Gas Industry Standards Board
1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

TO: EBB Internet Implementation (EII) Task Force Chairs: Carl Caldwell (absent), Dona Gussow (absent), Paul Keeler, Tammy Hopkins, Mike Novak

Business Practice Subcommittee (BPS) Chairs: Greg Lander, Diane McVicker, Robert McAnally (absent), Norm Walker (absent), Producer Vacancy

Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the BPS/EII Joint Task Force Meeting – June 23, 1999

DATE: June 24, 1999

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD

GISB BPS/EII JOINT TASK FORCEMEETING

El Paso Energy Offices, Travis Place, Houston, Texas

June 23, 1999

FINAL MINUTES

I. Administrative

Mr. Novak and Ms. Hopkins chaired the meeting and welcomed participants. Mr. Buccigross gave the anti-trust advice. Attendees introduced themselves. The format of the sign in sheet has changed to reflect GISB's privacy policy. On the discussion of the agenda, the EII meeting calendar was reviewed through year-end including how to address remaining requests - should it be through EII or through the normal triage process? Request No. R99039, the EII Dynegy work paper and Request No. R99041 were added to the agenda following conclusion of the stated items on the posted agenda. The agenda was adopted unanimously as modified. Mr. Buccigross reviewed the results of the Executive Committee meeting on May 20, which resulted in today's meeting. Transcripts are taken for this meeting, and they can be ordered from Ak/Ret Reporting (361) 882-9037.

II. Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity

Mr. Scheel described his request and the work paper regarding operationally available and unsubscribed capacity. He highlighted a change in data element name from "design capacity" to "operating capacity" for clarity.

R99033 Submitted by Dynegy as revised during the meeting

Request: Request to add the name and definition of the following data elements to the data set 5.4.13 Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity:

Business Name	Definition	U	Condition
Location Scheduled Quantity	The total net scheduled amount per gas day at the location, in the identified direction of flow, expressed in standard units.	C	Mandatory only for Operationally Available Capacity.
Operating Capacity	The operating capacity expressed in quantity per gas day at a location.	M	

This will increase the amount of information made available by pipelines to service requesters for both competitive and monitoring purposes. It will also assist service requesters in planning for their future transportation needs and will promote efficiencies in the market place.

The portion of the Dynegy work paper presented to EII related to this request follows:

4.3.X For the subcategories of Capacity, the first column headings in the Content Area should be Effective Date/Time, Location, Location Name or Location Zone, when applicable, Location Purpose, Operating Capacity, Location Scheduled Quantity, when applicable, Quantity Available and IT Indicator, when applicable.

Discussion: There may be a link to a pending request from Tennessee Gas Pipeline, Request No. R99024. Mr. Scheel responded that while there may be a relationship, this request adds new information and should be addressed independently. Others noted that the description should address netting. In the change from "design capacity" to "operating capacity," Mr. Scheel noted that it was changed to reflect the need to show different capacity numbers based on operational conditions that change throughout the year.

Mr. Lander noted that information posted on Form 567 – reporting the average capacity for physical flow at the location over the twelve months specified and the peak capacity over the same twelve months specified, reported in mcf, may provide the information requested in this request and work paper. Mr. Scheel was not so sure and noted that the pipelines do collect operating capacity which would be of more use than the information collected in Form 567.

Ms. Scott explained that because operating capacity is transient, it reflects the operating conditions currently in effect and disclaimers are provided to protect the use of this information. As such, she summarized that operating capacity is valuable commercially. Mr. Keisler and Ms. York disagreed that the information was commercially valuable because it is transient, contains significant disclaimers on use, and it must be viewed with other information. Ms. Crockett agreed with Ms. Scott that for the pipelines that post this information, she uses it every day in her scheduling activities. Mr. Whatley noted that providing this information should not be a burden to the pipelines as operating capacity is the addition of scheduled quantity plus operationally available capacity.

Ms. Hopkins noted that while this information is mathematically available for all points, it is not reasonable to provide it all – Enron provides it for the points where they received requests for the information – she defined it as commercially valuable. Mr. Bianchi noted that this information is not mathematically available for points that do not have flow control, such as wellheads and city gates. Ms. York explained that point capacity in and of itself does not support the commercial use of the information. Segment capacity should also be taken into account.

Ms. Wachter noted that some pipelines provide line capacity, and point capacity only at selected points. Ms. Scott noted that for pipelines that post this information, where point capacity is not provided, zone or segment capacity is provided.

Motion: Request to add the name and definition of the following data element to the data set 5.4.13 Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity:

Business Name	Definition	U	Condition
Location Scheduled Quantity	The total net scheduled amount per gas day at the location, in the identified direction of flow, expressed in standard units.	C	Mandatory only for Operationally Available Capacity.

Action: The motion passed with the following vote [this was revised later in the meeting]:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipeline	Totals
For	1	2	7	2	0	12
Against	1	0	0	0	11	12
Total	2	2	7	2	11	24
Wtg. For	1.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	0	7.000
Wtg. Against	1.000	0	0	0	2.000	3.000
Passed/Failed						PASSED

Motion: Request to modify the name and definition of the following data element Gas Transaction Point Code 1 to the data set 5.4.13, Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity:

Business Name	Definition	U	Condition
Location*	The location where the quantity will be scheduled by the Transportation Service Provider	M	

* Common Code

and delete Gas Transaction Point 2 Code and Description.

Discussion: There was confusion on the relationship of this motion to Request No. R99024. For consistency, location is an integral part of Request No. R99033 and is therefore addressed in this request. Request No. R99024 currently resides in Information Requirements Subcommittee. Ms. Hess noted that if we were to eliminate Gas Transaction Point and the associated definition and its replacement with Location, the implication is that the data element refers to the places where scheduling occurs. In further discussion, it was noted that this group should instruct Information Requirements to make necessary changes to accommodate given business practices, not define specific data elements. After discussion, the motion was withdrawn.

Action: Motion withdrawn.

Motion: Adopt the following business practice standard:

5.3.x (s86) Location Operationally Available Capacity should be reported as the quantity (in standard units) remaining available to be scheduled at (or through) the identified location in the indicated direction of flow. Location Operating Capacity should be recorded as the total capacity which could be scheduled at (or through) the identified location in the indicated direction of flow. When reporting Location Operationally Available Capacity and Location Operating Capacity, the Transportation Service Provider should indicate whether the individual reported location capacity is at the zone, segment, or point level.

Discussion: Mr. Lander noted that the further standards to be proposed would explain how this information could be used. Both he and Mr. Scheel noted that this

proposed standard could stand on its own. It was explained that how often operationally available capacity changes is at the discretion of the pipeline to indicate changing operating conditions.

Mr. Bianchi expressed concerns on the usefulness of the information. He explained that Location Operating Capacity is not always a result of the mathematical equation, previously noted by Mr. Whatley as: Location Operating Capacity is the addition of Scheduled Quantity at that location plus Location Operationally Available Capacity. It is more of a fluid benchmark that changes, and even though a disclaimer will be provided, it could be misused and misinterpreted.

Others noted that while this information in some cases may not be relied upon for business decisions, it is better than nothing. The disclaimer will note that the user should be aware of the transient nature of the information. Marketers and end users noted that they found this information to be useful.

Action:

The motion passed with the following vote [this was modified later in the meeting]:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipeline	Totals
For	1	2	7	2	0	12
Against	1	0	1	0	11	13
Total	2	2	8	2	11	25
Wtg. For	1.000	2.000	1.750	2.000	0	6.750
Wtg. Against	1.000	0	.250	0	2.000	3.250
Passed/Failed						PASSED

Discussion: Mr. Lander read the proposed standards defined during a break in the meeting. He read the group of proposed standards in its entirety before making the following motion.

Motion: The motion was made to adopt the following standard:

5.3.x When reporting Location Operationally Available Capacity (LOAC), a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) that currently reports operationally available capacity at the point level should continue to do so and should report Location Operating Capacity (LOC) and Location Scheduled Quantity (LSQ), as well, at the point level.

When reporting LOAC, a TSP that currently reports operationally available capacity at the zone level should continue to do so and should report LOC as well as the LSQ (which LSQ should be the total of scheduled quantities at the zone level ad in the same direction of flow).

When reporting LOAC, a TSP that currently reports operationally available capacity at the segment level should continue to do so and should report LOC as well as the LSQ (which LSQ should be the total of scheduled quantities at the segment level and in the same direction of flow).

Discussion: It was requested that this proposed standard plus the other two defined should be discussed but not voted until companies had time to review how these standards would be implemented or could be implemented in their operations. Mr. Lander and Ms. Scott as the motion maker and seconder did not support delay at this time. Mr. Spangler noted that there were no standards to allow for changes in the reporting from point, segment or zone. A break was taken to see if the flexibility for changing the basis for reporting could be accommodated in the proposed standards. It was explained by Mr. Whatley that LOAC, LOC and LSQ should be reported at the same level if possible. Mr. Novak noted that striking "should continue to do so" may support the changing of the basis for reporting. Mr. Whatley offered substitute language, which was further modified.

Ms. Scott and Mr. Lander concurred with the change so the motion was changed.

Rev. Motion: Adopt the following standard:

5.3.x Location Operationally Available Capacity (LOAC), Location Operating Capacity (LOC) and Location Scheduled Quantity (LSQ) are associated information and should be reported at the same level. LSQ should be the total of scheduled quantities, with respect to a given level of reporting, in the same direction of flow. Transportation Service Providers should report LOAC, LOC and LSQ at, at least one of, point, segment or zone level.

Discussion: It was noted that a definition is embedded in the standard and perhaps should be identified separately as a definition. The definition was removed through the consent of Mr. Lander and Ms. Scott. The abbreviation of Location Operating Capacity (LOC) was changed to LOPC for clarity.

Rev. Motion: Adopt the following standard:

5.3.x (s87) Location Operationally Available Capacity (LOAC), Location Operating Capacity (LOPC) and Location Scheduled Quantity (LSQ) are associated information and should be reported at the same level. Transportation Service Providers should report LOAC, LOPC and LSQ at, at least one of, point, segment or zone level.

Action: The motion passed with the following vote:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipeline	Totals
For	1	2	7	2	0	12
Against	1	0	1	0	11	13
Total	2	2	8	2	11	25
Wtg. For	1.000	2.000	1.750	2.000	0	6.750
Wtg. Against	1.000	0	.250	0	2.000	3.250
Passed/Failed						PASSED

Motion: Conforming change to s86 of the abbreviation LOC to LOPC.

5.3.x (s86) Location Operationally Available Capacity (LOAC) should be reported as the quantity (in standard units) remaining available to be scheduled at (or through) the identified location in the indicated direction of flow. Location Operating Capacity (LOPC) should be recorded as the total capacity which could be

scheduled at (or through) the identified location in the indicated direction of flow. When reporting LOAC and LOPC, the transportation service provider should indicate whether the individual reported location capacity is at the zone, segment, or point level.

The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Adopt the following standard:

5.3.y A Transportation Service Provider should support reporting in the Operationally Available Capacity data set (5.4.13) the Location, Location Scheduled Quantity and the Location Zone. When reporting Location, Operationally Available Capacity and Location Operating Capacity, the Location Zone should be identified.

Discussion: It was observed that zone is now a required field. Operationally available capacity can be reported at zone, point or segment. If it is reported at the point or segment level, this standard would require that the zone is identified. If a segment crosses zones, it is unclear which zone should be specified. Zones may be identified as rate zones or operational zones. It was noted that the proposed standard refers to operational zones. Mr. Aschbrenner observed that there are segments that are not identified to a zone. In a summary remark, Mr. Santerre observed that this proposed standard predisposes that there is a relationship between segment and zone, which may not exist. As a result of this discussion, the motion was modified:

Rev. Motion: .

5.3.y (s88) A Transportation Service Provider should support reporting in the Operationally Available Capacity data set (5.4.13) the Location, Location Scheduled Quantity and the Location Zone. When reporting Location Operationally Available Capacity and Location Operating Capacity, the Location Zone should be identified when the location is associated with one Location Zone.

Discussion: Some noted concern that this was not germane to the agenda. Because this is a joint EII/BPS meeting convened specifically for unsubscribed and operationally available capacity, the chairs determined that it was germane to the agenda.

Action:

The motion passed with the following vote:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipeline	Totals
For	0	2	5	2	0	9
Against	2	0	2	0	10	14
Total	2	2	7	2	10	23
Wtg. For	0	2.000	1.429	2.000	0	5.429
Wtg. Against	2.000	0	.571	0	2.000	4.571
Passed/Failed						PASSED

Motion: **5.3.z (s89)** The Location Scheduled Quantity and the Location Operationally Available Capacity information should be updated by the Transportation Service Provider to reflect scheduling changes and be reported promptly following at least the scheduling deadline associated with the timely and evening nominations cycles.

Discussion: There was discussion that this puts a reporting burden on the pipelines in an already aggressive timeline. As such, it was offered that the motion be modified to reflect scheduling cycles where bumping can occur. Further discussion highlighted changes to note that reporting should follow the timely and evening scheduling cycles. This reporting would provide additional information for shippers to manage their intraday nominations.

Action:

The motion passed with the following vote:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipeline	Totals
For	1	2	7	2	0	12
Against	0	0	0	0	11	11
Total	1	2	7	2	11	23
Wtg. For	1.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	0	7.000
Wtg. Against	0	0	0	0	2.000	2.000
Passed/Failed						PASSED

Motion: Modify the previously adopted modification to 5.4.13:

Request to add the name and definition of the following data element to the data set 5.4.13 Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity:

Business Name	Definition	U	Condition
Location Scheduled Quantity	The total net scheduled amount per gas day at (or through) the location, in the identified direction of flow, expressed in standard units.	C	Mandatory only for Operationally Available Capacity.

Action: The motion carried unanimously.

Motion: Send the adopted standards to Information Requirements Subcommittee for complete staffing.

Discussion: It was noted that because these votes were close, it may be more appropriate to send the proposed standards to the Executive Committee first. After discussion, the motion was revised.

Rev. Motion: Send the adopted standards to Executive Committee for consideration at its September meeting.

Action: The motion passed with the following vote:

	LDCs	End Users	Services	Producers	Pipeline	Totals
For	1	2	7	2	7	19
Against	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	2	7	2	11	19

Wtg. For	1.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	9.000
Wtg. Against	0	0	0	0	0.000	0.000
Passed/Failed						PASSED

III. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn the BPS/EII task force passed unanimously at 3:35 p.m. A ten minute break was taken, and the EII portion of the meeting reconvened. It was determined that the remaining EII requests, the Dynegy work paper, the 1999 EII calendar of dates and whether future EII requests should be forwarded to EII or addressed through the triage process will be addressed on July 14 in Las Vegas. Williams Natural Gas should also have several requests to address during that meeting. Meeting participants were asked to observe the chairs' management of the meeting, wait until recognized to speak, and to keep side conversations to a minimum. It was difficult to keep records for this meeting and several participants noted that it was difficult for them to follow the meeting because of side conversations. The EII portion of the meeting concluded at 4:00 p.m.

IV. Attendees

Name	Company	Address	Voting Attendee	GISB Member
PIPELINES:				
S. LeCureaux	ANR	stephanie.lecureaux@coastalcorp.com	No	Yes
Joe Bianchi	ANR	joseph.bianchi@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes
C. Aschbrenner	CIG	clancy.aschbrenner@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes
Michael Ng	Columbia Gas	mng@columbiaenergygroup.com	Yes	Yes
Michael Hansen	Columbia Gulf	mrhansen@columbiaenergygroup.com	Yes	Yes
Brent Phelps	CMS – Panhandle	bwphelps@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes
Iris King	CNG Transmission	iris_g._king@cngt.cng.com	Yes	Yes
Danielle Kappus	Duke – Texas Eastern	dmkapus@duke-energy.com	Yes	Yes
Debbie York	El Paso Energy – Tennessee Gas	yorkd@epenergy.com	No	Yes
Bob Truman	El Paso Energy – Tennessee Gas	trumanb@epenergy.com	No	Yes
Mark Gracey	El Paso Energy - Tennessee Gas	graceym@epenegy.com	Yes	Yes
Tammy Hopkins	Enron – Northern Natural	thopkins@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Theresa Hess	Enron – Transwestern	thess@enron.com	Yes	Yes
Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway	unruhj@kochind.com	Yes	Yes
Sandra Barnett	Koch Gateway	barnetts@kochind.com	No	Yes
Gene Fava	Great Lakes Gas Transmission	efava@glgt.com	Yes	Yes
Jim Keisler	Transco		Yes	No
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes	Yes
Kelly Wachter	Williston Basin	wachkw@wbip.com	Yes	Yes
LDCs:				
Mike Shahan	Peoples Natural Gas	mshahan@cngt.cng.com	Yes	Yes
Mike Novak	National Fuel Gas Distribution	novakm@natfuel.com	Yes	Yes
END USERS:				
Diane McVicker	SRP		Yes	Yes

Valerie Crockett	TVA	vjcrockett@tva.gov	Yes	Yes
PRODUCERS:				
Paul Keeler	Burlington Resources	pkeeler@br-inc.com	Yes	Yes
T. Hartmann	Exxon		Yes	Yes
SERVICES:				
Randy Young	Koch Midstream	young0r@kochind.com	Yes	Yes
Sylvia Munson	Altra Energy	sylviam@altranet.com	Yes	Yes
Pete Whatley	Dynegy Inc		Yes	Yes
Mark Scheel	Dynegy Marketing & Trade		Yes	Yes
Donna Scott	Enron Administrative Serv. Corp	dscott2@ect.enron.com	Yes	Yes
Gary Payne	Enron Capital and Trade	gpayne@ect.enron.com	Yes	Yes
Leigh Spangler	Latitude Technology	lspangler@latitudetech.net	Yes	Yes
Jim Buccigross	National Registry	legaljb@tcapserv.com	Yes	Yes
Greg Lander	TransCapacity		Yes	Yes
Rick Santerre	TransEnergy	rsanterre@transenergy.com	Yes	Yes
George Heal	Proxicom	gheal@proxicom.com	Yes	Yes