



**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: National Registry of Capacity Rights Request No.: R96022A**

**1. Recommended Action:**

- Accept as requested
- Accept as modified below
- Decline

**Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:**

- Change to Existing Practice
- Status Quo

**2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE**

**Per Request:**

- Initiation
- Modification
- Interpretation
- Withdrawal
- Deletion

**Per Recommendation:**

- Initiation
- Modification
- Interpretation
- Withdrawal
- Deletion

- Principle (x.1.z)
- Definition (x.2.z)
- Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)
- Document (x.4.z)
- Data Element (x.4.z)
- Code Value (x.4.z)
- X12 Implementation Guide
- Business Process Documentation

- Principle (x.1.z)
- Definition (x.2.z)
- Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)
- Document (x.4.z)
- Data Element (x.4.z)
- Code Value (x.4.z)
- X12 Implementation Guide
- Business Process Documentation

**3. RECOMMENDATION**

**SUMMARY:** \* Delete principles 1.1.7, 4.1.5 and 4.1.8.  
\* Add standard 4.3.x.

**BUSINESS PROCESS DOCUMENTATION** (for addition, modification or deletion of business process documentation language)

**Standards Book:** Nominations Related Standards

**[delete GISB Standard No. 1.1.7]**  
**Language:** ~~Activity codes should be included in the nominations data elements, and usage is at the shipper's option if offered by the transportation service provider.~~

**Standards Book:** Electronic Delivery Mechanism Related Standards

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: National Registry of Capacity Rights      Request No.: R96022A**

**[delete GISB Standard No. 4.1.5]**

**Language:** ~~Data should be made available to all requesters in an accepted standard format comparable both in time and delivery mechanism.~~

**[delete GISB Standard No. 4.1.8]**

**Language:** ~~The same business result should occur regardless of the electronic delivery mechanism: this principle should guide the definition of the business process, data content of the transaction, and the timing of the transaction.~~

**[add the following new standard 4.3.x]**

**Language:** *To the extent that multiple electronic delivery mechanisms are used, the same business result should occur.*

**4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**a. Description of Request:**

Modify several standards from disposition of principle to disposition of standard.

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Business Practices Subcommittee** (August 19, 1999)

**Request:** Revised by Submitter:

Make the following principles as standards: GISB Standard Nos. 1.1.4, 1.1.7, 3.1.2 and 4.1.8. Delete GISB Standard No. 4.1.5. GISB Standard No. 4.1.8 should be changed to delete the second sentence.

The balance of the request, namely, requested changes to GISB Standard Nos. 1.1.1, 4.1.6 and 4.1.7 are withdrawn by the requester, as noted in the August 5 minutes, in the restatement of the request.

**1.1.4** The motion was made that:

Upon adoption of 1.3.x, below, delete GISB Standard No. 1.1.4:

1.3.x Pre-nominations should not be a required step in the nominations process.

**Discussion:** Mr. Lander and Mr. Scheel noted that this should be a standard to emphasize that pre-nominations should not be required as LDCs and intrastate pipelines begin implementation of the standards in their roles as transporters. Mr. Young noted that the principles carry the same weight as the standards. Ms. Unruh stated that making this principle into a standard will not prevent non-regulated entities from requiring pre-nominations. Mr. Scheel noted that the FERC does not require that the principles be put in the tariffs.

**Action:** The motion failed in a balanced vote (3.5 in favor and 3.5 opposed), and the segment vote chart follows, with the individual votes recorded in the attendance section.

Segment	In Favor	Opposed	Balanced In Favor	Balanced Opposed
Pipelines	3	3	1	1

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: National Registry of Capacity Rights Request No.: R96022A**

Producers	0	0	0	0
LDCs	0	2	0	2
End Users	1	0	1	0
Services	3	1	1.5	.5
Total	7	6	3.5	3.5

**1.1.7** The motion was made that:  
Delete GISB Standard No. 1.1.7 upon adoption of the following instruction to the Information Requirements Subcommittee:

"Use of Service Provider's Activity Code should be mutually agreeable between the Transportation Service Provider and the Service Requester in all communications where it appears."

**Action:** Passed unanimously.

**4.1.8** The motion was made and seconded that:  
Upon adoption of 4.3.x, below, delete GISB Standard No. 4.1.8:

4.3.x To the extent that multiple electronic delivery mechanisms are used, the same business result should occur.

**Discussion:** Participants to the call agreed that: "The requester acknowledges that, from a timing point of view, the processing of transactions is dependent upon when and how a transaction is communicated. "

Ms. Barnum noted that there may be a consistency issue with this statement and GISB Standard No. 1.3.2 (v):

1.3.2 (v) For the purposes of 1.3.2 ii, iii and iv, "provide" shall mean for transmittals pursuant to standards 1.4.x, receipt of the designated site, and for purposes of other forms of transmittal, it shall mean send or post.

Several on the call described examples where the same business result would be achieved and no discrepancy existed. It was noted that the EBB Internet Implementation Task Force (EII) has addressed part of this issue in GISB Standard No. 4.3.72, but it was limiting in that it addressed only the presentation of data, not the business result.

**Action:** The motion passed unanimously.

**4.1.5** Delete GISB Standard No. 4.1.5, "Data should be made available to all requesters in an accepted standard format comparable both in time and delivery mechanism."

**Discussion:** Mr. Lander described the standard and why it was no longer needed, based on the efforts and resulting standards from EII. Several on the call noted that its vague wording made it difficult to implement.

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: National Registry of Capacity Rights      Request No.: R96022A**

**Action:**            The motion passed unanimously.

**3.1.2**    As stated in the August 5 minutes, for GISB Standard No. 3.1.2, Mr. Lander suggested the following word change:

"Elements should stay consistent from nominations through ~~billing~~ invoicing."

**Action:**            This portion of the request is "parked" as **R96022B** until after the resolution of Request Nos. R98011 and R98012 by the Executive Committee. There was no disagreement to this action. The balance of the request, namely, requested changes to GISB Standard Nos. 1.1.1, 4.1.6 and 4.1.7 are withdrawn by the requester, as noted in the August 5 minutes, in the restatement of the request.

**Information Requirements Subcommittee**

For the instructions associated with Standard 1.1.7, IR reviewed all data sets where the Service Provider’s Activity Code is used. The usage is ‘MA’ in all of them.

**MOTION:**

IR reviewed the actions taken by BPS and determined that no further action is needed to implement R96022A.

<b>Sense of the Room:</b> October 12 – 13, 1999	<u>  6  </u> In Favor	<u>  0  </u> Opposed
<b>Segment Check</b> (if applicable):		
In Favor: <u>  </u> End-Users <u>  </u> LDCs <u>  </u> Pipelines <u>  </u> Producers <u>  </u> Services		
Opposed: <u>  </u> End-Users <u>  </u> LDCs <u>  </u> Pipelines <u>  </u> Producers <u>  </u> Services		

**Technical Subcommittee**

No technical changes needed.

<b>Sense of the Room:</b> October 25, 1999	<u>  6  </u> In Favor	<u>  0  </u> Opposed
<b>Segment Check</b> (if applicable):		
In Favor: <u>  </u> End-Users <u>  </u> LDCs <u>  </u> Pipelines <u>  </u> Producers <u>  </u> Services		
Opposed: <u>  </u> End-Users <u>  </u> LDCs <u>  </u> Pipelines <u>  </u> Producers <u>  </u> Services		

**c. Business Purpose:**

Per the request: Adopting the enumerated principles as GISB standards would serve to fully implement the intent to standardize electronic business transactions, as contemplated by parties who adopted these principles. Secondly, adopting these resolutions as standards would improve transactional certainty in many areas and further develop the seamless, national, gas transportation grid.

**d. Commentary/Rationale of Subcommittee(s)/Task Force(s):**