

GISB Allocation Grid Drafting Team Meeting

Monday, April 27, 1998 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Tuesday, April 28, 1998 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Transco Tower – Level 6
Final Minutes

- **Welcome, Introductions, and Housekeeping by Dale Davis**
- **Anti-trust Warning by Jim Buccigross**
- **Adoption of Agenda** – the agenda was adopted with modifications
- **Adoption of Resulting Notes as Final Minutes for meeting of April 1, 1998** –
It was determined that the resulting notes for April 1, 1998 needed to be approved as minutes. Corrections were made and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Continue work on R96131, et al.

- **Review the need addition of Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID to the PDA and Allocation Statement grids**

Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID added to the nom key (MA) per R97022 (recommendation for E.C. vote 5/98). On the assumption the E.C. will approve these two data elements, the group decided to identify where in the PDA and Allocation grids the data elements were needed. The data elements were added on the applicable lines that are at the nomination level.

- **Review Use of Receipt / Delivery Location on the non-pathed Allocation and unthreaded portion of Pathed Non-Threaded**

Reviewed rationale for incorporating Receipt Location, Delivery Location and Location:

Location: point being allocated – is identified as a common data element

Receipt Location and Delivery Location: one of these may be the same as the Location and the other is needed for the nom level to distinguish transactions. Example, one pipeline allocates the delivery point at the level of a group of city gates so they would use Location to identify the group of gates and then the Delivery Location would be used to identify the unique transactions.

Group decided to delete the Receipt Location & Delivery Location from the Allocation for Non-Pathed and Pathed Non-threaded, as this will be the same as Location.

[Note: AGDT added statement type on 4/1/98, but deferred identifying specific code values at that time pending the results of the consolidation efforts. They will be the line level identifiers]

General Clean-up

Levels 1(3) and 2(3) determined not to be necessary as they are covered in both PDA and Allocation by lines 3 and 4.

Level 25 deleted from PDA and allocation as it is covered by 6(2).

Warning: Not needed

Location Code:

Error: already have: EPDQR300 – Invalid location code
EPDQR301 – Missing location code

Warning: Not needed

Statement Type Code:

Error: already have: EPDQR100 and 101
Currently in code value log these codes are at the header level and need to be moved to the detail level

Error: April 1, 1998 AGDT mtg added error: Statement type code not supported by TSP

Warning: Not needed

VARIABLE DATA ELEMENTS

SUBDETAIL LEVEL

Validation codes 01 – 12 were deleted in IR code clean-up R96121A in April, 1998

Allocation Rank Level:

Error: already have: EPDQR504 - Invalid allocation rank level
EPDQR505 – Missing allocation rank level

Warning: ADD Description: Allocation rank level not used for chosen allocation method
Definition: No definition necessary

Limit Value:

Error: already have: EPDQR512 – Invalid limit value
EPDQR513 – Missing limit value

Warning: already have: WPDQR500 – Limit value not processed
WPDQR505 – Limit value not applicable when allocation rank Indicator is “low”
(Note: above description reflect changes made at IR clean code clean up April 1998)

ADD: Description: Limit value not used for chosen allocation method
Definition: No definition necessary

Downstream Contract Identifier:

Error: already have: EPDQR508 – Invalid downstream contract identifier
EPDQR509 – Missing downstream contract identifier

Warning: already have: WPDQR502 – Downstream contract identifier not processed
Description needs to be changed since not used as “BC” to:
Description: Downstream Contract Identifier not used for chosen allocation method
Definition: No change to definition

Downstream Identifier:

Error: already have: EPDQR510 - Invalid downstream identifier
EPDQR511 – Missing downstream identifier

Warning: At April, 1998 IR code clean up – added a new one: Downstream Identifier Not

Processed

Description needs to be changed since not used as "BC" to:

Description: Downstream identifier not used for chosen allocation method

Definition: No change to definition

Downstream Package ID:

Error: ADD Description: Invalid downstream package id
Definition: No definition necessary

ADD Description: Missing downstream package id
Definition: No definition necessary

Warning: ADD Description: Downstream package id not used for chosen allocation method
Definition: No definition necessary

Package ID:

Error: already have: EPDQR514 – Invalid package id
EPDQR515 – Missing package id

Warning: ADD Description: Package id not used for chosen allocation method
Definition: No definition necessary

Service Provider's Activity Code:

Error: already have: EPDQR516 – Invalid service provider's activity code
EPDQR517 – Missing service provider's activity code

Warning: ADD Description: Service provider's activity code not used
(Note for IR: Service provider's activity code could be used for a particular PDA level but since it is a mutually agreed to data element, they may not have agreed to use it)
Definition: No definition necessary

ADD Description: Service provider's activity code not used for chosen allocation method
(Note for IR: never used)
Definition: No definition necessary

Service Requester ID:

Error: already have: EPDQR524 - Invalid service requester id
EPDQR525 – Missing service requester id

Warning: already have: WPDQR506 – Service requester id not processed
Description needs to be changed since not used as "BC" to:
Description: Service requester id not used for chosen allocation method
Definition: No change to definition

Service Requester Contract:

Error: already have: EPDQR518 - Invalid service requester contract
EPDQR519 – Missing service requester contract

Warning: already have: WPDQR504 - Service requester contract not processed
Description needs to be changed since not used as "BC" to:
Description: Service Requester Contract not used for chosen Allocation Method
Definition: No change to definition

Upstream Contract Identifier:

Error: already have: EPDQR520 – Invalid upstream contract identifier
EPDQR521 – Missing upstream contract identifier

Warning: already have: WPDQR503 - Upstream contract identifier not processed
Description needs to be changed since not used as “BC” to:
Description: Upstream contract identifier not used for chosen allocation method
Definition: No change to definition

Upstream Identifier:

Error: already have: EPDQR522 – Invalid upstream identifier
EPDQR523 – Missing upstream identifier

Warning: At April, 1998 IR code clean up – added a new one: Upstream identifier not processed
Needs to be changed since not used as “BC” to:
Description: Upstream identifier not used for chosen allocation method
Definition: No change to definition

Upstream Package ID:

Error: ADD Description: Invalid upstream package id
Definition: No definition necessary

ADD Description: Missing upstream package id
Definition: No definition necessary

Warning: ADD Description: Upstream package id not used for chosen allocation method
Definition: No definition necessary

Receipt Location:

Error: At April 1, 1998 AGDT added:
Invalid receipt location
Missing receipt location
Receipt location invalid for statement type code

NOTE: If do not identify unique Statement Type Code / Allocation Method combinations as unique Statement Type Codes, will need to change description of “Receipt location invalid for statement type code” to:
Receipt location invalid for chosen statement type code and allocation method

Delivery Location:

Error: At April 1, 1998 AGDT added:
Invalid delivery location
Missing delivery location
Delivery location invalid for statement type code

NOTE: If do not identify unique Statement Type Code / Allocation Method combinations as unique Statement Type Codes, will need to change description of “Delivery location invalid for statement type Code” to:
Delivery location invalid for chosen statement type code and allocation method

Associated Contract:

Error: Already have: EPDQR527 - Invalid associated contract
At April 1998 IR code clean up added Missing associated contract

Warning: ADD Description: Associated contract not used

(Note for IR: could be used for allocation method but have not mutually agreed to do so)

Definition: No definition necessary

ADD Description: Associated Contract not used for chosen Allocation Method
(Note for IR: never used)

Definition: No definition necessary

Bid Transportation Rate:

At April 1, 1998 AGDT, determined that we can not include Bid Transportation Rate

Delete: EPDQR506 – Invalid bid transportation rate

EPDQR507 – Missing bid transportation rate

WPDQR501 – Bid transportation rate not processed

New ERROR for PDA QR – Sub-detail level

Description: No match found for the combination of data elements as provided

Definition: The values provided for the individual data elements may be valid; however, the combination of data element values does not result in a match in the recipient's system.

[NOTE FOR FOLLOW-UP: If identify unique Statement Type Code / Allocation Method combinations as unique Statement Type Codes, will need to change “not chosen for Allocation Method” in above warnings to “not chosen for Statement Type Code” or “not chosen for allocation methodology”]

MOTION:

Motion to adopt the above changes to the errors and warnings in the PDA Quick Response.

Sense of Room: 9 – 0

- **Review sorts of grids for commonality and possible consolidation**

[Note: after sort need to see if pathed levels 13 and 15 aren't the same as non-pathed levels 3 and 4]

Jim Buccigross described what he did to obtain sort – workpaper handed out

Allocation: 23 different unique combinations of data elements (flavors)

PDA: 83 different unique combinations of data elements (flavors)

For allocation:

Just because we have 23 different flavors, it doesn't mean we have 23 different documents.

Could have one document with data elements listed down the side and flavors across the top and then fill in the matrix with the applicable usages.

Revision #1 to Sort:

Eliminate flow direction, associated contract and service provider's activity code from the sort

Results: 55 PDA flavors

No change to the 23 allocation flavors

Revision #2 to Sort:

Eliminate allocation rank level and limit value (make those conditional on the allocation method).

Results: 18 PDA flavors: (a) for prorata and (b) for the other three allocation methods

No change to the 23 allocation flavors

Revised workpaper generated and distributed at meeting.

Ideas to be considered for discussion on collapsing of flavors at next meeting:

- 1.) Do we just create a list of flavors without putting words or try to put words around them (words may come from the universal matrix)?
- 2) Do we need to differentiate by nomination model type?
- 3) Do we need to differentiate by allocation method?
- 4) Need to review warnings created on whether it should refer to allocation method and / or statement type.

- **Review of next steps**

Continue review of collapsing of flavors and above questions

Direction of Flow – review decision to eliminate from grids

Review Technical Implementation of Business Processes for PDA, PDA Quick Response and Allocation

- **Next meeting date and location:** Tentatively scheduled for May 13 – Transco

NOTE: (If you need a current copy of the file of the current workpapers in progress please e-mail either Dale Davis @ dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com or Jim Buccigross @ legaljb@tcapserv.com for a copy. Current to date on the grid is 4/27/98 and on the sort is 4/28/98.)

The meeting adjourned Tuesday April 28, 1998 at 12:40 pm