



RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Tennessee Gas Pipeline

Request No.: R98085

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

- 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

Per Recommendation:

- Initiation
- Modification
- Interpretation
- Withdrawal

- 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: * EII Task Force (12/2/98) –IR30.
 * Delete GISB Standard No. 4.3.77.

STANDARDS LANGUAGE:

GISB Standard No. 4.3.77: ~~Where a Transportation Service Provider populates the Upstream/Downstream Identifier via its EBB/EDM implementation based upon provision of an upstream or downstream contract identifier at pooling and logical points, an EDI nomination should be provided the same capability.~~

TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

Description of Change:
No Technical Changes required.

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Tennessee Gas Pipeline

Request No.: R98085

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

Revise the Nomination to accommodate the sending of the Upstream/Downstream Cocontract Identifier without sending the Upstream/Downstream Identifier Code at pooling and logical points.

b. Description of Recommendation:

EBB-Internet Implementation Task Force

After discussion on the request from Enron Capital and Trade, a proposed standard and an instruction were crafted:

s76 Where a Transportation Service Provider populates the Upstream/Downstream Identifier via its EBB/EDM implementation based upon provision of an upstream or downstream contract identifier at pooling and logical points, an EDI nomination should be provided the same capability.

IR30 Instruct IR to change the usage codes of the Upstream Identifier Code* and Downstream Identifier Code* from Conditional (C) to Business Conditional (BC). IR should craft a revised Condition based upon s76.

Sense of the Room: December 2, 1998 16 In Favor 3 Opposed

Segment Check (if applicable):

In Favor: End-Users 1 LDCs 7 Pipelines 2 Producers 6 Services

Opposed: End-Users LDCs 3 Pipelines Producers Services

Information Requirements Subcommittee (November 9 - 10, 1999)

Discussion: Per Kim Van Pelt (co-chair of ANSI subcommittee), the new Nomination data set that was approved by ANSI is set up so that a contract number cannot be sent unless a party is present. The new transaction set was submitted to ANSI approximately one year ago and will be published in December 1999. The data is in a looping structure. The upstream/downstream party initiates a loop, with all of the related data under that party (e.g., Package ID, ranks, upstream/downstream contract). The upstream/downstream party is the only information that is mandatory at that level. None of the other data is required, and therefore it is anchored by the party information.

It was noted that the request only applies to pooling and logical points, where the point is located on a single TSP's system. This does not apply at an interconnect between two TSPs.

MOTION:

Send the following issue to BPS:

Was the intention to change the existing Usage and Condition of the Downstream Identifier Code and Upstream Identifier Code if the circumstance in s76 (GISB Standard No. 4.3.77) is not applicable (i.e., the point is not a logical or pooling point). That is, do the existing Usage and Condition no longer apply to physical points?

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Tennessee Gas Pipeline

Request No.: R98085

The current Condition is based upon both Model Type and whether the location is a receipt or a delivery. Therefore, the underlying usage is 'Mandatory'. Was the intent to change this underlying 'Mandatory' usage to 'Business Conditional'?

Sense of the Room: November 9 - 10, 1999 7 In Favor; 0 Opposed

Business Practices Subcommittee (January 20, 2000)

The IR questions were presented. Ms. Van Pelt expressed some dismay with EIITF's instructions, noting that she considered it a minor comparability issue, not in wide usage, and that it had significant implications to the structure and usage of many data elements in the Nomination dataset.

Mr. Griffith added that the change to the conditionality and "reverse comparability" issues these instructions presented were not warranted based on the limited benefits gained by the request.

Mr. Lander added his general agreement with the opinions expressed and asked whether the proposed standard in the instructions, S76, had been adopted and published.

Note: The standard has been ratified and published as 4.3.77.

Mr. Lander noted his belief that 4.3.77 should be deleted as it was difficult if not impossible to implement via EDI. Various scenarios for the usage of the data elements were discussed. A primary issue complicating the usage discussion was the fact that this standard would only apply to those pipelines who support filling in the Upstream/Downstream Identifier based upon the sender filling in the Upstream/Downstream Contract Identifier data element.

Mr. Lander noted that the intent of the standard could potentially be accomplished by addition of an MA data element (supported by those TSPs who do the automatic fill-in on their EBBs) which then indicates that the Upstream/Downstream ID is to be filled-in by the TSP.

There was apparent general agreement that this standard perhaps went a little too far and Mr. Lander proposed (for next time) that consideration be given to deleting standard no. 4.3.77.

Business Practices Subcommittee (February 24, 2000)

This request was discussed at the January 20, 2000 meeting. It has been postponed until this meeting for vote. Reference BPS minutes of January 20, 2000 for additional detail.

Mr. Lander made the following motion which was seconded by Mr. Buccigross:

Motion BPS recommends that Standard No. 4.3.77 be deleted.

Mr. Lander explained his rationale. He believes that implementation of this standard would result in significant changes to the nomination dataset including major changes in the "current looping" structure related to upstream and downstream party and contract information.

He also noted that the requirement for providing upstream and downstream party information in the nomination has been a recognized business practice since the initial adoption of the GISB standards. The request to change this business practice for the limited case does not warrant the required changes to the dataset or the revamping of the business process.

There was additional discussion on any potential changes to the usage of the data elements in the nomination dataset. Mr. Keisler and others explained that removal of this standard (approving the recommendation to remove the standard) would result in the datasets remaining as they are. Implementing 4.3.77 (declining the motion to remove the standard) would result in significant changes to the nominations dataset and related business practices.

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Tennessee Gas Pipeline

Request No.: R98085

Action The motion passed unanimously. See voting record for specifics.

Sense of the Room: (February 24, 2000) 11 In Favor 0 Opposed
Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor: ___ End-Users ___ LDCs 7 Pipelines 1 Producers 3 Services
Opposed: ___ End-Users ___ LDCs ___ Pipelines ___ Producers ___ Services

Information Requirements Subcommittee (March 28 - 29, 2000)

Discussion: On February 24, 2000, the Business Practices Subcommittee recommended that Standard 4.3.77 be deleted. As a result, IR requires no further action.

Technical Subcommittee

No technical changes required.

Sense of the Room: April 20, 2000 3 In Favor 0 Opposed

c. Business Purpose:

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