



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002  
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: [gisb@aol.com](mailto:gisb@aol.com)  
Home Page: [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

**via email & posting**

**TO:** GISB Members, Posting on the GISB Home Page for Interested Industry Participants  
**FROM:** Rae McQuade, Executive Director  
**RE:** Request For Comments  
**DATE:** May 11, 2001

An industry comment period begins today and ends on June 11 for the recommendations listed below. The Executive Committee will meet in Seattle on June 14 to review these recommendations and consider them for vote as GISB standards or revisions to standards. The recommendations can be accessed from the GISB Web site, but is also attached to this request for comment<sup>1</sup>. All comments received by the GISB office by end of June 11 will be posted on the Home Page and forwarded to the EC members for their consideration. If you have difficulty retrieving this document, please call the GISB office at (713) 356-0060.

Best Regards,

**Rae McQuade**

cc: Jay Costan

<b>Request Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
R98035A	Decline the request to modify the confirmation data sets to accommodate sending of pre-limit quantities
R98044	From the EII Task Force (November 2 - 4, 1998 - noted as IR5). Add the data element 'Estimated BTU' to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator, and revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.63 to include the new data element.
R98061	Decline the request to create new standard nominations related data sets to allow No-Notice Transportation (NNT) shippers to request authorization for overrun deliveries under their NNT contracts, and determine the applicability of such functionality on the Customer Activities Web Page.
R98062	Decline the request to create new standard nominations related data sets to allow a Park and Loan shipper to submit a request for a specific Park/Loan deal, and determine the applicability of such functionality on the Customer Activities Web Page.

<sup>1</sup> All recommendations other than clarifications/interpretations can be found on the "Request For Standards" page (<http://www.gisb.org/req.htm>), which is accessible from the GISB main page. Clarifications/Interpretations (Cxxxxx) can be found on the "Clarification Requests" page (<http://www.gisb.org/clar.htm>).

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: ANR Pipeline**

**Request No.: R98035A**

**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:**

\* No change required—this request was declined by the BPS.

**4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**a. Description of Request:**

Modify the confirmation data sets to accommodate sending of pre-limit quantities.

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Executive Committee Meeting, August 24, 2000**

**Recommendation Summary:**

Decline the request to add a pre-limit quantity code value to the transaction identifier data element in the Request for Confirmation (G850RQCF) and the Confirmation Response (G855RRFC) datasets.



## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester: ANR Pipeline**

**Request No.: R98035A**

**Discussion:** Mr. Novak disagreed with the recommendation to decline the request, stating that the standard would be used in the industry to support existing business practices. Others responded that because pre-limit quantities in the confirmation would be used infrequently, and use of prelimit quantities in the confirmation process would require the development of a new data set rather than amending an existing data set, the effort required would not be commensurate with benefit. Ms. Phillips supported Mr. Novak's statement and added that in the normal course of business, this practice would be more frequently used when the standard is created.

**Motion:** Ms. Davis made the motion, seconded by Ms. Van Pelt to approve the recommendation to decline.

**Vote:** Procedural vote failed with 6 votes in favor, 12 votes opposed, and 3 abstentions.

**Motion:** Ms. Phillips made the motion seconded by Mr. Novak to instruct the BPS to reconsider request no. R98035A during normal course of business.

**Discussion:** Ms. Van Pelt urged those in support of this action to attend and participate in the BPS meetings when this request is considered.

**Vote:** Procedural vote passed with 17 votes in favor, 5 votes opposed and no abstentions.

### **Business Practices Subcommittee, October 19, 2000**

#### **Discussion:**

Mike Novak requested that we look at the request from two perspectives: as an operator of an interconnect with a pipeline and as a operator of a transportation system of its own. There are also level issues. The usefulness was identified to be in setting limits for purposes of facilitating confirmation by exception. He mentioned that it would be an MA practice in any event.

Mr. Lander asked what about the level of the confirmation, was this intended to mirror the level of confirmation in use between the confirming parties?

Mr. Novak then offered that for confirmations at the city gate where the LDC is the operator at a point, there would be a location and an entity. On the LDC side there would be a location and either an entity or contract. In the absence of a standardized entity to entity confirmation relationship at the city gate, there could be a contract on the pipeline side.

Mr. Gracey offered that there could be application of this data element at whatever level of confirmation is used between the confirming parties. Mr. Novak also offered that he intended for the data element to apply to any confirming party.

After further discussion, Mr. Novak and Ms. Bragg agreed to draft a Work Paper for the next meeting on this request. It was noted that the preparers of the work paper should also look at a memo from IR, dated 11/02/1999, and the schematic presented by ANR at the October 16, 1998 EII meeting.

### **Business Practices Subcommittee, November 30, 2000**

#### **BPS Discussion:**

Mr. Novak and Ms. Bragg were to post a work paper for discussion of this topic. Since no work paper has been posted at this time, this request will be moved to the next meeting agenda.

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: ANR Pipeline**

**Request No.: R98035A**

**Business Practices Subcommittee, December 8, 2000**

**BPS Discussion:**

Audrey Bragg attended the meeting and informed BPS that Mr. Novak was out of the office for the remainder of the year and that they are requesting to have this item added to the BPS agenda for 1/11/2001. Ms. Bragg and Mr. Novak will post a work paper for discussion of this topic at the 1/11/2001 meeting.

Ms. Lecureaux stated that in light of the merger between Coastal and El Paso, she is uncertain who, if anyone, will be able to represent this request after the beginning of the year. She also believes that BPS handled this request appropriately on November 18, 1999 when it was declined for standardization. Further discussion of this request is not worthwhile for this subcommittee.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, January 11, 2000**

**Discussion:**

The request should be declined to give ANR closure to its request and because the proponents of a similar business practice wish to put in their own request to more closely satisfy the needs of the proponents.

**Motion:** (motioned by Mike Novak, seconded by Greg Lander)

Upon further consideration, BPS reaffirms its decision to decline R98035A.

**Motion passes – see vote 2 on the attendee list**

**c. Business Purpose:**

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

The subcommittee re-affirms its initial action to decline standardization.

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Duke Energy**

**Request No.: R98044**

**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 (November 2 – 4, 1998) – IR5
- \* Add the data element ‘Estimated BTU’ to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator.
- \* Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.63 to include the new data element.

**STANDARDS LANGUAGE:**

**GISB Standard No. 1.3.63:**

On the scheduled quantity for operator Web page, fields in the data groups should appear in the following order:

- Business Entity Group:
  - Preparer ID
  - Statement Recipient ID
  - Statement Date/Time
- Contracts Data Group:
  - Confirmation Service Contract
  - Confirmation Service Identifier Code
- Dates Data Group:
  - Beginning Date
  - Beginning Time

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Duke Energy**

**Request No.: R98044**

- Ending Date
- Ending Time
- Location Data Group:
  - Location
  - Estimated BTU
- Transaction Specific Data Group:
  - Contractual Flow Indicator
  - Upstream Identifier Code/Downstream Identifier Code
  - Upstream Contract Identifier/Downstream Contract Identifier
  - Service Requester
  - Service Requester Contract
  - Package ID
  - Quantity
  - Reduction Reason
  - Upstream Package ID/Downstream Package ID
  - Confirmation Tracking Identifier
  - Confirmation Subsequent Cycle Indicator
  - Confirmation User Data 1
  - Confirmation User Data 2

**DATA DICTIONARY** (for new documents and addition, modification or deletion of data elements)

**Document Name and No.:** Scheduled Quantity for Operator, 1.4.6

<b>Business Name (Abbreviation)</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Data Group</b>	<b>EBB Usage</b>	<b>EDI / FF Usage</b>	<b>Condition</b>
<u>Estimated BTU</u> (Est BTU)	<u>The estimated BTU for the location.</u>	<u>LDG</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>SO</u>	

**TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG** (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

**Document Name and No.:** Scheduled Quantity for Operator, 1.4.6

<b>Description of Change:</b>
<b>Scheduled Quantity for Operator</b>
<b>Data Element XREF to X12</b>
Add a detail MEA segment below the LCD segment (in a new row): "MEA SO Estimated BTU"
<b>X12 Mapping</b>
Add a new detail MEA segment (position 450): MEA segment notes: "For GISB, this segment is sender's option."
Detail MEA segment (position 450): MEA01: mark as not used; MEA02: mark as not used, MEA03: add element note: "Estimated BTU", mark as Must Use; MEA04: add code values JM and M9, mark as Must Use; mark remaining elements as not used

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Duke Energy**

**Request No.: R98044**

**4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**a. Description of Request:**

Add nine data elements to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator (Standard 1.4.6).

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**EBB-Internet Implementation Task Force** (November 2 – 4, 1998)

Ms. Barnum presented the request. Several of the data elements on the original request were removed based on the reasons presented in the previous request R98042 and R98043. The addition of this data element to the EDI transaction set is required so that users of the Duke Energy pipelines' Internet Web site will have access to the same information as users of EDI transactions.

The estimated Btu could be considered derivable if the Measurement Information data sets is functionally related to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator data set. Some noted that these data sets are not necessarily related. In the majority of the cases the estimated Btu is from the most recent statement from the pipeline.

**Action:**

**IR5** Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a data element, Estimated Btu, with the usage of sender's option, to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator, GISB Standard No. 1.4.6.

The action carried with one vote in opposition.

**Information Requirements Subcommittee**

◆ Add the following data element at the same level as the location information in the Scheduled Quantity for Operator:

<b>Business Name (Abbreviation)</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Data Group</b>	<b>EBB Usage</b>	<b>EDI/FF Usage</b>	<b>Condition</b>
<i>Estimated Heating Factor (Est BTU)</i>	<i>Estimated quality information for measurement in MMBTU.</i>	<i>LDG</i>	<i>SO</i>	<i>SO</i>	

◆ Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.63 to 'Estimated Heating Factor' to the Location Data Group, after 'Location'.

**Sense of the Room:** October 12 – 13, 1999

7 In Favor

0 Opposed

**Technical Subcommittee**

**Sense of the Room:** October 26, 1999

6 In Favor

0 Opposed

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Duke Energy**

**Request No.: R98044**

**Executive Committee**

**Recommendation:** Add 'Estimated Heating Factor' data element to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator. Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.63 to include the new data element, "Estimated Heating Factor", abbreviated "Est BTU" and defined as "Estimated quality information for measurement in MMBTU."

**Motion:** Mr. Caldwell made the motion to adopt the recommendation, which was seconded by Ms. Munson.

**Discussion:** There was significant discussion that the definition should be revised. Mr. Keisler and Mr. LaTour noted that the definition of Heating Factor was consistent with the definition in the Measured Volume Audit Statement.

**Action:** The motion was withdrawn.

**Motion (2):** Ms. Hess made the motion that the recommendation and request for R98044 be transferred to the BPS to be addressed in conjunction with the existing data element heating factor in the Measured Volume Audit Statement. Ms. McVicker seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** The priority for this request is high.

**Vote:** Motion (2) passed unanimously.

**Sense of the Room:** February 10, 2000                    21 In Favor      0 Opposed

**Segment Check** (if applicable):

In Favor:            5 End-Users    3 LDCs    4 Pipelines    4 Producers    5 Services

Opposed            :               End-Users       LDCs       Pipelines       Producers  
Services

**Business Practices Subcommittee**

**Motion:** "Upon further consideration, it was determined that the Heating Factor and BTU are two different data elements. Therefore, the BPS instructs the Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate the sender's option business practice of sending an estimated BTU in the Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6), with a suggested name and definition of: Estimated BTU / The estimated BTU for the location."

**Action:** Passed unanimously

**Sense of the Room:** February 1, 2001                    7 In Favor      0 Opposed

**Segment Check** (if applicable):

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

Opposed            :               End-Users       LDCs       Pipelines       Producers  
Services

**Information Requirements Subcommittee**

**Motion:** Add the data element Estimated BTU to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6). This will replace the action previously adopted by IR to add the data element Estimated Heating Factor.

**Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6)**

<b>Business Name (Abbreviation)</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Data Group</b>	<b>EBB Usage</b>	<b>EDI / FF Usage</b>	<b>Condition</b>
<u>Estimated BTU</u> <u>(Est BTU)</u>	<u>The estimated BTU for the location.</u>	<u>LDG</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>SO</u>	

- No new code values are needed.
- Nothing needs to be added to the Sample Paper Transaction.



**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Duke Energy**

**Request No.: R98044**

- No changes needed to the TIBP.
- Add at the same level as the location information.
- Modify GISB Standard 1.3.63 to insert Estimated BTU in the Location Data Group after Location.

**Sense of the Room:** February 20, 2001 6 In Favor 0 Opposed

**Technical Subcommittee**

**Data Element XREF to X12**

Add a detail MEA segment below the LCD segment (in a new row): “MEA SO Estimated BTU”

**Sample ASC X12 Transaction**

No changes needed.

**X12 Mapping**

Add a new detail MEA segment (position 450): MEA segment notes: “For GISB, this segment is sender’s option.”

Detail MEA segment (position 450): MEA01: mark as not used; MEA02: mark as not used, MEA03: add element note: “Estimated BTU”, mark as Must Use; MEA04: add code values JM and M9, mark as Must Use; mark remaining elements as not used

**Transaction Set Tables**

No changes needed.

**Sense of the Room:** March 27, 2001 3 In Favor 0 Opposed

**c. Business Purpose:**

Per the request: The addition of these data elements to the EDI transaction set is required so that users of Duke Energy pipelines’ Internet Web site will have access to the same information as users of EDI transactions.

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

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Colorado Interstate Gas**

**Request No.: R98061**

**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:**

\* No change required—this request was declined by the BPS.

**4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**a. Description of Request:**

New standard data sets are requested under the GISB Nomination Related Standards (1.4.X) to allow No-Notice Transportation (NNT) shippers to request authorization for overrun deliveries under their NNT contracts. CIG also requests that a determination be made by the EII Task Force of the applicability of such functionality on CIG's Customer Activities Web Page.

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Executive Committee Meeting, August 24, 2000  
Recommendation Summary:**

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester: Colorado Interstate Gas**

**Request No.: R98061**

Decline the request to accommodate a mutually agreeable nominations related business practice to allow No Notice Transportation (NNT) shippers to request authorization for overrun deliveries under their NNT contracts by the addition of new data elements:

- contract number
- overrun quantity requested
- date range for the overrun quantity requested

or through the addition of new nominations related data sets and to accommodate the respective response documents.

**Discussion:** Mr. Novak noted that his comments are similar to the ones made in the above recommendation to decline. This is very usable – with EDI gaining more acceptance for LDC firm shippers. They would rather have no notice service available via EDI and implemented prior to the winter season 2002, when EDI should be widely accepted. Mr. Griffith noted that this was infrequently used, but Ms. Chezar noted that in several filings pipelines are beginning to use this as a request for pre-authorization for overrun. Mr. Novak added that he would support the development of standards or principles along the lines of the request with a modification for where nominations are required.

**Motion:** Mr. Griffith made the motion, seconded by Ms. Van Pelt to accept the recommendation to decline.

**Vote:** Procedural vote failed with 11 in favor and 13 opposed.

**Motion:** Mr. Novak made the motion, seconded by Ms. Phillips, that BPS reconsiders this request as a principle.

**Discussion:** Ms. Davis noted that the process of overturning subcommittee efforts is inefficient, and if members have concerns, they should participate in the meetings. She added that many of these meetings were held over the phone. Mr. Novak noted that he would withdraw the motion and resubmit as a request.

**Motion:** After further discussion, Ms. Phillips made the amended motion, seconded by Mr. Novak, to instruct BPS to accommodate the practice of communicating requests for authorized overrun for no notice service, to be addressed in the normal course of business.

**Discussion:** Mr. Novak described that this request would lead to fewer billing disputes, particularly where there are no flow controls. After additional conversation, it was noted that this would be best handled through withdrawal of the motion and submittal of a new request.

**Motion:** The motion was made by Mr. Scheel and seconded by Ms. Chezar to send the request back to BPS for reconsideration to be addressed in the normal course of business.

**Discussion:** Mr. Scheel explained that this will be reviewed in light of the new information that the LDCs expect a wider use of EDI, which might impact the recommendation. Ms. Phillips added that there is now additional information, which highlights that in some cases, the data sets do not accommodate communicating the request for authorized overruns when nominations for that service are not required. This can be accommodated through a new request, and Mr. Novak will prepare it.

**Vote:** Procedural vote passed with 18 in favor, zero opposed and five abstaining.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, October 19, 2000**

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Colorado Interstate Gas**

**Request No.: R98061**

**Discussion:**

There was discussion as to the relevance of this request (the narrowness of its scope in particular) to the range and type of existing and proposed practices arising in light of Order No. 637. In Mr. Novak's opinion, events subsequent to the initial processing of this request have made it more likely that there should be a standardization of this type of practice but that the current request is not the right vehicle. He feels that the way that the request was originally presented does not account for the practices that he would like to see standardized. Therefore as a result, Mr. Novak will put in a request that will likely be dealt with in Round 3 of nominations. As for this request, it is likely that the BPS will see a motion to decline it in favor of a later request taking a wider view of the issues identified within this set of practices.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, November 30, 2000**

**Motion:** BPS recommends that request R98061 be declined.

**BPS Discussion:**

none

**motion passes unanimously (noted as Vote 1 on the attendance list)**

**c. Business Purpose:**

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

The subcommittee re-affirms its initial action to decline standardization.

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Colorado Interstate Gas**

**Request No.: R98062**

**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:**

\* No change required—this request was declined by the BPS.

**4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**a. Description of Request:**

New standard data sets are requested under the GISB Nomination Related Standards (1.4.X) to allow a Park and Loan shipper to submit a request for a specific Park/Loan deal. CIG also requests that a determination be made by the EII Task Force of the applicability of such functionality on CIG’s Customer Activities Web Page.

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Executive Committee Meeting, August 24, 2000**

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Colorado Interstate Gas**

**Request No.: R98062**

**Recommendation Summary:**

Decline the request to accommodate a mutually agreeable nominations related business practice to allow a Park and Loan shipper to submit a request for a specific Park/Loan deal by the addition of new data elements or code values for:

- Park/Loan Contract
- Request for “Park” or “Loan”
- Park/Loan Location
- Maximum Park/Loan Quantity
- Park/Loan Deal Term
- Park/Loan Deal Rate

or through the addition of new nominations related data sets or instructions and to accommodate the respective response documents.

**Discussion:** Mr. Keisler described the request.

**Motion:** Ms. McVicker made the motion, seconded by Mr. Novak to send the request back to BPS for reconsideration with additional participation, to be addressed in the normal course of business.

**Discussion:** In response to a question from Ms. Davis, Mr. Novak noted that when this was first considered very few pipelines offered park and loan services. He noted that now more pipelines offer these services and more will continue to do so as reliance on penalties to manage pipeline capacity decreases.

**Vote:** The procedural vote passed with 13 in favor, 5 opposed and 4 abstaining.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, October 19, 2000**

**Discussion:**

There was discussion that clarified the issue in most people’s minds. The clarification was that the word “deal” meant contract and not “nomination”. Once the word “deal” was equated with contract, it seemed that there was not a desire to standardize the contracting for Park and Loan service. A request that more closely reflects the issues that matter to Mr. Novak will be put in by him and likely will be dealt with in Round 3 of nominations.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, November 30, 2000**

**Motion:** BPS recommends that request R98062 be declined.

**Discussion:**

none

**motion passes unanimously (noted as Vote 2 on the attendance list)**

**c. Business Purpose:**

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

The subcommittee re-affirms its initial action to decline standardization.