Commercial Systems Applications, Electric Reliability Council of Texas	In Person
Mark Jarrett	Team Leader – Market Information and Analysis, Market Intelligence, Southern Company	Absent
Supplier Segment		
Bill Barkas	Manager of Retail State Government Relations, Dominion Retail, Inc.	In Person
Margarida Williamson	Senior Counsel, Calpine Power America, LP	Absent
V A C A N C Y		
V A C A N C Y		
Administrative:	Rae McQuade	-Executive Director
	Todd Oncken	-NAESB Staff
	Meghan McMillan	-NAESB Staff

Observers to the Meeting:

Name	Company	In Person/Phone
Arnaout, Mariam	American Gas Association	Phone
Burden, Christopher	Williams Gas Pipeline	In Person
Davis, Dale	Williams Gas Pipeline	In Person
Griffith, Bill	El Paso Western Pipelines	In Person
Gussow, Dona	Florida Power & Light	In Person
Lane, Terry	Green Mountain Energy	In Person
Paulson, Lawrence	Hoffman-Paulson Associates	In Person
Precht, Phil	Baltimore Gas & Electric	In Person
Ringebach, Thomas	American Electric Power	In Person



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

TO: NAESB Retail Gas Quadrant Executive Committee, Posting for Interested Industry Participants
FROM: Meghan McMillan, NAESB Staff
RE: Draft Minutes from the NAESB Retail Gas Quadrant Executive Committee Meeting – December 10, 2003
DATE: January 29, 2004

**Retail Gas Quadrant Executive Committee
December 10, 2003 (3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Central)
Draft Minutes**

1. Welcome

Mr. Novak opened the meeting. Mr. Oncken gave the antitrust advice. Ms. McMillan called roll.

2. RGQ Draft Agenda & Draft Minutes

Mr. Novak noted changes to the agenda. Ms. McCain moved, seconded by Ms. Burnett to adopt the agenda as modified. The agenda was adopted absent objection. It was decided to adopt the draft minutes from October 8, 2003 by notational ballot.

3. Recap of RGQ REQ EC Meeting

It was noted that during the joint session the retail ECs discussed and modified the Billing and Payments Model Business Practices which were adopted by the REQ EC but will need to be sent out for a notational vote by the RGQ EC.

4. Retail Gas Business Practices Inventory Task Force Update

Mr. Novak stated a new information request will be drafted soon concerning the next items up for discussion in Customer Processes Subcommittees and Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittees.

5. Recruiting Task Force

Mr. Novak noted that both retail quadrants need to work on membership for 2004. He stated that hopefully doing some promotion at the NARUC meetings will help with the recruiting efforts. Ms. McQuade noted NAESB will be presenting a status report to NARUC which will include the new retail Model Business Practices. She also noted the WEQ is sending out a letter to the industry to encourage membership and stated she would be happy to work with the retail quadrants if they would like to send out a similar document.

6. Vacancies on the Executive Committee

Mr. Novak noted within the Distributors segment elections have already been started, and he reminded EC members that alternates can fill in for vacancies.

7. Other Business

2004 EC Officers

Mr. Novak and Ms. Calcagno agreed to serve another year as EC officers.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

Quadrant Size

Mr. Novak stated that there will be a vote during the February EC meeting to decide if the RGQ should reduce the number of seats on the EC and Board from 24 to 20. He asked that EC members review the modifications he made in the procedures between now and February.

Ms. Burnett suggested the quadrant should reduce the number of seats now because there are no members that will lose their seats as a result of that decision. Ms. McQuade noted that if the quadrant decides to maintain 24 seats on the EC and Board it is written in the bylaws that votes are taken by percent so vacancies are not a factor in voting. Mr. Novak suggested if someone would like to propose an alternative scenario then the EC will accept those comments to be discussed during the February meeting.

8. Adjourn

Ms. McCain moved, seconded by Mr. Nishida to adjourn the meeting on December 10, 2003 at 3:57 p.m. Central.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

9. Attendees

Retail Gas Quadrant Executive Committee		
	Title, Organization	Present
Distributors Segment		
Nancy Cianflone	Director, Marketing Services Area, KeySpan Energy	Absent
Alt. Kenneth Yagelski	Department Head of Regulatory Affairs, Washington Gas	Ballot
Alt. Joe Stengel	Manager Federal Regulatory Affairs, Philadelphia Gas Works	Phone
Leslie H. Nishida	Gas Federal Regulatory Supervisor, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation	In Person
Michael Novak	Assistant General Manager, National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation	In Person
V A C A N C Y		
Alt. Paul Szykman	Manager Rates and Strategic Planning, UGI Utilities, Inc.	Phone
Steven M. Zavodnick	Senior Engineer Gas Operations, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company	Absent
End Users Segment		
Bruce Hayes	Senior Regulatory Analyst, Ohio Consumers' Counsel	Absent
Tina Burnett	Chair, Northwest Industrial Gas Users Association	In Person
V A C A N C Y		
V A C A N C Y		
V A C A N C Y		
V A C A N C Y		
Service Providers Segment		
Rod Sipe	President, New Science Partners	Absent
Donald L. Sytsma	Vice President, R.J. Rudden Associates, Inc.	Absent
George M. Behr	Director, Energy Services Group, Inc.	Absent
V A C A N C Y		
V A C A N C Y		
V A C A N C Y		
Supplier Segment		
Suzanne Calcagno	Associate Director, Regulatory Compliance, UBS Warburg Energy, LLC	Phone
Barbara A. Fatina	Vice President, Exelon Energy	Phone
Marcy McCain	Project Manager – Regulatory Affairs, Duke Energy Gas Transmission, LLP	In Person
Richard Zollars	Director, Data and Information, Dominion Retail, Inc.	Absent
Alt. John Dosker	Stand Energy Corporation	Phone
V A C A N C Y		
V A C A N C Y		



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

Administrative:

Rae McQuade	-Executive Director
Todd Oncken	-NAESB Staff
Meghan McMillan	-NAESB Staff

Observers to the Meeting:

Name	Company	In Person/Phone
Arnaout, Mariam	American Gas Association	Phone
Burden, Christopher	Williams Gas Pipeline	In Person
Davis, Dale	Williams Gas Pipeline	In Person
Griffith, Bill	El Paso Western Pipelines	In Person
Gussow, Dona	Florida Power & Light	In Person
Lane, Terry	Green Mountain Energy	In Person
Paulson, Lawrence	Hoffman-Paulson Associates	In Person
Precht, Phil	Baltimore Gas & Electric	In Person
Ringenbach, Thomas	American Electric Power	In Person



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

TO: NAESB Wholesale Gas Quadrant Executive Committee, Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Todd Oncken, NAESB Deputy Director

RE: Draft Minutes from the NAESB Wholesale Gas Quadrant Executive Committee Meeting – December 11, 2003

DATE: December 23, 2003

**Wholesale Gas Quadrant
Executive Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 11, 2003
9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Central
Houston, TX**

1. Welcome

Mr. Buccigross called the meeting to order. Mr. Oncken gave the antitrust advice and called the roll of Executive Committee members. A quorum was established. The 2004 Executive Committee schedule was reviewed. The Executive Committee will meet February 24-26, May 4-6, August 24-26 and November 16-18, with the WGQ meeting on the third day of each session. It was noted that interim meetings could be called on an as needed basis. Locations are still being determined and in cases where a host is not available, the meetings will be held in Houston.

2. Wholesale Gas Quadrant Draft Agenda & Draft Minutes

During review of the draft agenda, it was noted that the letter from Chairman Wood and the Gas-Electric Coordination Task Force would be discussed in connection with the review of the 2004 Annual Plan. Review and vote on minor corrections was added as the first bullet under subcommittee updates. Ms. Davis moved, seconded by Ms. Chezar, to adopt the revised agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

The redlined WGQ Executive Committee draft minutes from October 9, 2003 were reviewed. No additional changes were made. Ms. Davis moved, seconded by Mr. Young, to adopt the redlined draft minutes from October 9, 2003. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Review of Board Approved 2004 Annual Plan and Assignments

The Board approved 2004 WGQ Annual Plan was reviewed in light of Chairman Wood's letter (Tab4) and the establishment documents for the Gas-Electric Coordination Task Force (Tab 6).

November 14, 2003 letter from Chairman Wood: Ms. McQuade reported that she, Mr. Desselle and Mr. Haynes met with Chairman Wood on November 10 and Chairman Wood sent a response on November 14 noting the items he found significant during the meeting. Ms. McQuade stated the Chairman was very disappointed in the work product produced on wholesale gas creditworthiness issues. However, she said the meeting, where the draft 2004 Annual Plans was discussed, was positive overall. Participants discussed the Chairman's displeasure over creditworthiness. Mr. Hinners suggested that the comments made in the filing should have explained the work product. Ms. McQuade explained the Chairman's seminal question was whether the NAESB process was broken, to which she responded that some members believed that clear policy was not provided, and as such could not vote for many parts of the proposed standards.

The elements of Chairman Wood's letter were reviewed and clarification was offered on several points. It was noted that the majority of the letter addressed wholesale electric concerns; however, LNG and the coordination of gas and electric on Intraday issues would directly impact the WGQ.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Ms. McQuade stated there would likely be communication back to the FERC on the plan of action and general timeline after the Gas-Electric Coordination Task Force has met.

NAESB Gas-Electric Coordination Task Force (GEC): The draft work plan for the GEC was reviewed. Participants discussed meeting locations and timing at length. It was noted that the first date (co-chairs planning conference call) was a firm date, but the subsequent dates outlined in the work plan and posted on the NAESB web site were proposed dates subject to change at the discretion of the task force chairs. Additionally, Executive Committee members expressed a preference to have two day meetings instead of single day meetings.

Ms. McVicker volunteered to co-chair the task force for the WGQ. Additional co-chairs of the task force include Ms. Calcagno representing the RGQ, Ms. Kiselewich representing the REQ, and Mr. Jackson representing the WEQ. Ms. McVicker agreed that two day meetings would be appropriate, especially since the initial meetings will be for the education of all participants. Further, Ms. McVicker said she would bring the meeting timing concerns noted to the attention of the other co-chairs during the planning meeting.

Ms. McQuade noted that the WEQ is forming an internal task force which will make up its participation in the GEC. She noted this task force will presumably meet separately on occasion to discuss WEQ specific issues. Ms. Van Pelt and Ms. Chezar favored that approach but a WGQ task force was not established at this time.

Mr. Griffith noted that the mission of the GEC has not been fully scoped and accepted by all four quadrants. Mr. Buccigross suggested that the GEC, possibly through its leadership, draft a mission statement for Executive Committee consideration in a four quadrant environment.

2004 WGQ Annual Plan: Mr. Buccigross stated the 2004 WGQ Annual Plan was presented and approved by the Board during its December meeting. He noted that the Board was informed of the potential change regarding Request R03031, but the draft plan was adopted without modifications.

Ms. Van Pelt moved, seconded by Mr. Young, to move the provisional item, "Intraday nomination issues" to active status. Ms. Van Pelt said this change would highlight potential resource issues for member organizations. Ms. Chezar suggested it would be more appropriate to address these issues as standards maintenance. It was suggested that "Status Report on Gas-Electric scheduling coordination issues" would be more descriptive language for the item. Further, it was suggested that the new item be assigned to the GEC TF with a completion date of 2Q2004. Ms. Van Pelt and Mr. Young accepted the changes to the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Spangler moved, seconded by Mr. Novak, to move the provisional item, "FERC order – Docket No. RM01-10-000 (Affiliate Order)" to active status, assigned to the BPS with a completion date of 2Q2004. Ms. Van Pelt proposed the following alternative language for the item: Review and develop necessary standards for FERC Order 2004 (Affiliate Order). Mr. Spangler and Mr. Novak accepted the change to the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Subcommittee Updates and Final Review of 2003 Annual Plan

Minor Corrections: Ms. Davis presented several minor corrections that were discovered during the compilation of version 1.7. Ms. Davis stated there were 23 corrections, and characterized them as follows: 4 relate to footnotes; 10 are typographical errors; 3 are transactional reporting; and 6 are modifications to the technical change log. Additionally, she noted the spelling of NAESB needed to be corrected on item 23 before the corrections were adopted. Ms. Davis moved, seconded by Mr. Griffith, to adopt the minor corrections revealed through compilation of NAESB WGQ Standards version 1.7. The motion passed unanimously.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Business Practices Subcommittee: Ms. Van Pelt reported on the Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS). She stated the BPS is currently working on several requests, including the request regarding segmented nominations. Regarding that request, she said the subcommittee is evaluating alternative measures that would produce a standard with broader applicability. Ms. Van Pelt stated the BPS would complete its work on the requests it has started and then look at the schedule and other pending requests. Included in the pending requests is Request R03023 (PGAS request for XML measurement), which will also have to be coordinated with the RGQ.

Contracts Subcommittee: Mr. Sappenfield gave the Contracts Subcommittee report. He stated an interpretations request has been referred to the subcommittee and a request regarding arbitration language for the Base Contract is pending in the Triage Subcommittee. Mr. Sappenfield projected that both items would be addressed after the arbitration request was assigned to the subcommittee.

EDM Subcommittee: Mr. Burden gave the EDM Subcommittee report. Mr. Burden stated the subcommittee is continuing its work with the retail quadrants to develop an Electronic Transport (ET) specification that would serve the general needs of all three quadrants, with quadrant-specific needs being served by individual quadrant specifications. Mr. Burden informed the Executive Committee that decisions about version and standards numbering, as well as document management and maintenance, will have to be addressed for the new ET since it would apply to the three quadrants. The Executive Committee recognized these as issues that should be resolved. Ms. Van Pelt suggested proposing the specification as NAESB ET version 1.0, and maintaining the specification through a multi-quadrant subcommittee, similar to how it was developed.

Information Requirements Subcommittee: Ms. Davis reported on the Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR). She stated IR is working through its backlog and a revised log has been posted. She noted two impending requests were for a storage report and fuel information request.

Technical/X12 Subcommittee: Ms. Van Pelt reported on the Technical/X12 Subcommittee. She stated the subcommittee is completing its work on a single data set for transactional reporting to be presented to the DISA X12 Subcommittee. Ms. Van Pelt noted that the single data set will be used in three different ways for the purposes of the NAESB standards. Ms. Van Pelt projected DISA's work on the data set will be completed by the end of 2004 and the new data sets can be included in NAESB WGQ Standards version 1.8. Additionally, she noted there is some backlog the subcommittee is working through.

Interpretations Subcommittee: Mr. Buccigross reported that the Interpretations Subcommittee met on October 16 regarding Request C03006 and referred that item to the Contracts Subcommittee for further action.

Final Update of 2003 Annual Plan: Mr. Buccigross reviewed the 2003 Annual Plan, but no modifications were offered. Mr. Buccigross noted that most of the items of the 2003 plan would be completed.

5. Board Meeting 12-04-03 Review

Mr. Buccigross reported on the December 4, 2003 Board of Directors Meeting. Mr. Buccigross stated that the Board approved all 2004 Annual Plans without modification. Additionally, Ms. McQuade stated the Board adopted the budget which contained the assumption of charging for selected conference calls and continued promotional dues of \$500 for three Consumer Advocate Representatives for each of the WEQ, REQ and RGQ. For the convenience of the Executive Committee, Ms. McQuade reviewed the conference call administration policy, as follows: With the exception of trade association staff, consumer advocates and government employees, \$50 fee will be assessed per line for conference calling attendance when the opportunity to attend in person is available; as an alternative, member organizations can pay a one time fee of \$1000 to cover all



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

conference calling needs of the organization for 2004. A letter describing how the policy will work will be distributed soon. Ms. McQuade noted the effects on participation and administration of the conference calling policy will be closely monitored by the Board.

6. Revised WGQ Procedures

Ms. Van Pelt presented the revised WGQ procedures. It was noted that the procedures were not redlined against the current procedures, but instead were based upon the RGQ procedures and modified accordingly. The revised procedures will be distributed in word format for member comment. It was noted that the procedures rely heavily on segment procedures, so Ms. Van Pelt suggested each segment review its procedures. Since the process for amendment of the procedures (section 18.1) is consistent with the current NAESB Certificate of Incorporation and Bylaws, those procedures will be followed in adoption of the revised procedures. Should significant comments be received, the WGQ Procedures Task Force will meet again to discuss the comments and make any warranted changes prior to adoption.

7. New Business.

Installation of 2004 EC Officers: Ms. McQuade announced that Mr. Buccigross and Ms. Van Pelt were elected as chair and vice chair, respectively, of the WEQ Executive Committee for 2004.

Publication Related Item: Ms. Van Pelt suggested that the WGQ develop a procedure to continually update the standards books after each ratification ballot. Ms. Van Pelt said that although the document would not be published, it would assist the subcommittee leadership in doing their work. Additionally, she suggested this process would help in the final compilation of the manuals prior to publication of the next version. All parties agreed that was a good idea. Documents in editable form will be forwarded to the subcommittee chairs for their editing, once the version 1.7 manuals have been completed.

Discussion of recent creditworthiness events: Mr. Hinnens briefly discussed the compliance order recently issued by the FERC (see tab 19 of the meeting materials). It was noted this order could impact NAESB WGQ Standard 5.3.zd. Mr. Hinnens suggested the Executive Committee should modify, or delete, NAESB WGQ Standard 5.3.zd to be consistent with FERC policy prior to publication of version 1.7. This option was discussed but action was not taken since there was not enough time for either process to conclude prior to the publication date. The process for modification or deletion is similar to the process for adoption of a standard.

To address the issue, it was decided that the transmittal letter to the FERC for NAESB WGQ Standards version 1.7 would include a notation that there is a pending request to modify or delete Standard 5.3.zd in light of the Cove Point Order. Ms. Chezar agreed to draft the noted standards request. There was tacit agreement among the Executive Committee that the request would be limited to this discrete issue and would not be a reopening of creditworthiness.

Comments from Mr. Oberski, chair of the WEQ Executive Committee: Mr. Oberski introduced himself to the Executive Committee and made brief comments on the WEQ's work for the coming year. He noted that Chairman Wood's letter closely parallels the 2004 WEQ Annual Plan. He noted it is incumbent upon the WEQ to demonstrate to the FERC and the industry that it can produce results. Mr. Oberski thanked the Executive Committee in advance for their cooperation regarding the Gas-Electric Coordination Task Force and noted the high priority that the WEQ has placed on this item.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. Central.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
 Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
 Home Page: www.naesb.org

9. Attendees

Note: The votes listed below are as follows: Y = In favor, O = Opposed, A = Abstain.

End User Segment	Title, Organization	Attendance	V1 ¹
Diane McVicker	Sr. Principal Fuel Supply Analyst, Salt River Project	In Person	Y
Gary Hinners	Director of Natural Gas Regulatory Issues, Reliant Energy Services, Inc.	In Person	Y
Kelly Daly	Partner, Stinson, Morrison & Hecker, rep. Arizona Public Service Co.	Phone	Y
Dona Gussow	Contracts Coordinator, Florida Power and Light	In Person	Y
Tina Burnett	Natural Gas Operations Administrator, The Boeing Company	In Person	Y
LDC Segment			
Rodger Schwecke	Pipeline Products Projects Manager, Southern California Gas Company	In Person	Y
Dolores Chezar	Director, Regulatory Policy, KeySpan Energy	In Person	Y
Craig Colombo, alt. for C. Maturo	Dominion Resources	In Person	Y
Mike Novak	Assistant General Manager, National Fuel Gas Distribution	In Person	Y
Steve Sullivan	Regulatory Manager of Gas Supply, Consolidated Edison Co. of NY	Phone	Y
Pipeline Segment			
Paul Love, alt. for M. Gracey	Director, Electronic Customer Services, Natural Gas Pipe Line Company of America	In Person	Y
Bill Griffith	Director, Transmission & Storage, Colorado Interstate Gas Co.	In Person	Y
Dale Davis	Consultant, Williams Gas Pipeline	In Person	Y
Randy Young	Director, Regulatory Compliance, Gulf South Pipeline Co., LP	In Person	Y
Kim Van Pelt	NAESB Coordinator, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line	In Person	Y
Producer Segment			
Jim Busch	Director of Energy Policy and Regulation, BP Energy Company	Absent	
Paul Keeler	Managing Attorney, Marketing, Burlington Resources	In Person	Y
Sherri Heslington	Dominion Exploration & Production, Inc.	Absent	
Richard Smith	Regulatory, ExxonMobil Gas & Power Marketing	In Person	Y
Mike Shepard	General Counsel, Mewbourne Oil Company	In Person	Y
Services Segment			
Suzanne Calcagno	Associate Director – Regulatory Compliance, UBS Warburg Energy	Absent	
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y		
Leigh Spangler	CEO, Latitude Technologies	In Person	Y
Jim Buccigross	Vice President, 8760 Inc.	In Person	Y
Keith Sappenfield	Regional Director of Regulatory Affairs, EnCana Marketing (USA) Inc.	In Person	Y

¹ Motion: adopt the minor corrections revealed through compilation of NAESB WGQ Standards version 1.7.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Administrative:

Rae McQuade	-Executive Director
Veronica Thomason	-NAESB Staff
Todd Oncken	-NAESB Staff

Observers to the Meeting:

Name	Company	In Person/Phone
Mariam Arnaout	American Gas Association	Phone
Bill Barkas	Dominion Retail	In Person
Mike Bray	Shell Gas Transmission	In Person
Curt Brechtel	Arizona Public Service Co.	Phone
Kathryn Burch	Duke Energy Gas Transmission	In Person
Christopher Burden	Williams Gas Pipeline	In Person
Yvette Camp	Southern Company	Phone
Pete Connor	NiSource	Phone
Valerie Crockett	Tennessee Valley Authority	In Person
Tom Gwilliam	Iroquois Gas Transmission System	Phone
Scott Hansen	Questar Pipeline Co.	In Person
Veronica Jones	Defense Energy Support Center	Phone
Melissa Lauderdale	Edison Electric Institute	Phone
Jane Lewis	American Gas Association	Phone
Les Nishida	Wisconsin Public Service Co.	In Person
Lou Oberski	Dominion	In Person
Bill Oppenheim	Not Provided	In Person
Lawrence Paulson	Hoffman-Paulson Associates	In Person
Marjorie Perlman	Energy East Management Corp.	Phone
Phil Precht	Baltimore Gas & Electric	In Person
Donna Scott	Transwestern Pipeline Co.	In Person
Leonard Wright	Questar Pipeline Co.	In Person

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting - WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

TAB 4

Triage Report & Executive Committee Report



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

January 14, 2003

TO: NAESB Triage Subcommittee: Kim Van Pelt, Mike Novak, Tina Burnett, Keith Sappenfield, Sheri Heslington, Barbara Alexander, Ruth Kiselewich, Rob Connell, Jack Leonard, Barry Green, Mike Gildea, John Hughes, Darrell Gerrard, Rod Sipe, Bruce Hayes, Suzanne Calcagno, Nancy Cianflone

Requesters: David E. Ulicne, Charlie Bass, Dona Gussow, Dolores Chezar, Dale Davis, Joel Dison,

CC: All NAESB EC Members

FROM: Todd Oncken, Deputy Director

RE: Triage Subcommittee Results – January 9, 2004

**NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
TRIAGE SUBCOMMITTEE RESULTS OF CONFERENCE CALL
January 9, 2004**

1. Administrative

Mr. Buccigross opened the meeting. Mr. Oncken gave the antitrust advice. Mr. Oncken called the roll of Triage Subcommittee members. The agenda was re-ordered to address Request R04005-R04007 first. Ms. Van Pelt moved, seconded by Ms. Gussow, to adopt the revised draft agenda. The agenda was adopted without objection.

2. Review and determine recommended scope and quadrant recommended assignments for:

Request R03033

Request: The American Arbitration Association (AAA) recommends the addition of an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Agreement as a special provision to the Base Contract.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R03033 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the Wholesale Gas Quadrant (WGQ).

Request R03034

Request: El Paso Eastern Pipelines requests a change to the Nominations set data mapping to allow for the Model type to be sent at a detailed level.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R03034 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the WGQ.

Request R03035

Request: Florida Power & Light requests that NAESB establish standards relating to gas quality specifications and measurement, as follows: (a) establish web-based reports for tracking all physical and chemical properties of natural gas defined in pipeline tariffs, including timelines for reporting; (b) develop a uniform process, including the underlying assumptions and methodologies, for determining gas quality specifications from measured data; and (c) examine the need to establish gas quality specification standards taking into consideration, (i) the specification needs of end users and providers of service to end users, and (ii) sources of supply (e.g. land-based, the Gulf, LNG).



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

During lengthy discussion of the item, it became apparent that that parts a-c of the request would likely be addressed differently.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee recommended that Request R03035 be split into three request according to the classifications found under item 3 of the request. Further, the Triage Subcommittee recommended that parts A and B be found within NAESB scope and properly assigned to the WGQ. The Triage Subcommittee did not make a recommendation on part C.

Request R03036

Request: KeySpan Energy requests the deletion of existing WGQ Standard 5.3.zD and development of a new standard regarding the prequalification of potential replacement shippers for capacity release offers that reflects FERC policy detailed in Dominion Cove Point LNG order in RP03-545 dated November 18, 2003.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R03036 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the WGQ.

Request R04001

Request: Williams Gas Pipeline requests a new Senders Option data element 'Preparer E-mail Address' be added in the Shipper Imbalance – NAESB WGQ Std. 2.4.4.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R04001 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the WGQ.

Request R04002

Request: Williams Gas Pipeline requests two new Senders Option data elements -'Billable Party (Payer) Contact' and 'Invoice Status Code', and associated code values, be added in the following data sets for NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.1 and NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.4.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R04002 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the WGQ.

Request R04003

Request: Williams Gas Pipeline requests a new Mutually Agreeable data element be added in the Transportation / Sales Invoice – NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.1.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R04003 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the WGQ.

Request R04004

Request: Williams Gas Pipeline requests a new Business Conditional data element 'Voluntary GRI Paid' be added in the Payment Remittance - NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.2.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R04004 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the WGQ.

Request R04005

Request: Southern Company proposes the Wholesale Electric Quadrant's (WEQ's) acceptance of the current OASIS Business Practice Standards and Communication Protocol Standards.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R04005 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the WEQ.

Request R04006



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Request: Southern Company proposes the WEQ's acceptance of the WEQ Information Technology Subcommittee's recommended actions on the OASIS 1A issues that were left over from the OASIS Scheduling Collaborative.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R04006 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the WEQ.

Request R04007

Request: Southern Company request the review of existing OASIS standards and Commission proceedings and development of a body of standards that would be considered OASIS Phase 2.

Disposition: The Triage Subcommittee found Request R04007 within NAESB Scope and properly assigned to the WEQ.

3. Determination of recommendation of disposition of the requests

Quadrant-specific assignments were addressed in parallel with the discussions regarding scope and quadrant assignment.

Request R03033, R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003, R04004

WGQ Triage Subcommittee members proposed that Requests R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003, and R04004 be assigned to the WGQ Business Practices Subcommittee to be addressed in the normal course of business and Request R03033 be assigned to the WGQ Contracts Subcommittee to be addressed in the normal course of business.

Request R04005, R04006, R04007

WEQ Triage Subcommittee members proposed the following subcommittee assignments and priority: Request R04005 to the WEQ ESS to be addressed as high priority, Request R04006 to the WEQ ESS and WEQ ITS jointly to be addressed as high priority and Request R04007 to the WEQ ESS and WEQ ITS jointly to be addressed in the normal course of business.

4. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

5. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m. Central.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

6. Attendees

Name	Company
Mariam Arnaout	AGA
Kathryn Burch	Duke Energy
Christopher Burden	Williams Gas Pipeline
James Cargas	NAESB
Dolores Chezar	KeySpan Energy
Pete Connor	NiSource Pipelines
Valerie Crockett	Tennessee Valley Authority
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline
Jim Dillon	Niagara
Bruce Garcey	Niagara
Bill Griffith	Colorado Interstate
Dona Gussow	Florida Power & Light Company
Tom Gwilliam	Iroquois Gas Transmission System
India Johnson	American Arbitration Association
Marcy McCain	Duke Energy
Debbie Miller	American Arbitration Association
Randy Mills	ChevronTexaco
Todd Oncken	NAESB
Marjorie Perlman	Energy East Management Corp.
Lisa Robert	Defense Energy Support Center
Micki Schmitz	Northern Natural Gas
Donna Scott	Transwestern Pipelines
Marilyn Specht	NiSource Pipelines
Maria Stateman	KeySpan
Jim Templeton	Comprehensive Energy
Scott Tomashefsky	California Energy Commission
David Ulicne	American Arbitration Association
Brian White	NiSource Pipelines
Randy Young	Gulf South Pipeline



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002
 Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
 Home Page: www.naesb.org

7. Triage Members and Voting Record

Present/Voting					Name	Seg	Company	Email	Phone	Fax
Wholesale Gas Quadrant										
1	2	3	4	5	Triage:					
Y	Y	Y	Y		Kim Van Pelt	pl	CMS Panhandle Eastern P/L	kvanpelt@panhandleenergy.com	713-989-7354	713-989-1121
Y	Y	Y	Y		Mike Novak	l	National Fuel Gas Distribution	novakm@natfuel.com	716-857-7884	716-857-7687
					Tina Burnett	e	Boeing Co.	tina.m.burnett@boeing.com	206-544-5752	206-544-5245
					Keith Sappenfield	s	EnCana Corporation	keith.sappenfield@encana.com	832-204-1247	713-952-3617
B	Y	Y			Sheri Heslington	p	Dominion E&P, Inc.	sheri_j_heslington@dom.com	801-463-1390	801-463-9443
					Alternates:					
					Randy Young	pl	Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP	randy.young@gulfsouthpl.com	713-544-4715	713-544-6257
					Dolores Chezar	l	KeySpan Energy	dchezar@keyspanenergy.com	718-403-2927	718-246-2927
					Diane McVicker	e	Salt River Project	dbmcvick@srpnet.com	602-236-4315	602-236-4322
Y	Y	Y	Y		Jim Buccigross	s	8760 Inc.	jhb@8760.com	508-238-0345	508-238-0858
Retail Electric Quadrant										
1	2	3	4	5	Triage:					
					VACANCY	su				
B	Y	Y			Barbara Alexander	e	Maine Office of Public Advocate	barbalex@ctel.net	207-395-4143	207-395-4143
B	Y	Y			Ruth Kiselewich	d	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	ruth.c.kiselewich@bge.com	410-265-4003	410-265-4696
					Rob Connell	s	ERCOT	rconnell@ercot.com	512-248-3963	512-248-3963
					Alternates:					
					Jim Minneman	s	PPL Solutions	jmminneman@pplweb.com	610-774-5774	610-774-7229
					Terry Moran	d	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	terrence.moran@pseg.com	973-430-7105	973-624-4107
					Steve LaFond	e	Boeing	steven.c.lafond@boeing.com	206-544-0583	
Wholesale Electric Quadrant										



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Present/Voting					Name	Seg	Company	Email	Phone	Fax
1	2	3	4	5	Triage:					
Y	Y	Y		Y	Jack Leonard	d	PECO Energy Company	jack.leonard@peco-energy.com	215-841-4879	215-841-4234
					Barry Green	g	Ontario Power Generation	barry.green@opg.com	416-592-7883	416-592-8519
					Mike Gildea	m	Duke Energy North America, LLC	mfgildea@duke-energy.com	713-598-5082	713-627-6566
B	Y	Y			John Hughes	e	ELCON	jhughes@elcon.org	202-682-1390	202-289-6370
					Darrell Gerrard	t	PacifiCorp	Darrell.gerrard@pacificorp.com	503-813-6994	
					Alternates:					
					Daniel Cooper	d	Michigan Public Power Agency	dcooper@mpower.org	517-232-8919	517-323-8373
					Bob Goss	g	Southeastern Power Admin	bobg@sepa.doe.gov	706-213-3860	706-213-3884
					Alan Johnson	m	Mirant	alan.r.johnson@mirant.com	678-579-3108	678-579-7726
Y	Y	Y		Y	Joel Dison	m	Southern Company Services	jjdison@southernco.com	205-257-6481	205-257-6824
					Steve Sayuk	e	ExxonMobil Gas Marketing	steve.m.sayuk@exxonmobil.com	713-656-3203	713-656-7343
					Mary Ellen Paravalos	t	National Grid USA	mary.ellen.paravalos@us.ngrid.com	508-389-3233	508-389-3129
Retail Gas Quadrant										
1	2	3	4	5	Triage:					
B	Y	Y			Rod Sipe	s	New Science Partners	rsipe@houston.rr.com	713-350-1014	713-438-1000
B	Y	Y			Bruce Hayes	e	Ohio Consumers Counsel	hayes@occ.state.oh.us	614-387-2964	614-466-9475
Y	Y	Y			Suzanne Calcagno	su	UBS Warburg Energy	suzanne.calcagno@ubs.com	713-584-4880	713-584-2138
					Nancy Cianflone	d	KeySpan Energy Delivery	ncianflone@keyspanenergy.com	718-403-2505	718-596-7802
					Alternates:					
					Marcy McCain	su	Duke Energy – Algonquin	mlmccain@duke-energy.com	713-627-4738	713-627-5947
Y	Y	Y			Steve Zavodnick	d	Baltimore Gas & Electric	steven.m.zavodnick@bge.com	410-291-4908	410-291-5104
					Greg Lander	s	CapacityCenter.com	glander@skippingstone.com	978-535-7500	978-535-7744



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

- Key:**
- (1) – PRESENT:** (Y) present during call, (N) not present during call and did not provide an indication of voting prior to the call, (A) not present during the call but did provide a vote via email, (B) not present during the call but did provide a vote via email after the call,
 - (2) – R03033, R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003, R04004, R04005, R04006, R04007:** (Y) found in scope and the following assignments - R03033, R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003, R04004 to the WGQ, R04005, R04006, R04007 to the WEQ, (blank) not present for voting or did not provide vote prior to call,
 - (3) -- R03025:** (Y) found parts a and b in scope and assigned to the WGQ, (blank) not present for voting or did not provide vote prior to call,
 - (4) -- R03033, R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003, R04004 for WGQ members only:** (Y) assigned R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003, R04004 to the WGQ Business Practices Subcommittee to be addressed in the normal course of business and assigned R03033 to the WGQ Contracts Subcommittee to be addressed in the normal course of business, (blank) not present for voting or did not provide vote prior to call
 - (5) – R04005, R04006, R04007 for WEQ members only:** (Y) assigned R04005 to the WEQ ESS to be addressed as high priority, R04006 to the WEQ ESS and WEQ ITS jointly to be addressed as high priority and R04007 to the WEQ ESS and WEQ ITS jointly to be addressed in the normal course of business, (blank) not present for voting or did not provide vote prior to call.

Shaded areas indicate that voting is not applicable for the given quadrant.



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

TO: NAESB Executive Committee, Posting for Interested Industry Participants
FROM: Todd Oncken, Deputy Director
RE: Draft Minutes from the NAESB All-Quadrant Executive Committee Conference Call – February 5, 2004
DATE: February 8, 2004

**NAESB Executive Committee Conference Call
February 5, 2004, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. Central
Draft Minutes**

1. Welcome

Mr. Buccigross called the meeting to order. Mr. Oncken gave the antitrust advice and called the roll of Executive Committee members. The draft agenda was reviewed and adopted by consent without modifications. Because quorum was not reached for all of quadrants (at the beginning of the meeting WGQ had quorum but WEQ, REQ and RGQ did not), this meeting was considered a working session and all votes to be taken would also go out notationally.

2. Discussion and Vote on Triage Recommendation for Requests R03033-R03036 and R04001-R04007 (scope and quadrant assignment)

Mr. Novak moved, seconded by Ms. Heslington, to accept the Triage Subcommittee recommendation that Requests R03033, R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003, and R04004 are within NAESB scope and properly assigned to the WGQ. The motion passed the WGQ unanimously and will be distributed for notational vote for the WEQ, REQ and RGQ. (Vote 1)

Ms. Kiselewich moved, seconded by Mr. Novak, to accept the Triage Subcommittee recommendation that Requests R04005, R04006 and R04007 are within NAESB scope and properly assigned to the WEQ. The motion passed the WGQ unanimously and will be distributed for notational vote for the WEQ, REQ and RGQ. (Vote 2)

The Triage Subcommittee recommendation for Request R03035 was discussed extensively. It was agreed to address parts A, B and C of the request individually. Ms. Gussow did not support the separation because she viewed them as parts of the single request.

Ms. Gussow moved, seconded by Ms. Heslington, to accept the Triage Subcommittee recommendation that Request R03035-A is within scope and properly assigned to the WGQ (Vote 3). During extensive discussion the following points were raised:

- The request is out of scope because it would require pipelines to dedicate considerable resources to implement and it does not note the frequency requested for reporting data.
- Setting timelines for reporting could be out of scope if the resulting standards would run contrary to established testing practices.
- Gas quality and chemical properties are defined differently in each tariff, and also in individual contracts. Addressing gas quality outside of a pipeline tariff is inappropriate.
- Gas quality should be examined because, from a producer's perspective, non-uniform specifications affect the ability to perform reliable service.



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

- Discussing the request is premature in light of the pending FERC Conference on February 18, 2004. There was disagreement on whether the conference would impact the scope determination.
- The American Society for Testing & Materials, another ANSI-accredited organization, has worked on gas quality issues for decades and this request might duplicate its work.
- The quality of gas that is feeding into utility generation facilities impacts the equipment at those facilities and there is no reliable, uniform source to obtain that information.
- The bill for gas service is typically tied to the quality of the gas, so quality is a germane issue in verifying charges.
- Concerns about gas quality specifications not meeting tariff guidelines should be addressed through the FERC complaint process rather than a standards process.
- It was suggested that installing chromatographs at receipt points, a method used by some LDCs, would address the utility concerns for information.
- Due to the upcoming FERC Conference on Gas Interchangeability on February 19, the vote and consideration of this request should be postponed.

The vote on the motion was taken and the motion failed the WGQ. Even though the motion will be distributed for notational vote for the WEQ, REQ and RGQ, the motion failed since it must pass the each quadrant of the Executive Committee. The matter will be referred to the Managing Committee and the Board of Directors for an ultimate decision on the scope determination.

Ms. Gussow moved, seconded by Mr. Johnson, to accept the Triage Subcommittee recommendation that Request R03035-B is within scope and properly assigned to the WGQ (Vote 4). During extensive discussion the following points were raised:

- The attachment to the recommendation demonstrates through a sampling of pipeline tariffs the methods through which heating value is determined – there are various standards used, or none stated.
- There are currently physical measurements that have evolved over decades, and the industry has participated in that process through other forums.
- There are some gas quality items reported on through the NAESB ‘Measured Volume Audit Statement.’
- It is significant to a shipper if gas quality is calculated differently on two connecting pipelines, because even though both calculations are valid it hinders the ability to a shipper to move gas.
- The opportunity for standards has long been viewed an opportunity to reliably move gas, because the same rules apply regardless of which pipeline is being used.
- These are operational issues for pipelines, not informational issues applicable to standards development.
- Due to the upcoming FERC Conference on Gas Interchangeability on February 19, the vote and consideration of this request should be postponed.

The vote on the motion was taken and the motion failed the WGQ. Even though the motion will be distributed for notational vote for the WEQ, REQ and RGQ, the motion failed since it must pass the



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

entire Executive Committee. The matter will be referred to the Managing Committee and the Board of Directors for an ultimate decision on the scope determination.

Ms. Gussow moved, seconded by Mr. Johnson, to find that Request R03035-C is within scope and properly assigned to the WGQ (Vote 5). There was no Triage Subcommittee recommendation for Request R03035-C. During extensive discussion the following points were raised:

- The Natural Gas Collaborative is looking at this issue and will develop an issues list.
- While NAESB does not necessarily provide gas quality expertise, it does provide a forum where all interested parties can participate in the process. It was noted that other trade organizations might not provide the same opportunities.
- A FERC proceeding is the proper forum to resolve the issues contemplated by Request R03035-C, since any resulting standards could result in cost shifts.
- There is no uniform specification that manufacturers can use to design and build equipment.
- Due to the upcoming FERC Conference on Gas Interchangeability on February 19, the vote and consideration of this request should be postponed.

The vote on the motion was taken and the motion failed the WGQ. Even though the motion will be distributed for notational vote for the WEQ, REQ and RGQ, the motion failed since it must pass the entire Executive Committee. The matter will be referred to the Board for an ultimate decision on the scope determination.

3. Discussion and Vote on Triage Recommendation for Requests R03033-R03036 and R04001-R04007 (subcommittee assignment & priority)

Ms. Van Pelt moved, seconded by Mr. Zavodnick, to 1) assign Requests R03034, R03036, R04001, R04002, R04003 and R04004 to the WGQ Business Practices Subcommittee to be addressed in the normal course of business; and 2) assign Request R03033 to the WGQ Contracts Subcommittee to be addressed in the normal course of business (Vote 6). Absent objection, the motion passed unanimously.

Subcommittee assignment and priority for Requests R04005, R04006 and R04007 was deferred until the February WEQ Executive Committee meeting.

4. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

5. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m. Central.



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

6. Attendees

Note: The votes listed below are as follows: Y = In favor, YN = In favor (notational), N = Opposed, NN = Opposed (notational), A = Abstain.

Wholesale Gas Quadrant

End User Segment		Attendance	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6
Diane McVicker	Sr. Principal Fuel Supply Analyst, Salt River Project	No			YN	YN	YN	
Valerie Crockett, alt. for G. Hinners	Gas Transportation Specialist, Tennessee Valley Authority	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kelly Daly	Partner, Stinson, Morrison & Hecker, rep. Arizona Public Service Co.	No			YN	YN	YN	
Dona Gussow	Contracts Coordinator, Florida Power and Light	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tina Burnett	Natural Gas Operations Administrator, The Boeing Company	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Distribution Segment								
Rick Ishikawa, alt. for R. Schwecke	Transportation Contract Administrator, Southern California Gas Company	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Craig Colombo, alt. for D. Chezar	Dominion Resources	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Pete Connor, alt. for C. Maturo	NiSource Distribution Companies	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Jennifer Deegan, alt. for M. Novak	Federal Regulatory Affairs, Washington Gas	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Steve Zavodnick, alt. for S. Sullivan	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Pipeline Segment								
Mark Gracey	Consultant – Transportation Services, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co.	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Paul Love, alt. for B. Griffith	Director, Electronic Customer Services, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Dale Davis	Consultant, Williams Gas Pipeline	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Randy Young	Director Regulatory Compliance, Gulf South Pipeline	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Kim Van Pelt	NAESB Coordinator, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y



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

Producer Segment

Jim Busch	Director of Energy Policy and Regulation, BP Energy Company	No							
Paul Keeler	Managing Attorney, Marketing, Burlington Resources Trading	No							
Sheri Heslington	Dominion Exploration & Production, Inc.	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Richard Smith	Director, Regulatory Affairs, ExxonMobil Gas Marketing Co.	No							
Mike Shepard	General Counsel, Mewbourne Oil Company	No							

Services Segment

Suzanne Calcagno	Associate Director – Regulatory Compliance, UBS Warburg Energy	No							
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y								
Leigh Spangler	CEO, Latitude Technologies	Yes	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	
Jim Buccigross	Vice President, 8760 Inc.	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Keith Sappenfield	Regional Director – US Regulatory Affairs, EnCana Marketing (USA) Inc.	Yes	Y	Y					Y

Retail Electric Quadrant

Distribution Segment		Attendance	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6
Ruth Kiselewich	Director Special Projects and Supplier Services, Baltimore Gas & Electric Company (MAAC NERC Region)	Yes	Y	Y	N	A	A	
Terry Moran	Regulatory Issues Manager, PSEG (MAAC NERC Region)	No						
William Newbold	Strategy Manager of Electric Choice Implementation Team, Detroit Edison (ECAR NERC Region)	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	
Jonathan Kubler	Manager of Pricing and Rates, Georgia Power Company	No						

End User Segment

V A C A N C Y								
V A C A N C Y								
Barbara Alexander	Consumer Affairs Consultant, State of Maine Public Advocate	Yes	Y	Y	Y			

V A C A N C Y

Services Segment

Jim Minneman	Director of Business Services, PPL Solutions LLC	No						
--------------	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--



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

Dick Brooks	Independent Consultant	No
Rob Connell	Manager of Commercial Systems Applications, Electric Reliability Council of Texas	No
Mark S. Jarrett	Team Leader – Market Information and Analysis, Market Intelligence, Southern Company	No

Supplier Segment

Bill Barkas	Manager of Retail State Government Relations, Dominion Retail, Inc.	No
Margarida Williamson	Senior Counsel, Calpine PowerAmerica, LP	No
V A C A N C Y		
V A C A N C Y		

Wholesale Electric Quadrant

End User Segment		Attendance	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6
John Hughes	Director Technical Affairs, Electricity Consumers Resource Council (ELCON)	No						
V A C A N C Y	To be filled by the Large Industrials Sub-segment							
Steve Sayuk	Manager Americas Supply, Power & Gas Services Group, ExxonMobil Power & Gas Services, Inc.	No						
Randy Corbin	Assistant Director Analytical Services, Ohio Consumers' Counsel	No						
Paul Jett	Manager of Electric System Operation Customer Choice Transition, Cinergy Services Inc.	No						
Lou Ann Westerfield	Policy Strategist, Idaho Public Utilities Commission, rep. National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners	No						

Distribution/LSE Segment

Thomas Ringenbach	Manager Business Standards, American Electric Power Service Corporation	No
Jack Leonard	Director, Transmission Management, Exelon PECO Energy	No
Patrick W. Frazier	Vice President of Energy Operations, American Municipal Power Ohio Inc.	No
Daniel E. Cooper	Engineering Manager, Michigan Public Power Agency	No
Syd Berwager	Industry Restructuring Project Manager, Bonneville Power	No



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

V A C A N C Y	Administration/Power Business Line V A C A N C Y							
Generation Segment								
Bob Goss	Deputy Assistant Administrator of Power Resources, Southeastern Power Administration	No						
Louis Oberski	Transmission Manager, Dominion Energy Marketing Inc.	Yes	Y	Y				
Tony Reed	Project Manager, Southern Company Generation and Energy Marketing	No						
Barry Green	Manager US Regulatory Affairs, Ontario Power Generation	No						
Steven B. Corneli	Director of Regulatory Affairs, NRG Power Marketing Inc.	No						
William J. Gallagher	General Manager of Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	No						
Marketer/Broker Segment								
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y	No						
Joel Dison	Project Manager, Southern Company Generation and Energy Marketing	No						
Clay A. Norris	Division Director, Planning, North Carolina Municipal Power Agency #1	No						
Charles Yeung	Director of Business Standards, Reliant Resources	Yes	Y	Y	A			
Alan Johnson	Senior Policy Analyst, Mirant	Yes	Y	Y	Y	N	N	
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y	No						
Transmission Segment								
Steven C. Cobb	Manager Grid Access and Scheduling Services, Salt River Project	No						
Jim Hicks, alt. for D. Gerrard	PacifiCorp	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	
John E. Lucas	Manager, Transmission Services, Southern Company	No						
Mary Ellen Paravalos	Manager ITC Development, National Grid USA	No						
Dan Klempel	Director Transmission Regulatory Compliance, Basin Electric Power Cooperative	No						
Julie Voeck	Manager Strategic Policy and Planning, American Transmission Company	No						



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

Retail Gas Quadrant

DISTRIBUTORS SEGMENT		ATTENDANCE	VOTE 1	VOTE 2	VOTE 3	VOTE 4	VOTE 5	VOTE 6
Nancy Cianflone	Director, Marketing Services Area, KeySpan Energy	No						
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
Leslie H. Nishida	Gas Federal Regulatory Supervisor, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Michael Novak	Assistant General Manager, National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation	Yes	Y	Y	A	N	N	
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
Steven M. Zavodnick	Senior Engineer Gas Operations, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company	No						
END USERS SEGMENT								
Bruce M. Hayes	Senior Regulatory Analyst, Ohio Consumers' Counsel	No						
Tina Burnett	Chair, Northwest Industrial Gas Users Association	No						
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
SERVICE PROVIDERS SEGMENT								
Rod Sipe	President, New Science Partners	No						
Donald L. Sytsma	Vice President, R.J. Rudden Associates, Inc.	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
George M. Behr	Director, Energy Services Group, Inc.	No						
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
SUPPLIER SEGMENT								
Suzanne Calcagno	Associate Director, Regulatory Compliance, UBS Warburg Energy, LLC	No						



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

Barbara A. Fatina	Vice President, Exelon Energy	No						
Marcy McCain	Project Manager – Regulatory Affairs, Duke Energy Gas Transmission, LLP	Yes	Y	Y	N	N	N	
Richard Zollars	Director, Data and Information, Dominion Retail, Inc.	No						
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							
V A C A N C Y	V A C A N C Y							

Quadrant	EC Members	In Favor	Opposed	Result
Wholesale Gas Quadrant				
Retail Gas Quadrant				
Wholesale Electric Quadrant				
Retail Electric Quadrant				



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

Observers to the Meeting:

Name	Company	Notes
Mike Bray	Shell Gas	
Christopher Burden	Williams Gas Pipelines	
Cynthia Corcoran	Enbridge Energy	
Greg Groat	Questar Pipeline	
Tom Gwilliam	Iroquois Gas Transmission Systems	
Nancy Hetrick	Northern Natural Gas	
Iris King	Dominion Transmission	
Jane Lewis	American Gas Association	
Todd Oncken	NAESB	Admin
Rae McQuade	NAESB	Admin
Rhone Resh	NGSA	
Lisa Robert	Defense Energy Support Center	
Marilyn Specht	Nisource	
Brian White	Nisource Pipelines	

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting - WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

Requests
R03033 – R04010

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Instructions:

1. Please fill out as much of the requested information as possible. It is mandatory to provide a contact name, phone number and fax number to which questions can be directed. If you have an electronic mailing address, please make that available as well.
2. Attach any information you believe is related to the request. The more complete your request is, the less time is required to review it.
3. Once completed, send your request to:
Rae McQuade
NAESB, Executive Director
1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625
Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713-356-0060
Fax: 713-356-0067

by either mail, fax, or to NAESB's email address, naesb@aol.com.

Once received, the request will be routed to the appropriate subcommittees for review.

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Date of Request: October 24, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

American Arbitration Association
Two Gateway Center, Suite 1382
603 Stanwix Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name : David E. Ulicne
Title : Asst. Vice President
Phone : (412) 261-2364
Fax : (412) 261-6055
E-mail : UlicneD@adr.org

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Pursuant to section 14.11 of the NAESB Base Contract for Sale and Purchase of Natural Gas, the American Arbitration Association (AAA) recommends the addition of an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Agreement as a special provision to the Base Contract. Section 14.11 of the NAESB Base Contract for Sale and Purchase of Natural Gas stipulates that parties may agree to dispute resolution procedures in Special Provisions attached to the Base Contract or in Transaction Confirmation executed in writing by both parties. The AAA recommends the addition of standard mediation and arbitration provisions and language that, in accordance with the purpose of the Base Contract, are easy to understand and adopt by contracting parties. Please refer to Attachment A for a complete description of the proposed ADR Agreement.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

Business Purpose:

In searching for dispute resolution options that avoid litigation, a growing number of energy organizations and energy companies are turning to alternative dispute resolution (ADR). ADR provides a wide range of options that are aimed either at outright dispute prevention or at the resolution of problems in their earliest stages through the use of less adversarial techniques than litigation.

Pursuant to section 14.11 of the NAESB Base Contract for Sale and Purchase of Natural Gas, the American Arbitration Association (AAA) recommends the addition of an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Agreement as a special provision to the Base Contract. The purpose of the ADR Agreement is to provide standard ADR provisions and language that are easy to understand and adopt by contracting parties.

The design and structure of the ADR Agreement provides the contracting parties the ease and flexibility of choosing a dispute resolution option(s) by simply checking a box. In addition, the parties can also choose additional provisions that allow greater control and management of their dispute resolution process. The entire agreement was designed with the intent to provide parties a simple, standard method of choosing a dispute resolution path, thus by-passing the sometimes lengthy and tense discussions that are a result of contract negotiations.

The ADR Agreement provides for six different ADR options (A,B,C,D,E,F). The first two options (A,B) are the traditional ADR methods of:

- Mediation
- Arbitration

The remaining four options (C,D,E,F) are new, online dispute resolution methods provided by the AAA. These options include:

- Telephonic Mediation
- Online, In-Person Mediation Hearing Process
- Documents-Only Arbitration

□ Online, In-Person Arbitration Hearing Process

In section 2.1 of the ADR Agreement (Traditional ADR Methods), the parties have the option of choosing one and/or both methods, depending upon their preference, by selecting the appropriate boxes. Within each method, the parties have the additional option of customizing their process by selecting the appropriate provisions and providing some additional information.

In section 2.2 of the ADR Agreement (Online Dispute Resolution Methods), the parties have the option of selecting between several new and innovative methods. These methods were designed specifically to increase the efficiency of the process and decrease the transactional costs that accompany disputes arising out of online transactions.

The AAA has been serving the energy industry for decades through programs designed specifically to assist in resolving disputes in the energy industry. The AAA is listed as an ADR provider in several Independent Service Operator agreements and approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

The Association offers a wide-range of ADR options (mediation, arbitration, etc.) to assist parties in the resolution of disputes. In addition, the AAA often aids parties (at no cost) in the development of effective ADR clauses/programs that preserve the primary benefits of ADR, which are speed, justice, economy and confidentiality. Furthermore, the AAA offers knowledgeable case managers, experienced and well-equipped to handle all oil, gas, and electric power systems cases. In 2002, the AAA managed over 147 cases involving energy matters around the United States and abroad. The total claims and counterclaims in dispute exceeded \$600 million. The cases included oil, gas, electric and nuclear power matters.

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

The benefits of mediation and arbitration are widely appreciated – costs are lower, the process is faster, privacy is maintained, and outcomes can preserve, or even improve, relationships among the disputing parties. The following is a complete list of the tangible and intangible benefits that the use of ADR can provide:

Choice of Impartial Neutrals - The parties can select a neutral from a list of qualified persons, chosen specifically for their area of expertise in relation to the dispute. Biographical information is supplied by the AAA. Parties can also mutually agree to choose a neutral person not on the AAA panel.

Expertise of Neutrals - The AAA's panel consists of expert and knowledgeable neutrals from many professions and industries. The AAA has formed a national

energy panel (over 200 neutrals) that consist of some of the most well-known, respected, qualified, and experienced people in the energy industry.

Privacy - The hearings and awards are private and confidential (except as required by law or regulation). This helps to preserve positive working relationships.

Speed - Expeditious procedures and established time frames for each step serve to limit the time required to resolve disagreements.

Economy - Time saved is money saved. Many of the costly procedures associated with formal court processes can be eliminated in arbitration.

Flexibility - The AAA's dispute resolution procedures are flexible and can be used for many kinds of claims.

Informality - Each party presents its side of the story to the neutral in an atmosphere that is less formal than a court proceeding.

Continuing Relationships – Mediation and arbitration are less acrimonious than judicial processes and may help to settle disputes while preserving future business relationships.

International Dimension - The AAA maintains cooperative agreements with arbitral agencies in over 41 nations throughout the world. The International Centre for Dispute ResolutionSM (ICDR), a division of the AAA, has become the largest international commercial arbitral institution in the world. As a full-service global conflict management provider, the Centre administers worldwide dispute resolution proceedings under a set of rules consistently applied by the ICDR, rather than under numerous sets of national rules applied by unfamiliar foreign court systems.

Finality - AAA arbitration awards are final, binding, and legally enforceable, subject only to limited review by the courts. Of course, parties may also agree in advance that awards will be advisory only.

The simplicity of the ADR agreement allows the parties to choose a dispute resolution path without the lengthy and time-consuming discussions associated with contract negotiations.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

There are not any specific incremental costs to implement the proposed ADR Agreement. The only costs associated would be the time involved with the review of the proposed special provision by the various NAESB committees.

R03034

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or
Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 1

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Instructions:

1. Please fill out as much of the requested information as possible. It is mandatory to provide a contact name, phone number and fax number to which questions can be directed. If you have an electronic mailing address, please make that available as well.
2. Attach any information you believe is related to the request. The more complete your request is, the less time is required to review it.
3. Once completed, send your request to:
Rae McQuade
NAESB, Executive Director
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350
Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713-356-0060
Fax: 713-356-0067

by either mail, fax, or to NAESB's email address, naesb@aol.com.

Once received, the request will be routed to the appropriate subcommittees for review.

R03034

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or
Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 2

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Date of Request: November 26, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

El Paso Eastern Pipelines
ANR Pipeline
P.O. Box 2511
Houston, TX 77252-2511

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Mark Gracey
832-676-3803
832-676-3129
Mark.Gracey@elpaso.com

Charlie Bass
832-676-3801
832-676-3136
Charlie.Bass@elpaso.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Request to change the Nominations set data mapping to allow for the Model type to be sent at a detailed level.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

In remapping the nomination dataset, NAESB moved the Model type from the nomination level to the contract level. ANR has contracts that require customers to send in both a path nomination and a non-pathed nomination. The NAESB mapping change will cause customers to change their process where they will no longer be able to send in all of the nominations for a contract in a single file.

R03034

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 3

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Providing a option to send in this data element at the detail level will significantly reduce the cost of EDI for ANR customers without impacting the cost for other TSP's.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

N/A

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

N/A

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

N/A

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners:

N/A

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

R03035

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction

or

Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice
or Electronic Transaction

Instructions:

1. Please fill out as much of the requested information as possible. It is mandatory to provide a contact name, phone number and fax number to which questions can be directed. If you have an electronic mailing address, please make that available as well.
2. Attach any information you believe is related to the request. The more complete your request is, the less time is required to review it.
3. Once completed, send your request to:
Rae McQuade
NAESB, Executive Director
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350
Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713-356-0060
Fax: 713-356-0067

by either mail, fax, or to NAESB's email address, naesb@aol.com.

Once received, the request will be routed to the appropriate subcommittees for review.

Please note that submitters should provide the requests to the NAESB office in sufficient time so that the NAESB Triage Subcommittee may fully consider the request prior to taking action on it. It is preferable that the request be submitted a minimum of 3 business days prior to the Triage Subcommittee meetings. Those meeting schedules are posted on the NAESB web site at http://www.naesb.org/monthly_calendar.asp.

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction

or

Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice
or Electronic Transaction

Date of Request: December 11, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Florida Power & Light Company
700 University Boulevard, EMT/JB
Juno Beach, FL 33058

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name : Dona Gussow
Title : Contracts Coordinator
Phone : 561-691-7886
Cell: 561-301-8598
Fax : 561-625-7567
E-mail : dgussow@fpl.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Establish standards relating to gas quality specifications and measurement, as follows:

- A. Establish web-based reports for tracking all physical and chemical properties of natural gas defined in pipeline tariffs, including timelines for reporting.
- B. Develop a uniform process, including the underlying assumptions and methodologies, for determining gas quality specifications from measured data.
- C. Examine the need to establish gas quality specification standards taking into consideration, (i) the specification needs of end users and providers of service to end users, and (ii) sources of supply (e.g. land-based, the Gulf, LNG). Draft such standards as appropriate.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

Development of the gas quality specification standards would assist end users by providing a means to determine fuel quality (needed for optimizing operation of gas powered electric power generation equipment), facilitate emissions reporting to regulatory agencies, and facilitate electric power generation planning.

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

The proposed standards would make standardized gas quality information, including the derivation of gas quality specifications, available to the industry.

A multi-quadrant task force (assuming multi-quadrant assignment by the quadrant Executive Committees) can be formed to review the issues resulting from participating gas and electric representatives having a full understanding of the costs vs. the benefits of standardizing gas quality specifications.

Given the realities in the marketplace and positive impact these standards would have on electricity generation, Florida Power & Light Company anticipates being actively involved on these issues.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Cannot be ascertained at this time.

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

Cannot be ascertained at this time. However, standards produced could result in the need to modify pipeline tariffs.

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

Not determined at this time.

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

Not Applicable.

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

A comparison table of current gas quality specification calculations is attached.

R03035-Attachment

DRAFT COMPARISON OF PIPELINE NATURAL GAS QUALITY SPECIFICATIONS

[REVISED 12/15/03]

PIPELINE	HOW HV DETERMINED	HEAT VALUE (HV) [BTU/SCF]	WATER (H ₂ O) [lbs/million cf]	HYDROGEN SULFIDE (H ₂ S) [grains/100 cuft]	MERCAPTAN [grains/100 cuft]	TOTAL SULFUR (S) [grains/100 cuft]	OXYGEN (O) [% by volume]	NITROGEN (N) [% by volume]	CARBON DIOXIDE (CO ₂) [% by volume]
A	Industry Practice	≥960	≤7	<1	No Spec	≤20 <i>NOTE 1.c</i>	No Spec	No Spec	No Spec
B	Standard Instrument	967-1200	≤7	≤¼ - Mainline ≤1 - SE & SW	No Spec	≤20 <i>NOTE 1.b & 1.d</i>	≤1	≤3	≤2
C	Not Defined	≥978	≤7	≤1	No Spec	≤20	≤1	4 less % by volume of CO ₂	≤3
D	AGA Rpt#5 -or- Other	967-1100	≤7	≤1/4	No Spec	≤20	≤.2 <i>NOTE 2.a</i>	≤4 + <i>NOTE 2.a</i>	≤3 + <i>NOTE 2.a</i>
E	Continuous Sampling AGA Rpts	≥967	≤7	≤0.25	≤0.75	≤5 Includes all forms of sulfur	≤.2 <i>NOTE 2.b</i>	<i>NOTE 2.b</i>	≤2 + <i>NOTE 2.b</i>
F	GPA Std 2172	≤1000	≤7	≤1/4	No Spec	≤10	≤1/4	<i>NOTE 2.c</i>	<i>NOTE 2.c</i>
G	Continuous Sampling -or- Other	No Spec	≤7	≤0.25	No Spec	≤20	≤.2	<i>NOTE 2.c</i>	2 + <i>NOTE 2.c</i>
H	Standard Methods	1000-1075	≤7	≤1/4	No Spec	≤10 <i>NOTE 1.b & 1.d</i>	≤.25	<i>NOTE 2.c</i>	<i>NOTE 2.c</i>
I	AGA Rpt#3	950-1175	≤7	16 PPM	No Spec	320 PPM	≤.2	≤3	≤3
J	Not Defined	≥950	≤4	≤1	No Spec	≤20	≤.2	4 less % by volume of CO ₂	≤3
K	Not Defined	≥950	≤7	≤1/4	≤1/4	≤1/2	10 PPM	≤3	≤2
L	Not Defined	≥950							

PIPELINE	HOW HV DETERMINED	HEAT VALUE (HV) [BTU/SCF]	WATER (H ₂ O) [lbs/million cf]	HYDROGEN SULFIDE (H ₂ S) [grains/100 cuft]	MERCAPTAN [grains/100 cuft]	TOTAL SULFUR (S) [grains/100 cuft]	OXYGEN (O) [% by volume]	NITROGEN (N) [% by volume]	CARBON DIOXIDE (CO ₂) [% by volume]
M	Standard Instrument	≥970	≤7	≤1/4	≤1/4	≤5	≤.2	NOTE 2.c	NOTE 2.c
N	Not Defined	≥950	≤7	≤10	No Spec	200 total	≤1	3 total (combined with CO ₂)	3 total (combined with N)
O	Not Defined	≥967	No Spec	≤0.25	No Spec	≤20	No Spec	No Spec	No Spec
P	Not Defined	≥967	≤7	≤.5 -or- 8PPM	No Spec	≤10	No Spec	4 less % by volume of CO ₂	≤3
Q	Not Defined	≥967	≤7	≤1/4	No Spec	≤20	No Spec	4 less % by volume of CO ₂	≤3
R	Not Defined	980-1100	≤7	≤.3	No Spec	≤20	No Spec	No Spec	No Spec
S	Not Defined	950-1100	≤7	≤1/4	1	≤5	≤.05	No Spec	≤2

NOTES:

1	Total Sulfur Content Notes 1.a Total Sulfur content not specified. 1.b Total Sulfur includes mercaptan. 1.c Total Sulfur excludes mercaptan. 1.d Total Sulfur includes H ₂ S. 1.e Total Sulfur excludes H ₂ S.
2	Nonhydrocarbon Gases Notes 2.a Gas shall not contain more than 5% by volume of nonhydrocarbon gases including, but not limited to, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, oxygen. 2.b Gas shall not contain more than 3% by volume of nonhydrocarbon gases including, but not limited to, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, oxygen, helium. 2.c Gas shall not contain more than 3% by volume of carbon dioxide + nitrogen..
3	
4	
5	

R03036

REQUEST FOR INITIATION OF A NAESB BUSINESS PRACTICE STANDARD

Date of Request: December 12, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address: KeySpan
One Metrotech Center
20th Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11201

2. Contract Person: Dolores Chezar
718 403 2987
718 246 2927
dchezar@keyspanenergy.com

3. Description:
Delete existing WGQ Standard 5.3.zD. Develop new standard regarding the prequalification of potential replacement shippers for capacity release offers that reflects FERC policy detailed in Dominion Cove Point LNG order in RP03-545 dated November 18, 2003.

4. Use of Proposed Standard:
Will aid in the development of an efficient capacity release process.

5. Description of Any Tangible Benefits:
Ensures that only qualified shippers bid on capacity release offers.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs: NA

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or other Considerations:
Existing Standard is contrary to existing FERC Policy (see Dominion Cove Point order dated November 18, 2003) and must be deleted. Suggested revised Standard properly implements stated FERC policy on the need for bidders on capacity release offers to prequalify. (See work paper submitted by KeySpan that was discussed at the December 11 WGQ EC meeting and posted with other December EC materials on the NAESB web site.)

- 8, 9, and 10 NA

**Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or
Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions**

R04001

North American Energy Standards Board

**Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions**

Date of Request: December 30, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Williams Gas Pipeline
2800 Post Oak Boulevard
P.O. Box 1396
Houston, TX 77251

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name: Dale Davis
Title: Consultant – eCommerce & Service Delivery
Phone: 713-215-2396
Fax: 713-215-3946
E-mail: dale.m.davis@williams.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) is requesting a new Senders Option data element 'Preparer E-mail Address' be added in the Shipper Imbalance – NAESB WGQ Std. 2.4.4.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

This data element will provide WGP the ability to communicate to the recipient of the Shipper Imbalance with information necessary for e-mail communications.

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

This is for informational purposes only.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Unknown

**Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or
Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions**

R04001

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

None

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

Unknown

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

Unknown

10. Attachments (such as: further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

See attached

**Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or
Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions**

**R04001
DATA DICTIONARY**

Standard 2.4.4

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Pathed Imb Rpt Type	EBB Non- Pathed Imb Rpt Type	EBB PNT – “T” Imb Rpt Type	EBB PNT – “U” Imb Rpt Type	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Preparer E-mail Address (Prep E-mail)	The e-mail address of the preparer's primary contact.	BEDG	SO	SO	SO	So	SO	

DATA GROUPS:

BEDG Business Entity Data Group
 CDG Contracts Data Group
 DDG Dates Data Group
 DelDG Delivery Data Group
 FGDG Flowing Gas Data Group
 RecDG Receipt Data Group
 TSDG Transaction Specific Data Group

R04002

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Date of Request: December 30, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Williams Gas Pipeline
2800 Post Oak Boulevard
P.O. Box 1396
Houston, TX 77251

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name: Dale Davis
Title: Consultant – eCommerce & Service Delivery
Phone: 713-215-2396
Fax: 713-215-3946
E-mail: dale.m.davis@williams.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) is requesting two new Senders Option data elements - 'Billable Party (Payer) Contact' and 'Invoice Status Code', and associated code values, be added in the following data sets:

Transportation / Sales Invoice: NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.1

Service Level Requester Charge/Allowance Invoice: NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.4

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

The data element 'Billable Party' will provide WGP the ability to better identify to whose attention the invoice should be sent at the Billable Party.

The data element 'Invoice Status Code' will provide the recipient with the knowledge as to whether the bill is preliminary or final.

R04002

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

This is for informational purposes only.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Unknown

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

None

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

Unknown

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

Unknown

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

R04002

DATA DICTIONARY

Data Sets:

Transportation / Sales Invoice: NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.1

Service Level Requester Charge/Allowance Invoice: NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.4

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Model Data Group	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Billable Party (Payer) Data	The party being billed.	BEDG		
Billable Party (Payer) * ⁴ (Bill Pty)		BEDG	M	
<u>Billable Party (Payer) Contact Name</u> (Bill Party Contact Name)		<u>BEDG</u>	<u>SO</u>	
Billable Party (Payer) Proprietary Code (Bill Pty Prop)		BEDG	C	Mandatory when Billable Party (Payer) is not present.
Invoice Status Code (Inv Stat)	<u>Designation as to the status of the invoice.</u>	<u>BEDG</u>	<u>SO</u>	

DATA GROUPS: NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.1

BEDG Business Entity Data Group
 CDG Contracts Data Group
 CurDG Currency Data Group
 DDG Dates Data Group
 DelDG Delivery Data Group
 RecDG Receipt Data Group
 SRLDG Service Requester Level Data Group
 TSDG Transaction Specific Data Group

DATA GROUPS: NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.4

BEDG Business Entity Data Group
 CurDG Currency Data Group
 DDG Dates Data Group
 SRLDG Service Requester Level Data Group

R04002

CODE VALUES DICTIONARY

Data Sets:

Transportation / Sales Invoice: NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.1

Service Level Requester Charge/Allowance Invoice: NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.4

Invoice Status Code

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Final	[no definition necessary]	
Preliminary	[no definition necessary]	

R04003

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Date of Request: December 30, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Williams Gas Pipeline
2800 Post Oak Boulevard
P.O. Box 1396
Houston, TX 77251

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name: Dale Davis
Title: Consultant – eCommerce & Service Delivery
Phone: 713-215-2396
Fax: 713-215-3946
E-mail: dale.m.davis@williams.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) is requesting a new Mutually Agreeable data element be added in the Transportation / Sales Invoice – NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.1
Discount Number

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

This data element will provide WGP the ability to communicate the proprietary code assigned to the type of discount being applied.

WGP assigns the numbers within its accounting system that identifies the specific type of discount. It is reflected on its website and for EDI comparability, WGP is requesting that it be added to the Transportation / Sales Invoice – NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.1. This is a reference number that is used by the accountants. This data element is for informational purposes only.

R04003

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

This is for informational purposes only.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Unknown

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

None

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

Unknown

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

Unknown

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

R04003

DATA DICTIONARY

Standard 3.4.1

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Model Data Group	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Discount Number (Disc No)	Number identifying the discount, as assigned by the Payee.	TSDG	MA	

DATA GROUPS:

BEDG Business Entity Data Group
CDG Contracts Data Group
CurDG Currency Data Group
DDG Dates Data Group
DelDG Delivery Data Group
RecDG Receipt Data Group
SRLDG Service Requester Level Data Group
TSDG Transaction Specific Data Group

R04004

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Date of Request: December 30, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Williams Gas Pipeline
2800 Post Oak Boulevard
P.O. Box 1396
Houston, TX 77251

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name: Dale Davis
Title: Consultant – eCommerce & Service Delivery
Phone: 713-215-2396
Fax: 713-215-3946
E-mail: dale.m.davis@williams.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) is requesting a new Business Conditional data element 'Voluntary GRI Paid' be added in the Payment Remittance - NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.2.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

This data element will provide WGP the ability to better identify the dollar amount being paid that is attributable to a voluntary GRI payment.

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

This is to provide WGP will the ability to better differentiate the GRI payments.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Unknown

R04004

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

None

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

Unknown

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners:

Unknown

10. Attachments (such as: further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

R04004

DATA DICTIONARY

NAESB WGQ Std. 3.4.2

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Model Data Group	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Voluntary GRI Paid (Vol GRI)	The dollar amount being paid that is attributable to a voluntary GRI payment.	BEDG	BC	

DATA GROUPS:

BEDG Business Entity Data Group
CurDG Currency Data Group
InvDG Invoice Data Group
TSDG Transaction Specific Data Group

R04005

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 1 of 4

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction or Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction

Instructions:

1. Please fill out as much of the requested information as possible. It is mandatory to provide a contact name, phone number and fax number to which questions can be directed. If you have an electronic mailing address, please make that available as well.
2. Attach any information you believe is related to the request. The more complete your request is, the less time is required to review it.
3. Once completed, send your request to:
Rae McQuade
NAESB, Executive Director
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350
Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713-356-0060
Fax: 713-356-0067

by either mail, fax, or to NAESB's email address, naesb@aol.com.

Once received, the request will be routed to the appropriate subcommittees for review.

Please note that submitters should provide the requests to the NAESB office in sufficient time so that the NAESB Triage Subcommittee may fully consider the request prior to taking action on it. It is preferable that the request be submitted a minimum of 3 business days prior to the Triage Subcommittee meetings. Those meeting schedules are posted on the NAESB web site at http://www.naesb.org/monthly_calendar.asp.

R04005

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 2 of 4

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction

or

Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction

Date of Request: December 29, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:
Southern Company Services
600 North 18th Street
Birmingham, AL 35291

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:
Name : Mr. Joel Dison
Title : Manager of Market Policy
Phone : (205) 257-6481
Fax : (205) 257-6824
E-mail: jjdison@southernco.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:
We propose the WEQ's acceptance of the current OASIS Business Practice Standards and Communication Protocol Standards.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

The business practice standards are designed to implement the Commission's policy related to on-line price negotiation and to improve the commercial operation of the Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS). Complete documentation of the business practice standards and the related communication protocols is attached to this request:

- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Business Practice Standards

R04005

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 3 of 4

for Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS) Transactions, Version 1.2, issued October 25, 2000 (Attachment A).

- Standards and Communication Protocols for Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS), Version 1.4, July 26, 2000 (Attachment B).
- Data Dictionary, Standards and Communication Protocols for Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS), Version 1.4, July 26, 2000 (Attachment C)
- Revisions to Section 4.2.10.2 of the S&CP Document, 4.2.10.2, Status Values (Attachment D).
- Oasis Version 1.4 corrections, outlined in a letter dated January 30, 2001, from Paul R. Sorenson, OSC Chair, to David P. Borgers, Office of the Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Attachment E).
- FERC Order 605 (Attachment F).
- FERC Order 889 (Attachment G).
- FERC Order 889 Appendix A Data Element Dictionary (Attachment H).
- FERC Order 889 Appendix B Request (Query) Variables (Attachment I).

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

The industry and the Commission have already ascertained and realized the benefits of these standards as they are already required by FERC regulation.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

No additional costs for implementation are expected – this request to adopt standards is reflective of a final order that requires companies to implement such. As the order is final, the parties have already implemented these standards.

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

This is an existing standard already adopted by the FERC.

R04005

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 4 of 4

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

N/A

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

The standard applies to transmission users' interactions with public utilities.

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

The Standards are composed from the following attached documents:

- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Business Practice Standards for Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS) Transactions, Version 1.2, issued October 25, 2000 (Attachment A).
- Standards and Communication Protocols for Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS), Version 1.4, July 26, 2000 (Attachment B).
- Data Dictionary, Standards and Communication Protocols for Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS), Version 1.4, July 26, 2000 (Attachment C)
- Revisions to Section 4.2.10.2 of the S&CP Document, 4.2.10.2, Status Values (Attachment D).
- Oasis Version 1.4 corrections, outlined in a letter dated January 30, 2001, from Paul R. Sorenson, OSC Chair, to David P. Borgers, Office of the Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Attachment E).
- FERC Order 605 (Attachment F).
- FERC Order 889 (Attachment G).
- FERC Order 889 Appendix A Data Element Dictionary (Attachment H).
- FERC Order 889 Appendix B Request (Query) Variables (Attachment I).

R04006

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 1

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction

or

Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction

Instructions:

1. Please fill out as much of the requested information as possible. It is mandatory to provide a contact name, phone number and fax number to which questions can be directed. If you have an electronic mailing address, please make that available as well.
2. Attach any information you believe is related to the request. The more complete your request is, the less time is required to review it.
3. Once completed, send your request to:
Rae McQuade
NAESB, Executive Director
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350
Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713-356-0060
Fax: 713-356-0067

by either mail, fax, or to NAESB's email address, naesb@aol.com.

Once received, the request will be routed to the appropriate subcommittees for review.

Please note that submitters should provide the requests to the NAESB office in sufficient time so that the NAESB Triage Subcommittee may fully consider the request prior to taking action on it. It is preferable that the request be submitted a minimum of 3 business days prior to the Triage Subcommittee meetings. Those meeting schedules are posted on the NAESB web site at http://www.naesb.org/monthly_calendar.asp.

R04006

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 2

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction or Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction

Date of Request: December 29, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:
Southern Company Services
600 North 18th Street
Birmingham, AL 35291

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:
Name : Mr. Monroe Landrum
Title : Manager, Operating Systems
Phone : (205) 257-6936
Fax : (205) 257-6663
E-mail: mjlandru@southernco.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:
We propose the WEQ's acceptance of the IT subcommittee's recommended actions on the OASIS 1A issues that were left over from the OASIS Scheduling Collaborative.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

The specification/business practice issues represent enhancements [or development of](#)-new standards [that would need to be created to support the recommendations of the IT Subcommittee that would need to be created](#). Our comments reflect which items that we feel that the NAESB WEQ EC should take action on and which items that we feel do not

R04006

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 3

warrant further consideration from a cost/benefit perspective. Note that some of the items that we recommended not to move forward on, only apply to OASIS 1A but should be considered in the development of OASIS II. Those are noted in the attachment.

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

The compliance/clarification issues involve concerns about standards not being followed or various implementations of the standard due to varying interpretations of the standards. It is our position that since NAESB is not a compliance monitoring organization and since the FERC has a hotline for presenting such issues, that NAESB take no further actions other than to post our responses on the ITS website.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

N/A

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

This is an existing standard already adopted by the FERC.

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

N/A

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

N/A

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

- **Letter from Monroe Landrum to Rae McQuade**

To: Rae McQuade, chair NAESB WEQ EC
From: Monroe Landrum, chair NAESB WEQ ITS

Subject: OASIS 1A Issues

On the behalf of the ITS, I am forwarding our recommended actions on the OASIS 1A issues that were left over from the OASIS Scheduling Collaborative. Looking at the attachment, you will notice that we have categorized the issues into general issues, compliance/clarification issues, and specification/business practices issues. We have provided comments on each of the issues and recommend that the document be posted on the ITS website with a notice to those subscribed to the ITS.

The general issues are primarily opinions on how we should proceed with OASIS 1A. The compliance/clarification issues involve concerns about standards not being followed or various implementations of the standard due to varying interpretations of the standards. It is our position that since NAESB is not a compliance monitoring organization and since the FERC has a hotline for presenting such issues, that NAESB take no further actions other than to post our responses on the ITS website.

The specification/business practice issues represent enhancements or new standards that would need to be created. Our comments reflect which items that we feel that the NAESB WEQ EC should take action on and which items that we feel do not warrant further consideration from a cost/benefit perspective. Note that some of the items that we recommended not to move forward on, only apply to OASIS 1A but should be considered in the development of OASIS II. Those are noted in the attachment. Our recommended action items are listed:

- **Redirect of Transmission Service**

Using OASIS to process and record redirects of transmission service is a difficult task. There are many issues related to the redirect and resale functionality, but most are caused by provider business rules or vendor design choices.

The primary issue concerns redirects of transmission service. The current OASIS standard does not facilitate primary provider approval of redirected transmission when that redirect is using resold (reassigned) transmission service. When transmission rights are resold to another customer, the customer on the original request is the seller on the resale request. In this case, the primary provider responsible for administering ATC no longer has approval rights for any future transactions, such as REDIRECTS, that use this resold or reassigned transmission service. This is only an issue when the 2nd customer wants to redirect transmission usage to a constrained path. Currently, unless the provider intervenes on the backend, that provider only has the option to deny this type of transaction when it is tagged. (Specification/Business Practice)

This issue, since it is not addressed in the S&CP, is ripe for standardization. It is suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort in specification in OASIS 1A.

- **Recalls of Transmission Service**

Recall allows a provider to reduce the capacity or duration of a transmission request. The issue with recalls concerns implementation and may be an issue to address at the provider/vendor level. However, clarification is needed.

When a provider recalls a transmission request that is a REDIRECT, should capacity be returned to the impacted request? When a provider recalls any impacting request type, should capacity be returned to the impacted request? If so, should a provider post reductions for the entire “chain” of requests? (Business Practices)

This issue also is not addressed in the S&CP and needs standardization through business practices process. It was suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort.

• Multiple Submissions of Identical Transmission Requests / Queuing Issues

OASIS business rules are very similar across most providers. In general, customers submitting transmission request have time periods when they can “queue” their requests. This queue process and the way it relates to the Internet can create issues when customers are “battling” for ATC on constrained interfaces.

Many customers have automated the submission of transmission requests. In order to ensure their place in the queue, these customers schedule these requests to be submitted as a scheduled event. To account for delays caused by the Internet and the nature of web server systems, customers usually submit multiple copies of the same request beginning a few minutes before the top of the hour and lasting until well after the top of the hour.

The issues created by duplicate request submittal are fairly straightforward. Backend systems and the operators working those systems are impacted dramatically. Each request that arrives after the top of the hour is a valid request. Therefore, the provider can have hundreds of requests in the queue that will never be confirmed.

Other issues that are created are related to OASIS performance. Anyone using transstatus to retrieve a list of OASIS requests submitted during a time period similar to the one described above can receive hundreds of bogus requests and only a hand full of legitimate requests. Also, while the systems are busy working on the bogus requests, valid requests can be delayed due to bottlenecks created by this issue. Does there need to be a standard to limit these issues? Will FERC Order 605 address this issue? (Specification/Business Practice)

This issue should be worked on as both a technical and business practice modification. This was discussed at length and the discussion revealed this is a very complex issue that needs to be resolved. (Note that the MIPS attempted to address this issue a couple of years ago, but their recommendations were turned down by FERC).

• Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS Part(b)

Examples:

Standardized process for NITS service on OASIS:

- a) Initial service application procedure
- b) Designation of network resources
- c) Addition of network resources
- d) Elimination of network resources
(Business Practice)

The enumerated standardization process was identified as a business process issue that should be referred to the ESS.

• Naming Standardization

Standardization for items such as service points is a continuing problem in OASIS and should be addressed. (Specification/Business Practices)

This confusion over multiple names for the same physical point(s) has been a long standing issue. The major issue was identified as follows: at a point of interconnect between two providers, how is the point name established and agreed-upon such that the name is used consistently for both parties. It was agreed that this would be both a technical and business process change for the IT and ESS to address.

It is our suggestion that the EC review these recommendations and assign them to the ITS and/or the ESS for the development of a request for standards for these issues. Our group acknowledges that this is not the normal approach for developing standards requests, however due to the uniqueness of the situation; we wanted the EC to confirm that these issues would be the types of activities that we should be pursuing. While the business practices and S&CP have not yet been adopted by NAESB, we understand that this is currently being addressed. By moving ahead with the development of the standards requests, we would have these in place by the time that the adoption of the BPs and S&CP were complete.

Executive Summary

The following recommendations to address the OASIS issues listed below have been submitted by the WEQ OASIS 1A Issues Task Force for general approval by the WEQ IT Subcommittee. All issues have been documented and sub-divided into three categories (specification/business practices issues, general issues, and compliance/clarification issues). The goal of this task force is to recommend to the IT subcommittee an appropriate categorization of and resolution process for the twenty (20) OASIS Phase 1A issues listed in this document. A quick overview of the task force recommendations are presented first, followed by more detailed discussion under each specific issue. The numbering system was maintained from the original listing to promote continuity in both sections and the original.

OASIS 1A Issues (Quick Overview)

- 1. Additional Standardization in OASIS Phase 1A** (General)
- 2. GUI Issue/Navigation** (General)
- 3. Output Formats** (Specification)
- 4. INFO.HTM** (Compliance)
- 5. Posting of Schedules** (Compliance)
- 6. TLR & Curtailment Posting** (Compliance/Clarification)
- 7. Posting of Advertisements** (Clarification)

- 8. Upgrade Planning & Progression** (General)
 - 9. Responsibility Determination** (General)
 - 10. Redirect of Transmission Service** (Specification/Business Practice)
 - 11. Recalls of Transmission Service** (Business Practices)
 - 12. Multiple Submissions of Identical Transmission Requests / Queuing Issues** (Specification/Business Practice)
 - 13. Population of System Data** (Compliance)
 - 14. Ancillary Service Requests and Purchases** (Compliance)
 - 15. ATC Updates** (Business Practice)
 - 16. NAESB Implementation of a Compliance Program** (General)
 - 17. Announcing / Posting of OASIS Outages** (Specification)
 - 18. This issue originally was one item; now broken into three separate items.**
 - 18(a). Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS (Use of Status Indicators)**
Part(a) (Compliance)
 - 18(b). Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS**
Part(b) (Specification/Business Practice)
 - 18(c). Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS (Difference in TP Posting and Capacity)**
Part(c) (Compliance/Clarification)
 - 19. Posting Reference Field** (Compliance/Clarification/Specification)
 - 20. This issue originally was six items; now condensed down to one item.**
 - 20. Other Items (Naming Standardization)** (Specification/Business Practices)
- OASIS 1A Issues

2

OASIS 1A Issues

Specification/Business Practices Issues

3. Output Formats

Should additional output formats, such as XML, be added to the S&CP? (Specification)

At this time there is not a need for making a massive change in the way output formats are generated. The S&CP standards for OASIS Phase 1A are the accepted way to communicate output formats at this time and does not need changing. Perhaps in OASIS Phase II the potential benefits of XML can be considered. It was suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort.

10. Redirect of Transmission Service

Using OASIS to process and record redirects of transmission service is a difficult task. There are many issues related to the redirect and resale functionality, but most are caused by provider business rules or vendor design choices.

The primary issue concerns redirects of transmission service. The current OASIS standard does not facilitate primary provider approval of redirected transmission when

that redirect is using resold (reassigned) transmission service. When transmission rights are resold to another customer, the customer on the original request is the seller on the resale request. In this case, the primary provider responsible for administering ATC no longer has approval rights for any future transactions, such as REDIRECTS, that use this resold or reassigned transmission service. This is only an issue when the 2nd customer wants to redirect transmission usage to a constrained path. Currently, unless the provider intervenes on the backend, that provider only has the option to deny this type of transaction when it is tagged. (Specification/Business Practice)

This issue, since it is not addressed in the S&CP, is ripe for standardization. It was suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort in specification in OASIS 1A.

11. Recalls of Transmission Service

Recall allows a provider to reduce the capacity or duration of a transmission request. The issue with recalls concerns implementation and may be an issue to address at the provider/vendor level. However, clarification is needed.

When a provider recalls a transmission request that is a REDIRECT, should capacity be returned to the impacted request? When a provider recalls any impacting request type, OASIS 1A Issues

3

should capacity be returned to the impacted request? If so, should a provider post reductions for the entire “chain” of requests? (Business Practices)

This issue also is not addressed in the S&CP and needs standardization through business practices process. It was suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort.

12. Multiple Submissions of Identical Transmission Requests / Queuing Issues

OASIS business rules are very similar across most providers. In general, customers submitting transmission request have time periods when they can “queue” their requests. This queue process and the way it relates to the Internet can create issues when customers are “battling” for ATC on constrained interfaces.

Many customers have automated the submission of transmission requests. In order to ensure their place in the queue, these customers schedule these requests to be submitted as a scheduled event. To account for delays caused by the Internet and the nature of web server systems, customers usually submit multiple copies of the same request beginning a few minutes before the top of the hour and lasting until well after the top of the hour. The issues created by duplicate request submittal are fairly straightforward. Backend systems and the operators working those systems are impacted dramatically. Each request that arrives after the top of the hour is a valid request. Therefore, the provider can have hundreds of requests in the queue that will never be confirmed.

Other issues that are created are related to OASIS performance. Anyone using transstatus to retrieve a list of OASIS requests submitted during a time period similar to the one described above can receive hundreds of bogus requests and only a hand full of legitimate requests. Also, while the systems are busy working on the bogus requests, valid requests

can be delayed due to bottlenecks created by this issue. Does there need to be a standard to limit these issues? Will FERC Order 605 address this issue? (Specification/Business Practice)

This issue should be worked on as both a technical and business practice modification. This was discussed at length and the discussion revealed this is a very complex issue that needs to be resolved. (Note that the MIPS attempted to address this issue a couple of years ago, but their recommendations were turned down by FERC).

15. ATC Updates

There is a need to revisit the FERC requirement for ATC adjustments and posting updates. In Order 638, FERC requires adjustments to ATC off-line (internally) when the Transmission Provider accepts reservation requests and then on-line, following confirmation, the ATC posting is to be updated. FERC reasoned that use of this two-step method should reduce the number of accepted requests that will be denied service. This OASIS 1A Issues

4

methodology tends to encourage delayed acceptance responses from Transmission Providers and has been a trigger for discontent expressed by marketers.

Over the last 3-4 years, there have been significant advances in the automation of backend systems, including calculation of ATC, which interface with OASIS. Revision of ATC postings can be made earlier now and with more certainty than before, so Transmission Providers can avoid the denials of service that once were more frequent due to ATC calculation uncertainties. A pilot project should be designed to test the concerns surrounding denial of service under a one-step method where ATC would only be adjusted upon confirmation. (Business Practice)

While a consensus was not arrived at on this issue it might be noted that the S&CP does not address this issue but Order 889 Part 37.6b and Order 638 does.

17. Announcing / Posting of OASIS Outages

OASIS Outage posting is inconsistent across OASIS nodes. Some nodes send messages to an email list, such as tsin@nerc.com or osc@nerc.com. Other nodes send a message to a list managed by that TSIP.

Section 4.3.10.1 of the S&CP requires providers to post outages “When the OASIS node is out of service and transmission requests are received by the TP by phone or fax.”

Using the message template, OASIS users can download this information. All other postings of outages are at the discretion of the provider.

The reality is that many providers leave the posting of node outages to the TSIP.

Therefore, the provider has the obligation to make sure that the TSIP is posting outage information on the provider’s behalf.

The message functionality was added to provide a standard for the posting of specific messages, such as node outage information. All OASIS outages can be posted using this standard and customers will have unilateral access to this data using the message template.

Should additional standards be implemented? How can compliance with this requirement be monitored? (Specification)

There was a consensus that this is a technical compliance and specification issue, but no consensus was reached on a method to include in this recommendation to the IT only that a specification for the notification of outages should be written.

18. Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS

Part(b)

Examples:

Standardized process for NITS service on OASIS:

a) Initial service application procedure

OASIS 1A Issues

5

b) Designation of network resources

c) Addition of network resources

d) Elimination of network resources

(Specification/Business Practice)

The enumerated standardization process was identified as a business process issue that should be referred to the ESS.

19. Posting Reference Field

The posting reference is a reference number that must identify the offers being posted on OASIS. The offer posting is in fact a combination of the ATC and the system data, reservations and the price information. When this data is combined to present the offers on the system the posting reference has no real meaning, as it is not clear which of the base items posting identifier is to be used. This worked fine in the past when the system data and the offers were not posted separately. This is a change or a clarification on the purpose of the post ref field. (Compliance/Clarification/Specification)

The S&CP provides guidance on the posting reference field in Section 4.3.7.1 and therefore becomes a compliance issue. There also is a clarification issue in that the S&CP references a posting reference field in Section 4.3.10.1, 4.3.10.2, and 4.3.10.3 and the Data Element Dictionary has a definition for two types of posting reference. The posting reference field needs to be redefined to split the type up into two definitions.

20. Other Items

1) Naming Standardization

Standardization for items such as service points is a continuing problem in OASIS and should be addressed. (Specification/Business Practices)

This confusion over multiple names for the same physical point(s) has been a long standing issue. The major issue was identified as follows: at a point of interconnect between two providers, how is the point name established and agreed-upon such that the name is used consistently for both parties. It was agreed that this would be both a technical and business process change for the IT and ESS to address.

General Issues

1. Additional Standardization in OASIS Phase 1A

Should additional standards be written for OASIS 1A while beginning OASIS Phase II initiatives? (General)

Additional standards should be written and outstanding issues addressed for OASIS Phase 1A. With all the unknowns surrounding OASIS Phase II it makes sense that the OASIS 1A Issues

6

WEQ IT Subcommittee becomes involved in enhancing and maintaining the standards for OASIS Phase 1A while developing OASIS Phase II.

2. GUI Issue/Navigation

Over the years there has been debate over the standardization of the HTML interface to OASIS. HTML “look & feel” requirements were intentionally left out of the S&CP.

The overwhelming majority of the OASIS How Working Group opposed the standardization of the HTML interface to OASIS. The reality is that, with the standardization of the CSV templates across OASIS nodes, vendors have the ability to provide a single interface to all OASIS nodes.

The GUI issue may have deeper roots in customer complaints and “free” OASIS usage. In other words, users of OASIS want a single “look & feel” and they want it at no cost. If standards were made concerning the HTML interface to OASIS, how would they be policed? What would be the scope of these standards? Would providers have the ability to offer a standard interface as well as an enhanced interface? (General)

At this time standardization of the HTML interface would not be beneficial and therefore not needed. With the existence of the current S&CP standards and with compliance issues resolved, standard template queries and responses should allow any Transmission Customer to perform the same functions across many OASIS nodes in virtually identical fashion.

8. Upgrade Planning & Progression

Should OASIS changes be incremental? Who determines if a modification is mandatory or voluntary or both? If a modification is voluntary, how can compliance be monitored? (General)

Anytime an incremental change in OASIS standards is adopted, the change should include a migration and testing plan as part of that standard. Mr. Burden (Williams Gas Pipeline) noted that the Wholesale Gas Quadrant (WGQ) has an Interpretations Subcommittee to resolve issues of standards interpretation. It was suggested that the WEQ employ a similar approach.

9. Responsibility Determination

Who is responsible for the categorization of issues? For example, given an issue, who determines if it is an implementation issue, a compliance issue, or a technical issue? (General)

There was no consensus proposal for this issue. However, for issues identified as OASIS issues, NAESB should be the governing body in determining an appropriate categorization and resolution.

OASIS 1A Issues

7

16. NAESB Implementation of a Compliance Program

Should an OASIS Compliance program be implemented? (General)

It was noted that this issue was discussed during the October IT meeting and was determined that NAESB does not perform a compliance function. Further, it was made clear that compliance was a function to be completed by FERC and that FERC does have a hotline established to handle compliance issues.

Compliance/Clarification Issues

4. INFO.HTM

The posting of information in the INFO.HTM file is inconsistent. The availability of the file across providers is also inconsistent.

Should additional standards be written to clarify the information and design of INFO.HTM? How should non-compliance be monitored? (Compliance)

It is clearly specified in the S&CP (3.4, 4.5) as to which documents should be included.

5. Posting of Schedules

There is a need for compliance on the use of the OASIS template “scheduledetail” for queries and responses associated with schedules and curtailments/interruptions (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.1). This is the template where FERC requires information specific to an individual schedule. There is a tendency to use the tag for this information; however, the OASIS data is currently the required source for audit information associated with schedules and curtailments/interruptions. (Compliance)

There is a compliance issue with some Transmission Providers (TPs) not posting this information in the required format as defined by S&CP (4.3.4.1).

6. TLR & Curtailment Posting

There is a need for compliance on use of the OASIS template “security” for queries and responses associated with security events such as curtailments or TLR's (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.2). This is the template where FERC requires information specific to the event, such as facilities involved, start time of the event, etc. Currently, the NERC website provides a central repository for such information associated with the Eastern Interconnection. There is a need to add Western Interconnection information to this repository. (Compliance/Clarification)

There is a compliance issue with S&CP (4.3.4.2) in the way that some TPs post the required events. There is also a compliance issue with some TPs not posting this information in the required format. There also is a clarification or interpretation issue in regards to which events should be posted.

OASIS 1A Issues

8

7. Posting of Advertisements

Should the posting of related and/or unrelated advertisements be allowed on OASIS nodes? (Clarification)

S&CP (4.3.10.1, 4.3.10.2) is somewhat vague in this area. A clarification is needed on this issue to more clearly define what types of messages are permissible. Note that this issue is complicated by the fact that many OASIS sites are hosted by external companies and a “hosted by” reference could be viewed as an advertisement.

13. Population of System Data

There is a need for compliance with the S&CP on use of the OASIS template “systemdata” for queries and responses associated with ATC/TTC, etc. (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.4).

This is the template that must be populated in order to meet FERC requirements associated with uploads and downloads of ATC/TTC data. Prior to publication of the S&CP version 1.4, the S&CP required provision of ATC/TTC data through use of the “transoffering” template.

When FERC required CBM data on OASIS, uploads and downloads of CBM were combined with all other system attribute data through the use of "systemdata". At the same time, use of “transoffering” for ATC/TTC data became optional. (Compliance) **S&CP (4.3.4.4) already specifies the use of “systemdata”; thus it appears that some TPs may not be in full compliance with the “systemdata” template.**

14. Ancillary Service Requests and Purchases

There is a need for compliance on use of the several ancillary services templates in OASIS for queries and responses associated with the sale and purchase of ancillary services. FERC requires this under Order 889, and as revised. This priority may be lower due to the complexities involved and chaos in the industry associated with ancillary services, in addition to the somewhat rigid methodology provided for in the current OASIS S&CP. This will also be a requirement under OASIS II. (Compliance)

Compliance issue, the S&CP (4.3.2.2, 4.3.3.2, 4.3.8, and 4.3.9) already specifies how to handle this type of service. Further enhancements may be required in the development of OASIS Phase II.

18. Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS (Use of Status Indicators)

Part(a)

Overall problem of misusing the different status indicators, e.g. setting a request to REFUSED because the request was incomplete. There is a need for a uniform interpretation of the S&CP. Specifically, making sure that similar conventions and data definitions are employed on all nodes. (Compliance)

OASIS 1A Issues

9

This issue is a compliance issue with S&CP (4.2.10.2) dealing with the misuse of the status indicators.

18. Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS (Difference in TP Posting and Capacity)

Part(c)

Some providers post things in “blocks” (i.e., an on-peak block), while others post everything in hourly increments (i.e., 24 discrete values). Another might be that some providers respond to a TRANSSTATUS by using CAPACITY REQUESTED and STATUS to allow a customer to derive CAPACITY_GRANTED, while other providers specifically indicate CAPACITY_GRANTED (and some only use CAPACITY_GRANTED if it differs from CAPACITY_REQUESTED).

There are different implementations all have their own unique flavor that have to be coded around. “If PROVIDER =” type statements must be written in order to catch all the node specific implementation details. Obviously you can write exception rules to deal with it, but you shouldn't have to.

If we did some standard queries against all the nodes and compared the data, we'd probably find some interesting differences. If there are valid reasons for the differences, then they should be codified in the S&CP or in Order 638. If not, they should be clarified to ensure uniform interpretation and the nodes modified to meet the clarified S&CP.

The standardization issue above is probably a good idea but it might be a little late unless we see the existence of OASIS according to the S&CP 1.4 continuing more than a couple of more years.

The key question is, is it a matter of S&CP 1.4 implementation (i.e., template access) or is it a really a matter of a TP's tariff (i.e., data content). It would not seem you could affect change to the latter (e.g., your reference to “block” vs. hourly), only the first (e.g., element name usage discrepancies).

Many solutions and associated support systems have been built around the different interpretations and implementations as they are today. Some companies may not be inclined to incur the cost to make significant changes, unless a clarified standard is issued.

A submission to FERC would be required since they are the ones responsible for enforcement of the OASIS S&CP. A validation suite should be developed.

(Compliance/Clarification)

This issue was identified as a technical clarification issue that needed to be clarified and provided by the WEQ IT Subcommittee.

19. Posting Reference Field

OASIS 1A Issues

10

The posting reference is a reference number that must identify the offers being posted on OASIS. The offer posting is in fact a combination of the ATC and the system data, reservations and the price information. When this data is combined to present the offers on the system the posting reference has no real meaning, as it is not clear which of the base items posting identifier is to be used. This worked fine in the past when the system data and the offers were not posted separately. This is a change or a clarification on the purpose of the post ref field. (Compliance/Clarification/Specification)

The S&CP provides guidance on the posting reference field in Section 4.3.7.1 and therefore becomes a compliance issue. There also is a clarification issue in that the S&CP references a posting reference field in Section 4.3.10.1, 4.3.10.2, and 4.3.10.3 and the Data Element Dictionary has a definition for two types of posting reference. There is also a need for a specification change to identified both and split the definition into parts.

R04006

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 1

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction

or

Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction

Instructions:

1. Please fill out as much of the requested information as possible. It is mandatory to provide a contact name, phone number and fax number to which questions can be directed. If you have an electronic mailing address, please make that available as well.
2. Attach any information you believe is related to the request. The more complete your request is, the less time is required to review it.
3. Once completed, send your request to:
Rae McQuade
NAESB, Executive Director
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350
Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713-356-0060
Fax: 713-356-0067

by either mail, fax, or to NAESB's email address, naesb@aol.com.

Once received, the request will be routed to the appropriate subcommittees for review.

Please note that submitters should provide the requests to the NAESB office in sufficient time so that the NAESB Triage Subcommittee may fully consider the request prior to taking action on it. It is preferable that the request be submitted a minimum of 3 business days prior to the Triage Subcommittee meetings. Those meeting schedules are posted on the NAESB web site at http://www.naesb.org/monthly_calendar.asp.

R04006

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 2

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction or Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or Electronic Transaction

Date of Request: December 29, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:
Southern Company Services
600 North 18th Street
Birmingham, AL 35291

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:
Name : Mr. Monroe Landrum
Title : Manager, Operating Systems
Phone : (205) 257-6936
Fax : (205) 257-6663
E-mail: mjlandru@southernco.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:
We propose the WEQ's acceptance of the IT subcommittee's recommended actions on the OASIS 1A issues that were left over from the OASIS Scheduling Collaborative.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

The specification/business practice issues represent enhancements [or development of](#)-new standards [that would need to be created to support the recommendations of the IT Subcommittee that would need to be created](#). Our comments reflect which items that we feel that the NAESB WEQ EC should take action on and which items that we feel do not

R04006

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or Request for Enhancement of a NAESB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 3

warrant further consideration from a cost/benefit perspective. Note that some of the items that we recommended not to move forward on, only apply to OASIS 1A but should be considered in the development of OASIS II. Those are noted in the attachment.

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

The compliance/clarification issues involve concerns about standards not being followed or various implementations of the standard due to varying interpretations of the standards. It is our position that since NAESB is not a compliance monitoring organization and since the FERC has a hotline for presenting such issues, that NAESB take no further actions other than to post our responses on the ITS website.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

N/A

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

This is an existing standard already adopted by the FERC.

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

N/A

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

N/A

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

- **Letter from Monroe Landrum to Rae McQuade**

To: Rae McQuade, chair NAESB WEQ EC
From: Monroe Landrum, chair NAESB WEQ ITS

Subject: OASIS 1A Issues

On the behalf of the ITS, I am forwarding our recommended actions on the OASIS 1A issues that were left over from the OASIS Scheduling Collaborative. Looking at the attachment, you will notice that we have categorized the issues into general issues, compliance/clarification issues, and specification/business practices issues. We have provided comments on each of the issues and recommend that the document be posted on the ITS website with a notice to those subscribed to the ITS.

The general issues are primarily opinions on how we should proceed with OASIS 1A. The compliance/clarification issues involve concerns about standards not being followed or various implementations of the standard due to varying interpretations of the standards. It is our position that since NAESB is not a compliance monitoring organization and since the FERC has a hotline for presenting such issues, that NAESB take no further actions other than to post our responses on the ITS website.

The specification/business practice issues represent enhancements or new standards that would need to be created. Our comments reflect which items that we feel that the NAESB WEQ EC should take action on and which items that we feel do not warrant further consideration from a cost/benefit perspective. Note that some of the items that we recommended not to move forward on, only apply to OASIS 1A but should be considered in the development of OASIS II. Those are noted in the attachment. Our recommended action items are listed:

- **Redirect of Transmission Service**

Using OASIS to process and record redirects of transmission service is a difficult task. There are many issues related to the redirect and resale functionality, but most are caused by provider business rules or vendor design choices.

The primary issue concerns redirects of transmission service. The current OASIS standard does not facilitate primary provider approval of redirected transmission when that redirect is using resold (reassigned) transmission service. When transmission rights are resold to another customer, the customer on the original request is the seller on the resale request. In this case, the primary provider responsible for administering ATC no longer has approval rights for any future transactions, such as REDIRECTS, that use this resold or reassigned transmission service. This is only an issue when the 2nd customer wants to redirect transmission usage to a constrained path. Currently, unless the provider intervenes on the backend, that provider only has the option to deny this type of transaction when it is tagged. (Specification/Business Practice)

This issue, since it is not addressed in the S&CP, is ripe for standardization. It is suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort in specification in OASIS 1A.

- **Recalls of Transmission Service**

Recall allows a provider to reduce the capacity or duration of a transmission request. The issue with recalls concerns implementation and may be an issue to address at the provider/vendor level. However, clarification is needed.

When a provider recalls a transmission request that is a REDIRECT, should capacity be returned to the impacted request? When a provider recalls any impacting request type, should capacity be returned to the impacted request? If so, should a provider post reductions for the entire “chain” of requests? (Business Practices)

This issue also is not addressed in the S&CP and needs standardization through business practices process. It was suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort.

• Multiple Submissions of Identical Transmission Requests / Queuing Issues

OASIS business rules are very similar across most providers. In general, customers submitting transmission request have time periods when they can “queue” their requests. This queue process and the way it relates to the Internet can create issues when customers are “battling” for ATC on constrained interfaces.

Many customers have automated the submission of transmission requests. In order to ensure their place in the queue, these customers schedule these requests to be submitted as a scheduled event. To account for delays caused by the Internet and the nature of web server systems, customers usually submit multiple copies of the same request beginning a few minutes before the top of the hour and lasting until well after the top of the hour.

The issues created by duplicate request submittal are fairly straightforward. Backend systems and the operators working those systems are impacted dramatically. Each request that arrives after the top of the hour is a valid request. Therefore, the provider can have hundreds of requests in the queue that will never be confirmed.

Other issues that are created are related to OASIS performance. Anyone using transstatus to retrieve a list of OASIS requests submitted during a time period similar to the one described above can receive hundreds of bogus requests and only a hand full of legitimate requests. Also, while the systems are busy working on the bogus requests, valid requests can be delayed due to bottlenecks created by this issue. Does there need to be a standard to limit these issues? Will FERC Order 605 address this issue? (Specification/Business Practice)

This issue should be worked on as both a technical and business practice modification. This was discussed at length and the discussion revealed this is a very complex issue that needs to be resolved. (Note that the MIPS attempted to address this issue a couple of years ago, but their recommendations were turned down by FERC).

• Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS Part(b)

Examples:

Standardized process for NITS service on OASIS:

- a) Initial service application procedure
- b) Designation of network resources
- c) Addition of network resources
- d) Elimination of network resources
(Business Practice)

The enumerated standardization process was identified as a business process issue that should be referred to the ESS.

• Naming Standardization

Standardization for items such as service points is a continuing problem in OASIS and should be addressed. (Specification/Business Practices)

This confusion over multiple names for the same physical point(s) has been a long standing issue. The major issue was identified as follows: at a point of interconnect between two providers, how is the point name established and agreed-upon such that the name is used consistently for both parties. It was agreed that this would be both a technical and business process change for the IT and ESS to address.

It is our suggestion that the EC review these recommendations and assign them to the ITS and/or the ESS for the development of a request for standards for these issues. Our group acknowledges that this is not the normal approach for developing standards requests, however due to the uniqueness of the situation; we wanted the EC to confirm that these issues would be the types of activities that we should be pursuing. While the business practices and S&CP have not yet been adopted by NAESB, we understand that this is currently being addressed. By moving ahead with the development of the standards requests, we would have these in place by the time that the adoption of the BPs and S&CP were complete.

Executive Summary

The following recommendations to address the OASIS issues listed below have been submitted by the WEQ OASIS 1A Issues Task Force for general approval by the WEQ IT Subcommittee. All issues have been documented and sub-divided into three categories (specification/business practices issues, general issues, and compliance/clarification issues). The goal of this task force is to recommend to the IT subcommittee an appropriate categorization of and resolution process for the twenty (20) OASIS Phase 1A issues listed in this document. A quick overview of the task force recommendations are presented first, followed by more detailed discussion under each specific issue. The numbering system was maintained from the original listing to promote continuity in both sections and the original.

OASIS 1A Issues (Quick Overview)

- 1. Additional Standardization in OASIS Phase 1A** (General)
- 2. GUI Issue/Navigation** (General)
- 3. Output Formats** (Specification)
- 4. INFO.HTM** (Compliance)
- 5. Posting of Schedules** (Compliance)
- 6. TLR & Curtailment Posting** (Compliance/Clarification)
- 7. Posting of Advertisements** (Clarification)

- 8. Upgrade Planning & Progression** (General)
 - 9. Responsibility Determination** (General)
 - 10. Redirect of Transmission Service** (Specification/Business Practice)
 - 11. Recalls of Transmission Service** (Business Practices)
 - 12. Multiple Submissions of Identical Transmission Requests / Queuing Issues** (Specification/Business Practice)
 - 13. Population of System Data** (Compliance)
 - 14. Ancillary Service Requests and Purchases** (Compliance)
 - 15. ATC Updates** (Business Practice)
 - 16. NAESB Implementation of a Compliance Program** (General)
 - 17. Announcing / Posting of OASIS Outages** (Specification)
 - 18. This issue originally was one item; now broken into three separate items.**
 - 18(a). Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS (Use of Status Indicators)**
Part(a) (Compliance)
 - 18(b). Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS**
Part(b) (Specification/Business Practice)
 - 18(c). Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS (Difference in TP Posting and Capacity)**
Part(c) (Compliance/Clarification)
 - 19. Posting Reference Field** (Compliance/Clarification/Specification)
 - 20. This issue originally was six items; now condensed down to one item.**
 - 20. Other Items (Naming Standardization)** (Specification/Business Practices)
- OASIS 1A Issues

2

OASIS 1A Issues

Specification/Business Practices Issues

3. Output Formats

Should additional output formats, such as XML, be added to the S&CP? (Specification)

At this time there is not a need for making a massive change in the way output formats are generated. The S&CP standards for OASIS Phase 1A are the accepted way to communicate output formats at this time and does not need changing. Perhaps in OASIS Phase II the potential benefits of XML can be considered. It was suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort.

10. Redirect of Transmission Service

Using OASIS to process and record redirects of transmission service is a difficult task. There are many issues related to the redirect and resale functionality, but most are caused by provider business rules or vendor design choices.

The primary issue concerns redirects of transmission service. The current OASIS standard does not facilitate primary provider approval of redirected transmission when

that redirect is using resold (reassigned) transmission service. When transmission rights are resold to another customer, the customer on the original request is the seller on the resale request. In this case, the primary provider responsible for administering ATC no longer has approval rights for any future transactions, such as REDIRECTS, that use this resold or reassigned transmission service. This is only an issue when the 2nd customer wants to redirect transmission usage to a constrained path. Currently, unless the provider intervenes on the backend, that provider only has the option to deny this type of transaction when it is tagged. (Specification/Business Practice)

This issue, since it is not addressed in the S&CP, is ripe for standardization. It was suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort in specification in OASIS 1A.

11. Recalls of Transmission Service

Recall allows a provider to reduce the capacity or duration of a transmission request. The issue with recalls concerns implementation and may be an issue to address at the provider/vendor level. However, clarification is needed.

When a provider recalls a transmission request that is a REDIRECT, should capacity be returned to the impacted request? When a provider recalls any impacting request type, OASIS 1A Issues

3

should capacity be returned to the impacted request? If so, should a provider post reductions for the entire “chain” of requests? (Business Practices)

This issue also is not addressed in the S&CP and needs standardization through business practices process. It was suggested that the IT and ESS work jointly on this issue as both a technical and business practices effort.

12. Multiple Submissions of Identical Transmission Requests / Queuing Issues

OASIS business rules are very similar across most providers. In general, customers submitting transmission request have time periods when they can “queue” their requests. This queue process and the way it relates to the Internet can create issues when customers are “battling” for ATC on constrained interfaces.

Many customers have automated the submission of transmission requests. In order to ensure their place in the queue, these customers schedule these requests to be submitted as a scheduled event. To account for delays caused by the Internet and the nature of web server systems, customers usually submit multiple copies of the same request beginning a few minutes before the top of the hour and lasting until well after the top of the hour. The issues created by duplicate request submittal are fairly straightforward. Backend systems and the operators working those systems are impacted dramatically. Each request that arrives after the top of the hour is a valid request. Therefore, the provider can have hundreds of requests in the queue that will never be confirmed.

Other issues that are created are related to OASIS performance. Anyone using transstatus to retrieve a list of OASIS requests submitted during a time period similar to the one described above can receive hundreds of bogus requests and only a hand full of legitimate requests. Also, while the systems are busy working on the bogus requests, valid requests

can be delayed due to bottlenecks created by this issue. Does there need to be a standard to limit these issues? Will FERC Order 605 address this issue? (Specification/Business Practice)

This issue should be worked on as both a technical and business practice modification. This was discussed at length and the discussion revealed this is a very complex issue that needs to be resolved. (Note that the MIPS attempted to address this issue a couple of years ago, but their recommendations were turned down by FERC).

15. ATC Updates

There is a need to revisit the FERC requirement for ATC adjustments and posting updates. In Order 638, FERC requires adjustments to ATC off-line (internally) when the Transmission Provider accepts reservation requests and then on-line, following confirmation, the ATC posting is to be updated. FERC reasoned that use of this two-step method should reduce the number of accepted requests that will be denied service. This OASIS 1A Issues

4

methodology tends to encourage delayed acceptance responses from Transmission Providers and has been a trigger for discontent expressed by marketers.

Over the last 3-4 years, there have been significant advances in the automation of backend systems, including calculation of ATC, which interface with OASIS. Revision of ATC postings can be made earlier now and with more certainty than before, so Transmission Providers can avoid the denials of service that once were more frequent due to ATC calculation uncertainties. A pilot project should be designed to test the concerns surrounding denial of service under a one-step method where ATC would only be adjusted upon confirmation. (Business Practice)

While a consensus was not arrived at on this issue it might be noted that the S&CP does not address this issue but Order 889 Part 37.6b and Order 638 does.

17. Announcing / Posting of OASIS Outages

OASIS Outage posting is inconsistent across OASIS nodes. Some nodes send messages to an email list, such as tsin@nerc.com or osc@nerc.com. Other nodes send a message to a list managed by that TSIP.

Section 4.3.10.1 of the S&CP requires providers to post outages “When the OASIS node is out of service and transmission requests are received by the TP by phone or fax.”

Using the message template, OASIS users can download this information. All other postings of outages are at the discretion of the provider.

The reality is that many providers leave the posting of node outages to the TSIP.

Therefore, the provider has the obligation to make sure that the TSIP is posting outage information on the provider’s behalf.

The message functionality was added to provide a standard for the posting of specific messages, such as node outage information. All OASIS outages can be posted using this standard and customers will have unilateral access to this data using the message template.

Should additional standards be implemented? How can compliance with this requirement be monitored? (Specification)

There was a consensus that this is a technical compliance and specification issue, but no consensus was reached on a method to include in this recommendation to the IT only that a specification for the notification of outages should be written.

18. Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS

Part(b)

Examples:

Standardized process for NITS service on OASIS:

a) Initial service application procedure

OASIS 1A Issues

5

b) Designation of network resources

c) Addition of network resources

d) Elimination of network resources

(Specification/Business Practice)

The enumerated standardization process was identified as a business process issue that should be referred to the ESS.

19. Posting Reference Field

The posting reference is a reference number that must identify the offers being posted on OASIS. The offer posting is in fact a combination of the ATC and the system data, reservations and the price information. When this data is combined to present the offers on the system the posting reference has no real meaning, as it is not clear which of the base items posting identifier is to be used. This worked fine in the past when the system data and the offers were not posted separately. This is a change or a clarification on the purpose of the post ref field. (Compliance/Clarification/Specification)

The S&CP provides guidance on the posting reference field in Section 4.3.7.1 and therefore becomes a compliance issue. There also is a clarification issue in that the S&CP references a posting reference field in Section 4.3.10.1, 4.3.10.2, and 4.3.10.3 and the Data Element Dictionary has a definition for two types of posting reference. The posting reference field needs to be redefined to split the type up into two definitions.

20. Other Items

1) Naming Standardization

Standardization for items such as service points is a continuing problem in OASIS and should be addressed. (Specification/Business Practices)

This confusion over multiple names for the same physical point(s) has been a long standing issue. The major issue was identified as follows: at a point of interconnect between two providers, how is the point name established and agreed-upon such that the name is used consistently for both parties. It was agreed that this would be both a technical and business process change for the IT and ESS to address.

General Issues

1. Additional Standardization in OASIS Phase 1A

Should additional standards be written for OASIS 1A while beginning OASIS Phase II initiatives? (General)

Additional standards should be written and outstanding issues addressed for OASIS Phase 1A. With all the unknowns surrounding OASIS Phase II it makes sense that the OASIS 1A Issues

6

WEQ IT Subcommittee becomes involved in enhancing and maintaining the standards for OASIS Phase 1A while developing OASIS Phase II.

2. GUI Issue/Navigation

Over the years there has been debate over the standardization of the HTML interface to OASIS. HTML “look & feel” requirements were intentionally left out of the S&CP.

The overwhelming majority of the OASIS How Working Group opposed the standardization of the HTML interface to OASIS. The reality is that, with the standardization of the CSV templates across OASIS nodes, vendors have the ability to provide a single interface to all OASIS nodes.

The GUI issue may have deeper roots in customer complaints and “free” OASIS usage. In other words, users of OASIS want a single “look & feel” and they want it at no cost. If standards were made concerning the HTML interface to OASIS, how would they be policed? What would be the scope of these standards? Would providers have the ability to offer a standard interface as well as an enhanced interface? (General)

At this time standardization of the HTML interface would not be beneficial and therefore not needed. With the existence of the current S&CP standards and with compliance issues resolved, standard template queries and responses should allow any Transmission Customer to perform the same functions across many OASIS nodes in virtually identical fashion.

8. Upgrade Planning & Progression

Should OASIS changes be incremental? Who determines if a modification is mandatory or voluntary or both? If a modification is voluntary, how can compliance be monitored? (General)

Anytime an incremental change in OASIS standards is adopted, the change should include a migration and testing plan as part of that standard. Mr. Burden (Williams Gas Pipeline) noted that the Wholesale Gas Quadrant (WGQ) has an Interpretations Subcommittee to resolve issues of standards interpretation. It was suggested that the WEQ employ a similar approach.

9. Responsibility Determination

Who is responsible for the categorization of issues? For example, given an issue, who determines if it is an implementation issue, a compliance issue, or a technical issue? (General)

There was no consensus proposal for this issue. However, for issues identified as OASIS issues, NAESB should be the governing body in determining an appropriate categorization and resolution.

OASIS 1A Issues

7

16. NAESB Implementation of a Compliance Program

Should an OASIS Compliance program be implemented? (General)

It was noted that this issue was discussed during the October IT meeting and was determined that NAESB does not perform a compliance function. Further, it was made clear that compliance was a function to be completed by FERC and that FERC does have a hotline established to handle compliance issues.

Compliance/Clarification Issues

4. INFO.HTM

The posting of information in the INFO.HTM file is inconsistent. The availability of the file across providers is also inconsistent.

Should additional standards be written to clarify the information and design of INFO.HTM? How should non-compliance be monitored? (Compliance)

It is clearly specified in the S&CP (3.4, 4.5) as to which documents should be included.

5. Posting of Schedules

There is a need for compliance on the use of the OASIS template “scheduledetail” for queries and responses associated with schedules and curtailments/interruptions (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.1). This is the template where FERC requires information specific to an individual schedule. There is a tendency to use the tag for this information; however, the OASIS data is currently the required source for audit information associated with schedules and curtailments/interruptions. (Compliance)

There is a compliance issue with some Transmission Providers (TPs) not posting this information in the required format as defined by S&CP (4.3.4.1).

6. TLR & Curtailment Posting

There is a need for compliance on use of the OASIS template “security” for queries and responses associated with security events such as curtailments or TLR's (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.2). This is the template where FERC requires information specific to the event, such as facilities involved, start time of the event, etc. Currently, the NERC website provides a central repository for such information associated with the Eastern Interconnection. There is a need to add Western Interconnection information to this repository. (Compliance/Clarification)

There is a compliance issue with S&CP (4.3.4.2) in the way that some TPs post the required events. There is also a compliance issue with some TPs not posting this information in the required format. There also is a clarification or interpretation issue in regards to which events should be posted.

OASIS 1A Issues

8

7. Posting of Advertisements

Should the posting of related and/or unrelated advertisements be allowed on OASIS nodes? (Clarification)

S&CP (4.3.10.1, 4.3.10.2) is somewhat vague in this area. A clarification is needed on this issue to more clearly define what types of messages are permissible. Note that this issue is complicated by the fact that many OASIS sites are hosted by external companies and a “hosted by” reference could be viewed as an advertisement.

13. Population of System Data

There is a need for compliance with the S&CP on use of the OASIS template “systemdata” for queries and responses associated with ATC/TTC, etc. (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.4).

This is the template that must be populated in order to meet FERC requirements associated with uploads and downloads of ATC/TTC data. Prior to publication of the S&CP version 1.4, the S&CP required provision of ATC/TTC data through use of the “transoffering” template.

When FERC required CBM data on OASIS, uploads and downloads of CBM were combined with all other system attribute data through the use of "systemdata". At the same time, use of “transoffering” for ATC/TTC data became optional. (Compliance) **S&CP (4.3.4.4) already specifies the use of “systemdata”; thus it appears that some TPs may not be in full compliance with the “systemdata” template.**

14. Ancillary Service Requests and Purchases

There is a need for compliance on use of the several ancillary services templates in OASIS for queries and responses associated with the sale and purchase of ancillary services. FERC requires this under Order 889, and as revised. This priority may be lower due to the complexities involved and chaos in the industry associated with ancillary services, in addition to the somewhat rigid methodology provided for in the current OASIS S&CP. This will also be a requirement under OASIS II. (Compliance)

Compliance issue, the S&CP (4.3.2.2, 4.3.3.2, 4.3.8, and 4.3.9) already specifies how to handle this type of service. Further enhancements may be required in the development of OASIS Phase II.

18. Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS (Use of Status Indicators)

Part(a)

Overall problem of misusing the different status indicators, e.g. setting a request to REFUSED because the request was incomplete. There is a need for a uniform interpretation of the S&CP. Specifically, making sure that similar conventions and data definitions are employed on all nodes. (Compliance)

OASIS 1A Issues

9

This issue is a compliance issue with S&CP (4.2.10.2) dealing with the misuse of the status indicators.

18. Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS (Difference in TP Posting and Capacity)

Part(c)

Some providers post things in “blocks” (i.e., an on-peak block), while others post everything in hourly increments (i.e., 24 discrete values). Another might be that some providers respond to a TRANSSTATUS by using CAPACITY REQUESTED and STATUS to allow a customer to derive CAPACITY_GRANTED, while other providers specifically indicate CAPACITY_GRANTED (and some only use CAPACITY_GRANTED if it differs from CAPACITY_REQUESTED).

There are different implementations all have their own unique flavor that have to be coded around. “If PROVIDER =” type statements must be written in order to catch all the node specific implementation details. Obviously you can write exception rules to deal with it, but you shouldn't have to.

If we did some standard queries against all the nodes and compared the data, we'd probably find some interesting differences. If there are valid reasons for the differences, then they should be codified in the S&CP or in Order 638. If not, they should be clarified to ensure uniform interpretation and the nodes modified to meet the clarified S&CP.

The standardization issue above is probably a good idea but it might be a little late unless we see the existence of OASIS according to the S&CP 1.4 continuing more than a couple of more years.

The key question is, is it a matter of S&CP 1.4 implementation (i.e., template access) or is it a really a matter of a TP's tariff (i.e., data content). It would not seem you could affect change to the latter (e.g., your reference to “block” vs. hourly), only the first (e.g., element name usage discrepancies).

Many solutions and associated support systems have been built around the different interpretations and implementations as they are today. Some companies may not be inclined to incur the cost to make significant changes, unless a clarified standard is issued.

A submission to FERC would be required since they are the ones responsible for enforcement of the OASIS S&CP. A validation suite should be developed.

(Compliance/Clarification)

This issue was identified as a technical clarification issue that needed to be clarified and provided by the WEQ IT Subcommittee.

19. Posting Reference Field

OASIS 1A Issues

10

The posting reference is a reference number that must identify the offers being posted on OASIS. The offer posting is in fact a combination of the ATC and the system data, reservations and the price information. When this data is combined to present the offers on the system the posting reference has no real meaning, as it is not clear which of the base items posting identifier is to be used. This worked fine in the past when the system data and the offers were not posted separately. This is a change or a clarification on the purpose of the post ref field. (Compliance/Clarification/Specification)

The S&CP provides guidance on the posting reference field in Section 4.3.7.1 and therefore becomes a compliance issue. There also is a clarification issue in that the S&CP references a posting reference field in Section 4.3.10.1, 4.3.10.2, and 4.3.10.3 and the Data Element Dictionary has a definition for two types of posting reference. There is also a need for a specification change to identified both and split the definition into parts.

R04007

North American Energy Standards Board

**Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model
Business Practice or Electronic Transaction
or
Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model
Business Practice or Electronic Transaction**

Instructions:

1. Please fill out as much of the requested information as possible. It is mandatory to provide a contact name, phone number and fax number to which questions can be directed. If you have an electronic mailing address, please make that available as well.
2. Attach any information you believe is related to the request. The more complete your request is, the less time is required to review it.
3. Once completed, send your request to:
Rae McQuade
NAESB, Executive Director
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350
Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713-356-0060
Fax: 713-356-0067

by either mail, fax, or to NAESB's email address, naesb@aol.com.

Once received, the request will be routed to the appropriate subcommittees for review.

Please note that submitters should provide the requests to the NAESB office in sufficient time so that the NAESB Triage Subcommittee may fully consider the request prior to taking action on it. It is preferable that the request be submitted a minimum of 3 business days prior to the Triage Subcommittee meetings. Those meeting schedules are posted on the NAESB web site at http://www.naesb.org/monthly_calendar.asp.

North American Energy Standards Board

**Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model
Business Practice or Electronic Transaction**

or

**Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model
Business Practice or Electronic Transaction**

Date of Request: December 29, 2003

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Southern Company Services
600 North 18th Street
Birmingham, AL 35291

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name : Mr. Joel Dison
Title : Manager of Market Policy
Phone: (205) 257-6481
Fax : (205) 257-6824
E-mail : jjdison@southernco.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Review existing OASIS standards [and Commission proceedings](#) and develop a body of standards that would be considered OASIS Phase 2. Using the Use Cases and other deliverables of the Electronic Scheduling Collaborative as a model template, identify core functionality, design, and behavior of OASIS Phase II, and develop business practices supportive of OASIS Phase II. The business practices standards developed would complement the activities underway to [revise- implement](#) the NERC functional model.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard and required communication protocols):

The business practice standards are designed to implement the Commission's policy related to on-line price negotiation and to improve the commercial operation of the Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS). The business practice standards may address the day ahead market, congestion revenue rights and real-time market. OASIS II may also need to include some capability to provide dynamic feedback to the market participants , i.e., publish LMP MW and pricing.

At a very high level, OASIS II may need to accommodate the following:

Miscellaneous:

- ICAP contract information,
- Market Participant registration,
- Asset registration,
- Long-term/seasonal market information.

Transmission related services:

- Information to conduct CRR auctions,
- Information to facilitate a secondary CRR market,
- Total Transfer Capabilities,
- Congestion information (ATC may become irrelevant under LMP).

Day Ahead Market:

- Generator bid information,
- External transaction bid information,
- Internal bilateral contract information,
- Demand/Load bid information,
- Ancillary services bid information,
- Virtual bidding (inc and dec bids),
- CRR information where applicable,
- Final market clearing MW amounts, pricing, congestion areas, etc.

Real-time Market:

- Generator bid or re-bid information,
- External transaction bid or re-bid information,
- Demand/Load bid or re-bid information,
- Internal bilateral contract information,
- Real-time dispatch points for generators,
- Real-time dispatch points for dispatchable loads,
- Real-time metering for Settlements,
- Real-time pricing, ex-post and/or ante-post.

Settlements:

- ICAP market,
- LMP with Energy, Congestion charge and Loss components,
- Applicable transmission charges,
- Congestion revenue and payments.

Business practices development may be needed a a base for OASIS II, to support the following E-Tag issues:

1. Distinguish between IDC and CA initiated curtailments
 - a. Determine costs for implementing the “two-level” reliability profile
2. Add TERMINATE and CANCEL states back into valid states
 - a. Develop “whitepaper” explaining need for this feature
 - b. Provide estimate of costs associated with doing this
3. Create a “Printable Tag” for use during service failures (would have reduced amount of data provided).
4. Use “WITHDRAWN” state rather than “killed tag” (WSCC-RMS)
 - a. Develop “whitepaper” explaining need for this feature
 - b. Provide estimate of costs associated with doing this
5. Create CHECKOUT feature.

6. Are FRONT_END tag extensions going to be developed or can we take this off of our list of possible enhancements?
7. Can GPEs have the ability to CURTAIL tags due to loss of generation?
8. With intermediate CAs being allowed to CURTAIL transactions, the significance of the first issue listed above is heightened. Without some method of distinguishing between reliability profiles, each CA will have the ability to inadvertently reload another CA's CURTAILMENT, which is the problem with IDC reloads today.
9. Are there any problems with the new functionality of the RC being able to modify the CURTAILMENT start time?
10. For each TP there should be a Scheduling Entity. This was approved back in the first part of 2003. The TISWG will move ahead with a specification change, unless the IS has a reason not to proceed.

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

The industry and the Commission have already ascertained and realized the benefits of the standards that compose OASIS I. OASIS I is being reviewed for modifications for OASIS IA. OASIS II is the natural progression from OASIS IA and would more accurately reflect today's market conditions.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Unknown at this time.

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

The efforts to develop OASIS II business practices standards should support the NERC efforts to ~~revise~~ implement the functional model.

Note that although some of the items listed within this Request may appear to be directed to a specific market design, we recognize that OASIS Phase 2 is meant to accommodate all market designs and that there may be other ways to address accommodation of all market design characteristics.

Also note that regarding settlements, the OASIS II System Requirements document indicates a need to "interface" with settlement systems, but not, at least at this point, provide settlement services. We recognize that these services are important, but could be added at a later phase.

Further note that:

The standard needs to be written to also accommodate forward markets as necessary. This may not be a big deal but entities should have the ability to submit information for a forward block of time.

The standard needs to be written broad enough to encompass all markets, not just LMP.

ATC calculations and posting mechanisms need to be included. The comment that ATC may be irrelevant under LMP may be valid, but I don't think that the industry in the West is ready to implement LMP as presently proposed. We need to keep the standards flexible enough to allow for regional needs, or if specificity is required, then to develop some form of regional standards. Also "existing transmission rights" need to be honored in the standard methodology.

Specific WECC language is included in the possibilities (RMS). In addition, there is a WECC process currently underway to develop a tracking mechanism for reserve obligations by identifying interruptible and non interruptible components. This is presently in the form of a proposed WECC ISAS Business Practice recommendation authored by a joint task force to deal with this regional issue. The standard may need to include some language on tracking reserve obligations. What is presently being discussed is a check box with an "I" to be toggled on and off, or a new set of transmission product codes with "I" added.

Although the standard does apply to "public utilities", nonjurisdictional entities are also affected as they are also trading partners. As standards are being developed it is important to write these so that they encompass the entire industry and reflect the needs of all.

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

Testing plans will be devised to support the development and implementation of OASIS II standards.

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners:

The standard applies to transmission users' interactions with public utilities.

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

Electronic Scheduling Collaborative [OASIS II](#) System Requirements
OASIS II Use Case Specification
NERC Reliability Functional Model which can be accessed from the following address: (<http://www.nerc.com/~filez/functionalmodel.html>)

R04008

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction
or
Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction

Date of Request: _____

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Natural Gas Pipeline of America
500 Dallas Street, Suite 1000
Houston, TX 77002

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name : Paul Love
Title : Director of Electronic Customer Services
Phone : 713-369-9320
Fax : 713-369-9115
E-mail : Paul_Love@Kindermorgan.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Add a Business Conditional (BC) data element to the Capacity Release Offer which will allow the Releasing Party to specify whether they will assume financial responsibility for overrun charges when overlapping quantities have been nominated by both Releasing Party and Replacement Party.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

This data element should have values of "Yes" and "No" and is assigned by the Releasing Party when they create their Offer. This element should also be added to all relevant Capacity Release documents 'downstream' of the Offer in terms of the business process, as applicable.

R04008

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Required as part of NGPL's Order 637 implementation.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

R04010

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction
or
Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction

Date of Request: _____

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Natural Gas Pipeline of America
500 Dallas Street, Suite 1000
Houston, TX 77002

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name : Paul Love
Title : Director of Electronic Customer Services
Phone : 713-369-9320
Fax : 713-369-9115
E-mail : Paul_Love@Kindermorgan.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Add a Business Conditional (BC) data element to the Capacity Release Offer which will allow the Releasing Party to specify whether they will allow the Replacement Party to change points in the replacement contract to points that fall outside the primary path.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

This data element should have values of "Yes" and "No" and is assigned by the Releasing Party when they create their Offer. This element should also be added to all relevant Capacity Release documents 'downstream' of the Offer in terms of the business process, as applicable.

R04010

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Required as part of NGPL's Order 637 implementation.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

R04011

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction

or

Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction

Instructions:

1. Please fill out as much of the requested information as possible. It is mandatory to provide a contact name, phone number and fax number to which questions can be directed. If you have an electronic mailing address, please make that available as well.
2. Attach any information you believe is related to the request. The more complete your request is, the less time is required to review it.
3. Once completed, send your request to:
Rae McQuade
NAESB, Executive Director
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350
Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713-356-0060
Fax: 713-356-0067

by either mail, fax, or to NAESB's email address, naesb@aol.com.

Once received, the request will be routed to the appropriate subcommittees for review.

Please note that submitters should provide the requests to the NAESB office in sufficient time so that the NAESB Triage Subcommittee may fully consider the request prior to taking action on it. It is preferable that the request be submitted a minimum of 3 business days prior to the Triage Subcommittee meetings. Those meeting schedules are posted on the NAESB web site at http://www.naesb.org/monthly_calendar.asp.

R04011

North American Energy Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction
or
Enhancement of an Existing NAESB Business Practice Standard, Model Business Practice or
Electronic Transaction

Date of Request: January , 2004

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

**Bonneville Power Administration
P.O. Box 491
Vancouver, WA 98666-0491**

Also PacifiCorp

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name : **Barbara Rehman**
Title : **OASIS Policy Manager**
Phone : **360 418 8079**
Fax : **360 418 8207**
E-mail : bmrehman@bpa.gov

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

**Establish a task force to review and investigate possible standards creation
Associated with OASIS posting requirements under FERC Order 2003, Docket
No. RM 02-1- 000, Standardization of Generator Interconnection Agreements
and Procedures, Issued July 24, 2003. The effective date of the Order is
January 20, 2004. See attachments for specific OASIS posting requirements
under the Order.**

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

Standards created under this Request will assist the wholesale electric industry in compliance with OASIS postings required under Order 2003. Also see attachments.

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Assist the wholesale electric industry in compliance with OASIS posting requirements under Order 2003 and provide consistent implementation across OASIS sites.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Unknown at this point.

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

Unknown at this point.

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

Sponsors and potentially all OASIS nodes.

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners :

N/A

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

1. Order 2003

2. Rehman Paper on Order 2003 Transmission Provider OASIS Requirements and Summary Table

Order 2003 Transmission Provider OASIS Requirements (Large Generation Interconnection)

Draft 12/30/03

I. OASIS Requirements under the Standard Large Generator Interconnection Procedure (LGIP):

- A. LGIP Section 3.4:
1. The Transmission Provider shall maintain on its OASIS a list of all Interconnection Requests. The list will identify, for each Interconnection Request:
 - (i) the maximum summer and winter megawatt electrical output;
 - (ii) the location by county and state; (iii) the station or transmission line or lines where the interconnection will be made; (iv) the projected In-Service Date; (v) the status of the Interconnection Request, including Queue Position; (vi) the type of Interconnection Service being requested; and (vii) the availability of any studies related to the Interconnection Request; (viii) the date of the Interconnection Request; (ix) the type of Generating Facility to be constructed (combined cycle, base load or combustion turbine and fuel type); and (x) for Interconnection Requests that have not resulted in a completed interconnection, an explanation as to why it was not completed.
 2. Mask the identify of the Interconnection Customer until Customer executes an LGIA or requests that the TP file an unexecuted LGIA with FERC.
 3. Post on OASIS any deviations from the study timelines set forth in the LGIP along with explanation for the delay (see Docket No.RM02-1-000, paragraph 115).
 4. Post on OASIS Interconnection Study reports (not actual studies) and Optional Interconnection Study reports subsequent to the meeting between the Interconnection Customer and the TP to discuss applicable study results.
 5. Post any known deviations in the In-Service Date.
- B. LGIP Section 3.3.2 **[no posting required, unless automated]**
The TP shall acknowledge receipt of the Interconnection Request within five (5) Business Days of receipt of the request and attach a copy of the received Interconnection Request to the acknowledgement.
- C. LGIP Section 3.6 Withdrawal
The TP shall update the OASIS Queue Position posting in the event of Withdrawal.
- D. LGIP Section 4.1 Queue Position **[no posting required; information only]**
The Queue Position is based on the date and time of receipt of the valid Interconnection Request.
- E. LGIP Section 4.2 Clustering
Any changes to the established Queue Cluster Window interval and opening or closing dates shall be announced with a posting on the TP's OASIS, beginning at least one hundred and eighty (180) Calendar Days in advance of the change and continuing thereafter through the end date of the first Queue Cluster Window that is to be modified.
- F. LGIP Section 4.3 Transferability of Queue Position **[may required posting change]**
Any Interconnection Customer may transfer its Queue Position to another entity only if such entity acquires the specific Generating Facility identified in the Interconnection Request and the Point Of Interconnection (POI) does not change.

- G. LGIP Section 4.4 Modifications **[may require posting change]**
The Interconnection Customer shall retain its Queue Position if the modifications are In accordance with Sections 4.4.1, 4.4.2, or 4.4.5 or are determined not be Material Modifications pursuant to Section 4.4.3.

II. OASIS Requirements under the Standard Large Generator Interconnection Agreement (LGIA):

- A. LGIA Section 9.7.1.2 Outage Schedules
The TP shall post scheduled outages of its transmission facilities on the OASIS.

SUMMARY OF TP OASIS POSTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER ORDER 2003

	OASIS Posting Requirement	Reference	Notes/Issues
1	The maximum summer and winter megawatt electrical output	LGIP Section 3.4, (i)	See Appendix 1, 4.b. Interconnection Request Template
2	The type of Interconnection Service being requested	LGIP Sections 3.2 and 3.4, (vi)	See Appendix 1, 3. Types = Energy Resource Interconnection Service (ER) or Network Resource Interconnection Service (NR)
3	Date of the Request	LGIP Section 3.4, (viii)	See Appendix 1, 9.
4	The station or transmission line or lines where the interconnection will be made	LGIP Section 3.4, (iii)	<u>Possibly</u> included under Appendix 1, 4.a. (address) or f. (POI approx. location)
5	Status of Request including Queue Position	LGIP Section 3.4, (v)	Some Standard OASIS status value definitions could apply (See S&CP, Sec. 4.2.10.2 and Exhibit 4 -1 – State Diagram), for the States: QUEUED (see LGIP, section 4.1), INVALID (see LGIP, section 4.1), RECEIVED (see LGIP, section 4.1), STUDY, WITHDRAWN, and ANNULLED. Some definitions might need to be modified to clearly apply also to Interconnection Requests, including: DECLINED, CONFIRMED, REFUSED, ACCEPTED, and RETRACTED. TRANSFERRED could be a new state value when Queue Position is transferred to another entity. Implementation of Queue Position is complicated by the issue of required integrated queue per geographic region (see Docket No. RM02-1-000, paragraph 147).
6	Type of Generating Facility to be constructed and fuel type	LGIP Section 3.4, (ix)	<u>Possibly</u> included under Appendix 1, c. Generating Facility Types include: combined cycle, base load or combustion turbine
7	Explanation if Request has not resulted in a completed interconnection	LGIP Section 3.4 (x)	The period for this posting could be greater than 10 yrs from date of Request (see LGIP Section 3.3.1.) This could hamper automation of OASIS postings on Interconnection Requests if tracking Requests is desired. Current OASIS template data only retained for 3 yrs
8	Mask identity of Interconnection Customer until Customer executes an LGIA or requests that TP to file an unexecuted LGIA with FERC.	LGIP Section 3.4	May require internal protocol for posting LGIA information, unless automated. This could be more complex than current OASIS unmasking procedures.
9	Any deviations from the study timelines set forth in the LGIP along with explanation for the delay.	Docket No. RM02-1-000, paragraph 115	May require internal protocol for posting timeline deviation information, unless automated.
10	Interconnection Study reports (not actual studies) and Optional Interconnection Study reports subsequent to the meeting between the Interconnection Customer and the TP to discuss applicable study results.	LGIP Section 3.4	May require internal protocol for posting Study reports subsequent to meeting on applicable study results, unless automated.
11	Any known deviations in the In-Service Date.	LGIP Section 3.4	May require internal protocol for In-Service Date deviation information, unless automated.
12	Update the OASIS Queue Position posting in the event of Withdrawal	LGIP Section 3.6	May require internal protocol for Withdrawal information, unless automated.
13	Any changes to the established Queue Cluster Window interval and opening or closing dates, beginning at least one hundred and eighty (180) Calendar Days in advance of the change and continuing thereafter through the end date of the first Queue Cluster Window that is to be modified.	LGIP Section 4.1	May require internal protocol for information on established Queue Cluster Window interval and opening or closing dates, at least 180 days in advance of change through end date of changed Window, unless automated.
14	Scheduled outages of its transmission facilities.	LGIA Section 9.7.1.2	OASIS Template <i>security</i> may be used for this. See S&CP section 4.3.4.2. Unclear whether all scheduled outages must be posted or only related outages.

15	The location by county and state	Section 3.4, (ii)	Interconnection Request Template does <u>not</u> require "county" information
16	The projected" In-Service" date	Section 3.4, (iv)	Interconnection Request Template requires "Commercial Operation Date" only
17	Availability of studies related to the Request	Section 3.4, (vii)	Interconnection Request Template does <u>not</u> require this information.
18	Lower Queue Position for moving POI, if deemed a Material Modification under Section 4.4.3.	Section 4.1	LGIP does not indicate where to place Request that changes the POI, except that it shall be "lower". Possible BP needed here.

Legend:

Postings may be taken from Interconnection Request information; easy to automate.
May require modifications to Request template and OASIS S&CP Status Value definitions for automation of postings on OASIS. Tracking of Requests for Section 3.4 (x) will be difficult to maintain because of potential length of time involved. May require internal protocols for postings.
Requires modifications to Request template for automation of postings on OASIS.

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting - WEQ, REQ, RGQ, WGQ Meeting Materials
February 24-26, 2004

Board Request for Notational Vote



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

TO: NAESB Board Members
FROM: Rae McQuade, NAESB Executive Director
RE: **Notational Ballot for Board Votes on Managing Committee Decision on Scope for Request R03035 from Florida Power and Light regarding Gas Quality**
DATE: February 11, 2004

Dear Board Members:

Yesterday afternoon the Managing Committee held a conference call to consider the disposition of request R03035. The Managing Committee members present¹ found the request within scope for each of the parts identified below. The Managing Committee is asking you to vote notationally your position on whether request R03035 is within the scope of NAESB. The request itself, the minutes of the Triage Subcommittee, the Executive Committee, and yesterday's meetings are available for your review as you determine your position. These minutes include comments provided by participants both in favor of and opposed to finding the request within scope. Please respond to the NAESB office with your vote by end of business **Tuesday, February 17**. Should you have any questions, please feel free to call the Managing Committee or our general counsel Bill Boswell.

Request:

Florida Power and Light prepared a request for standards development regarding gas quality. It was described in three parts:

- A. Establish web-based reports for tracking all physical and chemical properties of natural gas defined in pipeline tariffs, including timelines for reporting.
- B. Develop a uniform process, including the underlying assumptions and methodologies, for determining gas quality specifications from measured data.
- C. Examine the need to establish gas quality specification standards taking into consideration, (i) the specification needs of end users and providers of service to end users, and (ii) sources of supply (e.g. land-based, the Gulf, LNG). Draft such standards as appropriate.

Background:

The Triage Committee met on Jan. 9, 2004, and addressed a portion of request R03035 and forwarded its recommendations to the Executive Committee (EC). It found two of the three parts of the request within scope with assignments to the Wholesale Gas Quadrant. The third part was referred to the EC for consideration without a scope recommendation. At its Feb. 5, 2004, conference call, the EC recommended that the entire request was outside NAESB's scope. While not all quadrant votes are in yet, the wholesale gas quadrant has met quorum requirements and voted it out of scope. A request is found within scope only if each quadrant EC through a simple majority vote determines that the request is within scope. Should the EC recommend that a request is out of scope, it is remanded to the Board and Managing

¹ Managing Committee Members present were Leonard Haynes, Michael Desselle, Joe Stepenovitch, Jim Templeton and Rae McQuade (non-voting member). Mark Maassel was unavailable for the meeting. Bill Boswell as General Counsel was present.



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

Committee for final determination. As such, the EC decision on the question of scope for request R03035 was remanded to the Managing Committee for a determination. The Managing Committee members present voted unanimously to find the request within scope.

It should be noted that in March 1996, GISB, the precursor of NAESB, filed with the FERC a set of business practice standards, and in that filing so noted with regard to gas quality that:

- (page 24 of Volume 1) “Work will commence after January 1, 1997 on the following issues: 2.37 – Gas Quality Reporting, 3.35 – GRI – Customer Education, 4.24 – Work space for batch work in progress, 5.46 – Include 100% load factor tariff provision, 5.50 – contingent bids, 5.52 – Title to Gas in Released Storage, 5.53 – disclosure of minimum conditions associated with a release.
- (page 38 of Volume 1) “Upon review of these proposals, the Executive Committee has adopted the principles and standards (collectively, the “standards”) set forth in sections B and C below. The Executive Committee has also identified several issues requiring further examination: standard resolution of imbalances, penalties and cashout; reallocation; difference between transporter to shipper allocations and scheduled quantities; multi-tiered allocations and title transfer; and gas quality reporting.”

In addition, on November 10, Chairman Wood sent a letter to the organization and in that letter, noted: “In addition, I find it quite important to resolve LNG gas quality standards, as LNG is an important element of our natural gas supply and, in some areas like Maryland, feeds directly into the market area with little opportunity for commingling.”

Also, you should be aware that several trade associations are working on related issues regarding gas quality, including an industry collaborative effort outgrowth from the Natural Gas Council. In addition, the FERC is holding a technical conference on a related topic – gas interchangeability on February 18, and NAESB will make a presentation at that meeting regarding the process used by NAESB to develop standards.

The scope of NAESB as described in our certificate in Article 2, Section 1 is as follows:

“The objects and purposes of NAESB are to propose and adopt voluntary standards and model business practices designed to promote more competitive and efficient natural gas and electric service, as such standards apply to electronic data interchange (“EDI”) record formats and communications protocols and related business practices that streamline the transactional processes of the natural gas and electric industries.”

and the question you are asked to answer is: Is request R03035 within NAESB’s scope? Please feel free to respond by email to rmcquade@naesb.org, call in to the office (713-356-0060), or fax your response (713-356-0067).

Best Regards,

Rae



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

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD

Board of Directors Ballot Notational Vote Regarding the Scope Question for Request R03035 February 11, 2004

Agreement? (Yes/No/Abstain)	Statement
--------------------------------	-----------

I vote in support of the Managing Committee decision to find R03035 for each of the parts listed below as within NAESB's scope as identified in the NAESB Certificate of Incorporation:

Part A : Establish web-based reports for tracking all physical and chemical properties of natural gas defined in pipeline tariffs, including timelines for reporting.

Part B: Develop a uniform process, including the underlying assumptions and methodologies, for determining gas quality specifications from measured data.

Part C: Examine the need to establish gas quality specification standards taking into consideration, (i) the specification needs of end users and providers of service to end users, and (ii) sources of supply (e.g. land-based, the Gulf, LNG). Draft such standards as appropriate.

Name:	_____
Signature:	_____
Company:	_____
Date:	_____

**Please return to the NAESB Office by February 17, 2004
Fax: 713-356-0067**

TAB 5

***Gas Electric Coordination Task Force
Issues List***



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

Preliminary GECTF Issues List as of February 11, 2004 - noon

Flexibility/Planning:

3. Identify the impact of weather and other uncontrollable factors on generation and gas load swings.
9. Discuss ways to accommodate the natural gas requirements of new generation as it comes online in various regions.
 - a. The impact on the gas infrastructure of new gas-fired generation facilities.
 - b. The impact on the gas infrastructure of non-scheduled gas-fired generation coming on or going off without notice.
12. Identify differences in the factors driving dispatch priority between natural gas and power.
13. Distinguish between the need for changes to the NAESB WGQ Standards and the need to make adjustments to contract portfolios and/or infrastructure requirements. Additional incentives may be needed to encourage entities to diversify their contract portfolios to meet their market requirements.
18. The implications that changes allowing more flexibility to non-firm gas shippers might have on the service levels and contractual rights of existing / traditional firm shippers.
19. Identify Examples of the service characteristics that could meet the market needs for increased delivery flexibility.
21. Is there a need for more intraday flexibility in gas scheduling?

Timelines / Scheduling:

4. How does the NAESB WGQ standard gas day interact with the various power days? There is one NAESB WGQ standard gas day and there are many regional power days that create associated difficulties in cross-commodity standardization.
5. How do the NAESB WGQ standard nomination deadlines interact with the various power deadlines? Identify the impact of regional power timeline differences.
8. Identify notice requirements that are to be provided to pipelines and/or service providers by shippers regarding load and flow changes. Identify the need for increased and/or more formal communication protocols between natural gas and power operations / control room personnel.
15. Identify the impact of the timing of peaking requirement differences between natural gas markets and power markets.
20. Can the natural gas producers and marketers react to 'within the day' requirement changes?

Reliability:

11. Identify the impact of any contemplated changes on natural gas and power reliability.
23. Distinguish between coordination issues that are originated by 1) true reliability issues versus 2) those caused by trading risk management practices.



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

Terminology:

22. Clarify the differences in terminology between natural gas and power (e.g., does "Firm" mean the same thing in both commodities?)

Note: Original numbering was maintained from the January 29-30, 2004 GECTF meeting.