



RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: GISB 1998 Annual Plan

Request No.: AP981C

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

STANDARD LANGUAGE (for addition, modification or deletion of a principle, definition or business practice standard)

Standard No. and Language: Modify GISB Standard No. 2.3.29 as detailed below.

At a minnum, Transportation Service Providers should enter into Operational Balancing Agreements at all pipeline-to-pipeline (interstate and intrastate) interconnects. ~~where economically and operationally feasible.~~

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

GISB 1998 Annual Plan, Item 1.c. Finish The Work Of The Open Issues - OBA standards.

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: GISB 1998 Annual Plan

Request No.: AP981C

b. Description of Recommendation:

**OBA Task Force - April 23, 1998
GISB Standard No. 2.3.29**

Mr. Hahn reviewed the producer segment work paper which states as follows:

"Standard 2. 3. 29 not adopted by FERC – we propose to modify 2. 3. 29 by merely deleting the phrase, “where economically and operationally feasible”. This phrase was made part of the standard because the interstate pipelines, in particular, indicated that there were interconnected companies that represented financial risk. In the NOPR, the Commission makes clear on Page 29 that it stands ready to assist in resolving problems with implementing OBA’s at points."

He recommended deletion of the phrase "where economically and operationally feasible" from GISB Standard No. 2.3.29.

Mr. Hahn made a motion which was seconded to modify GISB Standard 2.3.29 to delete the phrase "where economically and operationally feasible." Mr. Young noted that further modifications may be required to define intrastate pipelines references. There was debate over the applicability of this standard. The motion passed.

Motion: Delete the phrase "where economically and operationally feasible" from Standard No. 2.3.29.

Sense of the Room: April 23, 1998 13 In Favor 7 Opposed 4 Abstain

Segment Check (if applicable):

In Favor:	<u> </u> End-Users	<u> </u> LDCs	<u> 9</u> Pipelines	<u> 1</u> Producers	<u> 3</u> Services
Opposed:	<u> </u> End-Users	<u> </u> LDCs	<u> 7</u> Pipelines	<u> </u> Producers	<u> </u> Services
Abstain :	<u> </u> End-Users	<u> 1</u> LDCs	<u> 1</u> Pipelines	<u> 1</u> Producers	<u> 1</u> Services

c. Business Purpose:

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

OBA Task Force: See relevant sections of meeting minutes in Supporting Documentation section above.