# Gas Industry Standards Board

# Executive Committee Meeting

## September 27, 2000

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**
**MEETING MATERIALS**
**SEPTEMBER 27, 2000**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


**Tab 1.** **Welcome & Opening Remarks**

- Antitrust Guidelines

**Tab 2.** **Enron Transportation Services Comments**

**Tab 3.** **GISB LDC Comments**

**Tab 4.** **Imbalance Recommendation**

**Tab 5.** **BPS Order 637 Report and Recommendation**

# GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
# EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
# MEETING MATERIALS
# SEPTEMBER 27, 2000

## 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

- The GISB Executive Committee determined at its last meeting to hold special meeting to discuss two items. The meeting is to be held in conjunction with the Annual Meeting: in San Antonio at the Menger Hotel.
- The chairman may elect to extend the hours of the meeting if more time is required to complete the agenda.
- For further assistance please reach:

  Veronica Thomason at (713) 356 - 0060

- The officers presiding over the Executive Committee meeting are:

| | |
|---|---|
| Jim Buccigross | - Chairman |
| Mike Novak | - Vice Chairman |
| Rae McQuade | - Executive Director |
| Jay Costan | - General Counsel |

- Transcripts will be available from Jane Copeland, Ak/Ret Reporting, Inc. and can be ordered either during the meeting, or by calling 361-882-9037.

## 1. Antitrust Guidelines

- GISB General Counsel Jay Costan will review the antitrust guidelines. The points are:

Antitrust guidelines direct meeting participants to avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior including: restraint of trade and conspiracies to monopolize, unfair or deceptive business acts or practices, price discriminations, division of markets, allocation of production, imposition of boycotts, and exclusive dealing arrangements.

# GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
# EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
# MEETING MATERIALS
# SEPTEMBER 27, 2000

## 1. Adoption of Agenda

- The proposed agenda, attached, has been distributed and is available on GISB's home page.
- **The Executive Committee is requested to review the agenda, suggest changes if needed, and vote to adopt the agenda.**

**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:** | GISB Executive Committee Members & Alternates, Posting for Interested Industry Participants |
| **FROM:** | Rae McQuade, Executive Director |
| **RE:** | Draft Agenda for Executive Committee Meeting – September 27, 2000 |
| **DATE:** | August 30, 2000 |

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**
**The Menger Hotel, San Antonio, Texas**
**Wednesday, September 27, 2000 – 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.**

**MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT**

As a result of the Executive Committee (EC) meeting held on August 24, it was determined to hold an additional EC meeting in conjunction with the annual meeting. After polling the EC members for which dates were preferable, it was determined that quorum could best be met if the meeting were held on the afternoon of September 27. Below are the meeting arrangements:

| | |
|---|---|
| WHERE: | The Menger Hotel<br>204 Alamo Plaza<br>San Antonio, Texas 78205<br>Phone: 210-223-4361 |
| WHEN: | Wednesday, September 27, 2000<br>1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. |

A printed copy of the materials for the meeting will be provided shortly to EC members or their alternates for this meeting and presenters. The materials will be posted on the GISB Home Page in the "Executive Committee" area for attendees to download.

**Please notify the GISB office by Wednesday, September 20** of your intent to attend so that appropriate meeting arrangements can be made. As always, the chair reserves the right to extend the time of the meeting to ensure that agenda items are addressed. The times indicated on the agenda will be followed to ensure that agenda items are allotted appropriate time slots. Should an agenda item conclude earlier than its stated time slot, the remaining time can be allotted to other agenda items at the discretion of the chair.

I look forward to seeing you at the meeting. Please feel free to call the GISB office should you have any questions or comments.

Best Regards,

Rae McQuade

**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

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**
**The Menger Hotel, San Antonio, Texas**
**Wednesday, September 27, 2000 – 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.**

**DRAFT AGENDA**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1:30 p.m. | 1. | Welcome<br>• Antitrust Guidelines<br>• Welcome to members and attendees<br>• Adoption of Agenda |
| 1:45 p.m. | 2. | Imbalance Trading and Netting<br>• Discussion on Proposed Standards outlined in the Recommendation<br>• Review of Submitted Comments<br>• Vote on Proposed Standards<br>• Other Related Issues |
| 2:30 p.m. | 3. | Order 637 Business Practices Subcommittee Report/Recommendation<br>• Discussion on Proposed Standards outlined in the Recommendation<br>• Discussion on Order 637 Action Items for which there are no proposed standards or modifications<br>• Review of Submitted Comments<br>• Vote on Proposed Standards |
| 3:45 p.m. | 4. | Other Business |
| 4:00 p.m. | | Adjourn |

September 20, 2000

Rae McQuade
Gas Industry Standards Board
1100 Louisiana
Houston, TX 77002

Re: Comments for **September 27**, 2000
GISB Executive Committee Meeting

Rae,

Enron Transportation Services (ETS) submits the following comments on the GISB recommendations that have been posted for industry comment. Comments are due by September 20, 2000 and will be addressed at the September 27, 2000 meeting of the GISB Executive Committee.

- **R97117, R97118, 1999AP7 (*Imbalance Subcommittee*)**

- **GISB Standard No. 2.3.32** was revised by the Imbalance Subcommittee to accommodate the new imbalance trading data sets. Currently, the standard lists the data sets where groupings are required. The list does not include the PDA Quick Response, which does not have data groupings. The note at the end of the standard excludes the Measured Volume Audit Statement (MVAS).

  The standard was revised to state that the data on the 'Flowing Gas Web pages' should be in groupings. The note at the end of the standard still excludes the MVAS. However, the standard now seems to include the PDA Quick Response. And, since the imbalance trading data sets are now part of Flowing Gas, it also includes the Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response which does not have data groupings.

  In order to add clarity, ETS suggests adding the phrase "where specified in the related data dictionary" to the end of the first sentence and deleting the second sentence. The standard would then read as follows:

  > "On the Flowing Gas Web pages, data should be organized in logical groupings, where specified in the related data dictionary.
  >
  > Note: GISB Standard No. 2.4.6, 'Measured Volume Audit Statement', is very data intensive and lends itself well to EDI. It may be too intensive for a visual display and is not required to be supported on Customer Activities Web sites."

- **GISB Standard No. 4.3.54** was revised by the Imbalance Subcommittee to specify the abbreviations used for the new imbalance trading data sets on Customer Activities Web sites. All of the imbalance trading data sets have been placed under the 'Flowing Gas Area'. ETS agrees that all of the new data sets should be included in the 'Flowing Gas Area', except for the Posted Imbalances Download. This listing of the imbalances that are posted for trade should be easily and quickly accessible. The display of the Posted Imbalances Download on EBBs should be in the Informational Postings area. This would allow parties to view the listing without the need to log in using an id and password.

  Although this set-up would mean that the Posted Imbalances Download is displayed in a different area than the data sets that are used for the actual trading of imbalances, ETS does not believe this is a problem. The imbalance trading data sets are designed for prearranged trading. The Request for Imbalance Trade, which is used to initiate the process of trading imbalances, includes data pertaining to both parties – the Initiating Trader and the Confirming Trader. Therefore, it is not likely that a party would view the listing of posted imbalances and immediately submit a Request for Imbalance Trade. Such party would first contact the other party with whom they wish to trade. The specifics of the trade would be worked out and then the Request for Imbalance Trade would be submitted.

  Based on the above, ETS suggests the following:
  - Do not add the Posted Imbalances Download to GISB Standard No. 4.3.54.
  - Revise GISB Standard No. 4.3.23 to add the category 'Posted Imbalances' immediately after the existing 'Tariff' category. No subcategories are necessary.
  - Add a new standard 2.3.X to address logical groupings for the Posted Imbalances Download:

    "For the Posted Imbalances Download, data should be organized in logical groupings. The logical groupings of data are specified in the related data dictionary."

Thank you,

Theresa L. Hess

# RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMBALANCE NETTING AND TRADING (CORRESPONDING TO REQUEST NOS. R97117, R97118, R00025 AND 1999AP7) AND FOR THE BPS RESOLUTION AND PROPOSED STANDARDS REGARDING ITEMS ASSIGNED TO THEM FROM THE ORDER 637 WORK PLAN AS A PART OF THE 2000 ANNUAL PLAN (CORRESPONDING TO REQUEST NO. 2000AP9).

## COMMENTS OF CONSOLIDATED EDISON, KEYSPAN AND NATIONAL FUEL DISTRIBUTION ("Commenting GISB LDCs")

The Commenting GISB LDCs endorse the Recommendations for Imbalance Netting and Trading issued for industry comment on September 5, 2000. The Commenting GISB LDCs support the concept of moving the logical groupings from GISB Standard 2.3.32 to the related data dictionaries but cautions against those that in the future may wish to delete or otherwise dilute the logical grouping concept because it is no longer detailed within the Standard.

Additionally, the Commenting GISB LDCs endorse much of BPS Order 637 Work Plan (BPS 637 Plan) issued for industry comment on the same date. Where the Commenting GISB LDCs do not support the BPS 637 Plan, it asserts that the BPS made significant errors during its deliberations. To correct for these errors, the Commenting GISB LDCs propose alternate standards.

### Index of Customers

The Commenting GISB LDCs support the proposed changes to GISB Standard 4.3.16. The BPS, however, erred in proposing deletion of GISB Standard 4.3.35. The action item identified on page 2 of the Status Report states "Correctly reflect the FERC order reference and section number (GISB Standard No. 4.3.16) and data element ordering (GISB Standard No. 4.3.35)." The current GISB Standard No. 4.3.35 includes both a list of items to be included and specific ordering. While the Status Report includes a footnote stating that work should "Begin once the FERC issues the revised report format", the BPS took an unwarranted leap when it deleted the standard entirely. As a result, Order Number 637, Docket No. RM98-10-000, issued February 29, 2000, "Appendix A, Instruction Manual for Electronic Filing of the Index of Customers" would control. Order 637 (p. 194) added additional Information Requirements to the Index of Customers (receipt and delivery points, zones, segments, common transaction point codes, contract numbers, shipper identification numbers, negotiated rate indicators, names of agents or asset managers and affiliate relationship identification) but it did not comment on the ordering of elements. Without GISB Standard 4.3.35, the is no specified order of elements. Rather than use Order 637 as a back door means to remove the ordering requirement in the GISB standards, those advocating that position should propose such a change through normal GISB procedures. Tellingly, the Commentary/Rationale of Subcommittee(s)/Task Force(s) section of the BPS recommendation is blank.

The Commenting GISB LDCs propose the following modification to GISB Standard 4.3.35:

4.3.35 The header information should be displayed at the top before the columnar information. The column headings for the posting of "Index of Customers" should be displayed as follows:

Rate Schedule
Customer
Contract Effective Date
Contract Termination Date
Maximum Daily Quantity
Maximum Storage Quantity
Rollover Period
Receipt Points
Delivery Points
Capacity Zones and/or Segments
Common transaction point codes
Contract numbers
Shipper identification numbers
Negotiated rate indicators
Agents/Asset Managers
Affiliate relationship Identification
Footnotes (when applicable)

These columns should appear in this order from left to right. The data should be sorted in ascending order by rate schedule and then by customer name within rate schedule. Footnote text should be displayed below the columnar information.

Partial Day Capacity Release

The BPS 637 Plan modifies GISB Standard 5.3.2, to permit partial day capacity releases where releases are non-biddable. While these changes are commendable, they are incomplete because there are no provisions for biddable partial day capacity releases. Order 637-A clarifies that since the maximum tariff rate is no longer applicable to short-term capacity release transactions, the exemption from posting and bidding does not apply as long as the rate ceilings are waived. As a result of this price cap waiver, there will be fewer non-biddable releases and more biddable releases. Accordingly, the proposed 5.3.2 modifications will not come into play as often as they would have under the original capacity release regulations. GISB standards that do not facilitate the biddable capacity release deals may sabotage FERC's price cap waiver experiment.

One rationale provided in the Status Report against providing for partial day biddable releases was that "some participants expressed their continued concern that treasury for credit approval and contract desk for producing the contract will not be staffed 24 X 7 or after 5:00 P.M.". Another rationale was that "biddable deals was out of scope of GISB's

work for Order 637." Still another was "There was further discussion that this issue may not be ripe for standards development." Finally, "the Enron pipelines reviewed the order again (since the last meeting) and they feel the Commission did not mean to include biddable deals at this time."

Except for the first rationale, these excuses are feeble and a blatant attempt to undercut the scheduling equality provided for in Order 637.

One of the primary goals of Order No. 637 was to achieve comparability between released capacity and pipeline service offerings.[1] To that end, the Commission adopted Section 284.12(c)(1)(ii) which states:

> *Capacity release nominations.* Pipelines must permit shippers acquiring released capacity to submit a nomination at the earliest available nomination opportunity after the acquisition of capacity. If the pipeline requires the replacement shipper to enter into a contract, the contract must be issued within one hour after the pipeline has been notified of the release, but the requirement for contracting must not inhibit the ability of the replacement shipper to submit a nomination at the earliest available nomination opportunity.

If released capacity is to be comparable with pipeline service offerings, shippers must be permitted to both release and recall capacity in a manner that allows the replacement or recalling shipper to use the capacity on the day that it is obtained, just as the pipelines are able to do when they sell their own services.[2]

The Commenting GISB LDCs acknowledge that the Commission has approved Gas Industry Standards Board ("GISB") standards that reflect capacity release timelines that are inconsistent with both partial day releases involving competitive bidding and partial day recalls. For example, GISB Standard 5.3.7 precludes partial day recalls of capacity. Similarly, GISB Standard 5.3.2 sets forth a capacity release timeline that requires that nominations of released capacity need only be permitted by the next day. Nonetheless, in Order No. 637-A, the Commission confirmed that the policies and regulations adopted in Order No. 637 supplant GISB Standard 5.3.2 to the extent that they are inconsistent.[3] The Commission's ruling concerning the resolution of conflicts between Commission policy and existing GISB standards is completely appropriate. GISB standards should be modified to comply with Commission policy. Any other result would be a case of the tail wagging the dog.

---

[1] *See* Order No. 637-A, FERC Stats & Regs. at 31,588.

[2] There is nothing that prevents pipelines from offering new services on an almost instantaneous basis.

[3] *See* Order No. 637-A, FERC Stats. & Regs. at 31,588.

Consistent with this view, the Commenting GISB LDCs believe that GISB standards that do not allow shippers to either post and release capacity that must be competitively bid on a partial day basis or recall capacity on a partial day basis are inconsistent with Order No. 637, regardless of whether they are consistent with existing GISB standards.

GISB has made provisions in its standards for limiting certain capacity release transactions to normal business hours so some limits may be reasonable. Never the less, there is no reason that a biddable partial day release for an Intraday 2 nomination cannot be accommodated by a morning bidding session. As such, the Commenting GISB LDCs propose the following addition to the proposed changes to GISB Standard 5.3.2. Unless the capacity release timeline is modified, replacement shippers will not be given the opportunity to nominate competitively bid released capacity that can be used on a partial day basis. This is not consistent with the Commission's policy on comparability described above.

For short-term *biddable partial day* releases (less than 5 months):

- Offers should be tendered by 8:00 A.M. on the Business Day for which Intraday 2 Cycle nominations may be placed;
- open season ends no later than 9:00 A.M. on the Business Day Intraday 2 Cycle nominations are due (evaluation period begins at 9:00 A.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken);
- evaluation period ends at 10:15 A.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 10:15 A.M.;
- match response by 11:00 A.M.;
- award posting by 12:00 P.M.;
- contract tendered with contract # by 1:00 P.M.; contract executed; Intraday 2 Cycle nomination possible for current day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

Additionally, so long as the posting and bidding activity can be contained within normal business hours, the short-term timeline in 5.3.2 can be tightened to allow for nominations on the evening and intraday 1 cycles. The change relative to what has been proposed in the BPS 637 Plan is to strike the phrase "before timely nominations…" which will essentially return the standard to its current form and make it consistent with the non-biddable release timeline. The insertion of this term restricts any ambiguity that may have existed which would have permitted an Intraday 1 nomination, at the very least and represents a deliberate attempt to take away the ability to schedule released capacity during both the intraday 1 and intraday 2 cycles. Secondly, there is no reason to take a leisurely approach for the award posting or tendering the contract. With the adjustments below, 5.3.2 accommodates evening and intraday 1 nominations:

5.3.2 For short-term *biddable* releases (less than 5 months):

- *offers* should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. on ~~the~~ a *Business* Day ~~before *timely* nominations~~;
- open season ends no later than *2:00* P.M. on ~~the~~ a *Business* Day ~~before *timely* nominations are due~~ (evaluation period begins at *2:00* P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken);
- evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.;
- match response by *4:00* P.M.;
- award posting by ~~*5:00*~~*4:30* P.M.;
- contract tendered with contract # by ~~*10:00* A.M~~5:00 P.M.; contract executed; ~~*timely*~~ *Evening or Intraday 1* nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

The leisurely pace within 5.3.2 for Non-Biddable releases should also be tightened:

For non-biddable releases:

Timely Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by ~~9:30~~10:00 A.M. *on a Business Day;*
- contract tendered with contract # by ~~10:30~~11:00 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Timely Cycle.

Evening Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 4:~~00~~ 30 P.M. *on a Business Day;*
- contract tendered with contract # by 5:~~00~~ 30 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Evening Cycle.

Intraday 1 Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 8:~~00~~ 30 A.M. *on a Business Day;*
- contract tendered with contract # by 9:~~00~~ 30 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 1 Cycle.

Intraday 2 Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 3:~~00~~ 30 P.M. *on a Business Day;*
- contract tendered with contract # by 4:~~00~~ 30 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 2 Cycle. (Central Clock Time)

Partial Day Recalls

LDCs made the importance and priority of partial day recalls known at the June Executive Committee meeting. The BPS Order 637 Plan dismisses this issue as follows:

GISB Standard 5.3.6 and 5.3.7

- *The issue identified was whether an intraday release can be recalled.*
  The sense of the room was upon the review of GISB Standards 5.3.6 and 5.3.7 no changes are required. Specifically, there is no need to eliminate the prohibition on partial day recalls. There was no objection.

This conclusion, after LDC concerns on this issue had been made known at the June EC meeting, and the absence of deliberation is disingenuous. The scheduling equality offered by Order 637 is severely diminished unless the deletion of the prohibition of partial day recalls in GISB Standard 5.3.7. GISB standards should be revised so that (1) a releasing shipper that acts in accordance with its specified recall rights may notify the pipeline of a recall and then nominate service at the first nomination deadline following the communication of the recall; and (2) a shipper can post and release capacity on a short-term basis subject to competitive bidding in a manner that will permit the replacement shipper to use the released capacity on a partial day basis at the first available intra-day nomination deadline.

If an LDC nominates on a timely basis to an alternative market and subsequent to that nomination, determines that gas needs to be rescheduled at its city gate, the LDC can place an Evening, Intraday 1 or Intraday 2 nomination to utilize that capacity where it is needed. It follows that shippers should have the ability to recall capacity released to another shipper on a partial day basis and place intraday nominations under the same circumstances. Without the ability to recall, LDCs cannot afford the risk of failing to meet their obligation to serve and therefore, cannot risk a capacity release. LDCs that release their capacity risk overruns or worse, not receiving service. Many LDCs will be reluctant to release capacity during peak periods and therefore will inhibit the market and price discovery for capacity during such a period.

No business, technical or regulatory rationale against partial day recalls is provided within the Status Report. The parties present at the BPS meetings clearly did not want to go on record with their objections to partial day recalls. One can only speculate why.

The Commenting GISB LDCs offer the following revisions to GISB Standard 5.3.7:

5.3.7 ~~There should be no partial day recalls of capacity.~~ Transportation service providers should support the function of reputting by releasing shippers. A Releasing Shipper with recall rights may exercise such rights at any time by notifying the Transportation Service Provider which in turn, should notify the replacement shipper. The recalling shipper may nominate at the next available nomination deadline following notification.

The Commenting GISB LDCs offer the corresponding change to GISB Standard 5.3.6:

5.3.6 If the releasing shipper wishes to recall capacity to be effective for a gas day or a partial gas day, the notice should be provided to the transportation service provider and the acquiring shipper no later than 2 hours prior to the next available ~~8 A.M. Central Clock Time on~~ nomination ~~day~~deadline.

In conclusion, the Commenting GISB LDCs wish to reiterate that much of the BPS 637 Plan is sound. Combined with the changes provided within this document, the industry will benefit from standards that carry forward the intent of Order 637.

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**
**MEETING MATERIALS**
**SEPTEMBER 27, 2000**

**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

**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:** September 5, 2000

The GISB industry comment period begins today and ends on September 20 for two sets of recommendations for imbalance netting and trading (corresponding to Request Nos. R97117, R97118, R00025 and 1999AP7) and for the BPS resolution and proposed standards regarding items assigned to them from the Order 637 work plan as a part of the 2000 Annual Plan (corresponding to Request No. 2000AP9). The Index of Customers recommendation that was sent out for comment and noted for consideration at the October Executive Committee (EC) meeting is also included here as it may be considered at the September EC meeting.

The shortened period of time for comments for both imbalance netting and trading and the BPS Order 637 recommendations was discussed and supported through a vote at the August EC meeting. A separate EC meeting in September (not included in the original schedule of EC meetings) to be held in conjunction with the Annual Meeting was also discussed and supported through a vote at the August EC meeting.

The recommendations can be accessed from the GISB Web site, but are also attached to this request for comment[1]. All comments received by the GISB office by end of business September 20 will be posted on the Home Page and forwarded to the EC members for their consideration. The EC members will consider all comments and are scheduled to cast their votes on these recommendations on September 27 at the EC meeting, (held in conjunction with the annual meeting in San Antonio at the Menger Hotel, 204 Alamo Plaza).

If you have difficulty retrieving this document, please call the GISB office at (713) 356-0060.

Best Regards,

*Rae McQuade*

cc: Jay Costan

[1] All recommendations other than clarifications/interpretations can be found on the "Request For Standards" page (http://www.gisb.org/req.htm) indexed by the relevant request number. Clarifications/Interpretations (Cxxxxx) can be found on the "Clarification Requests" page (http://www.gisb.org/clar.htm) indexed by the relevant clarification number.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester:** GISB 1999 Annual Plan Imbalance Subcommittee

**Request No.:** R97117, R97118, 1999AP7

### 1. Recommended Action:

___Accept as requested
_X_Accept as modified below
___Decline

### Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:

_X_Change to Existing Practice
___Status Quo

### 2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

**Per Request:**

___Initiation
_X_Modification
___Interpretation
___Withdrawal

___Principle (x.1.z)
___Definition (x.2.z)
_X_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
_X_Modification
___Interpretation
___Withdrawal

___Principle (x.1.z)
___Definition (x.2.z)
_X_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: Revised Standard 2.3.32**

On the Flowing Gas Web pages ~~for the following datasets~~, data should be organized in logical groupings. The logical groupings of data are specified in the related ~~D~~data ~~Dictionary~~ dictionaries.

~~Flowing Gas Related Datasets:~~
~~2.4.1 Pre-determined Allocation~~
~~2.4.3 Allocation~~
~~2.4.4 Shipper Imbalance~~
~~2.4.5 Measurement Information~~

Note: GISB Standard No. 2.4.6, 'Measured Volume Audit Statement', is very data intensive and lends itself well to EDI. It may be too intensive for a visual display and is not required to be supported on Customer Activities Web sites. ~~which is why at this time it is not addressed in the above motion~~.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester:** GISB 1999 Annual Plan Imbalance Subcommittee

**Request No.:** R97117, R97118, 1999AP7

**Standard No. and Language: Revised Standard 4.3.54**

With regard to the navigational links on Customer Activities Web sites, when using abbreviations, the following should be used:

| Full Name | Abbreviation |
|---|---|
| **Customer Activities** | **Customer Activities** |
| Nominations | Nominations |
| Flowing Gas | Flowing Gas |
| Invoicing | Invoicing |
| Capacity Release | Capacity Release |
| Contracts | Contracts |
| Informational Postings | Info Postings |
| | |
| **Nomination Area** | **Nominations** |
| Nomination | Nom |
| Nomination Quick Response | Nom QR |
| Request for Confirmation | Req for Conf |
| Confirmation Response | Conf Resp |
| Confirmation Response Quick Response | Conf Resp QR |
| Scheduled Quantity | Sched Qty |
| Scheduled Quantity for Operator | Sched Qty Oper |
| | |
| **Flowing Gas Area Flowing Gas** | |
| Pre-determined Allocation | PDA |
| Pre-determined Allocation Quick Response | PDA QR |
| Allocation | Allocation |
| Shipper Imbalance | Shipper Imbal |
| Measurement Information | Meas Info |
| Measured Volume Audit Statement | Meas Vol Audit |
| Authorization to Post Imbalances | Auth to Post Imbal |
| Posted Imbalances Download Post | Imbal Dwnld |
| Request for Imbalance Trade | Req for Imbal Trd |
| Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response | Req for Imbal Trd QR |
| Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade | W/D of Req for Imbal Trd |
| Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade | Req for Conf of Imbal Trd |
| Imbalance Trade Confirmation | Imbal Trd Conf |
| Imbalance Trade Notification | Imbal Trd Notify |
| | |
| **Invoicing Area** | **Invoicing** |
| Invoice | Invoice |
| Service Requester Level Charge / Allowance Invoice | Svc Req Invc |
| Payment Remittance | Pmt Remit |
| Statement of Account | Stmt of Acct |

**Revised Standard 4.3.54 (continued)**

| **Capacity Release Area** | **Capacity Release** |
|---|---|
| Offers | Offers |
| Bids | Bids |
| Awards | Awards |
| **Contracts Area** | **Contracts** |

## 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

**a. Description of Request:**

To: GISB Imbalance Subcommittee Chairs
From: GISB Expedited Data Development Subcommittee Chairs
Subject: Proposed Imbalance Netting / Trading Data Sets
Date: July 27, 2000

During the processing of **R97117** and **R97118**, the Expedited Data Development Subcommittee determined to send the following to the Imbalance Subcommittee:

> EDD requests the Imbalance Subcommittee to review the existing business standards for possible revisions related to the Imbalance Netting / Trading data sets on Web sites. Some examples are: GISB Standard Nos. 2.3.32, 4.3.42 and 4.3.54, 4.3.75.

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Imbalances Subcommittee August 17, 2000**

**Web Page Navigation**
Review of Version 1.4 standards for possible changes to web page navigation to accommodate imbalance netting and trading standards, such as GISB Standard Nos. 2.3.32, 4.3.42, 4.3.54, and 4.3.75. Standard No. 4.2.10 may also be affected.
Suggested changes to standards language discussed.
Possible vote on suggested language changes.
Communicate response to the EDD Subcommittee.

**2.3.32** The group addressed the standards working off the work paper prepared by Dennis LaTour. Ms. Munson suggested that Imbalance Netting and Trading be categorized under its own grouping, separate from the existing Flowing Gas datasets. There was discussion on this topic.

Mr. Spangler made the following motion, which was seconded by Ms. Davis:

**Motion:** Replace existing standard no. 2.3.32 with the following language:

On the Flowing Gas Web pages, data should be organized in logical groupings. The logical groupings of data are specified in the related data dictionaries.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester: GISB 1999 Annual Plan Imbalance Subcommittee**

**Request No.: R97117, R97118, 1999AP7**

Note: GISB Standard No. 2.4.6, 'Measured Volume Audit Statement', is very data intensive and lends itself well to EDI. It may be too intensive for a visual display and is not required to be supported on Customer Activities Web sites.

Sense of the Room: The motion passed unanimously. A role call vote was not necessary.

| | In Favor | Balanced | Opposed | Balanced |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| LDC's | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| End Users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **15** | **4** | **0** | **0** |

**4.2.10** There was agreement by the group that no changes were necessary to Standard no. 4.2.10, therefore no action was taken on this standard. See reasons in work paper.

**4.2.42** There was agreement by the group that no changes were necessary to Standard no. 4.3.42, therefore no action was taken on this standard. See reasons in work paper.

**4.3.54** The group discussed the modified standard 4.3.54 as prepared by Mr. LaTour. The following motion was made by Ms. Van Pelt and seconded by Ms. Davis:

**Motion:** Modify Standard No. 4.3.54 to add the following to the flowing gas area immediately after the Measured Volume Audit Statement:

| [Full Name] | [Abbreviation] |
|---|---|
| Authorization to Post Imbalances | Auth to Post Imbal |
| Posted Imbalances Download | Post Imbal Dwnld |
| Request for Imbalance Trade | Req for Imbal Trd |
| Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response | Req for Imbal Trd QR |
| Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade | W/D of Req for Imbal Trd |
| Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade | Req for Conf of Imbal Trd |
| Imbalance Trade Confirmation | Imbal Trd Conf |
| Imbalance Trade Notification | Imbal Trd Notify |

Sense of the Room: The motion passed unanimously. A role call vote was not necessary.

| | In Favor | Balanced | Opposed | Balanced |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| LDC's | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| End Users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **15** | **4** | **0** | **0** |

**4.3.75** There was agreement by the group that no changes were necessary to Standard no. 4.3.75, therefore no action was taken on this standard. See reasons in work paper.

See also attached Imbalance Subcommittee Work Papers: GISB Imbalance Subcommittee Workpaper 2 for the August 17, 2000 Meeting and GISB Imbalance Subcommittee Workpaper for August 31, 2000 Meeting.

**c. Business Purpose:**

Modification of existing Web Page standards to accomodate the additional Imbalance Netting and Trading datasets.

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

See enclosed minutes and attached work papers.

# GISB Imbalance Subcommittee
Workpaper for August 17, 2000 Meeting

*Current Standard 2.3.32*

On the Web pages for the following datasets, data should be organized in logical groupings. The logical groupings of data are specified in the related Data Dictionary.

Flowing Gas Related Datasets:

- 2.4.1 Pre-determined Allocation
- 2.4.3 Allocation
- 2.4.4 Shipper Imbalance
- 2.4.5 Measurement Information

Note: GISB Standard No. 2.4.6, 'Measured Volume Audit Statement', is very data intensive and lends itself well to EDI. It may be too intensive for a visual display which is why at this time it is not addressed in the above motion.

*Proposed Standard 2.3.32*

On the Web pages for the following datasets, data should be organized in logical groupings. The logical groupings of data are specified in the related Data Dictionary.

Flowing Gas Related Datasets:

- 2.4.1 Pre-determined Allocation
- 2.4.3 Allocation
- 2.4.4 Shipper Imbalance
- 2.4.5 Measurement Information
- 2.4.x Authorization to Post Imbalances
- 2.4.x Posted Imbalances Download
- 2.4.x Request for Imbalance Trade
- 2.4.x Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade
- 2.4.x Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade
- 2.4.x Imbalance Trade Confirmation
- 2.4.x Imbalance Trade Notification

Note: GISB Standard No. 2.4.6, 'Measured Volume Audit Statement', is very data intensive and lends itself well to EDI. It may be too intensive for a visual display which is why at this time it is not addressed in the above motion.

*Current Definition 4.2.10*

"Customer Activities" is the term used to refer to the business function categories relating to Nominations, Flowing Gas, Invoicing, Capacity Release, Contracts, and other business functions on industry Web sites.

*Proposed Definition 4.2.10*

Since the Imbalance Netting / Trading Datasets are being included within the Flowing Gas business function category, no change is proposed to this definition.

*Current Standard 4.3.42*

The categories and the labels for Customer Activities Web sites should appear, if applicable, in the Navigational Area as follows:

- Nominations
- Flowing Gas
- Invoicing
- Capacity Release
- Contracts
- Informational Postings
- Site Map

Links supporting Mutually Agreeable categories should precede Informational Postings.

*Proposed Standard 4.3.42*

Since the Imbalance Netting / Trading Datasets are being included within the Flowing Gas business function category, no change is proposed to this standard.

*Current Standard 4.3.54*

With regard to the navigational links on Customer Activities Web sites, when using abbreviations, the following should be used:

| Full Name | Abbreviation |
|---|---|
| **Customer Activities** | **Customer Activities** |
| Nominations | Nominations |
| Flowing Gas | Flowing Gas |
| Invoicing | Invoicing |
| Capacity Release | Capacity Release |
| Contracts | Contracts |
| Informational Postings | Info Postings |
| Site Maps | Site Maps |
| **Nomination Area** | **Nominations** |
| Nomination | Nom |
| Nomination Quick Response | Nom QR |
| Request for Confirmation | Req for Conf |
| Confirmation Response | Conf Resp |
| Confirmation Response Quick Response | Conf Resp QR |
| Scheduled Quantity | Sched Qty |
| Scheduled Quantity for Operator | Sched Qty Oper |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Flowing Gas Area** | **Flowing Gas** |
| Pre-determined Allocation | PDA |
| Pre-determined Allocation Quick Response | PDA QR |
| Allocation | Allocation |
| Shipper Imbalance | Shipper Imbal |
| Measurement Information | Meas Info |
| Measured Volume Audit Statement | Meas Vol Audit |
| **Invoicing Area** | **Invoicing** |
| Invoice | Invoice |
| Service Requester Level Charge / Allowance Invoice | Svc Req Invc |
| Payment Remittance | Pmt Remit |
| Statement of Account | Stmt of Acct |
| **Capacity Release Area** | **Capacity Release** |
| Offers | Offers |
| Bids | Bids |
| Awards | Awards |
| **Contracts Area** | **Contracts** |

*Proposed Standard 4.3.54*

With regard to the navigational links on Customer Activities Web sites, when using abbreviations, the following should be used:

| Full Name | Abbreviation |
|---|---|
| **Customer Activities** | **Customer Activities** |
| Nominations | Nominations |
| Flowing Gas | Flowing Gas |
| Invoicing | Invoicing |
| Capacity Release | Capacity Release |
| Contracts | Contracts |
| Informational Postings | Info Postings |
| Site Maps | Site |
| **Nomination Area** | **Nominations** |
| Nomination | Nom |
| Nomination Quick Response | Nom QR |
| Request for Confirmation | Req for Conf |
| Confirmation Response | Conf Resp |
| Confirmation Response Quick Response | Conf Resp QR |
| Scheduled Quantity | Sched Qty |
| Scheduled Quantity for Operator | Sched Qty Oper |
| **Flowing Gas Area** | **Flowing Gas** |
| Pre-determined Allocation | PDA |
| Pre-determined Allocation Quick Response | PDA QR |
| Allocation | Allocation |
| Shipper Imbalance | Shipper Imbal |

| | |
|---|---|
| Measurement Information | Meas Info |
| Measured Volume Audit Statement | Meas Vol Audit |
| Authorization to Post Imbalances | Auth to Post Imbal |
| Posted Imbalances Download | Post Imbal Dwnld |
| Request for Imbalance Trade | Req for Imbal Trd |
| Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response | Req for Imbal Trd QR |
| Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade | W/D of Req for Imbal Trd |
| Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade | Req for Conf of Imbal Trd |
| Imbalance Trade Confirmation | Imbal Trd Conf |
| Imbalance Trade Notification | Imbal Trd Notify |
| **Invoicing Area** | **Invoicing** |
| Invoice | Invoice |
| Service Requester Level Charge / Allowance Invoice | Svc Req Invc |
| Payment Remittance | Pmt Remit |
| Statement of Account | Stmt of Acct |
| **Capacity Release Area** | **Capacity Release** |
| Offers | Offers |
| Bids | Bids |
| Awards | Awards |
| **Contracts Area** | **Contracts** |

*Current Standard 4.3.75*

The sub-categories and the labels for the category of Flowing Gas should appear, if applicable, in the Navigational Area as follows:

Pre-determined Allocation
Allocation
Imbalance
Measurement

Links supporting additional sub-categories will follow these links. This does not preclude a further breakdown within each sub-category from being listed in the Navigational Area.

*Proposed Standard 4.3.75*

Since the Imbalance Netting / Trading Datasets are being included within the Imbalance category of Flowing Gas, no change is proposed to this standard.

# GISB Imbalance Subcommittee
Workpaper for August 31, 2000 Meeting

*Revised Standard 2.3.32*

On the Flowing Gas Web pages ~~for the following datasets~~, data should be organized in logical groupings. The logical groupings of data are specified in the related ~~D~~data ~~D~~dictionar~~y~~ies.

~~Flowing Gas Related Datasets:~~
~~2.4.1 Pre-determined Allocation~~
~~2.4.3 Allocation~~
~~2.4.4 Shipper Imbalance~~
~~2.4.5 Measurement Information~~

Note: GISB Standard No. 2.4.6, 'Measured Volume Audit Statement', is very data intensive and lends itself well to EDI. It may be too intensive for a visual display and is not required to be supported on Customer Activities Web sites.~~which is why at this time it is not addressed in the above motion~~.

*Revised Standard 4.3.54*

With regard to the navigational links on Customer Activities Web sites, when using abbreviations, the following should be used:

| Full Name | Abbreviation |
|---|---|
| **Customer Activities** | **Customer Activities** |
| Nominations | Nominations |
| Flowing Gas | Flowing Gas |
| Invoicing | Invoicing |
| Capacity Release | Capacity Release |
| Contracts | Contracts |
| Informational Postings | Info Postings |
| Site Maps | Site |
| **Nomination Area** | **Nominations** |
| Nomination | Nom |
| Nomination Quick Response | Nom QR |
| Request for Confirmation | Req for Conf |
| Confirmation Response | Conf Resp |
| Confirmation Response Quick Response | Conf Resp QR |
| Scheduled Quantity | Sched Qty |
| Scheduled Quantity for Operator | Sched Qty Oper |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Flowing Gas Area** | **Flowing Gas** |
| Pre-determined Allocation | PDA |
| Pre-determined Allocation Quick Response | PDA QR |
| Allocation | Allocation |
| Shipper Imbalance | Shipper Imbal |
| Measurement Information | Meas Info |
| Measured Volume Audit Statement | Meas Vol Audit |
| Authorization to Post Imbalances | Auth to Post Imbal |
| Posted Imbalances Download | Post Imbal Dwnld |
| Request for Imbalance Trade | Req for Imbal Trd |
| Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response | Req for Imbal Trd QR |
| Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade | W/D of Req for Imbal Trd |
| Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade | Req for Conf of Imbal Trd |
| Imbalance Trade Confirmation | Imbal Trd Conf |
| Imbalance Trade Notification | Imbal Trd Notify |
| **Invoicing Area** | **Invoicing** |
| Invoice | Invoice |
| Service Requester Level Charge / Allowance Invoice | Svc Req Invc |
| Payment Remittance | Pmt Remit |
| Statement of Account | Stmt of Acct |
| **Capacity Release Area** | **Capacity Release** |
| Offers | Offers |
| Bids | Bids |
| Awards | Awards |
| **Contracts Area** | **Contracts** |

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Expedited Data Development Subcommittee**

**Requester: GISB 1999 Annual Plan** **Request No.: 1999AP7, R97117, R97118**

## 1. Recommended Action:

___Accept as requested
_X_ Accept as modified below
___Decline

## Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:

_X_ 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:**

_X_ Initiation
___Modification
___Interpretation
___Withdrawal

___Principle (x.1.z)
___Definition (x.2.z)
___Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)
_X_ Document (x.4.z)
___Data Element (x.4.z)
___Code Value (x.4.z)
___X12 Implementation Guide
_X_ Business Process Documentation

## 3. RECOMMENDATION

**SUMMARY:**

- Revise the following in the Flowing Gas Standards Book:
  - Executive Summary
  - Business Process and Practices
- Add the following documents:
  - Authorization to Post Imbalances
  - Posted Imbalances Download
  - Request for Imbalance Trade
  - Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response
  - Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade
  - Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade
  - Imbalance Trade Confirmation
  - Imbalance Trade Notification

- For each of the above documents, add the following:
  - Technical Implementation of Business Process (TIBP)
  - Data Dictionary
  - Code Values Dictionaries
  - Sample Paper Transaction

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

**Document Name and No.: See list of documents in Summary above.**

**see attached Data Dictionaries**

**CODE VALUES LOG** (for addition, modification or deletion of code values)

**Document Name and No.: See list of documents in Summary above.**

**See Attached Code Values Dictionaries**

**BUSINESS PROCESS DOCUMENTATION (**for addition, modification or deletion of business process documentation language)

**Standards Book: Flowing Gas Related Standards Book**

- See attached Executive Summary
- See attached Business Process and Practices
- See attached Technical Implementation of Business Process for each of the above listed Data Dictionaries
- See attached Sample Paper Transaction for each of the above listed Data Dictionaries

## 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

**a. Description of Request:**

1999AP7 GISB 1998 and 1999 Annual Plan

R97117 Add two new business practice standards, one new associated dataset (EDI document) to facilitate the posting of Shippers' Imbalances, and a new code value for the Data Sets Requested data element in the Upload of Request for Download of Posted Data Sets (GISB Standard No. 5.4.14) and Response to Upload of Request for Download of Posted Data Sets (GISB Standard No 5.4.15).

| | |
|---|---|
| R97118 | Add two new codes to the Transaction Type data element to delineate nominations of imbalance trades across contracts in the Nomination and nomination related data sets. |

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Imbalances Subcommittee**

Excerpt from Final Minutes of July 6, 2000 conference call:

> **"Motion:** The Authorization to Post Imbalances and the Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade are not suitable for EDI development. The Imbalance Subcommittee instructs the EDD Subcommittee that it **not** address EDI development for these two datasets.
> **Motion passed unanimously**."

**Expedited Data Development Subcommittee**

See minutes for the following Expedited Data Development meetings:

- March 13 – 14, 2000
- May 9 – 10, 2000
- June 6 – 7, 2000
- July 11 – 12, 2000
- July 28, 2000
- July 31, 2000
- August 10, 2000
- August 29 – 30, 2000

**c. Business Purpose:**

Expedited Data Development Subcommittee developed information requirements for the standards for imbalance netting and trading adopted by the GISB Executive Committee on July 15, 1999.

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

Expedited Data Development Subcommittee developed information requirements for the standards for imbalance netting and trading adopted by the GISB Executive Committee on July 15, 1999.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

~~Four areas of the natural gas business processes are classified within the Flowing Gas area. The four areas include the communications concerning an agreement on the factors that should be used to drive the determination of entitlement rights of flowing gas at a location (Pre-determined Allocation), the communications of the entitlement rights of flowing gas at a location (Allocation), the communications of entitlement rights of flowing gas on a contract level (Shipper Imbalance), and the communications of the estimated or actual physical flow of gas at a location (Measurement Information) and the communication of the estimated or actual physical flow of gas at a location along with gas quality information (Measured Volume Audit Statement).~~

Six areas of the natural gas business processes are classified within the Flowing Gas area. The six areas include:

1. **Pre-determined Allocation**
   The communications concerning an agreement on the factors that should be used to drive the determination of entitlement rights of flowing gas at a location,
2. **Allocation**
   The communications of the entitlement rights of flowing gas at a location,
3. **Shipper Imbalance**
   The communications of entitlement rights of flowing gas on a contract level,
4. **Imbalance Netting & Trading**
   The communications and management of Imbalance Trading,
5. **Measurement Information**
   The communications of the estimated or actual physical flow of gas at a location, and
6. **Measured Volume Audit Statement**
   The communication of the estimated or actual physical flow of gas at a location along with gas quality information.

To clarify the expectations and responsibilities of all parties prior to gas flow, pre-determined allocation data is exchanged via the Pre-determined Allocation (PDA) data set. The PDA allows parties to manage the impact of variances between the actual quantities flowing and scheduled quantities. Before the flow of gas across a location, the PDA secures the agreement between the allocating party and the allocated parties as to the method to be used for computing the allocations of relating scheduling quantities to actual physical flow.

Many different parties can be involved with the movement of natural gas across a particular location. The determination of the entitlement rights for each particular party of the actual flowing gas moving across the location is accomplished by allocating the actual flow among the parties. Allocations are performed by the operator of the affected location, using the pre-determined allocation methodology agreed to by the parties involved. The Allocation is used to communicate the allocation information to the parties involved.

Allocation information at a contract level is presented in the Shipper Imbalance. This information can be used by the shippers to manage their transactions and determine if the actual or estimated gas flows are in balance.

The Posted Imbalances Download allows shippers and other interested parties to obtain a listing from the transportation service provider of all the imbalances for parties who have authorized their posting via the Authorization to Post Imbalances. With this information, shippers and other interested parties may trade imbalances with each other. Parties trading imbalances communicate their transactions to the transportation service provider utilizing the Request for Imbalance Trade, Imbalance Trade Confirmation, and Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade. The transportation service provider communicates with the trading parties using the Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response, Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade, and Imbalance Trade Notification.

The Measurement Information data set contains a subset of the information that has traditionally been considered a measurement statement. The data set is designed to provide information on the actual or estimated physical flow moving across a location. It can be used to support other flowing gas or invoicing data sets. It does not include data utilized to verify the calculation of the measured flow.

Like the Measurement Information data set, the Measured Volume Audit Statement also contains the actual or estimated physical flow. In addition, it is used to convey information on the various components of the gas which can be utilized for audit purposes.

# BUSINESS PROCESS AND PRACTICES

## A. Overview

Pre-Determined Allocation (PDA)

Actual flow of natural gas is allocated to the parties involved in the transaction. These parties can include producers, operators, transporters and shippers using various methodologies to allocate actual quantities. In order to manage the impact of actual quantities varying from scheduled quantities, the specification of the method to be used in allocating actual quantities prior to gas flow is imperative. PDA's accomplish this goal by securing the agreement of the allocating--and allocated--parties on the method to be used for computing the allocation, i.e. relating scheduled quantities to actual physical flow. The implementation of a PDA clarifies all parties' expectations and responsibilities prior to gas flow.

Allocation

The allocation data set will communicate the result of the allocation process at a point. Actual measured quantities are distributed to scheduled transactions at a location. The allocation process takes into account the actual measured quantities, the scheduled quantities and the predetermined allocation method in effect for the allocation period. Quantities are allocated on either a daily or monthly basis.

There are two basic types of allocation -- Single Level or Multiple Level. The Single Level allocation type indicates the location operator will allocate to the service requester level in one step. The Multiple Level allocation type indicates that allocations are performed at multiple levels in a hierarchical manner with parties specifying the allocation method for their purchasers or contracts. There is currently no established GISB standard concerning whether allocations are performed at a single level or multiple levels. Therefore, the allocation data set has been defined in such a way to accommodate either type of allocation. Accommodating both types requires varied usage of data elements dependent on the information being communicated. Information is always shared with the interconnecting operator of a location and limited information may be shared with other business parties (or their designated agents) who at some level may have ownership of gas quantities at the location. The interconnecting operator receives allocated information for the total quantity at the location. Other parties receive information that directly applies to their business transactions. The level of allocation is specified in the data set.

The Multiple Level allocation type is further complicated by the title tracking issue. There is currently no established GISB standard concerning title tracking. This data set should accommodate allocating parties that perform title tracking. The usage of the data elements does not fundamentally change in title tracking. However in title tracking, the terms upstream and downstream refer to the immediate supplier or receiving party relative to the service requester as opposed to the party taking or relinquishing custody at a physical location. Example: In title tracking at a receipt point, the service requester would only know the identity of their direct suppliers and markets and would provide this information on the nomination. The upstream party may not have ownership of gas upstream of the meter. If this is the case, the upstream party would also be providing a nomination to the allocating party identifying their direct supplier. All parties involved in a marketing chain would nominate and the service provider would ultimately be able to identify the true upstream party that has ownership on the upstream facility. An “Operator” allocation statement would identify the upstream party with ownership on the upstream facility. A “Marketer” allocation statement would identify the direct supplier to the recipient of the allocation statement.

The Allocation data set uses information from the nomination, confirmation, pre- determined allocation method and measurement processes. Information contained in the allocation data set will impact the imbalance and invoice processes.

Shipper Imbalance

Natural gas flows from source points to disposition points in accordance with the scheduled nominations made by various parties. The actual flow of gas is then allocated among the various parties to transactions, in accordance with pre- determined allocation methodologies. A shipper nominates a quantity of gas at a receipt point and contracts with a pipeline to transport this quantity of gas to a delivery point. However, allocated quantities at the receipt point and delivery point may not be the same. For example, with reductions for fuel quantities, over-delivery by the transportation service provider at the delivery point, or under delivery by the transportation requester at the receipt point, the quantities at the receipt point and delivery point may not be the same. The resulting difference is referred to as an imbalance.

Imbalances are reported by the allocating party to the affected parties involved in the transportation transaction. Imbalances may be reported on a daily or monthly basis. Imbalances may be resolved in a number of different ways.

The nomination starts the procedure, after which the allocation takes place. Gas is allocated at a location level and a contract level. The imbalance data set provides contract allocation information. The imbalance can be calculated using this information. This information can be a daily or a multi-day function, or it can be final closing data for an accounting period. The monthly imbalance should be monitored throughout the month, so the imbalance may be minimized.

Imbalance Netting and Trading

Shippers must authorize the transportation service provider to post their imbalances via the Authorization to Post Imbalances before such time as they may be included on the Posted Imbalances Download. Shippers and other interested parties request the Posted Imbalances Download using the Upload of Request for Download of Posted Datasets (GISB Standard 5.4.14).

Once trading parties have arranged a potential trade, the initiating trader provides the specifics of the trade via the Request for Imbalance Trade for both the initiating trader and the party with whom they are proposing to trade, the confirming trader. This Request for Imbalance Trade is sent by the initiating trader to the transportation service provider for this purpose. The transportation service provider will inform the initiating trader of the receipt of their request and of any errors using the Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response.

The transportation service provider may choose to request a confirmation from the confirming trader through the use of the Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade.

The Imbalance Trade Confirmation is sent by the confirming trader to the transportation service provider to indicate whether the imbalance trade has been accepted or rejected. Without a successful confirmation prior to the close of the transportation service provider's imbalance trading period, the trade will not take place.

Upon successful confirmation of a requested trade, the transportation service provider will notify the initiating trader and the confirming trader of the status of the trade using the Imbalance Trade Notification. The parties cannot consider their trade confirmed and/or approved until such time as they receive the Imbalance Trade Notification. The Imbalance Trade Notification will inform the parties of any reductions through the use of the reduction reason codes.

Measurement

The Measurement Information data set and the Measured Volume Audit Statement data set are both used to report gas measurement information in support of the allocation, imbalance and invoice processes. The Measured Volume Audit Statement also contains gas component data which is used for calculation and audit purposes.

# TECHNICAL IMPLEMEMENTATION OF BUSINESS PROCESS

The Authorization to Post Imbalances is used to initiate the process of posting imbalances. It is sent from a service requester, or their agent, to the transportation service provider. This authorization instructs the transportation service provider to "post" the service requester's imbalances. Posted imbalances can be viewed or, upon request, downloaded by other service requesters, or their agents. A transportation service provider will continue to post the service requester's imbalances until the authorization to post imbalances is rescinded by the service requester.

# SAMPLE PAPER TRANSACTION

**The following example illustrates a paper transaction for the Authorization to Post Imbalances:**

## Authorization to Post Imbalances

Transportation Service Provider: General Pipeline (333222555)

Service Requester: Omega, Corp (222333444)
Contact Name : Orville Omega
Contact Phone: 999-555-4325

Authorization Effective Date: March 24, 2001
Authorization Indicator: Yes

Contract Holder: Beta, Inc. (666555444)

# DATA DICTIONARY

## x.4.z Authorization to Post Imbalances

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Service Requester Data | Identifies the party requesting the service, or their agent. | BEDG | | |
| Service Requester * (Svc Req) | | BEDG | M | |
| Service Requester Name (Svc Req Name) | | BEDG | M | |
| Authorization Effective Date (Auth Eff Date) | The date on which the authorization becomes effective. | ADG | M | |
| Authorization Indicator Data | Specifies whether imbalances are authorized to be posted. | ADG | | |
| Authorization Indicator (Auth Ind) | | ADG | C | At least one of Authorization Indicator or Authorization Indicator Description is required. |
| Authorization Indicator Description (Auth Ind Desc) | | ADG | C | At least one of Authorization Indicator or Authorization Indicator Description is required. |
| Contract Holder Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider. | BEDG | | |
| Contract Holder * (K Holder) | | BEDG | M | |
| Contract Holder Name (K Holder Name) | | BEDG | M | |
| Service Requester Contact Name (Svc Req Contact) | The name of the service requester primary contact. | BEDG | M | |
| Service Requester Contact Phone Number (Svc Req Phone) | The phone number of the service requester primary contact. | BEDG | M | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation Service Provider Data | Identifies the party providing the requested service. | BEDG | | |
| Transportation Service Provider * (TSP) | | BEDG | M | |
| Transportation Service Provider Name) (TSP Name) | | BEDG | M | |

* Indicates Common Code

**DATA GROUPS:**

ADG Authorization Data Group
BEDG Business Entity Data Group

# CODE VALUES DICTIONARY

## Authorization Indicator

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | Transportation service provider is authorized to post imbalances. | |
| No | Prior authorization to post imbalances is rescinded. | |

# TECHNICAL IMPLEMEMENTATION OF BUSINESS PROCESS

The Posted Imbalances Download is a listing of all posted imbalances on a transportation service provider's system that have been authorized for posting. It is sent from the transportation service provider to the data requester in response to an Upload of Request for Download of Posted Data Sets that requested the Posted Imbalances Download.

The **posted imbalance quantity** is expressed as a positive whole number. The **imbalance direction indicator** is used to designate whether the quantity is due to the service requester or due from the service requester.

# SAMPLE PAPER TRANSACTION

**The following example illustrates a paper transaction for the Posted Imbalances Download:**

## Posted Imbalances Download

Transportation Service Provider: General Pipeline (333222555)

Imbalance Period: June 2001

Statement Date/Time: July 12, 2001 / 10:00 a.m.

Operational Impact Area: OA1

| Service Requester / Contract Holder | Imbalance Quantity | Imbalance Direction |
|---|---|---|
| Alpha Services (999888777) / Alpha Services (999888777)<br>Contact Name: Mary B. Service<br>Contact Phone: 999-555-1212 | 100 | Due To Svc Req |
| Omega, Corp. (222333444) / Beta, Inc. (666555444)<br>Contact Name: Orville Omega<br>Contact Phone: 999-555-4325 | 300 | Due From Svc Req |
| Gamma Tech. (555444333) / Gamma Tech. (555444333)<br>Contact Name: Gary Gamma<br>Contact Phone: 999-555-2222 | 500 | Due From Svc Req |
| Delta Dist. (444333222) / Delta Dist. (444333222)<br>Contact Name: Delta Burque<br>Contact Phone: 999-555-3322 | 800 | Due To Svc Req |

# DATA DICTIONARY

## x.4.z Posted Imbalances Download

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imbalance Period (Imb Per) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported. | BEDG | M | M | |
| Statement Date/Time (Stmt D/T) | Date and time the statement was produced. | BEDG | M | M | |
| Transportation Service Provider Data | Identifies the party providing the requested service. | BEDG | | | |
| Transportation Service Provider * (TSP) | | BEDG | M | M | |
| Transportation Service Provider Name (TSP Name) | | BEDG | M | nu | |
| Operational Impact Area (OIA) | A transportation service provider's designation of the largest possible area(s) on its system in which imbalances have a similar operational effect. | OIADG | M | M | |
| Service Requester Data | Identifies the party requesting the service, or their agent. | CDG | | | |
| Service Requester * (Svc Req) | | CDG | M | M | |
| Service Requester Name (Svc Req Name) | | CDG | M | nu | |
| Contract Holder Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider. | CDG | | | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contract Holder * (K Holder) | | CDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder Name (K Holder Name) | | CDG | M | nu | |
| Service Requester Contact Name (Svc Req Contact) | The name of the service requester primary contact. | CDG | M | M | |
| Service Requester Contact Phone Number (Svc Req Phone) | The phone number of the service requester primary contact. | CDG | M | M | |
| Service Requester Contract (Svc Req K) | This is the contract under which service is being requested. | CDG | SO | SO | |
| Posted Imbalance Quantity (Posted Imb Qty) | The posted imbalance quantity which occurred during an imbalance period, or the posted imbalance quantity as of the end of an imbalance period. The quantity is expressed as a positive whole number. | TSDG | M | M | |
| Imbalance Type (Imb Type) | A transportation service provider defined abbreviation for the type of imbalance. | TSDG | SO | SO | |
| Imbalance Direction Data | Indicates whether the Posted Imbalance Quantity is due to the service requester from the transportation service provider or due from the service requester to the transportation service provider. | TSDG | | | |
| Imbalance Direction Indicator (Imb Dir) | | TSDG | C | M | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Direction Indicator or Imbalance Direction Description is required. |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imbalance Direction Description (Imb Dir Desc) | | TSDG | C | nu | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Direction Indicator or Imbalance Direction Description is required. |

* Indicates Common Code

**DATA GROUPS:**

| | |
|---|---|
| BEDG | Business Entity Data Group |
| CDG | Contracts Data Group |
| OIADG | Operational Impact Area Data Group |
| TSDG | Transaction Specific Data Group |

# CODE VALUES DICTIONARY

### Imbalance Direction Indicator

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| Due TO Svc Req | The Posted Imbalance Quantity is due to the service requester from the transportation service provider. | |
| Due FROM Svc Req | The Posted Imbalance Quantity is due from the service requester to the transportation service provider. | |

# TECHNICAL IMPLEMEMENTATION OF BUSINESS PROCESS

The Request for Imbalance Trade is used to initiate the process of trading imbalances. The party submitting the request to the transportation service provider is identified as the **initiating trader**. The initiating trader provides the specifics of the trade for both the initiating trader and the party with whom they are proposing to trade, the **confirming trader**.

The contract holder is the party to whom the imbalance has been assigned. In the situation where the transportation service provider has the business practice of netting imbalances across contract holders for a single agent, the agent becomes the party listed as the contract holder.

The **imbalance trade tracking id** originates in the Request for Imbalance Trade. It is line item specific and is used to tie the Request for Imbalance Trade to the Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response, the Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade (a mutually agreed data set), the Imbalance Trade Confirmation and the Imbalance Trade Notification. It is neither validated by the receiver of the process, nor is it used as a key in the receiver of the process' data base.

The **trade quantity requested** is expressed as a positive whole number. The **imbalance trade direction indicator** is used to designate whether the quantity is being traded:

- TO the initiating trader FROM the confirming trader, or
- FROM the initiating trader TO the confirming trader.

# SAMPLE PAPER TRANSACTION

**The following example illustrates a paper transaction for the Request for Imbalance Trade:**

## Request for Imbalance Trade

Transportation Service Provider: General Pipeline (333222555)

| Initiating Trader Data | Confirming Trader Data |
|---|---|
| Delta Dist. (444333222) | Omega Corp. (222333444) |
| Contact Name: Delta Burque | Contact Name: Orville Omega |
| Contact Phone: 999-555-3322 | Contact Phone: 999-555-4325 |
| Contract Holder: Delta Dist. (444333222) | Contract Holder: Beta, Inc. (666555444) |

Imbalance Period: June 2001

Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader: OA1

Imbalance Trade Tracking ID: T1

Trade Quantity Requested: 300

Imbalance Trade Direction: FROM Initiating Trader

# DATA DICTIONARY

## x.4.z Request for Imbalance Trade

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the confirming trader imbalance. | CTDG | | | |
| Contract Holder - Confirming Trader * (K Holder-Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder - Confirming Trader Name (K Holder-Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | nu | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the initiating trader imbalance. | ITDG | | | |
| Contract Holder - Initiating Trader * (K Holder-Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder - Initiating Trader Name (K Holder-Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | nu | |
| Imbalance Period – Confirming Trader (Imb Per-Conf Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the confirming trader. | CTDG | BC | BC | Used when the transportation service provider allows imbalances to be traded across imbalance periods. |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imbalance Period – Initiating Trader (Imb Per-Init Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the initiating trader. | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Contact Name (Init Trdr Contact) | The name of the initiating trader primary contact. | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Contact Phone Number (Init Trdr Phone) | The phone number of the initiating trader primary contact. | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Data | The party requesting the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Initiating Trader, or their agent. | ITDG | | | |
| Initiating Trader * (Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Name (Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | nu | |
| Confirming Trader Data | The party confirming the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Confirming Trader, or their agent. | CTDG | | | |
| Confirming Trader * (Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | M | |
| Confirming Trader Name (Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | nu | |
| Transportation Service Provider Data | Identifies the party providing the requested service. | BEDG | | | |
| Transportation Service Provider * (TSP) | | BEDG | M | M | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation Service Provider Name (TSP Name) | | BEDG | M | nu | |
| Operational Impact Area – Confirming Trader (OIA-Conf Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the confirming trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | BC | BC | Used when the transportation service provider allows trading across operational impact areas. |
| Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader (OIA-Init Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the initiating trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | M | M | |
| Contract – Confirming Trader (K-Conf Trdr) | The confirming trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | BC | BC | Based on the transportation service provider's method of accounting for imbalances. |
| Contract – Initiating Trader (K-Init Trdr) | The initiating trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | BC | BC | Based on the transportation service provider's method of accounting for imbalances. |
| Imbalance Trade Tracking ID (Imb Trd Trk ID) | Used to identify a line item in the imbalance trading process. This field contains alpha-numeric data. | TSDG | BC | M | For EBB, used by transportation service providers who require/display tracking IDs. |
| Imbalance Type – Confirming Trader (Imb Type-Conf Trdr) | Identifies the specific Imbalance Type being traded by the confirming trader. | TSDG | BC | BC | Based on the transportation service provider's method of accounting for imbalances. |
| Imbalance Type – Initiating Trader (Imb Type-Init Trdr) | Identifies the specific Imbalance Type being traded by the initiating trader. | TSDG | BC | BC | Based on the transportation service provider's method of accounting for imbalances. |
| Trade Fuel Quantity – Confirming Trader (Trd Fuel Qty-Conf Trdr) | The confirming trader's quantity of fuel in standard units associated with the imbalance trade. | TSDG | BC | BC | Used when the transportation service provider requires a fuel quantity to be associated with the Trade Quantity Requested. |
| Trade Fuel Quantity – Initiating Trader (Trd Fuel Qty-Init Trdr) | The initiating trader's quantity of fuel in standard units associated with the imbalance trade. | TSDG | BC | BC | Used when the transportation service provider requires a fuel quantity to be associated with the Trade Quantity Requested. |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Trade Quantity Requested (Trd Qty Req) | The amount expressed (as a positive whole number) is the quantity in standard units being requested for trade. | TSDG | M | M | |
| Imbalance Trade Direction Data | Indicates whether the quantity is being traded to the initiating trader from the confirming trader or is being traded from the initiating trader to the confirming trader. | TSDG | | | |
| Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator (Imb Trd Dir) | | TSDG | C | M | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator or Imbalance Trade Direction Description is required. |
| Imbalance Trade Direction Description (Imb Trd Dir Desc) | | TSDG | C | nu | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator or Imbalance Trade Direction Description is required. |

* Indicates Common Code

**DATA GROUPS:**

| | |
|---|---|
| BEDG | Business Entity Data Group |
| CTDG | Confirming Trader Data Group |
| ITDG | Initiating Trader Data Group |
| OIADG | Operational Impact Area Data Group |
| TSDG | Transaction Specific Data Group |

# CODE VALUES DICTIONARY

## Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| TO Init Trdr | The quantity is being traded to the initiating trader from the confirming trader. | |
| FROM Init Trdr | The quantity is being traded from the initiating trader to the confirming trader. | |

# TECHNICAL IMPLEMEMENTATION OF BUSINESS PROCESS

The Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response is the response to the Request for Imbalance Trade. It is sent from the transportation service provider to the initiating trader. The quick response informs the initiating trader of any errors or warnings associated with the Request for Imbalance Trade.

The **transaction status code** informs the receiver of the status of the entire Request for Imbalance Trade transaction. It also indicates the presence or absence of warnings and/or errors. **Validation codes** specify any errors or warnings. All validation codes may have an associated **validation message**. The validation message is a free form text field used to further clarify the validation code.

The **imbalance trade tracking id** used in the quick response originates in the Request for Imbalance Trade. It is sent in the quick response when there is an error or warning that pertains to a specific imbalance trade. If there is no error or warning associated with an imbalance trade, then the tracking id for that trade is not sent in the quick response.

# SAMPLE PAPER TRANSACTION

**The following example illustrates a paper transaction for the Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response:**

## Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response

Transportation Service Provider: General Pipeline (333222555)

Transaction Status Code: Accepted

| Initiating Trader | Confirming Trader |
|---|---|
| Delta Dist. (444333222) | Omega Corp. (222333444) |
| Contract Holder: Delta Dist. (444333222) | Contract Holder: Beta, Inc. (666555444) |

Imbalance Period: June 2001

# DATA DICTIONARY

## x.4.z Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Confirming Trader * (Conf Trdr) | The party confirming the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Confirming Trader, or their agent. | M | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader (K Holder-Conf Trdr) | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the Confirming Trader imbalance. | M | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader (K Holder-Init Trdr) | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the initiating trader imbalance. | M | |
| Imbalance Period – Confirming Trader (Imb Per-Conf Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the confirming trader. | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Period – Initiating Trader (Imb Per-Init Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the initiating trader. | M | |
| Initiating Trader * (Init Trdr) | The party requesting the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Initiating Trader, or their agent. | M | |
| Transaction Status Code (Txn Stat) | Status of the entire transaction set. | M | |
| Transportation Service Provider * (TSP) | Identifies the party providing the requested service. | M | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Validation Code (Val Cd) | Code that identifies errors/warnings. | C | Mandatory when Transaction Status Code indicates that an error or warning was issued. |
| Validation Message (Val Message) | A text field which further explains the error or warning depicted by the Validation Code. | SO | |
| Contract – Confirming Trader (K-Conf Trdr) | The confirming trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | C | Sent when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade and when errors/warnings occur at the operational impact area/contract level or at the imbalance trade tracking ID level. |
| Contract – Initiating Trader (K-Init Trdr) | The initiating trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | C | Sent when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade and when errors/warnings occur at the operational impact area/contract level or at the imbalance trade tracking ID level. |
| Operational Impact Area – Confirming Trader (OIA-Conf Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the confirming trader's imbalance occurred. | C | Sent when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade and when errors/warnings occur at the operational impact area/contract level or at the imbalance trade tracking ID level. |
| Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader (OIA-Init Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the initiating trader's imbalance occurred. | C | Sent when errors/warnings occur at the operational impact area/contract level or at the imbalance trade tracking ID level. |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Imbalance Trade Tracking ID (Imb Trd Trk ID) | Used to identify a line item in the imbalance trading process. This field contains alpha-numeric data. | C | Sent when errors/warnings occur at the imbalance trade tracking ID level. |

* Indicates Common Code

# CODE VALUES DICTIONARY

## Transaction Status Code

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| Errors or warnings occurred in the transaction. Transaction has been acknowledged. Errors and warnings follow. | [no definition necessary] | |
| The entire transaction was accepted. | [no definition necessary] | |
| The entire transaction was rejected due to header level errors. | [no definition necessary] | |

## Validation Code (Heading Errors)

| Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition |
|---|---|---|
| | Invalid Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Contract Holder – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Contract Holder – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Imbalance Period – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Imbalance Period – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Transportation Service Provider | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Imbalance Period – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |

| Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition |
|---|---|---|
| | Missing Imbalance Period – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Initiating Trader Contact Name | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Initiating Trader Contact Phone Number | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Transportation Service Provider | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Contract Holder - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Contract Holder - Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Temporary Error Code – Message follows. Use only until code is approved for use. | [no definition necessary] |

**Validation Code (Heading Warnings)**

| Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition |
|---|---|---|
| | Imbalance Period – Confirming Trader not processed | [no definition necessary] |
| | Temporary Warning Code – Message follows. Use only until code is approved for use. | [no definition necessary] |

**Validation Code (Detail Errors)**

| Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition |
|---|---|---|
| | Invalid Contract – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |

| Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition |
|---|---|---|
| | Invalid Contract – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Operational Impact Area – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Contract – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Contract – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Operational Impact Area - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Temporary Error Code – Message follows. Use only until code is approved for use. | [no definition necessary] |

**Validation Code (Detail Warnings)**

| Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition |
|---|---|---|
| | Contract – Confirming Trader not processed | [no definition necessary] |
| | Contract – Initiating Trader not processed | [no definition necessary] |
| | Operational Impact Area - Confirming Trader not processed | [no definition necessary] |
| | Temporary Warning Code – Message follows. Use only until code is approved for use. | [no definition necessary] |

**Validation Code (Sub-detail Errors)**

| Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition |
|---|---|---|
| | Invalid Imbalance Type – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Imbalance Type – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Trade Fuel Quantity – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Trade Fuel Quantity – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Trade Quantity Requested | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Imbalance Trade Tracking ID | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Imbalance Type – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Imbalance Type – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Trade Fuel Quantity – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Trade Fuel Quantity – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Trade Quantity Requested | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator | [no definition necessary] |
| | Temporary Error Code – Message follows. Use only until code is approved for use. | [no definition necessary] |

**Validation Code (Sub-detail Warnings)**

| Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition |
|---|---|---|
| | Imbalance Type – Confirming Trader not processed | [no definition necessary] |
| | Imbalance Type – Initiating Trader not processed | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Trade Fuel Quantity – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Invalid Trade Fuel Quantity – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Trade Fuel Quantity – Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Missing Trade Fuel Quantity – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] |
| | Trade Fuel Quantity – Confirming Trader not processed | [no definition necessary] |
| | Trade Fuel Quantity – Initiating Trader not processed | [no definition necessary] |
| | Temporary Warning Code – Message follows. Use only until code is approved for use. | [no definition necessary] |

# TECHNICAL IMPLEMEMENTATION OF BUSINESS PROCESS

The Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade is used when the initiating trader decides to withdraw an imbalance trade. It is sent from the initiating trader to the transportation service provider.

An imbalance trade can be withdrawn only if the confirming trader has not confirmed the imbalance trade.

The **imbalance trade tracking id** used in the Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade originates in the Request for Imbalance Trade. It identifies the specific trade being withdrawn.

# SAMPLE PAPER TRANSACTION

**The following example illustrates a paper transaction for the Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade:**

## Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade

Transportation Service Provider: General Pipeline (333222555)

| Initiating Trader Data | Confirming Trader Data |
|---|---|
| Delta Dist. (444333222)<br>Contact Name: Delta Burque<br>Contact Phone: 999-555-3322 | Omega Corp. (222333444) |
| Contract Holder: Delta Dist. (444333222) | Contract Holder: Beta, Inc. (666555444) |

Imbalance Period: June 2001

Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader: OA1

Imbalance Trade Tracking ID: T1

# DATA DICTIONARY

## x.4.z Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the confirming trader imbalance. | CTDG | | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader * (K Holder-Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader Name (K Holder-Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the initiating trader imbalance. | ITDG | | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader * (K Holder-Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader Name (K Holder-Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | |
| Imbalance Period – Confirming Trader (Imb Per-Conf Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the confirming trader. | CTDG | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imbalance Period – Initiating Trader (Imb Per-Init Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the initiating trader. | ITDG | M | |
| Initiating Trader Contact Name (Init Trdr Contact) | The name of the initiating trader primary contact. | ITDG | M | |
| Initiating Trader Contact Phone Number (Init Trdr Phone) | The phone number of the initiating trader primary contact. | ITDG | M | |
| Initiating Trader Data | The party requesting the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Initiating Trader, or their agent. | ITDG | | |
| Initiating Trader * (Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | |
| Initiating Trader Name (Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | |
| Confirming Trader Data | The party confirming the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Confirming Trader, or their agent. | CTDG | | |
| Confirming Trader * (Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | |
| Confirming Trader Name (Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | |
| Transportation Service Provider Data | Identifies the party providing the requested service. | BEDG | | |
| Transportation Service Provider * (TSP) | | BEDG | M | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation Service Provider Name (TSP Name) | | BEDG | M | |
| Operational Impact Area – Confirming Trader (OIA-Conf Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the confirming trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader (OIA-Init Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the initiating trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | M | |
| Contract – Confirming Trader (K-Conf Trdr) | The confirming trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Contract – Initiating Trader (K-Init Trdr) | The initiating trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Trade Tracking ID (Imb Trd Trk ID) | Used to identify a line item in the imbalance trading process. This field contains alpha-numeric data. | TSDG | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |

* Indicates Common Code

**DATA GROUPS:**

| | |
|---|---|
| BEDG | Business Entity Data Group |
| CTDG | Confirming Trader Data Group |
| ITDG | Initiating Trader Data Group |
| OIADG | Operational Impact Area Data Group |
| TSDG | Transaction Specific Data Group |

# TECHNICAL IMPLEMEMENTATION OF BUSINESS PROCESS

The sending of the Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade is optional. If the transportation service provider chooses to support it, then the request will be sent from the transportation service provider to the confirming trader. The Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade requests confirmation from the confirming trader of a valid Request for Imbalance Trade that has been received and processed by the transportation service provider.

The **imbalance trade tracking id** used in the Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade originates in the Request for Imbalance Trade. It identifies the specific trade for which confirmation is being requested.

The **trade quantity requested** is expressed as a positive whole number. The **imbalance trade direction indicator** is used to designate whether the quantity is being traded:

- TO the initiating trader FROM the confirming trader, or
- FROM the initiating trader TO the confirming trader.

# SAMPLE PAPER TRANSACTION

**The following example illustrates a paper transaction for the Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade:**

## Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade

Transportation Service Provider: General Pipeline (333222555)
Contact Name: Robert E. Lee
Contact Phone: 999-555-1865

| Initiating Trader Data | Confirming Trader Data |
|---|---|
| Delta Dist. (444333222)<br>Contact Name: Delta Burque<br>Contact Phone: 999-555-3322 | Omega Corp. (222333444) |
| Contract Holder: Delta Dist. (444333222) | Contract Holder: Beta, Inc. (666555444) |

Imbalance Period: June 2001

Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader: OA1

Imbalance Trade Tracking ID: T1

Trade Quantity Requested: 300

Imbalance Trade Direction: FROM Initiating Trader

# DATA DICTIONARY

## x.4.z Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the confirming trader imbalance. | CTDG | | | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader * (K Holder-Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader Name (K Holder-Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | nu | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the initiating trader imbalance. | ITDG | | | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader * (K Holder-Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader Name (K Holder-Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | nu | |
| Imbalance Period – Confirming Trader (Imb Per-Conf Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the confirming trader. | CTDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imbalance Period – Initiating Trader (Imb Per-Init Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the initiating trader. | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Contact Name (Init Trdr Contact) | The name of the initiating trader primary contact . | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Contact Phone Number (Init Trdr Phone) | The phone number of the initiating trader primary contact. | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Data | The party requesting the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Initiating Trader, or their agent. | ITDG | | | |
| Initiating Trader * (Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Name (Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | nu | |
| Confirming Trader Data | The party confirming the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Confirming Trader, or their agent. | CTDG | | | |
| Confirming Trader * (Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | M | |
| Confirming Trader Name (Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | nu | |
| Transportation Service Provider Data | Identifies the party providing the requested service. | BEDG | | | |
| Transportation Service Provider * (TSP) | | BEDG | M | M | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation Service Provider Name (TSP Name) | | BEDG | M | nu | |
| Transportation Service Provider Contact Name (TSP Contact) | The name of the transportation service provider primary contact. | BEDG | M | M | |
| Transportation Service Provider Contact Phone Number (TSP Phone) | The phone number of the transportation service provider primary contact. | BEDG | M | M | |
| Operational Impact Area – Confirming Trader (OIA-Conf Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the confirming trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader (OIA-Init Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the initiating trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | M | M | |
| Contract – Confirming Trader (K-Conf Trdr) | The confirming trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Contract – Initiating Trader (K-Init Trdr) | The initiating trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Trade Tracking ID (Imb Trd Trk ID) | Used to identify a line item in the imbalance trading process. This field contains alpha-numeric data. | TSDG | SO | C | For EDI and FF, mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Type – Confirming Trader (Imb Type-Conf Trdr) | Identifies the specific Imbalance Type being traded by the confirming trader. | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Type – Initiating Trader (Imb Type-Init Trdr) | Identifies the specific Imbalance Type being traded by the initiating trader. | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Trade Fuel Quantity – Confirming Trader (Trd Fuel Qty-Conf Trdr) | The confirming trader's quantity of fuel in standard units associated with the imbalance trade. | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Trade Fuel Quantity – Initiating Trader (Trd Fuel Qty-Init Trdr) | The initiating trader's quantity of fuel in standard units associated with the imbalance trade. | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Trade Quantity Requested (Trd Qty Req) | The amount expressed (as a positive whole number) is the quantity in standard units being requested for trade. | TSDG | M | M | |
| Imbalance Trade Direction Data | Indicates whether the quantity is being traded to the initiating trader from the confirming trader or is being traded from the initiating trader to the confirming trader. | TSDG | | | |
| Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator (Imb Trd Dir) | | TSDG | C | M | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator or Imbalance Trade Direction Description is required. |
| Imbalance Trade Direction Description (Imb Trd Dir Desc) | | TSDG | C | nu | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator or Imbalance Trade Direction Description is required. |

* Indicates Common Code

**DATA GROUPS:**

| | |
|---|---|
| BEDG | Business Entity Data Group |
| CTDG | Confirming Trader Data Group |
| ITDG | Initiating Trader Data Group |
| OIADG | Operational Impact Data Group |
| TSDG | Transaction Specific Data Group |

# CODE VALUES DICTIONARY

## Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| TO Init Trdr | The quantity is being traded to the initiating trader from the confirming trader. | |
| FROM Init Trdr | The quantity is being traded from the initiating trader to the confirming trader. | |

# TECHNICAL IMPLEMEMENTATION OF BUSINESS PROCESS

The Imbalance Trade Confirmation is used by the confirming trader to indicate whether the imbalance trade has been accepted or rejected. It is sent from the confirming trader to the transportation service provider.

The confirming trader may not change any of the terms of the imbalance trade. The Imbalance Trade Confirmation must be received by the transportation service provider prior to the closing of the transportation service provider's imbalance trading period or the imbalance trade will not take place.

The **imbalance trade tracking id** used in the Imbalance Trade Confirmation originates in the Request for Imbalance Trade. It identifies the specific trade being confirmed.

# SAMPLE PAPER TRANSACTION

**The following example illustrates a paper transaction for the Imbalance Trade Confirmation:**

## Imbalance Trade Confirmation

Transportation Service Provider: General Pipeline (333222555)

| Initiating Trader Data | Confirming Trader Data |
|---|---|
| Delta Dist. (444333222) | Omega Corp. (222333444)<br>Contact Name: Orville Omega<br>Contact Phone: 999-555-4325 |
| Contract Holder: Delta Dist. (444333222) | Contract Holder: Beta, Inc. (666555444) |

Imbalance Period: June 2001

Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader: OA1

Imbalance Trade Tracking ID: T1

Imbalance Trade Response: Accept

# DATA DICTIONARY

## x.4.z Imbalance Trade Confirmation

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Confirming Trader Contact Name (Conf Trdr Contact) | The name of the confirming trader primary contact. | CTDG | M | M | |
| Confirming Trader Contact Phone Number (Conf Trdr Phone) | The phone number of the confirming trader primary contact. | CTDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the confirming trader imbalance. | CTDG | | | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader * (K Holder-Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader Name (K Holder-Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | nu | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the initiating trader imbalance. | ITDG | | | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader * (K Holder-Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader Name (K Holder-Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | nu | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imbalance Period – Confirming Trader (Imb Per-Conf Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the confirming trader. | CTDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Period – Initiating Trader (Imb Per-Init Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the initiating trader. | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Data | The party requesting the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Initiating Trader, or their agent. | ITDG | | | |
| Initiating Trader * (Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Name (Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | nu | |
| Confirming Trader Data | The party confirming the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Confirming Trader, or their agent. | CTDG | | | |
| Confirming Trader * (Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | M | |
| Confirming Trader Name (Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | nu | |
| Transportation Service Provider Data | Identifies the party providing the requested service. | BEDG | | | |
| Transportation Service Provider * (TSP) | | BEDG | M | M | |
| Transportation Service Provider Name (TSP Name) | | BEDG | M | nu | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Operational Impact Area – Confirming Trader (OIA-Conf Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the confirming trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader (OIA-Init Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the initiating trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | M | M | |
| Contract – Confirming Trader (K-Conf Trdr) | The confirming trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Contract – Initiating Trader (K-Init Trdr) | The initiating trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Trade Response Data | A code which indicates whether the confirming imbalance trader accepts or rejects the trade. | TSDG | | | |
| Imbalance Trade Response Code (Imb Trd Rsp) | | TSDG | C | M | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Trade Response Code or Imbalance Trade Response Description is required. |
| Imbalance Trade Response Description (Imb Trd Rsp Desc) | | TSDG | C | nu | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Trade Response Code or Imbalance Trade Response Description is required. |
| Imbalance Trade Tracking ID (Imb Trd Trk ID) | Used to identify a line item in the imbalance trading process. This field contains alpha-numeric data. | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |

* Indicates Common Code

**DATA GROUPS:**

| | |
|---|---|
| BEDG | Business Entity Data Group |
| CTDG | Confirming Trader Data Group |
| ITDG | Initiating Trader Data Group |
| OIADG | Operational Impact Area Data Group |
| TSDG | Transaction Specific Data Group |

# CODE VALUES DICTIONARY

## Imbalance Trade Response Code

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| Accept | [no definition necessary] | |
| Reject | [no definition necessary] | |

# TECHNICAL IMPLEMEMENTATION OF BUSINESS PROCESS

The Imbalance Trade Notification is sent to both the initiating trader and the confirming trader when the confirming trader confirms a Request for Imbalance Trade. Following the receipt of an Imbalance Trade Confirmation, the transportation service provider should send this notification no later than Noon CCT, the next business day. If a requested trade is not confirmed by the close of a transportation service provider's trading period, the Imbalance Trade Notification is not sent.

If the Imbalance Trade Confirmation matches a Request for Imbalance Trade previously received by the transportation service provider, the Imbalance Trade Notification will notify both parties to the trade of the status of the trade. Reductions to the requested trade quantity, if any, are relayed via the **trade reduction reason**.

If the Imbalance Trade Confirmation does not match a Request for Imbalance Trade previously received by the transportation service provider, the Imbalance Trade Notification will notify the confirming trader via the trade reduction reason that no match exists.

# SAMPLE PAPER TRANSACTION

**The following example illustrates a paper transaction for the Imbalance Trade Notification:**

## Imbalance Trade Notification

Transportation Service Provider: General Pipeline (333222555)
Contact Name: Robert E. Lee
Contact Phone: 999-555-1865

Statement Date/Time: July 18, 2001 / 11:45 a.m.

| Initiating Trader Data | Confirming Trader Data |
|---|---|
| Delta Dist. (444333222) | Omega Corp. (222333444) |
| Contact Name: Delta Burque | Contact Name: Orville Omega |
| Contact Phone: 999-555-3322 | Contact Phone: 999-555-4325 |
| Contract Holder: Delta Dist. (444333222) | Contract Holder: Beta, Inc. (666555444) |

Imbalance Period: June 2001

---

Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader: OA1

---

Imbalance Trade Tracking ID: T1

Trade Quantity Requested: 300

Trade Quantity: 300

Imbalance Trade Direction: FROM Initiating Trader

# DATA DICTIONARY

## x.4.z Imbalance Trade Notification

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Confirming Trader Contact Name (Conf Trdr Contact) | The name of the confirming trader primary contact. | CTDG | M | M | |
| Confirming Trader Contact Phone Number (Conf Trdr Phone) | The phone number of the confirming trader primary contact. | CTDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the confirming trader imbalance. | CTDG | | | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader * (K Holder-Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder – Confirming Trader Name (K Holder-Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | nu | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader Data | The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider for the initiating trader imbalance. | ITDG | | | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader * (K Holder-Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | M | |
| Contract Holder – Initiating Trader Name (K Holder-Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | nu | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imbalance Period – Confirming Trader (Imb Per-Conf Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the confirming trader. | CTDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Period – Initiating Trader (Imb Per-Init Trdr) | The period during which the imbalance occurred or the cumulative imbalance is reported for the initiating trader. | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Contact Name (Init Trdr Contact) | The name of the initiating trader primary contact. | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Contact Phone Number (Init Trdr Phone) | The phone number of the initiating trader primary contact. | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Data | The party requesting the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Initiating Trader, or their agent. | ITDG | | | |
| Initiating Trader * (Init Trdr) | | ITDG | M | M | |
| Initiating Trader Name (Init Trdr Name) | | ITDG | M | nu | |
| Confirming Trader Data | The party confirming the imbalance trade. This is either the Contract Holder – Confirming Trader, or their agent. | CTDG | | | |
| Confirming Trader * (Conf Trdr) | | CTDG | M | M | |
| Confirming Trader Name (Conf Trdr Name) | | CTDG | M | nu | |
| Statement Date/Time (Stmt D/T) | Date and time the statement was produced. | BEDG | M | M | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transportation Service Provider Data | Identifies the party providing the requested service. | BEDG | | | |
| Transportation Service Provider * (TSP) | | BEDG | M | M | |
| Transportation Service Provider Name (TSP Name) | | BEDG | M | nu | |
| Transportation Service Provider Contact Name (TSP Contact) | The name of the transportation service provider primary contact. | BEDG | M | M | |
| Transportation Service Provider Contact Phone Number (TSP Phone) | The phone number of the transportation service provider primary contact. | BEDG | M | M | |
| Operational Impact Area – Confirming Trader (OIA-Conf Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the confirming trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader (OIA-Init Trdr) | The Operational Impact Area where the initiating trader's imbalance occurred. | OIADG | M | M | |
| Contract – Confirming Trader (K-Conf Trdr) | The confirming trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Contract – Initiating Trader (K-Init Trdr) | The initiating trader's contract under which the imbalance is being traded. | OIADG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Trade Tracking ID (Imb Trd Trk ID) | Used to identify a line item in the imbalance trading process. This field contains alpha-numeric data. | TSDG | SO | C | For EDI and FF, mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Imbalance Type – Confirming Trader (Imb Type-Conf Trdr) | Identifies the specific Imbalance Type being traded by the confirming trader. | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imbalance Type – Initiating Trader (Imb Type-Init Trdr) | Identifies the specific Imbalance Type being traded by the initiating trader. | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Trade Fuel Quantity – Confirming Trader (Trd Fuel Qty-Conf Trdr) | The confirming trader's quantity of fuel in standard units associated with the imbalance trade. | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Trade Fuel Quantity – Initiating Trader (Trd Fuel Qty-Init Trdr) | The initiating trader's quantity of fuel in standard units associated with the imbalance trade. | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the Request for Imbalance Trade. |
| Trade Quantity (Trd Qty) | The amount expressed (as a positive whole number) is the quantity in standard units being traded. | TSDG | M | M | |
| Trade Quantity Requested (Trd Qty Req) | The amount expressed (as a positive whole number) is the quantity in standard units being requested for trade. | TSDG | M | M | |
| Imbalance Trade Direction Data | Indicates whether the quantity is being traded to the initiating trader from the confirming trader or is being traded from the initiating trader to the confirming trader. | TSDG | | | |
| Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator (Imb Trd Dir) | | TSDG | C | M | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator or Imbalance Trade Direction Description is required. |
| Imbalance Trade Direction Description (Imb Trd Dir Desc) | | TSDG | C | nu | For EBB, at least one of Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator or Imbalance Trade Direction Description is required. |
| Trade Reduction Reason Data | A code identifying the reason that the Trade Quantity Requested has been rejected or reduced. | TSDG | | | |

| Business Name (Abbreviation) | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI / FF Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Trade Reduction Reason (Trd RR) | | TSDG | C | C | Mandatory when the Trade Quantity is not equal to the Trade Quantity Requested. For EBB, when this condition is met, at least one of Trade Reduction Reason or Trade Reduction Reason Description is required. |
| Trade Reduction Reason Description (Trd RR Desc) | | TSDG | C | nu | Mandatory when the Trade Quantity is not equal to the Trade Quantity Requested. For EBB, when this condition is met, at least one of Trade Reduction Reason or Trade Reduction Reason Description is required. |

* Indicates Common Code

**DATA GROUPS:**

| | |
|---|---|
| BEDG | Business Entity Data Group |
| CTDG | Confirming Trader Data Group |
| ITDG | Initiating Trader Data Group |
| OIADG | Operational Impact Area Data Group |
| TSDG | Transaction Specific Data Group |

# CODE VALUES DICTIONARY

## Imbalance Trade Direction Indicator

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| TO Init Trdr | The quantity is being traded to the initiating trader from the confirming trader. | |
| FROM Init Trdr | The quantity is being traded from the initiating trader to the confirming trader. | |

## Trade Reduction Reason

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| Trade Quantity Requested reduced to quantity available for confirming trader. | [no definition necessary] | |
| Trade Quantity Requested reduced to quantity available for initiating trader. | [no definition necessary] | |
| Trade rejected because Trade Quantity Requested exceeds quantity available for trade for confirming trader. | [no definition necessary] | |
| Trade rejected because Trade Quantity Requested exceeds quantity available for trade for initiating trader. | [no definition necessary] | |

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| Trade rejected because confirming trader rejected the trade. | [no definition necessary] | |
| Trade rejected because confirming trader did not submit an Imbalance Trade Confirmation. | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Confirming Trader Contact Name | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Confirming Trader Contact Phone Number | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Confirming Trader Contact Phone Number | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Contract Holder - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Contract Holder - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Contract Holder - Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Contract Holder - Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Imbalance Period - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Imbalance Period - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Imbalance Period - Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Imbalance Period - Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| Missing Transportation Service Provider | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Transportation Service Provider | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Operational Impact Area - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Operational Impact Area - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Operational Impact Area – Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Contract - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Contract - Confirming Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Contract - Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Contract - Initiating Trader | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Imbalance Trade Response Code | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Imbalance Trade Response Code | [no definition necessary] | |
| Missing Imbalance Trade Tracking ID | [no definition necessary] | |
| Invalid Imbalance Trade Tracking ID | [no definition necessary] | |

**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

**FERC Order No. 637 GISB Action Items**
**Assigned to Business Practices Subcommittee**
**Status Report**

| Item # | Priority | Action Item | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. | 1 | Change data sets to accommodate rates in excess of TSP's max rate. (Affects GISB Standard Nos. 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.7, 5.4.8, 5.4.9). | See recommendation form.<br>See also BPS Minutes for 6/26 and 7/13. |
| 17. | 2 | Accommodate increased frequency of posting for operationally available capacity. (*To be addressed together with item XV*). | No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation.<br>See also BPS Minutes for 7/13. |
| 15. | 2 | Review the EC adopted standards resulting from request no. R99033 to identify inconsistencies with FERC Order No. 637. | No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation.<br>See also BPS Minutes for 7/13. |
| 8. | 3 | Review award data set codes and structure for firm and interruptible transportation (FT and IT) reporting (Affects GISB Standard No. 5.4.3). | See recommendation form.<br>See also BPS Minutes for 7/07, 7/25-26, 8/1-2, and 8/8-9. |
| 9. | 4 | Accommodate visual display web pages for FT and IT reporting. | See recommendation form.<br>See also BPS Minutes for 7/07 and 8/1-2. |
| 13. | 5 | Review the method for collecting information on the releasing shipper's relationship to the acquiring shipper. | See recommendation form.<br>See also BPS Minutes for 6/30 a.m. and 8/8-9. |
| 1. | 6 | Review timelines for modifications including accommodation of intraday or partial day capacity releases (Affects GISB Standard No. 5.3.2 and related interpretations). | See recommendation form.<br>See also BPS Minutes for 6/30 p.m., 8/8-9, and 8/15. |
| 2. | 6 | Review elimination of the restrictions on partial day recalls (Affects GISB Standard Nos. 5.3.6, 5.3.7). | No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation.<br>See also BPS Minutes for 6/30 p.m. and 8/8-9. |
| 19. | 7 | Accommodate reporting of the reasons for and the severity of outages. To accommodate the reporting, there are two issues: (1) where the OFO reporting is placed on the web site and (2) whether the report is standardized for reasons of outage and severity or whether the report is textual (i.e. through the existing informational postings). | No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation.<br>See also BPS Minutes for 8/15. |

| Item # | Priority | Action Item | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7. | 8 | Accommodate 3rd party balancing services interaction with TSPs. | No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation. See also BPS Minutes for 8/15. |
| 10. | 9 | Review and establish a timeline for posting. | No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation. See also BPS Minutes for 8/15. |
| 18. | See note[1] | Correctly reflect the FERC order reference and section number (GISB Standard No. 4.3.16) and data element ordering (GISB Standard No. 4.3.35). | See recommendation form. See also BPS Minutes for 7/7. |

[1] Begin once the FERC issues the revised report format.

**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

**FERC Order No. 637 GISB Action Items**
**Assigned to Business Practices Subcommittee**
**Status Report**

**Supporting Documentation**

| Item # | Priority | Action Item | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| **17.** | **2** | **Accommodate increased frequency of posting for operationally available capacity. (*To be addressed together with item XV*).** | **No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation. See also BPS Minutes for 7/13.** |

**Business Practices Subcommittee, July 13, 2000:**
**Discussion (Accommodate increased frequency of posting for operationally available capacity.):**
It was discussed that the S89 standard adopted by the Executive Committee in GISB Request R99033 is not in conflict with the order, but is a GISB minimum. The standards adopted by GISB apply to the entire industry, including non-regulated entities. The content of the order only applies to regulated entities. Implementation of the FERC regulations is an individual implementation issue.

**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

| Item # | Priority | Action Item | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| **15.** | **2** | **Review the EC adopted standards resulting from request no. R99033 to identify inconsistencies with FERC Order No. 637.** | **No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation. See also BPS Minutes for 7/13.** |

**Business Practices Subcommittee, July 13, 2000:**
**Discussion (Review the EC adopted standards resulting from Request No. R99033 to identify inconsistencies with FERC Order No. 637.):**
It was discussed that the Design Capacity referred to by FERC in Order 637 is compatible with the Operating Capacity defined in S86 that was approved by the Executive Committee for GISB Request R99033. While the words in the standard S86 are different than the order, the two terms are interchangeable and no changes are needed to the adopted GISB standard.

**Motion:**
The term Operating Capacity as utilized in the standards approved by the Executive Committee in GISB Request R99033 represents the data necessary to comply with FERC's Design Capacity requirement, as specified in Order 637, for the posting of capacity information by the Transportation Service Provider.
(Motion by Joe Bianchi, seconded by Bill Hebenstreit.)

| **Segments** | **Vote For** | **Balanced For** | **Vote Against** | **Balanced Against** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| **Motion passes** | | | | |

**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

| Item # | Priority | Action Item | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2.** | **6** | **Review elimination of the restrictions on partial day recalls (Affects GISB Standard Nos. 5.3.6, 5.3.7).** | **No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation. See also BPS Minutes for 6/30p.m. and 8/8-9.** |

**Business Practices Subcommittee, June 30, 2000 p.m. conference call:**
Capacity release standards and related interpretations were identified followed by a review of each on a one by one basis. The standards identified were:

5.3.2
5.3.6
5.3.7

The related interpretations identified were:

7.3.2
7.3.15
7.3.3
7.3.44
7.3.45

In addition, the proposed response to C99003 was identified for review. This proposed response is pending adoption by the Executive Committee.

Standard 5.3.2 was reviewed.

**Issues Identified:**

Are the last two bullets of the short term section of 5.3.2 still appropriate in light of the intraday release language of FERC?

Is a new section of 5.3.2 needed to deal with intraday pre-arranged releases?

Is there any requirement that an intraday release be only for the balance of the first day?

Is there a need to be clear that the duration of the release is what determines the bidding requirement and not the intraday nature of the first day of the release?

Is there a need for an "end " to the current longer term releases section of 5.3.2 at a period less than a year (i.e., greater than or equal to five months and less than a year), then a third category added for those releases whose duration is equal to or greater than a year?

**Discussion:**
This issue was identified because the thought was that there was no longer a waiver of bidding for deals less than a year, as there was no longer a maximum rate for deals less than a year. This may be an issue because for deals that are greater than 31 days in duration and less than a year in duration there is no longer a non-biddable status. All these deals have to be posted for open bidding. There is no longer the greater than five months non-biddable prearranged deals at max rate exemption from bidding.

**Additional Issues:**

Is there a need to rearrange the structure of 5.3.2 to take account of intra day, 31 days or less, greater than 31 days to five months, then five months to a year and over a year?

**Discussion:**

There needs to be careful review of any possible new language to ensure that there are not any loopholes in any possible new language.

Interpretation 7.3.2 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.2

Interpretation 7.3.15 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.15

Interpretation 7.3.3 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.3

Interpretation 7.3.44 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.44

Standard 5.3.6 was reviewed
The issue identified was whether an intra day release can be recalled.

Standard 5.3.7 was reviewed.
The issue identified was whether an intra day release can be recalled.

Interpretation 7.3.45 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.45.

The proposed response in C99003 was reviewed. It consists of a proposed interpretation and a proposed revision to GISB Std. 5.3.24

- Text below of the proposed interpretation

> A Service Requester may have its offer posted for review either immediately or at another specified time and if not specified then, at the Transportation Service Provider's option, the offer can be posted for review either immediately or at the next occurrence of 1:00 p.m. on a business day. GISB has no requirement that bidding upon such posting be available prior to the next occurrence of 1:00 p.m. on a business day. Neither is there any prohibition on bidding occurring upon a posting provided that bidding upon such posting continue to be available through at least the next occurrence of 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. on a business day or the longer period where such offer is a long term offer.

It was agreed that there were no issues identified within the proposed for interpretation C99003.

- Proposed revised Standard 5.3.24 was reviewed. Text of the proposed revised standard follows:

> 5.3.24 Capacity release facilitator should post offers and bids, including prearranged deals, upon receipt. A releasing shipper may request a later posting time for posting of such offer, and the capacity release service facilitator should support such request insofar as it comports

with the standard Capacity Release timeline specified in GISB Standard No. 5.3.2.

It was agreed that there were no issues identified within proposed revised Standard 5.3.24.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 8-9, 2000:**
GISB Standard 5.3.6 and 5.3.7

- *The issue identified was whether an intraday release can be recalled.*

The sense of the room was upon the review of GISB Standards 5.3.6 and 5.3.7 no changes are required. Specifically, there is no need to eliminate the prohibition on partial day recalls. There was no objection.

| Item # | Priority | Action Item | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| **19.** | **7** | **Accommodate reporting of the reasons for and the severity of outages. To accommodate the reporting, there are two issues: (1) where the OFO reporting is placed on the web site and (2) whether the report is standardized for reasons of outage and severity or whether the report is textual (i.e. through the existing informational postings).** | **No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation. See also BPS Minutes for 8/15.** |

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 15, 2000:**
Mr. Love made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Aschbrenner:
**Motion:**
No action is required on OFOs relative to Order 637 as existing GISB standards effectively accommodate the provision of timely information, through critical notice postings and email, that will enable shippers to minimize the adverse impacts of an OFO.

**Discussion:**
Mr. Love discussed that existing GISB Standard Nos. 4.3.28, 4.3.29, 5.3.34 - 5.3.40 sufficiently address the handling of OFOs.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

**Motion passes unanimously**

| Item # | Priority | Action Item | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| **7.** | **8** | **Accommodate 3rd party balancing services interaction with TSPs.** | **No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation.**<br>**See also BPS Minutes for 8/15.** |

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 15, 2000:**
Mr. Whatley made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Payne:
**Motion:**
No further action is required to accommodate third party balancing services interaction with TSPs as existing and proposed GISB standards adequately address the inclusion of agents in related data sets.

**Discussion:**
The current work completed by the Expedited Data Development Subcommittee with regard to the imbalance trading and netting data sets has already addressed third party balancing services. Additionally, nominations and flowing gas data sets already have provisions for agency.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

**Motion passes unanimously**

| Item # | Priority | Action Item | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| **10.** | **9** | **Review and establish a timeline for posting.** | **No action suggested. See attached supporting documentation.**<br>**See also BPS Minutes for 8/15.** |

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 15, 2000:**
Mr. Whatley made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Love:
**motion:**
No further action is required to establish a timeline for the posting of transactional data, since FERC Order 637-A clarified "contemporaneously" (from FERC Order 637) to mean "no later than the first nomination under a transaction."

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

**Motion passes unanimously**

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 3 (Priority 1)

### 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
_X_Modification
___Interpretation
___Withdrawal

___Principle (x.1.z)
___Definition (x.2.z)
_X_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:** Modify GISB Standard No. 5.3.22.

**STANDARDS LANGUAGE:**

**Proposed revision to GISB Standard No. 4.3.16:**

~~For less than maximum rate transactions only, c~~*C*onverting *a* daily rate to *a* monthly rate is accomplished by multiplying the daily rate times *the* number of days in *the* rate period, dividing the result by *the* number of months in *the* rate period, ~~and~~ taking the remainder out to 5 decimal~~s~~ places, and rounding up or down to the transporter's specified decimal place.

Converting a monthly rate to a daily rate is accomplished by multiplying the monthly rate by *the* number of months in *the* rate period~~;~~, dividing the result by *the* number of days in *the* rate period, ~~and~~ taking the remainder out to 5 decimal~~s~~ places, and rounding up or down to the transporter's specified decimal place.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 3 (Priority 1)

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

NOTE: Data dictionaries recommendations were sent to IR. See the supporting documentation below. IR discussed the suggested changes to the data dictionaries and made additional modifications at their August 22-23, 2000 meeting. These modifications will be presented to the EC with the "fully staffed" recommendation.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS:

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to develop appropriate Validation Codes and descriptions for the Capacity Release Quick Response data sets to address the removal of the maximum rate cap criteria for certain releases.

Instruct Information Requirements to accommodate the business practice of allowing the releaser to specify a minimum rate even when that minimum rate is above the maximum tariff rate, as allowed pursuant to Order 637. IR should note in the Executive Summary of the Capacity Release Related Standards book that this business practice may expire at the end of the time period specified by FERC (September 30, 2002). The releaser may choose to specify such minimum rate as disclosed or undisclosed.

## 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

**a. Description of Request:**

Change data sets to accommodate rates in excess of TSP's max rate. (Affects GISB Standard Nos. 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.7, 5.4.8, 5.4.9).

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Business Practices Subcommittee, June 26, 2000**
Each of the Capacity Release standards, interpretations, and data elements were reviewed one by one. The following results were recorded. Mr. Young motioned and Mr. Keisler seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Modify the standards as follows:**
**5.3.22** ~~For less than maximum rate transactions only, c~~*C*onverting *a* daily rate to *a* monthly rate is accomplished by multiplying the daily rate times *the* number of days in *the* rate period, dividing the result by *the* number of months in *the* rate period, ~~and~~ taking the remainder out to 5 decimal~~s~~ places, and rounding up or down to the transporter's specified decimal place.

Converting a monthly rate to a daily rate is accomplished by multiplying the monthly rate by *the* number of months in *the* rate period~~;~~, dividing the result by *the* number of days in *the* rate period, ~~and~~ taking the remainder out to 5 decimal~~s~~ places, and rounding up or down to the transporter's specified decimal place.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 3 (Priority 1)

**Modify the data dictionaries as follows:**

In Capacity Release data set 5.4.1 Offer Download, modify the data element Maximum Rate as follows:

**Offer Download, 5.4.1**

| Business Name | Definition | Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum *Tariff* Rate | The maximum tariff rate ~~allowed~~ for the Rate Identification Code specified. | SO | |

In data sets 5.4.3 Award Download, 5.4.7 Offer Upload, 5.4.9 Offer Upload Notification, modify the data element Maximum Rate as follows:

**Award Download, 5.4.3**

| Business Name | Definition | Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum *Tariff* Rate | The maximum tariff rate ~~allowed~~ for the Rate Identification Code or Surcharge Identification Code specified. | M | |

**Offer Upload 5.4.7**

| Business Name | Definition | Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum *Tariff* Rate | The maximum tariff rate ~~allowed~~ for the Rate Identification Code or Surcharge Identification Code specified. | BC | |

**Offer Upload Notification 5.4.9**

| Business Name | Definition | Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum *Tariff* Rate | The maximum tariff rate ~~allowed~~ for the Rate Identification Code or Surcharge Identification Code specified. | C | Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload or when this document is sent by the transportation service provider. |

In the data set 5.4.3 Award Download, modify the data element Award Percentage of Maximum Rate as follows:

**Award Download, 5.4.3**

| Business Name | Definition | Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Award Percentage of Maximum *Tariff* Rate | The percentage of maximum tariff rate per unit of the Rate Identification Code or Surcharge Identification Code specified. | C | Mandatory when the Bidder Designation of Bidding Basis is 'percentage of maximum tariff rate'. |

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 3 (Priority 1)

In the data sets 5.4.1 Offer Download and 5.4.7 Offer Upload, modify the code value descriptions for the data element Lesser Rate Indicator as follows:

**Document Name and No.:** Offer Download 5.4.1, Offer Upload 5.4.7

**Data Element:** Lesser Rate Indicator

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|---|---|---|
| Releasing shipper will accept bids for less than the maximum *tariff* rate. | | Y |
| Releasing shipper will not accept bids for less than the maximum *tariff* rate. | | N |

In the data sets 5.4.1 Offer Download and 5.4.7 Offer Upload, modify the data element Minimum Acceptable Percentage of Maximum Rate as follows:

**Offer Download 5.4.1, Offer Upload 5.4.7**

| Business Name | Definition | Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Minimum Acceptable Percentage of Maximum *Tariff* Rate | The minimum acceptable percentage of *the* maximum*tariff* rate per unit of the rate form specified that the releasing shipper will entertain. | C | Mandatory when the Lesser Rate Indicator is 'y', and the Releaser Designation of Acceptable Bidding Basis is 'absolute dollars and cents per unit basis' or 'either'. |

In the data sets 5.4.2 Bid Download, 5.4.7 Offer Upload, and 5.4.9 Offer Upload Notification, modify the data element Percentage of Maximum Rate Bid as follows:

**Bid Download, 5.4.2, Offer Upload 5.4.7, Offer Upload Notification 5.4.9**

| Business Name | Definition | Usage | Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| Percentage of Maximum *Tariff* Rate Bid | The percentage of *the* maximum *tariff* rate bid per the Rate Identification Code or Surcharge Identification Code specified. | C | Mandatory when the Bidder Designation of Bidding Basis is 'percentage of maximum tariff rate'. |

**Instructions to IR:**

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to develop appropriate Validation Codes and descriptions for the Capacity Release Quick Response data sets to address the removal of the maximum rate cap criteria for certain releases.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 3 (Priority 1)

(Note: balanced vote taken from conference call voting record in minutes)

**Business Practices Subcommittee, July 13, 2000**
**Discussion:**
This agenda item was originally discussed via conference call on June 26, 2000 (see the meeting minutes for details). It was added to this meeting agenda because it was felt by some that the usage of the Minimum Rate Indicator or the code values of the Lesser Rate Indicator in the Offer Upload and Offer Download should be evaluated based on the elimination of the maximum rate in Order 637.

Denise Breeden from El Paso Energy explained how the data is currently used in the Offer Upload and Download. The Lesser Rate Indicator has three code values:

Y – releaser will accept bids for less than max tariff rate (disclosed)
U – releaser will accept bids for less than max tariff rate (undisclosed)
No – releaser will not accept bids for less than maximum tariff rate

The Minimum Acceptable Rate and Minimum Acceptable Percentage of Maximum Rate is then mandatory in the Offer Upload when the Lesser Rate Indicator is Y or U.

There needs to be a way to specify the minimum rate the releaser will accept when the minimum is above maximum tariff rate.

There was discussion that there may not still be a need for the data element Lesser Rate Indicator. This could be accomplished by placing the minimum rate in the minimum rate field and having an indicator that tells whether the rate is disclosed or undisclosed.

There was discussion as to whether the minimum rate should be required to be disclosed when it is above maximum tariff rate.

Should we have language in the instructions to IR to limit the time period for the implementation to what was specified in the Order? We could asterisk the business standard to say that the business practice should be reviewed at the end of the FERC specified time period.

**Motion:**
Instruct Information Requirements to accommodate the business practice of allowing the releaser to specify a minimum rate even when that minimum rate is above the maximum tariff rate, as allowed pursuant to Order 637. IR should note in the Executive Summary of the Capacity Release Related Standards book that this business practice may expire at the end of the time period specified by FERC (September 30, 2002). The releaser may choose to specify such minimum rate as disclosed or undisclosed.
Motion by Theresa Hess, seconded Joe Kardas

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

**Motion passes**

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 3 (Priority 1)

**c. Business Purpose:**

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

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

### 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
_X_Modification
___Interpretation
___Withdrawal

___Principle (x.1.z)
___Definition (x.2.z)
_X_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:** Add new GISB Standard No. X.3.1.

### STANDARDS LANGUAGE:

**Proposed GISB Standard No. X.3.1:**
With respect to reporting of firm service, Transportation Service Providers should communicate the Rate Charged, Maximum Tariff Rate, quantity(ies), and location information to identify the pertinent terms & conditions of the contract. In addition, these characterizations should be specified as to reservation and usage (or a blended rate, if applicable), and surcharge(s) (where such surcharge(s) are not otherwise included within specified reservation, usage or blended rate(s)). To the extent there are different such rates associated with different quantities or time periods, the quantities and time periods to which the distinct rates apply should also be identified. Where a rate is applicable only with respect to the entire contract for a quantity and time period it should be reported as a contract level rate.

### INSTRUCTIONS TO INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS:

1) BPS instructs IR to provide clarity in the implementation guide that the data element, Service Requester Contract, identifies the contract issued by the Transportation Service Provider to the contract holder.

2) BPS instructs IR to provide clarity in the implementation guide that when an effective rate can not be described/reported at reporting time using the data elements contained in the data set, it should be communicated in an associated Special Terms & Miscellaneous Notes.

3) BPS instructs IR to accommodate Contract Begin Date and Time as the date and time service can first be requested under the contract; and to accommodate Contract End Date and Time as the last date and time that service can be provided without regard to any evergreen or rollover provision(s). IR should also provide clarity that the specifics with respect to evergreen or rollover, if any, would be contained in the Index of Customers.

4) BPS instructs IR to accommodate communication of the existence or lack of an affiliate relationship between the contract holder and the transportation service provider.

5) BPS instructs IR to provide clarity in the implementation guide that for each separate Rate Charged for a contract or for a time period within a contract, the rate should be reported at a level that reflects the contractual agreement. The reporting level for a rate may be at one or more levels, such as:
   contract,
   storage capacity(ies),
   receipt(s),
   delivery(ies),
   receipt(s) to delivery(ies),
   injection(s),
   withdrawal(s).

6) BPS instructs IR to accommodate the Rate Charged and Maximum Tariff Rate in a manner consistent with the accommodation of rates and surcharges in the Capacity Release data sets.

7) Instruct IR to accommodate the receipt and/or delivery points, zones and/or segments in a manner consistent with the accommodation of receipt and/or delivery points, zones and/or segments in the Capacity Release data sets.

8) BPS instructs IR to utilize Contract Holder Data as developed by EDD.

9) BPS instructs IR to utilize the definition of Award Rate as a basis for developing the definition for the Rate Charged if there is not a current GISB data element that would apply.

10) BPS instructs IR to accommodate the reporting of Contract Quantity to reflect:
   - the maximum daily contract quantity for a firm transportation service contract and
   - the maximum storage quantity for a firm storage service contract.

11) BPS instructs IR to accommodate the indication of whether the contract is a negotiated rate contract.

12) [Intentionally omitted]

13) BPS instructs IR to provide clarity in the implementation guide that the date element, Releaser Contract Number, identifies the contract issued by the Transportation Service Provider to the releasing shipper.

14) BPS instructs IR to accommodate communication of the existence or lack of an affiliate relationship between the contract holder and the releasing shipper for capacity release reporting only.

15) BPS instructs IR to accommodate the indication that the pipeline is the seller of transportation capacity for reporting of firm service.

16) BPS instructs IR to accommodate the reporting of interruptible quantity for the reporting of interruptible services as the quantity that the Service Requester is entitled to nominate.

17) BPS instructs IR to utilize the "Combined Table for Firm and Interruptible Services and Capacity Release" as a basis for the development of the reporting of firm service, interruptible service, and capacity release.

## 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

**a. Description of Request:**

Review award data set codes and structure for firm and interruptible transportation (FT and IT) reporting. (Affects GISB Standard No. 5.4.3.)

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Business Practices Subcommittee, July 7, 2000**
Review of Order No. 637 Action Item BPS Priority 3 and 4 for discussion and possible vote:

3 - Review award data set codes and structure for firm and interruptible transportation (FT and IT) reporting. (Affects GISB Standard No. 5.4.3.)

4 - Accommodate visual display web pages for FT and IT reporting.

Mr. Lander gave a quick review of the applicable portion of the FERC Order 637. Greg provided a redlined draft data dictionary (GISB STD 5.4.3) as a work paper to begin the discussion. He explained that using the same mappings limited the number of changes to the awards data set and provided the same information that is currently provided on Capacity Release.
Discussion on the best route to achieve the desired results followed. One point agreed to by the participants is that there are three types of contracts to report, FT, FT Released and IT.

Question: Should there even be a new data set created? Can the reporting of FT and IT transactions be handled with the Informational Posting on Pipeline Web Sites?
Discussion: The Order states, " To assure parity of the transactional information…in the same format". One opinion expressed was that this instructs the group to develop a data set.

**NOTE**: In the discussions that follow Data Set = Award Download Data Set.

Question: What should transactional reporting be?
Discussion continued on what Order 637 is directing the pipelines to do. Various opinions surfaced on what the phrase "same format" means and what data must be provided. A proposal was made to start from scratch due to the differences in contracting practices of the pipelines handling rate design, discounting and segmentation practices.

One of the requirements of Order 637 is to report the contract number. Various proposals for dealing with this were discussed. One proposal was to change the Award Number data element to Contract Number in the Award

Download dataset. Questions surfaced on what business practices would be affected by this change and what other data sets used this data element.

A second proposal was made to add Contract Number as a new mandatory data element to Std 5.4.3. Various solutions and problems were reviewed.

Mr. Lander made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Phillips:

**Motion:**

Add 'Award Contract Number', definition (below) and usage (below) to the Award Download GISB Std 5.4.3

- Definition: "A unique identifier within each transportation service provider identifying the contract that will be used in the nomination, flowing gas, and invoicing processes for the awarded capacity.
- Usage: Mandatory.

**Discussion**:

Some questioned if there was a need for adding a new data element when there is a current GISB data element, *Service Requester Contract Number*. Concerns were expressed on the different information and use of *contract number* and *service requestor contract number* in the various GISB data sets.

A concern was raised that a business practice should not be included in the definition. This resulted in modifications to the motion and definition.

**Modified motion**:

Add the data element Award Contract Number, existing definition (below) and usage (below) to the Award Download GISB Std 5.4.3.

- Definition: A unique identifier within each transportation service provider identifying the contract for the awarded capacity.
- Usage: Mandatory

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 20 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

**The motion passed unanimously on a balanced vote.**

Greg Lander made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Phillips:

**Motion**:

Add the existing data element Releaser Contract Number to the Award Download GISB Std 5.4.3 with the existing definition (see below) and usage (below).

- Definition: The identifier used by the transportation service provider for the contract from which the releaser's capacity was released.
- Usage: Mandatory

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

**Discussion:**
It was observed that the Releaser Contract Number data element already existed with its own definition. The definition was reviewed and determined to be appropriate for this data set as well. Greg and Joyce accepted the amendment to the motion.

**Modified Motion:**

Add the existing data element Releaser Contract Number to the Award Download GISB Std 5.4.3 with the existing definition (see below) and usage (below).

- Definition: A unique identifier assigned by each transportation service provider identifying the contract (applicable to the offer) between the transportation service provider and the releasing shipper.
- Usage: Mandatory

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 20 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

**The Modified Motion passed unanimously on a balanced vote.**

Mr. Lander made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Phillips:

**Motion:**

Add the data element "Added to Master Contract Indicator" to the Award Download GISB Std 5.4.3 with definition (below) and usage (below)

- Definition: An indicator that identifies whether the identified capacity has been added to a pre-existing master contract identified by the Award Contract Number.
- Usage: Mandatory

**Discussion**:
Concerns were expressed and the question was asked; "Should the usage of this data element be mandatory when all TSPs are not using master contracts?" Discussion included the available GISB usage codes and which, if any would be applicable to this data element. Ideas of how this proposed data element could be used were expressed. Concerns were also raised as to whether the need for this data element was within the scope of this meeting, as this was not information that was specifically identified in §284.13 of the Commission's Order 637. Some believed the scope of the meeting was to only provide the itemized information contained in §284.13 while others felt it was to determine what information is needed to report FT and IT and Capacity Release contract information. There was support for both positions.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 4 | .89 | 5 | 1.11 |
| **Totals** | 9 | 4.89 | 5 | 1.11 |

**The motion passed unanimously on a balanced vote.**

It was next determined that for the reporting of capacity release contracts, no other changes needed to be made to the Award Download data set. At this point, the topic changed to Firm Transportation (FT) reporting. Various ideas were offered on how to proceed, such as whether to determine what would need to be modified in the award data set or start with Order 637 requirements and a blank sheet of paper. The consensus was to start with a clean sheet of paper. The process would be to:

- agree on data elements, definition, and usages,
- determine which data elements had issues and put them on a 'parking lot' list to be discussed later; and,
- agree that the data element grouping(s) can be determined by the Information Requirement Subcommittee.

BPS will not be creating the look and feel, only the data elements

**NOTE:** The following reflects the discussions on specific data elements. Each is shown in the order in which they appear in the table following this discussion section and not necessarily in the order in which they were discussed. The table below reflects the data elements, issues and specific instructions to IR that were discussed at this meeting.

**Service Requester Info:**

**Contract Holder Data:** the party executing contract with TSP. This includes the name and the identifier of the service requester.

**Contract Info:**

**Contract Maximum Daily Quantity:** Review of different types of contract quantities that are in use.

**Roll Over Indicator**: added to the parking lot to be revisited

**Rates Info:**

**Rate Charged under each contract**: - usage, reservation, surcharges

**Negotiated Rate Indicator:** added to the parking lot to be revisited. This information is already provided in the Index of Customers.

**Max Tariff Rate under each contract**; usage, reservation, surcharges

There was discussion on what information should be provided to IR on this data element. A proposal was made to instruct IR to accommodate the same rates and charges, including surcharges and indicators, for FT Reporting that are accommodated for in capacity release. Ms. Corcoran pointed out that we were establishing a business practice to mimic the rates displayed in capacity release. Does this also include discounted rates? Some believed that it should. What is the parallel to Capacity Release, which does not show discounted rates? Does the instruction to IR require the same data elements, definition and usage for FT as used in Capacity Release? Most believed it did not.

**Times Info:**

There was a lengthy discussion on time, primary term of contract, posting time, discounting time, and others. The question came up: Are these associated? Some people thought that for a given contract and time period that there could be many locations and for a given location there could be many quantities, prices and discounts/special terms.

**Location Info:**

The issue was raised if this is for specific points or logical points that can be a grouping of many physical points. Should it be at point level/DRN level?

What is the requirement? Sync up with capacity release data sets or all data sets? There was not a consensus to sync up the data elements.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

**Quantities Info:**
What type of quantity and at what level is the quantity being reported was a question posed to start the discussion. Based on Order 637, is Primary/Secondary (Capacity Type) Associated with locations?

**Special Terms and Conditions:** this pertains to a pipeline contract

| Information | Definition | Usage | Issues |
|---|---|---|---|
| Service Requester Data | | | |
| Contract Holder Name | | | IR should use the EDD definition in the imbalance trading dataset |
| Contract Holder Identifier | | | |
| TSP Data | | | |
| Transportation Service Provider Identifier | | | |
| Transportation Service Provider Name | | | |
| Contracts | | | |
| Contract Number | | | |
| Contract Maximum Quantities | The quantities that are specified at the contract level | | Instruct IR to accommodate annual contract quantities, daily quantities for the contract term at the contract level, and the different types of contract quantities |
| Contract Rollover Indicator | | | To be revisited |
| Rates | | | Instruct IR to accommodate the same rates and charges including surcharges and indicators (as appropriate) for FT Reporting as are accommodated for the Capacity Release data sets. |
| Rates Charged | | | |
| Maximum Tariff Rate | | | |
| Negotiated Rate Indicator | | | To be revisited |
| Times | | | |
| Contract Effective Date Time | | | |
| Contract Effective thru Date Time | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Transaction Effective Date Time | | | A transaction that is for a specified time range where the price, quantity, location(s) and special terms respectively are unchanged. |
| | Transaction Effective thru Date Time | | | A transaction that is for a specified time range where the price, quantity, location(s) and special terms respectively are unchanged |
| | Posting Date Time | | | |
| Locations | | | | Instruct IR to accommodate the same indicators and qualifiers (as appropriate) for the locations as are accommodated in the Capacity Release data sets. |
| | Gas Transaction Point 1 | | | |
| | Gas Transaction Point 2 | | | |
| | Gas Transaction Point 1 Zone | | | |
| | Gas Transaction Point 2 Zone | | | |
| | Capacity Type Indicator | | | Instruct IR to accommodate the indication of whether the location capacity is primary or secondary (see capacity type indicator). Do this in a manner that is permissive of identifying whether it is primary /secondary versus a requirement that secondary be provided |
| Quantities | | | | Instruct IR to accommodate the same quantity related indicators and qualifiers as are accommodated in the Capacity Release data sets. |
| | Storage related Qty's | | | |
| | Transportation Related Qty's | | | |
| Special Terms | | | | |
| | Special Terms and Conditions | | | |
| Affiliates | | | | |
| | Affiliate relationship | | | |

At this point of the development of the list of data elements, the issue was re-raised on the level of detail appropriate for this discussion. The pipeline segment voiced continued concern with the level of drill down occurring in today's meeting, stating that it was not necessary to duplicate the capacity release data sets for firm and interruptible

transportation reporting. The number 1 issue for the pipelines was the visual display that they will be implementing on September 1, 2000. Further, are there any standard abbreviations? IR will be responsible for the development of the abbreviations. Data Elements, grouping and standard abbreviations should only include the 8 or 9 elements listed in Order 637 under revised Section 284.13.

Greg Lander made the motion: Accept the preliminary list of data elements and placeholders, return next meeting to address usages. Move next to navigation summary and abbreviation/grouping issues. After discussion, the motion was withdrawn

It was agreed to stop work on the list of data elements at this point, with the understanding that we would start the next meeting by returning to it.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, July 25-26, 2000**
**Discussion** began with the question of timing for postings.
Mr. Lander reviewed discussion from July 7, 2000 meeting.
Mr. Scheel asked if GISB should undertake the development of standards related to when the information should be posted. There was no consensus on this issue.
There was general agreement that contracts be posted no later than nomination time or contemporaneous with first nomination. Mr. Love raised the issue that it may not be possible to post information on discounts for IT because the information is not available until the transaction is processed. Mr. Lander asked if it helped to clarify the distinction that FT is reported based on contract information and IT is reported based on scheduled quantities? Mr. Bass asserted that when defining customer rights, IT doesn't have rights until scheduled. Ms. Hopkins agreed, stating that IT isn't known until scheduled quantities are available, but that is later than the Order requires.

Ms. Hopkins requested the timeline be parked for now and the group move on to the data sets.

Mr. Young suggested the data set discussion start with the requirements from the Order and provided the following table as a work paper.

FIRM SERVICE

The following information is required pursuant to Orders 637 and 637A.

| Ref No. | Regulation / Requirement per Order* | Dataset Names | Definition(s) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | ***Unless otherwise specified these requirements are from Order 637 @ referenced page.** | | |
| 1 | The full legal name of the shipper, and identification number, of the shipper receiving service under the contract and the full legal name, and identification number, of the releasing shipper if a capacity release is involved or an indication that the pipeline is the seller of transportation capacity. (253) | Contract Holder<br>Contract Holder Name | |
| 2 | The contract number of the shipper receiving service under the contract, and, in addition, for released transactions, the contract number of the releasing shipper's contract. (253) | Service Requester Contract | This is the contract under which service is provided. (Recommendation to IR) |
| 3 | Rate charged under each contract. (253) | | |
| 4 | The maximum rate, and for capacity release transactions not subject to | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | a maximum rate, the maximum rate that would be applicable to a comparable sale of pipeline services. (253) | | |
| 5 | The duration of the contract. (253) | K Begin D/T<br>K Ending D/T<br>Rollover Indicator | |
| 6 | The receipt and delivery points and zones or segments covered by the contract, including the industry common code for each point, zone, or segment. (253). | | |
| 7 | Contract quantity or volumetric quantity under a volumetric release. (253) | | |
| 8 | ~~Special terms and conditions applicable to a capacity release and special details pertaining to a pipeline transportation contract. (253)~~ Revised by 637A - Special terms and conditions applicable to a capacity release transaction, including all aspects in which the contract deviates from the pipeline's tariff, and special details pertaining to a pipeline transportation contract, including whether the contract is a negotiated rate contract, conditions applicable to a discounted transportation contract and all aspect in which the contract deviates from the pipeline's tariff. (275 of 637A) | Special Terms and Misc. Notes | |
| 9 | Whether there is an affiliate relationship between the pipeline and the shipper or between the releasing and replacement shipper. (253) | Affiliate Indicator | |
| 10 | TSP | Transportation Service Provider (DUNS) | |

INTERRUPTIBLE SERVICE

The following information is required pursuant to Orders 637 and 637A.

| **Ref No.** | **Regulation / Requirement per Order*** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ***Unless otherwise specified these requirements are from Order 637 @ referenced page.** | | | |
| 1 | The full legal name, and identification number, of the shipper receiving service (254) | | | |
| 2 | Rate charged (254) | | | |
| 3 | The maximum rate (254) | | | |
| 4 | ~~The receipt and delivery points and zones or segments covered by the contract over which the shipper is entitled to transport gas, including the industry common code for each point, zone, or segment (254).~~ The receipt and delivery points covered between which the shipper is entitled to transport gas at the rate charged, including the industry common code for each point, zone, or segment. (275 of 637A) | | | |
| 5 | The quantity of gas the shipper is entitled to transport (254) | | | |
| 6 | ~~Special details pertaining to the contract (254)~~ Special details pertaining to the agreement, including conditions applicable to discounted transportation contract and all aspects in which the | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | agreement deviates from the pipeline's tariff. (276 of Order 637A) | | | |
| 7 | Whether the shipper is affiliated with the pipeline (253) | | | |

**Data Element/Field discussion:** (note: the data elements identified are in italics)

1) Full legal name & ID of shipper receiving service under contract

*Contract Holder*

*Contract Holder Name*

2) Contract number, lengthy discussion occurred on what the appropriate data element name should be *Contract Number or Service Requester Contract*

Service requestor Contract definition was discussed and the merits of changing it evaluated. Ms. Davis pointed out that before the definition for Service Requester is modified, all data sets should be reviewed for the impact of this change. Ms. Munson and Ms. Hess expressed opposition to changing the definition. The current definition works in the data sets and the change does not justify the effort required to change all places where Service Requester Contract is used. Mr. Lander put forward the suggestion that this be a recommendation to Information Requirements to review the existing definition and usage, determine if the definition should be changed or not.

**Motion made by Mr. Lander and seconded by Ms. Phillips:**

The data element Service Requester Contract with the recommended definition; "This is the contract under which service is provided. Motion withdrawn and replaced with the following instruction to IR (#1).

- BPS instructs IR to provide clarity in the implementation guide that the data element, Service Requestor Contract, identifies the contract issued by the Transportation Service Provider to the contract holder.

2.a.) Contract type negotiated Y/N

3.) Rate for each Contract

You have many combinations of receipt point, delivery point, and quantity relationships to determine rates. (Price for a receipt, price for a delivery, price for a receipt/delivery) There is also a distinction between reservation and usage and prices tied to quantity commitments.

*Effective Rate, Rate Form Type Code, Reservation Rate Basis*

*4)* Max Tariff Rate

*Maximum Tariff Rate, Rate Form Type Code, Reservation Rate Basis, Reservation, Usage, Surcharge*

Rates can be a result of the relationship between 4) Max tariff Rate, 6) Rec Pt/Del Pt (zones or segments) and 7) Contract Quantity/Volumetric Quantity.

Discussion on what needs to be reports and where circled the room. There was not consensus on what is required.

**Motion made by Mr. Lander and seconded by Ms. Phillips to add the following standard (X.3.1**) (as modified during the discussion):

With respect to reporting of firm service, Transportation Service Providers should communicate the Effective Rate, Maximum Tariff Rate, quantity(ies), Location Data, location zone and/or segment (where zone and/or segment are applicable) information to characterize the following, where applicable:

receipt(s) under a contract,
delivery(ies) under a contract,
receipt(s) to delivery(ies) under a contract,
injection(s) under a contract,
withdrawal(s) under a contract, and
storage capacity(ies) under a contract.

In addition, these characterizations should be specified as to reservation, usage, and surcharge(s) (where such surcharge(s) are not otherwise included within specified reservation or usage rate(s)). To the extent there are different such rates associated with different quantities or time periods, the quantities and time periods to which the distinct rates apply should also be identified. Where a rate is applicable only with respect to the entire contract for a quantity and time period it should be reported as a contract level rate.

**Discussion on motion:**
Mr. Young and Ms. Sikora felt that this exceeds the information required by the Order. Mr. Lander replied that this information is necessary in order to provided useful information. Mr. Young stated, the FERC didn't ask for "useful information," in regards to rates, it asked for rate charged. Ms. Sikora asked how this information would be implemented. Mr. Lander gave an explanation of how it could be implemented.

Ms. Munson proposed the following replacement standard to the motion makers:

> For each separate effective rate for a contract or for a time period within a contract, the rate should be reported at a level that reflects its impact. Each rate may be inclusive of one or more charges, or may be broken into its components (surcharges, reservation, usage). The reporting level for a rate may be at one or more of the following levels:
>
> contract,
> storage capacity(ies),
> receipt(s),
> delivery(ies),
> receipt(s) to delivery(ies),
> injection(s),
> withdrawal(s).

The concerns expressed during discussion of the motion and the proposed amendment focused on implementation and the clarity needed in the standards to achieve the desired reporting levels and not to add redundant information. Mr. Lander and Ms. Phillips declined the proposed amendment.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 1.33 | 2 | .67 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 |
| **Totals** | 6 | 3.33 | 14 | 2.67 |

**Motion passes.**

**BPS instruction to IR (#2)** as modified during the discussion:

- When an effective rate can not be ~~fully~~ described/reported at reporting time using the data elements contained in the data set, it should be communicated in an associated Special Terms & Miscellaneous Notes.
- Ms. Munson's amendment should be sent to IR as explanation for TIBP

Mr. Scheel expressed concerns that "fully described" is ambiguous and this instruction does not accommodate formula rates. If the data elements can not express the rate then it should be reported in the Special Terms &

Miscellaneous Notes. Instruction was modified.5) Duration of Contract (contract effective date/time, contact through date/time)
~~*Contract Effective Date & Time*~~
~~*Contract Through Date & Time*~~
~~*Contract Effective Through Date & Time*~~
*Contract Begin Date & Time*
*Contract End Date & Time*
The issue of evergreen contracts and how they should be handled was raised. One suggestion was to use the contract primary term and footnote the rollover. There was opposition to the use of rollover, which has a defined meaning. An objection was also made to the use of end date. Ms. Barnett suggested the treatment used in Index of Firm Customers. Ms. Davis suggested that a rollover indicator be used. Mr. Lander pointed out that there are unlimited conditions/periods for rollover. Ms. Davis clarified that the rollover indicator as she saw it would be yes or no. Mr. Lander asserted that the Order requests duration and therefore the terms were needed. Mr. Love pointed out that the issue of contracts with rollovers should be dealt with, but that is in the Index of Customers and is not sure that rollover belongs in this data set. Mr. Scheel suggested that the definition of Contract End Date & Time include " without regard to any rollover provisions."

- **BPS instructs IR (#3)** to accommodate Contract Begin Date and Time as the date and time service can first be requested under the contract; and to accommodate Contract End Date and Time as the last date and time that service can be provided without regard to any evergreen or rollover provision(s). IR should also provide clarity that the specifics with respect to evergreen or rollover, if any, would be contained in the Index of Customers.

6) Receipt point/Delivery point (zones or segments)

7) Contract quantity/volumetric quantity
*A) Quantity-Contract*
*B) Quantity-Location*C) *Rate Form/Type Code*
*D)*~~*Quantity type*~~ *Reservation Rate Basis*
~~per day~~
Contract quantity: A CD
Contract quantity: B CD

8) Special Terms & Conditions (page 275 of order 637A)
*Special Terms and Miscellaneous Notes*
Use existing definition and field which is free form text.

9) Affiliate relationship Pipeline & Shipper
*Affiliate Indicator represents whether or not there is an affiliation between the contract holder and the transportation service provider.*
A suggestion was made to change the name and definition of Bidder Affiliate Indicator and use that with its current code values used for EBB implementation.

- **BPS instructs IR (#4)** to accommodate communication of the existence or lack of an affiliate relationship between the contract holder and the transportation service provider.

It was noted that this was already implemented for released capacity.

10) Transportation Service Provider, use existing definition.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

Ms. Hess made a **motion,** seconded by Mr. Griffith, to amend the proposed standard (X.3.1) as voted on July 25, 2000 as follows.

**Standard X.3.1**

With respect to reporting of firm service, Transportation Service Providers should communicate the Effective Rate, Maximum Tariff Rate, quantity(ies), Location Data, location zone and/or segment (where zone and/or segment are applicable) information to characterize the following, where applicable:

receipt(s) under a contract,
delivery(ies) under a contract,
receipt(s) to delivery(ies) under a contract,
injection(s) under a contract,
withdrawal(s) under a contract, and
storage capacity(ies) under a contract.

In addition, these characterizations should be specified as to reservation and usage (or a blended rate, if applicable), and surcharge(s) (where such surcharge(s) are not otherwise included within specified reservation, usage or blended rate(s)). To the extent there are different such rates associated with different quantities or time periods, the quantities and time periods to which the distinct rates apply should also be identified. Where a rate is applicable only with respect to the entire contract for a quantity and time period it should be reported as a contract level rate.

**Discussion on the above motion.** Members of the group felt that the proposed standard [X.3.1] from the July 25, 2000 meeting did not allow for the display of blended rates. Blended rates were described as a combination of reservation and usage.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Pipelines | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 18 | 4 | 2 | 2 |

**Motion passes**

Mr. Love made a **motion,** second by Mr. Griffith**,** to further amend the proposed standard (X.3.1).**Standard (X.3.1)**

With respect to reporting of firm service, Transportation Service Providers should communicate the Effective Rate, Maximum Tariff Rate, quantity(ies), Location Data, location zone and/or segment (where zone and/or segment are applicable) information to identify the pertinent terms & conditions of the contract.

~~receipt(s) under a contract,~~
~~delivery(ies) under a contract,~~
~~receipt(s) to delivery(ies) under a contract,~~
~~injection(s) under a contract,~~
~~withdrawal(s) under a contract, and~~
~~storage capacity(ies) under a contract.~~

In addition, these characterizations should be specified as to reservation and usage (or a blended rate, if applicable), and surcharge(s) (where such surcharge(s) are not otherwise included within specified reservation, usage or blended rate(s)). To the extent there are different such rates associated with different quantities or time periods, the quantities and time periods to which the distinct rates apply should also be identified. Where a rate is applicable only with respect to the entire contract for a quantity and time period it should be reported as a contract level rate.

**Discussion of motion:** The participants felt that the extra language needs to be deleted as proposed in this motion, otherwise it added confusion to the standard.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Pipelines | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 20 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| **Motion passes** | | | | |

Mr. Love made a **motion**, second by Ms. Hess, to send the following **instruction (#5) to Information Requirements** along with the four instructions from July 25, 2000 meeting:

- BPS instructs IR to provide clarity in the implementation guide that for each separate effective rate for a contract or for a time period within a contract, the rate should be reported at a level that reflects the contractual agreement. The reporting level for a rate may be at one or more levels, such as:
  - contract,
  - storage capacity(ies),
  - receipt(s),
  - delivery(ies),
  - receipt(s) to delivery(ies),
  - injection(s),
  - withdrawal(s).

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 19 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| **Motion passes** | | | | |

**Review of data elements proposed on July 25, 2000 and discussion of outstanding issues.**

| Firm Posting Requirements from Order 637 | Proposed Data Elements to communicate the posting requirements. | Notes and/or instructions to Information Requirements |
|---|---|---|
| Full legal name & id of shipper receiving service under contract | Contract Holder<br>Contract Holder Name | See IR instruction #8 |
| Contract number | Service Requester Contract | See IR instruction #1. (Contract Type Negotiated y/n, on hold for later discussion) |
| Rate for each contract | ~~Effective~~ Rate Charged~~, Rate/Form Type Code, Reservation Rate Basis, Rate Identification Code, Surcharge~~ | See IR instruction #6. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | ~~Identification Code~~ | |
| Maximum Rate | Maximum Tariff Rate~~, Rate/Form Type Code, Reservation Rate Basis, Rate Identification Code, Surcharge Identification Code~~ | See IR instruction #6 |
| Duration of Contract | Contract Begin Date & Time<br>Contract End Date & Time | See IR instruction #3 |
| Receipt Point/Delivery Point (Zones or Segments) | --- | See IR instruction #7 |
| Contract Quantity/Volumetric Quantity | | |
| Special Terms & Condition | Special Terms & Miscellaneous Notes | See IR instruction #2 |
| Affiliate relationship<br>Pipeline & shipper | Affiliate Indicator | See IR instruction #4 |
| TSP | Transportation Service Provider | |
| Posting Date/Time | Posting Date<br>Posting Time | Refer to BPS minutes from Jan 20, 2000 for request R97110 modifications to definitions |

Ms. Hess made a motion, second by Ms. Barnett, to send the following **instruction (#6) to IR**:

- Instruct IR to accommodate the Effective Rate and Maximum Tariff Rate for reporting of firm service in a manner consistent with the accommodation of rates and surcharges in the Capacity Release data sets.

**Discussion of instruction**: handle firm reporting of rates the same way it is reported in capacity release. (using the same data elements and codes)

| **Segments** | **Vote For** | **Balanced For** | **Vote Against** | **Balanced Against** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 19 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

**Motion passes**

Mr. Whatley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Hess, to send the following instruction to IR **(IR instruction #7)**:

- Instruct IR to accommodate the receipt and/or delivery points, zones and/or segments for reporting of firm service in a manner consistent with the accommodation of receipt and/or delivery points, zones and/or segments in the Capacity Release data sets.

**Discussion on instruction:**
Mr. Bass explained his position that the Capacity Release Data Sets are not currently consistent with the other data sets, such as allocations and invoicing, and there is a request moving through the GISB process on a different track. Ms. Davis expressed her belief that the Tennessee request was not in scope for this meeting. Question called.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 10 | 1.82 | 1 | .18 |
| **Totals** | 15 | 5.82 | 1 | .18 |
| **Motion passes** | | | | |

The group reviewed the draft and red-lined minutes from the following meetings:

June 30, 2000 a.m. conference call
June 30, 2000 p.m. conference call
July 7, 2000 face-to-face meeting
July 13, 2000 face-to-face meeting

The minutes were adopted as modified and will be posted. The red-lined minutes for June 26, 2000 will be posted and review of the minutes will be added to the August 1 & 2, 2000 agenda.

Mr. Keisler made a motion, seconded by Ms. Davis, for BPS **instruction (#8) to IR**:

- BPS instructs IR to utilize Contract Holder Data as developed by EDD.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| **Motion passes** | | | | |

Mr. Keisler made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Bass, to adopt the following:

- BPS **instruction (#9) to IR**:
  - BPS instructs IR to utilize the definition of Award Rate as a basis for developing the definition for the Rate Charged if there is not a current GISB data element that would apply.

- **Modify proposed standard X.3.1** as follows:
  - With respect to reporting of firm service, Transportation Service Providers should communicate the ~~Effective~~ Rate Charged, Maximum Tariff Rate, quantity(ies), Location Data, location zone and/or segment (where zone and/or segment are applicable) information to identify the pertinent terms & conditions of the contract. In addition, these characterizations should be specified as to reservation and usage (or a blended rate, if applicable), and surcharge(s) (where such surcharge(s) are not otherwise included within specified reservation, usage or blended rate(s)). To the extent there are different such rates associated with different quantities or time periods, the quantities and time periods to which the distinct rates apply should also be identified. Where a rate is applicable only with respect to the entire contract for a quantity and time period it should be reported as a contract level rate.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

- **Modify BPS instructions #5** as follows:
  - 5) BPS instructs IR to provide clarity in the implementation guide that for each separate ~~effective~~ Rate Charged for a contract or for a time period within a contract, the rate should be reported at a level that reflects the contractual agreement. The reporting level for a rate may be at one or more levels, such as:
    contract,
    storage capacity(ies),
    receipt(s),
    delivery(ies),
    receipt(s) to delivery(ies),
    injection(s),
    withdrawal(s).

- **Modify BPS instructions #6** as follows:
  - 6) BPS instructs IR to accommodate the ~~Effective~~ Rate Charged and Maximum Tariff Rate for reporting of firm service in a manner consistent with the accommodation of rates and surcharges in the Capacity Release data sets.

**Discussion on motion:**
Different opinions were expressed on the use of Effective Rate. One proposal was to just say rates and use a qualifier to achieve the unit rate charged as currently implemented in GISB Capacity Release data sets. A second proposal was to use unit rate as implemented in the GISB Invoicing data sets. A third proposal was to use contract rate. There was not consensus on any of these points. A fourth proposal was to use rate element instead of Effective Rate to reduce this confusion. This proposal seemed to garner the most support. Mr. Keisler and Mr. Bass agreed to modify their motion to use Rate Charged instead of Effective Rate. Some participants expressed the concern that this modification would create a need to review and possibly modify the standards and instruction passed in the July 25, 2000 meeting and earlier today.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 15 | 5 | 1 | 1 |

**Motion passes**

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 1-2, 2000**
**Discussion on Contract Quantity for Firm Service Reporting:**
Question was asked, "in the Index of Customers, the Capacity Held is used. Will it work here?" There was not consensus that this element was equivalent to contract quantity. There seemed to be consensus that the posting requirement was for contract quantity, not for volume transported.

Maximum Offer Quantity Contract, from the Offer Download, was reviewed for a possible definition by the participants. A suggestion was made to define the quantity as being reported as "the total transportation capacity under the specified contract." A lengthy discussion on the use of the terms 'transportation' or 'service' occurred. The concern was to craft a definition that would apply to firm transportation and firm storage service. Mr. Aschbrenner proposed using Contract Quantity, defined as quantity of service specified under the contract. Discussion focused on terms recognized by FERC, such as in the Index of Customers, for maximum daily quantity and total capacity. Mr. Scheel requested the definition be *the total capacity held under the specified contract.*

The applicable section on the electronic format requirements from Order 637-A on Index of Customers was reviewed.

Mr. Whatley suggested the use of an indicator to specify when the quantity is contract or location. A second suggestion, by Ms. Van Pelt, was to craft an instruction to IR to handle the quantity. Mr. Scheel would like the instruction to also use the Index of Customers to clarify the information needed. Ms. Van Pelt voiced her concern that this is a FERC requirement not a GISB Standard or data set. There was a general reluctance to send a business document to an information group. The conflict was resolved by specifying the data requirements in the instruction to IR.

Ms. Davis made the following motion , second by Mr. Aschbrenner:

**Motion**

**BPS Instruction to IR (#10):**

BPS instructs IR to accommodate the reporting of Contract Quantity to reflect:

- the maximum daily contract quantity for a firm transportation service contract and
- the maximum storage quantity for a firm storage service contract.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 18 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

Mr. Keisler made the following motion, second by Ms. Hess:

**Motion**

**Revise proposed standard X.3.1 as follows:**

- With respect to reporting of firm service, Transportation Service Providers should communicate the Rate Charged, Maximum Tariff Rate, quantity(ies), and location~~Location Data, location zone and/or segment (where zone and/or segment are applicable)~~ information to identify the pertinent terms & conditions of the contract. In addition, these characterizations should be specified as to reservation and usage (or a blended rate, if applicable), and surcharge(s) (where such surcharge(s) are not otherwise included within specified reservation, usage or blended rate(s)). To the extent there are different such rates associated with different quantities or time periods, the quantities and time periods to which the distinct rates apply should also be identified. Where a rate is applicable only with respect to the entire contract for a quantity and time period it should be reported as a contract level rate.

**Discussion on Motion:** Location data should be lower case, it is not a data element

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

From parking lot: Should the indication regarding negotiated rates (from Section 284.13 (b)(1)(vii) of FERC's regulations) be reflected in Special Terms or via a data element? A suggestion was made to add an indicator for negotiated rates.

Ms. Davis made the following motion, second by Ms. Hess:,

**Motion**
**BPS Instruction to IR (#11):**

- BPS instructs IR to accommodate the indication of whether the contract is a negotiated rate contract.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

**Discussion of data element usage in Firm Service Reporting versus Interruptible Service Reporting:**
Mr. Young suggested at this point to move to interruptible service reporting prior to development of usage for firm service reporting. Others asserted that usage was applicable to the data and should be completed before leaving firm service reporting. Consensus was to move to interruptible service reporting and handle usage for capacity release, firm service and interruptible service after the data element development for all three was completed.
A review of the proposed data elements for firm service reporting was completed to determine which elements would be applicable for interruptible service reporting.

Ms. Hess made the following motion, second by Mr. Whatley:
**Motion**
Modify proposed BPS Instruction #6 to IR as follows:
6) BPS instructs IR to accommodate the Rate Charged and Maximum Tariff Rate ~~for reporting of firm service~~ in a manner consistent with the accommodation of rates and surcharges in the Capacity Release data sets.

No discussion on the motion.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

Mr. Whatley made the following motion, second by Ms. Hess:

**Motion:**

Modify proposed BPS Instruction #7 to IR as follows:

7) Instruct IR to accommodate the receipt and/or delivery points, zones and/or segments ~~for reporting of firm service~~ in a manner consistent with the accommodation of receipt and/or delivery points, zones and/or segments in the Capacity Release data sets.

No discussion on the motion.

| **Segments** | **Vote For** | **Balanced For** | **Vote Against** | **Balanced Against** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

**Discussion of Quantity of gas a shipper is entitled to transport:**

Ii was determined that Contract Quantity, as used in IR instruction #10, would not be appropriate for interruptible service reporting. One suggestion was to use Scheduled Quantity. Concerns were raised that this information would not be available at the required posting time of first nomination.

Mr. Young made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Aschbrenner:

**Motion**

**BPS Instruction to IR**

- BPS instructs IR to accommodate the reporting of Interruptible Quantity to reflect the quantity of gas the service requester is entitled to transport.

**Discussion on motion:**

Concerns were voiced over the use of "entitled" and the different meanings for entitled. This issue requires more consideration. The topic could be parked until tomorrow or next week. A second thought was to continue with this discussion and if problems are brought forward later, address the problem then. Mr. Aschbrenner suggested having shippers bring forward work papers on what they would like to see reported. Mr. Scheel stated that you could report MDQ when the contract has one and N/A when the interruptible contract does not have a MDQ. Ms. LeCureaux suggested the data element should be a vehicle used to report quantity and the individual service providers could determine what would be reported.

Mr. Young and Mr. Aschbrenner agreed to **withdraw the motion** so that parties could research the possible implementations.

**Discussion on special details pertaining to the agreement:**
Does BPS instruction #2 still apply? Instruction #2 in the context of rate still applies.

**Discussion on including Contract Number:**
Should Contract Number be reported? One opinion, do not report it, because it is not required as there is not a comparable need for contract number in IT reporting as there is in FT reporting. There was consensus on this point. Further, Posting Date and Posting Time will give shippers a benchmark for comparison of Interruptible Service. It was discussed that there is not a duration date in all interruptible contracts.

This concluded the discussion of interruptible service reporting. Next steps? Complete a side by side comparison of the three sets of data sets, firm, interruptible and capacity release. As an alternate the group could move to usage codes.

Mr. Whatley made the observation that the proposed data elements for firm and interruptible are similar and could be provided by the same data set. If there is consensus, then it would be possible to go through the elements and create usage once.

The group agreed that, as originally formatted at the July 7, 2000 meeting, the capacity release reporting would be a separate data set. Firm and interruptible would be reported separately. Usage determinations were made for the proposed data elements for firm and interruptible reporting. (See attachment to August 1-2, 2000 minutes.)

Following a review of the progress made since July 7, 2000 it was observed that GISB Standards 4.3.21 and 4.3.22 should be reviewed for possible modifications for inclusion of transactional reporting.
Ms. Hess made the following motion, second by Mr. Keisler:
**Motion:**
Retract the proposed modifications to GISB Standard 4.3.21.

**Discussion:**
It was determined through discussion that the proposed modification, from July 7, 2000 BPS meeting, to GISB Standard 4.3.21 is in conflict with 4.3.6. To resolve the conflict, consensus was to strike the changes in Standard 4.3.21.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

Mr. Young made the following motion, second by Mr. Whatley::
**Motion**
**BPS instruction to IR (#12)** (as modified during the discussion)

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

- BPS instructs IR to accommodate reporting of firm and interruptible service in a single data set to the extent possible. The reporting of released capacity will be accommodated in the Award Download data set as modified by BPS.

**Discussion:**
Ms. Hess offered an amendment to the motion, which was accepted by Mr. Young and Mr. Whatley. The modifications to the Award Download data set were proposed by BPS during the July 7, 2000 meeting.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Pipelines | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 13 | 4 | 2 | 2 |

Motion passes

A question was raised as to the reason the two segments voted No. It was noted that they are not required to respond. One participant questioned whether the group had missed something and possibly needed to readdress any aspects of the instruction to IR. The responses from these segments were not the same. Concerns centered on two issues:

(1) possible loss of detail in reporting; and,
(2) the use of separate data sets to report "the same information".

GISB protocol issues were discussed about. In response to issue (1) above, Ms. Hess indicated that there would not be a loss of detail that is reported. The data would merely be combined into one data set. To further explain issue (2) above, Ms. Phillips stated she has a problem with putting segment/participants on the spot to defend their position following a vote, but would give her reason this time only. She said that taking the path of separate data set development could result in non-comparable data between the three (capacity release contracts, firm contracts, and interruptible contracts).

Concerns were raised that this vote raises a flag that the EC may reject the data sets and whether the data set development should go forward. Another concern was raised that this instruction places restrictions on IR, limiting the number of changes to the Capacity Release data set and how to go forward with developing firm and interruptible reporting. Mr. Young suggested a compromise, go back through the FERC Order and determine the requirements for capacity release reporting and compare to the firm and interruptible reporting requirements.

A review of the firm service reporting requirements for capacity either sold by the pipeline or through capacity release, as given in FERC Order 637, was made. (See attachment to BPS August 1-2, 2000 minutes)

The issue of whether there should be an indication that the pipeline is the seller of the capacity was sent to the parking lot of issues.

**Discussion** centered on what and how capacity seller should be reported, y/n indicator, TSP or releasing shipper name, seller of capacity, or other method. Discussion on certain of the data requirements for capacity release reporting from FERC Order 637, 637-A and 637-B are as follows: (For a complete list of data elements, see attachment to BPS August 1-2, 2000 minutes)
*Contract Holder* and *Contract Holder Name* are associated with Service Requester Contract and Rate Charged.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

*Releaser Company Code* and *Releaser Company Name* are associated Releaser Contract Number.

The rate charged under each contract: the meeting participants determined that the rate charged should be reported in the replacement shipper's contract. The releasing shipper's rate would be reported under firm service reporting)

Maximum comparable rate - participants decided not to list as a separate data element as it is the same as maximum rate.

*Negotiated Rate Indicator* -participants reviewed the element and determined it did not apply to capacity release.

Contract Quantity/Volumetric Quantity

- What does the term "volumetric quantity" mean? Some participants feel the quantity type is tariff/contract driven. The discussion continued to address the questions, "do you need two quantity fields?" "can you use one field for reporting quantity?" A second area of discussion was what is volumetric. Volumetric, is it MCF? And you have a quantity type indicator. The discussion pursued this point for volumetric releases and the ability to have a one to one comparison. Mr. Whatley asserted that the field should just be quantity. A single field use to report for contract quantity or volumetric quantity. Consensus developed for single data element, Contract Quantity.

Affiliate relationship – releasing shipper and replacement shipper OR pipeline and shipper

- The question was raised, who is the shipper in the latter pair? Consensus was this was referring to the replacement shipper, who is the contract holder.

The question, "what about recallable quantities?" was asked. Participants felt this was not addressed in the reporting requirements in Order 637 et al.

Mr. Whatley made the following motion, second by Mr. Scheel
**Motion**:
**BPS instruction to IR (#13)**

- BPS instructs IR to provide clarity in the implementation guide that the date element, Releaser Contract Number, identifies the contract issued by the Transportation Service Provider to the releasing shipper.

**Discussion:**
Concerns were raised that this is unnecessary information, others felt it provided clarity for developers. Discussion expanded to include BPS instruction to IR #1. Mr. Scheel asked for clarification on contract holder so as to distinguish between the shipper and the replacement shipper when the data element Contract Holder is used.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

Mr. Whatley made the following motion, second by Mr. Scheel:
**Motion**

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

Modify BPS instruction to IR #10 as follows:

**BPS instruction to IR (#10)**

BPS instructs IR to accommodate the reporting of Contract Quantity to reflect:

the maximum daily contract quantity for a firm transportation service contract,~~and~~
the maximum storage quantity for a firm storage service contract, and,
the contract quantity or the volumetric quantity under a volumetric release for capacity release.

**Discussion:**

Some participants expressed their position that this modification was not necessary since the use of a single contract had been decided. Mr. Whatley agreed to **withdraw his motion**.

Ms. Davis made the following motion, second by Mr. Gwilliam:

**Motion**

**BPS instruction to IR (#14)**

BPS instructs IR to accommodate communication of the existence or lack of an affiliate relationship between the contract holder and the releasing shipper for capacity release reporting only.

No discussion on the motion.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

**Discussion** on BPS's proposed changes to the Award Download data set. Should the data elements, Award Contract Number and Master Contract Indicator, be added to the capacity release reporting requirements? Some participants voiced the opinion that these data elements would not be needed if a new data set was developed for capacity release reporting.

Mr. Whatley made the following motion, second by Ms. Hess:

**Motion:**

Rescind the proposed addition of the data elements, Award Contract Number, Releaser Contract Number, and Added To Master Contract Indicator to the Award Download data set and to rescind BPS instruction to IR #12.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Gwilliam asked what is the effect on pipelines that have master contracts? Consensus was a pipeline experiencing an implementation problem would submit a request to GISB to modify the applicable standard.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

From the parking lot: Pipeline is seller of capacity – firm

Ms. Hess made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Stubblefield:

**Motion**

**BPS instruction to IR (#15)**

BPS instructs IR to accommodate the indication that the pipeline is the seller of transportation capacity for reporting of firm service.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Scheel asked if this would require a modification to GISB Standard 4.3.23 to include capacity release under transactional reporting? Consideration on this question was deferred.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 8-9, 2000**

**Discussion of Interruptible Service Reporting, Contract Quantity:**

The meeting opened with a review of the interruptible service reporting requirements as stated in FERC Order 637-A for contract quantity. Discussion ensued on when an interruptible contract has rights and/or entitlements. Many felt that interruptible does not have an entitlement prior to scheduling of its nomination. The issue of "posting prior to first nomination" was reiterated. Discussion of "entitled to transport" and "eligible to transport" raised many different opinions for implementation scenarios. Some requested the use of "eligible to nominate."

**Motion:**

Ms. Van Pelt made a motion, second by Ms. Davis, to send the following instruction to IR (#16).

- BPS instructs IR to accommodate the reporting of interruptible quantity for the reporting of interruptible services as the quantity that the Service Requester is entitled to transport.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Van Pelt stated that the CMS pipelines had contract quantities on IT contracts and that quantity would be posted. Other pipeline representative explained that their companies had different contract implementations. Mr. Scheel stated his support of Ms. Van Pelt's interpretation of the requirements in the Order and his concern that there would not be consistent implementation by all pipelines. Mr. Griffith suggested the use of what a shipper is entitled

to nominate. Mr. Payne and Mr. Scheel asked the motion maker to modify the instruction by replacing 'transport' with 'nominate'. Ms. Van Pelt and Ms. Davis agreed to modify the proposed instruction.

**Modified Motion:**
BPS instruction to IR (#16).

- BPS instructs IR to accommodate the reporting of interruptible quantity for the reporting of interruptible services as the quantity that the Service Requester is entitled to nominate.

Ms. Phillips asked the motion makers to consider the following modification to the proposed instruction to allow for different contracting practices and reporting implementations by the transportation service providers:

BPS instructs IR to accommodate the reporting of interruptible quantity for the reporting of interruptible services as the quantity that the ~~Service Requester is eligible to nominate~~. Transportation Service Provider is willing to transport.

The motion makers declined the modification. Ms. Van Pelt clarified that her motion is for a single quantity, this is in place of Contract Quantity, not in addition to Contract Quantity.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Pipelines | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 17 | 5 | 1 | 1 |

Motion passes

Mr. Keisler made the following motion, second by Ms. Hess.

**Motion:**
Modify BPS instruction to IR #10 as follows:
**BPS instruction to IR (#10)**
BPS instructs IR to accommodate the reporting of Contract Quantity for the reporting of firm and capacity release services to reflect:

the maximum daily contract quantity for a firm transportation service contract and
the maximum storage quantity for a firm storage service contract.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 8 (Priority 3)

A discussion ensued on what the usage should be for the Interruptible Quantity data element. After discussion, the consensus was that it should be Sender's Option.

**Discussion on Contract Number:**
Mr. Whatley offered his opinion that Service Requester Contract should be added to the list of reporting requirements for interruptible service with a usage of Sender's Option.

Mr. Keisler made the following motion, second by Ms. Hess.

**Motion:**

Approve the "Combined Table for Firm and Interruptible Services and Capacity Release" and adopt the following BPS instruction to IR #17:

> BPS instructs IR to utilize the "Combined Table for Firm and Interruptible Services and Capacity Release" as a basis for the development of the reporting of firm service, interruptible service, and capacity release.

| **Segments** | **Vote For** | **Balanced For** | **Vote Against** | **Balanced Against** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 1.6 | 1 | .4 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Pipelines | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 16 | 4.6 | 2 | 1.4 |

Motion passes

**c. Business Purpose:**

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

**Attachment to the BPS Minutes**
**Combined Table for Firm and Interruptible Services and Capacity Release**
**As of August 9, 2000**

| Firm Posting Requirements from Order 637, et al | Interruptible Posting Requirements from Order 637, et al | Capacity Release Posting Requirements from Order 637, et al | Proposed Data Elements to communicate the posting requirements. (existing/*proposed)* | Notes and/or instructions to Information Requirements | Usage Firm Reporting | Usage Interruptible Reporting | Usage Capacity Release Reporting |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Full legal name & id of shipper receiving service under contract | Full legal name & id of shipper receiving service | Full legal name & id of the shipper receiving service under the contract | *Contract Holder*<br>*Contract Holder Name* | See IR instruction #8 | M | M | M |
| | | Full legal name & id of the releasing shipper | Releaser Company Code<br>Releaser Company Name | | | | M |
| Contract number | | Contract Number (shipper receiving service) | Service Requester Contract | See IR instruction #1. | M | SO | M |
| Rate for each contract | Rate charged | Rate charged under each contract (Service Requester Contract) | *Rate Charged* | See IR instruction #2, #5, #6, and #9. | M | M | M |
| Maximum Rate | Maximum rate | Maximum Rate | Maximum Tariff Rate | See IR instruction #6 | M | M | M |
| Whether the contract is a negotiated rate contract | | | *Negotiated Rate Indicator* | See IR instruction #11 | M | nu | nu |
| Duration of Contract | | Duration of Contract | *Contract Begin Date & Time*<br>*Contract End Date & Time* | See IR instruction #3 | M | nu | M |
| Receipt Point/Delivery Point (Zones or Segments) | Receipt Point/Delivery Point (Zones or Segments) | Receipt Point/Delivery Point (Zones or Segments) | See IR instruction #7 | See IR instruction #7 | M | M | M |
| Contract Quantity | | Contract Quantity/volumetric quantity | *Contract Quantity* | See IR instruction #10 (firm and capacity release) | M | nu | M |

| Firm Posting Requirements from Order 637, et al | Interruptible Posting Requirements from Order 637, et al | Capacity Release Posting Requirements from Order 637, et al | Proposed Data Elements to communicate the posting requirements. (existing/*proposed)* | Notes and/or instructions to Information Requirements | Usage Firm Reporting | Usage Interruptible Reporting | Usage Capacity Release Reporting |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantity of gas a shipper is entitled to transport | | *Interruptible Quantity* | See IR instruction #16 (interruptible) | nu | SO | nu |
| Special Terms & Condition | Special details pertaining to the agreement | Special Terms & Conditions | Special Terms & Miscellaneous Notes | See IR instruction #2 | SO | SO | SO |
| Affiliate relationship Pipeline & shipper | Affiliate relationship Pipeline & Shipper | Affiliate relationship Releasing shipper & replacement shipper pipeline & shipper | *Affiliate Indicator* | See IR instruction #4 (firm and interruptible)<br>See IR instruction #4 and #14 (capacity release) | M | M | M |
| | | | Transportation Service Provider Transportation Service Provider Name | | M | M | M |
| | | | Posting Date<br>Posting Time | Refer to BPS minutes from Jan 20, 2000 for request R97110 modifications to definitions | M | M | M |

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 9 (Priority 4)

### 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
_X_Modification
___Interpretation
___Withdrawal

___Principle (x.1.z)
___Definition (x.2.z)
_X_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:** Modify GISB Standard No. 4.3.23.

### STANDARDS LANGUAGE:

**Proposed revision to GISB Standard No. 4.3.23:**
The subcategories and labels for the categories of Informational Postings should be as follows:

| CATEGORIES | SUBCATEGORIES |
|---|---|
| Affiliated Marketer Info. | Capacity Allocation Log (when applicable) |
| | Discount Offers |
| Capacity | Operationally Available |
| | Unsubscribed |
| Index of Customers | |
| Notices | Critical |
| | Non-Critical |
| Tariff | Title Page |
| | Table of Contents |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Preliminary Statement |
| | Map |
| | Currently Effective Rates |
| | Rate Schedules |
| | General Terms and Conditions |
| | Form of Service Agreement |
| | Entire Tariff |
| | Sheet Index |
| *Transactional Reporting* | *Firm* |
| | *Interruptible* |

## 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

**a. Description of Request:**

Accommodate visual display of web pages for FT and IT reporting.

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Business Practices Subcommittee, July 7, 2000**
It was agreed to stop work on the list of data elements at this point, with the understanding that we would start the next meeting by returning to it. The group then moved on to the issues raised by the pipelines, starting with visual display. The discussion began with a review of GISB Std 4.3.42. There was a consensus that no changes to the standard were necessary. It was also determined that this information should be displayed in the Informational Postings, where all other FERC required postings are located.

Review of GISB Standards 4.3.18, 4.3.21 and 4.3.23.

- No changes are necessary to Std 4.3.18
- Add a category below "Tariff" in 4.3.21 entitled "Transactional Reporting"
- Add the category "Transactional Reporting" with its subcategories "Firm" and "Interruptible" to Std 4.3.23

Ms. Corcoran made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Hopkins:
**Motion**:

> Modify GISB Standard. Nos. 4.3.21 and 4.3.23 (as proposed above) and in addition there would be no changes to GISB Standard Nos. 4.3.18, 4.3.22 and 4.3.42.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

**The motion passed unanimously on a balanced vote.**

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 9 (Priority 4)

Ms. Van Pelt made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Love:

**Motion**:

There is no requirement for a summary page(s) for Transactional Reporting.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

**The motion passed unanimously on a balanced vote.**

Mr. Love made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Hess:

**Motion:**

There should be no required ordering of the contents of the Transactional Reporting Web pages.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

The motion passed on a balanced vote.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 1-2, 2000**

Following a review of the progress made since July 7, 2000 it was observed that GISB Standards 4.3.21 and 4.3.22 should be reviewed for possible modifications for inclusion of transactional reporting.

Ms. Hess made the following motion, second by Mr. Keisler:

**Motion:**

Retract the proposed modifications to GISB Standard 4.3.21.

**Discussion:**

It was determined through discussion that the proposed modification, from July 7, 2000 BPS meeting, to GISB Standard 4.3.21 is in conflict with 4.3.6. To resolve the conflict, consensus was to strike the changes in Standard 4.3.21.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 9 (Priority 4)

**c. Business Purpose:**

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

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 13 (Priority 5)

### 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:** Send instructions to Information Requirements.

### INSTRUCTIONS TO INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS:

BPS instructs IR to require affiliate information between the releasing shipper and the replacement shipper to be provided to the TSP in the Offer Upload (applicable only to prearranged deals) and the Bid Upload.

### 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

**a. Description of Request:**

Review the method for collecting information on the releasing shipper's relationship to the acquiring shipper.

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Business Practices Subcommittee, June 30, 2000 a.m. conference call**

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 13 (Priority 5)

**Discussion:**

1) The issues identified were: How to obtain the information on the affiliate relationship between the releasing shipper and the acquiring shipper, if any, in the offer, bid, and award processes, and how to communicate that information.

2) How does the acquiring shipper know that he is affiliated with the releasing shipper in the offer process?

   When and how does the relationship between the acquiring shipper and releasing shipper become known and communicated?

3) Determine if it is necessary to identify the relationship between the acquiring shipper and the TSP and the releasing shipper and the TSP in the Capacity Release processes.

The first issue identified was how an acquiring shipper would advise a TSP as to how it is related to a releasing shipper.

There was discussion as to whether it was appropriate to identify the relationship between the acquiring shipper and the TSP and the relationship between the releasing shipper and the TSP. Some participants said that the affiliate informational was already posted by the pipeline in the Information Postings and it was not necessary to get the information in the Offer Upload. Some participants asked, what the outcome should be if the releasing shipper or acquiring shipper did not report the affiliation or reported it incorrectly.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 8-9, 2000**

Mr. Keisler made the following motion, second by Ms. Davis.

**Motion:**

**BPS instruction to IR #18**

- BPS instructs IR to require affiliate information between the releasing shipper and the replacement shipper to be provided to the TSP in the Offer Upload (applicable only to prearranged deals) and the Bid Upload.

**Discussion:**

Some participants expressed their view that the Order only requires the reporting of affiliate relationships between the TSP and the shipper and between the releasing shipper and the replacement shipper. The TSP should know who its affiliates are. Therefore only the relationship between the releasing shipper and the replacement shipper needs to be communicated to the TSP. There was consensus that the affiliate information should be mandatory.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes unanimously.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 13 (Priority 5)

**c. Business Purpose:**

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

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 1 (Priority 6)

**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
_X_Modification
___Interpretation
___Withdrawal

___Principle (x.1.z)
___Definition (x.2.z)
_X_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:** Modify GISB Standard No. 5.3.2.

**STANDARDS LANGUAGE:**

**Proposed revision to GISB Standard No. 5.3.2:**

5.3.2 For short-term *biddable* releases (less than 5 months):

- ~~O~~*offers* should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. on the *Business* ~~d~~*D*ay before *timely* nominations ~~for short-term releases (less than 5 months)~~;
- open season ends no later than 2*:00* P.M. on the *Business* ~~d~~*D*ay before *timely* nominations are due (evaluation period begins at 2*:00* P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken);
- evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.;
- match response by 4*:00* P.M.;
- award posting by 5*:00* P.M.;
- ~~posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid by 9 A.M. the day of nominations;~~
- contract tendered with contract # by 10*:00* A.M.; contract executed; *timely* nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

For longer term *biddable* releases (five months or more):

- offers should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. four ~~b~~*B*usiness ~~d~~*D*ays before award ~~for long-term releases~~;
- open season ends no later than 2*:00* P.M. on the *Business* ~~d~~*D*ay before *timely* nominations are due (open season is three ~~b~~*B*usiness ~~d~~*D*ays)*;*
- evaluation period begins at 2*:00* P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken;
- evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.;
- match response by 4*:00* P.M.;
- award posting by 5*:00* P.M.;
- ~~posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid by 9 A.M. the day of nominations;~~
- contract tendered with contract # by 10*:00* A.M.; contract executed; *timely* nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

*For non-biddable releases:*

*Timely Cycle*

- *posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 9:30 A.M. on a Business Day;*
- *contract tendered with contract # by 10:30 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Timely Cycle.*

*Evening Cycle*

- *posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 4:00 P.M. on a Business Day;*
- *contract tendered with contract # by 5:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Evening Cycle.*

*Intraday 1 Cycle*

- *posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 8:00 A.M. on a Business Day;*
- *contract tendered with contract # by 9:00 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 1 Cycle.*

*Intraday 2 Cycle*

- *posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 3:00 P.M. on a Business Day;*
- *contract tendered with contract # by 4:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 2 Cycle. (Central Clock Time)*

## 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

**a. Description of Request:**

Review timelines for modifications including accommodation of intraday or partial day capacity releases (Affects GISB Standard No. 5.3.2 and related interpretations).

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 1 (Priority 6)

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Business Practices Subcommittee, June 30, 2000 p.m. conference call**
Capacity release standards and related interpretations were identified followed by a review of each on a one by one basis. The standards identified were:

5.3.2
5.3.6
5.3.7

The related interpretations identified were:

7.3.2
7.3.15
7.3.3
7.3.44
7.3.45

In addition, the proposed response to C99003 was identified for review. This proposed response is pending adoption by the Executive Committee.

Standard 5.3.2 was reviewed.

**Issues Identified:**

Are the last two bullets of the short term section of 5.3.2 still appropriate in light of the intraday release language of FERC?

Is a new section of 5.3.2 needed to deal with intraday pre-arranged releases?

Is there any requirement that an intraday release be only for the balance of the first day?

Is there a need to be clear that the duration of the release is what determines the bidding requirement and not the intraday nature of the first day of the release?

Is there a need for an "end" to the current longer term releases section of 5.3.2 at a period less than a year (i.e., greater than or equal to five months and less than a year), then a third category added for those releases whose duration is equal to or greater than a year?

**Discussion:**
This issue was identified because the thought was that there was no longer a waiver of bidding for deals less than a year, as there was no longer a maximum rate for deals less than a year. This may be an issue because for deals that are greater than 31 days in duration and less than a year in duration there is no longer a non-biddable status. All these deals have to be posted for open bidding. There is no longer the greater than five months non-biddable prearranged deals at max rate exemption from bidding.

**Additional Issues:**

Is there a need to rearrange the structure of 5.3.2 to take account of intra day, 31 days or less, greater than 31 days to five months, then five months to a year and over a year?

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 1 (Priority 6)

**Discussion:**

There needs to be careful review of any possible new language to ensure that there are not any loopholes in any possible new language.

Interpretation 7.3.2 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.2

Interpretation 7.3.15 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.15

Interpretation 7.3.3 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.3

Interpretation 7.3.44 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.44

Standard 5.3.6 was reviewed
The issue identified was whether an intra day release can be recalled.

Standard 5.3.7 was reviewed.
The issue identified was whether an intra day release can be recalled.

Interpretation 7.3.45 was reviewed.
It was agreed that there were no issues identified within Interpretation 7.3.45.

The proposed response in C99003 was reviewed. It consists of a proposed interpretation and a proposed revision to GISB Std. 5.3.24

- Text below of the proposed interpretation

  A Service Requester may have its offer posted for review either immediately or at another specified time and if not specified then, at the Transportation Service Provider's option, the offer can be posted for review either immediately or at the next occurrence of 1:00 p.m. on a business day. GISB has no requirement that bidding upon such posting be available prior to the next occurrence of 1:00 p.m. on a business day. Neither is there any prohibition on bidding occurring upon a posting provided that bidding upon such posting continue to be available through at least the next occurrence of 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. on a business day or the longer period where such offer is a long term offer.

It was agreed that there were no issues identified within the proposed for interpretation C99003.

- Proposed revised Standard 5.3.24 was reviewed. Text of the proposed revised standard follows:

  5.3.24 Capacity release facilitator should post offers and bids, including prearranged deals, upon receipt. A releasing shipper may request a later posting time for posting of such offer, and the capacity release service facilitator should support such request insofar as it comports with the standard Capacity Release timeline specified in GISB Standard No. 5.3.2.

It was agreed that there were no issues identified within proposed revised Standard 5.3.24.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 8-9, 2000**
**Discussion:**
Review issues identified with GISB Standard 5.3.2 from the minutes of June 30, 2000:

- *Are the last two bullets of the short-term section of 5.3.2 still appropriate in light of the intraday release language of FERC?*
- *Is a new section of 5.3.2 needed to deal with intraday pre-arranged releases?*

What actions are necessary to achieve comparability of nomination rights between firm service purchased from the TSP and firm service purchased through capacity release? Discussion began with prearranged deals not subject to bidding and extended to biddable releases. Some participants requested a standardized process to address the issue of nominations in each of the four nomination cycles for both types of releases. There was not consensus on the issue of intraday biddable deals. A suggestion was made to continue the discussion; addressing non-biddable releases separate from biddable releases.

**Prearranged Deals not subject to bidding**
Mr. Fava explained one approach for prearranged deals, notification to TSP 1 hour and 45 minutes prior to each nomination cycle. The TSP processes the deal and provides the replacement shipper with a contract in an hour or less; the replacement shipper then has 45 minutes to submit a nomination. Other TSP representatives offered a different solution, in which the TSP processes the prearranged deal in an hour and makes the contract available for the next nomination cycle. The releasing and replacement shippers would be responsible to submit their prearranged deal to the TSP with sufficient time to submit a nomination in the nomination cycle to achieve the needed service, taking into account the one hour processing time for contracting by the TSP.
**Development of a strawman (as modified during the discussion):**

| Cycle | Prearranged non/bid deal due to TSP (Posted) | Contract Due | Noms Leave Control of Nominator | Noms Received by TSP | Gas Flow (Nom Effective) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Timely | 9:30 AM | 10:30 AM | 11:30 AM | 11:45 AM | 9:00 AM next day |
| Evening | 4:00 PM | 5:00 PM | 6:00 PM | 6:15 PM | 9:00 AM next day |
| Intraday 1 | 8:00 AM | 9:00 AM | 10:00 AM | 10:15 AM | 5:00 PM same day |
| Intraday 2 | 3:00 PM | 4:00 PM | 5:00 PM | 5:15 PM | 9:00 PM same day |

Some participants expressed the desire to have a one hour turn around. Others expressed concerns that this could require a 24 by 7 capacity release desk. Mr. Young asked if the strawman allowed time for contract execution? Mr. Payne asked if the strawman should include a column for deal posting time? It was determined that the column labeled "Prearranged non/bid deal due to TSP" was the deal posting time.

Mr. Fava made the following motion, second by Mr. Young:

**Motion:**
Adopt the above strawman as the timeline for processing prearranged deals not subject to bidding.

**Discussion on motion:**
Mr. Scheel requested the column labeled "Contract Due" should be changed to "contract tendered and executed" to mirror the language in GISB Standard 5.3.2. Others pointed to the FERC Order stating execution of contract should not inhibit the ability to nominate. Mr. Payne expressed his belief that there should be additional time in the

strawman to allow replacement shippers the ability to process the contract and communicate with its parties once the contract is received from the TSP. Mr. Whatley asked if the motion makers would modify the strawman to allow an additional 30 minutes in the posted time. Mr. Fava and Mr. Young agreed to the change.

Mr. Whatley then requested the strawman include a clarification that the contract is available for nomination when received by the replacement shipper be included in the "Contract Due" column. In response, some participants expressed their concern that the business practices in regards to nomination and contract execution vary between companies and this was not the arena to address those contract execution practices. Mr. Whatley explained he needs to receive a contract that is useful, in other words, be able to nominate. Mr. Young expressed his understanding of the language in FERC Order 637-A that the hour is for issuance of the contract and does not require execution of the contract. Mr. Young feels the phrase "contract executed" in GISB Standard 5.3.2 should be included in any proposal to modify this standard.

Mr. Young offered the following language for the group's consideration:

> For prearrange deals the following timeline shall govern the processing of contracts based upon when prearranged/non-biddable releases are submitted to the TSP. Contracts may be executed in a variety of ways; however, contracts should be executed no later than the time of nominations.

Discussion on "the time of nomination" versus "before gas flow" did not achieve consensus in the group.

Mr. Whatley proposed the following language for addition to GISB Standard 5.3.2 for the group's consideration:

Timely Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid by 9:30 A.M. the day of nominations
- contract tendered with contract # by 10:30 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for next day gas flow at 9:00 A.M. (Central Clock Time)

Evening Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid by 4:00 P.M. the day of nominations
- contract tendered with contract # by 5:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for next day gas flow at 9:00 A.M. (Central Clock Time)

Intraday 1 Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid by 8:00 A.M. the day of nominations
- contract tendered with contract # by 9:00 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for same day gas flow at 5:00 P.M. (Central Clock Time)

Intraday 2 Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid by 3:00 P.M. the day of nominations
- contract tendered with contract # by 4:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for same day gas flow at 9:00 P.M. (Central Clock Time)

**Revised motion:**

Mr. Fava and Mr. Young agreed to modify their motion as follows:

> Adopt the following modifications to GISB Standard 5.3.2.
>
> For short-term releases (less than 5 months):
>
> - Offers should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. on the day before nominations for short-term releases (less than 5 months);
> - open season ends no later than 2 P.M. on the day before nominations are due (evaluation period begins at 2 P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken);

- evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.
- match response by 4 P.M.;
- award posting by 5 P.M.;
- ~~Posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid by 9A.M. the day of nominations;~~
- contract tendered with contract # by 10 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

For longer term releases (five months or more):

- offers should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. four business days before award for long-term releases;
- open season ends no later than 2 P.M. on the day before nominations are due (open season is three business days)
- evaluation period begins at 2 P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken;
- evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.;
- match response by 4 P.M.;
- award posting by 5 P.M.;
- ~~Posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid by 9A.M. the day of nominations;~~
- contract tendered with contract # by 10 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

For non-biddable releases:

Timely Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 9:30 A.M.
- contract tendered with contract # by 10:30 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Timely cycle.

Evening Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 4:00 P.M.
- contract tendered with contract # by 5:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Evening cycle.

Intraday 1 Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 8:00 A.M.
- contract tendered with contract # by 9:00 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 1 cycle.

Intraday 2 Cycle

- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 3:00 P.M.
- contract tendered with contract # by 4:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 2 cycle. (Central Clock Time)

**Discussion on revised motion:**

The group had a lengthy discussion on availability of contract for nomination, what it means and how to convey this point in a standard.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 1 (Priority 6)

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

Motion passes

**Discussion on biddable releases and scheduling equality with firm service:**
Mr. Scheel offered the following modifications to proposed Standard 5.3.2 (above) as a possible way to address biddable releases.

- If a TSP is able to post the award by 5 P.M., can they also provide the contract contemporaneous with the award posting?
  - Mr. Young suggested the contract be provided at 9:00 A.M. the morning following the award.
- On longer-term releases it is four business days before award, can this time be reduced to two or three?
  - Mr. Scheel stated a desire to tighten up the timeline.
- Do we want to define short term and long term to make the rules comparable?

It was pointed out for Mr. Scheel's first proposed change, there may need to be time for the TSP to be able to process the contract between the time when the award is posted and when the contract is available. In response to Mr. Scheel's second proposed modification, it was pointed out that the biding period was an issue for those parties evaluating the offers and bids. Due to the long term nature of these deals, these parties had previously wanted this amount of time in order to do their evaluations. Further, some participants expressed their continued concern that treasury for credit approval and contract desk for producing the contract will not be staffed 24 X 7 or after 5:00 P.M.

After some discussion and reiteration of issues, participants are asked to take these issues back to their office and it will be discussed at the next meeting.

**Discussion on issues identified during the June 30, 2000 afternoon conference call:**

- *Is there any requirement that an intraday release be only for the balance of the first day?*

The sense of the room was there is not a requirement that an intraday release be only for the balance of the first day. There was no objection.

- *Is there a need to be clear that the duration of the release is what determines the bidding requirement and not the intraday nature of the first day of the release?*

The sense of the room was the duration of the release determines the bidding requirements. There was no objection.

- *Is there a need for an "end" to the current longer term releases section of 5.3.2 at a period less than a year (i.e., greater than or equal to five months and less than a year), then a third category added for those releases whose duration is equal to or greater than a year?*

  *Discussion (from the June 30 minutes):*
  *This issue was identified because the thought was that there was no longer a waiver of bidding for deals less than a year, as there was no longer a maximum rate for deals less than a year. This may be an issue because for deals that are greater than 31 days in duration and less than a year in duration there is no longer a non-*

*biddable status. All these deals have to be posted for open bidding. There is no longer the greater than five months non-biddable prearranged deals at max rate exemption from bidding.*

What is the amount of time that is reasonable to analyze an offer and determine what an acceptable bid would be? One participant responded that the open season requirements do not require changes. GISB Standard 5.3.2 defines the open season; it does not address what is biddable or non-biddable.

The sense of the room was there is not a need for an "end" to the current longer-term release section of 5.3.2 at a period less than a year. There was no objection.

The sense of the room was a third category should not be added for those releases whose duration is equal to or greater than a year. There was no objection.

- *Is there a need to rearrange the structure of 5.3.2 to take account of intraday, 31 days or less, greater than 31 days to five months, then five months to a year and over a year?*

The sense of the room was no change in the structure of 5.3.2 is required. There was no objection.

GISB Standard 5.3.6 and 5.3.7

- *The issue identified was whether an intraday release can be recalled.*

The sense of the room was upon the review of GISB Standards 5.3.6 and 5.3.7 no changes are required. Specifically, there is no need to eliminate the prohibition on partial day recalls. There was no objection.

**Business Practices Subcommittee, August 15, 2000**
Mr. Scheel made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Whatley:

**Motion:**
Modify GISB Standard No. 5.3.2 as follows (which includes modification made by BPS on 8/9/2000):
5.3.2 For short-term releases (less than 5 months):

- Offers should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. on the day before nominations
- open season ends no later than 2 P.M. on the day before nominations are due (evaluation period begins at 2 P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken);
- evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.;
- match response by 4 P.M.;
- award posting by 5 P.M.;
- contract tendered with contract # by ~~10~~ 9 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

For longer term releases (five months or more):

- offers should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. four business days before award for long-term releases;
- open season ends no later than 2 P.M. on the day before nominations are due (open season is three business days)

- evaluation period begins at 2 P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken;
- evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.;
- match response by 4 P.M.;
- award posting by 5 P.M.;
- contract tendered with contract # by ~~10~~ 9 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

For non-biddable releases:

Timely Cycle
- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 9:30 A.M.
- contract tendered with contract # by 10:30 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Timely cycle.

Evening Cycle
- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 4:00 P.M.
- contract tendered with contract # by 5:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Evening cycle.

Intraday 1 Cycle
- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 8:00 A.M.
- contract tendered with contract # by 9:00 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 1 cycle

Intraday 2 Cycle
- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 3:00 P.M.
- contract tendered with contract # by 4:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 2 cycle. (Central Clock Time)

**Discussion:**
There was discussion and disagreement as to whether Order 637 gives direction to biddable deals, in addition to pre-arranged capacity release deals. It was discussed by some that biddable deals was out of scope of GISB's work for Order 637. It was discussed by others that to the extent scheduling equality can be offered, the order does not preclude parties to give scheduling equality to biddable as well as pre-arranged capacity releases. There was further discussion that this issue may not be ripe for standards development.

Ms. Hopkins reported that the Enron pipelines reviewed the order again (since the last meeting) and they feel the Commission did not mean to include biddable deals at this time.

Mr. Whatley observed that we ought to at least address the timelines in 5.3.2 so that they refer to the time and date that gas flows and not the time and date of nomination. In response, some felt that now is probably not the time to clean up the standards.

Mr. Scheel stated that even though it is his opinion that Order 637 does address scheduling equality for biddable deals, in light of the feeling by some participants that the FERC did not give direction to scheduling equality for biddable deals, he agreed to withdraw his motion and wait for further direction from the FERC.

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item 1 (Priority 6)

Motion withdrawn

Mr. Whatley made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Scheel:

**Motion:**
Modify GISB Standard No. 5.3.2 as follows:

5.3.2 For short-term *biddable* releases (less than 5 months):

- ~~O~~*offers* should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. on the *Business* ~~d~~*D*ay before *timely* nominations ~~for short-term releases (less than 5 months)~~;
- open season ends no later than 2*:00* P.M. on the *Business* ~~d~~*D*ay before *timely* nominations are due (evaluation period begins at 2*:00* P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken);
- evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.;
- match response by 4*:00* P.M.;
- award posting by 5*:00* P.M.;
- contract tendered with contract # by 10*:00* A.M.; contract executed; *timely* nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

For longer term *biddable* releases (five months or more):

- offers should be tendered by 1:00 P.M. four ~~b~~*B*usiness ~~d~~*D*ays before award ~~for long-term releases~~;
- open season ends no later than 2*:00* P.M. on the *Business* ~~d~~*D*ay before *timely* nominations are due (open season is three ~~b~~*B*usiness ~~d~~*D*ays)*;*
- evaluation period begins at 2*:00* P.M. during which contingency is eliminated, determination of best bid is made, and ties are broken;
- evaluation period ends at 3:15 P.M.;
- match or award is communicated by 3:15 P.M.;
- match response by 4*:00* P.M.;
- award posting by 5*:00* P.M.;
- contract tendered with contract # by 10*:00* A.M.; contract executed; *timely* nomination possible for next day gas flow. (Central Clock Time)

For non-biddable releases:

Timely Cycle
- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 9:30 A.M. *on a Business Day;*
- contract tendered with contract # by 10:30 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Timely ~~c~~*C*ycle.

Evening Cycle
- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 4:00 P.M. *on a Business Day;*
- contract tendered with contract # by 5:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Evening ~~c~~*C*ycle.

Intraday 1 Cycle
- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 8:00 A.M. *on a Business Day;*
- contract tendered with contract # by 9:00 A.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 1 ~~c~~*C*ycle.

Intraday 2 Cycle
- posting of pre-arranged deals not subject to bid are due by 3:00 P.M. *on a Business Day;*
- contract tendered with contract # by 4:00 P.M.; contract executed; nomination possible for Intraday 2 ~~c~~*C*ycle. (Central Clock Time)

| **Segments** | **Vote For** | **Balanced For** | **Vote Against** | **Balanced Against** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

**Motion passes unanimously**

**c. Business Purpose:**

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

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## BPS Order 637 Priority Action Item – Index of Customers

**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
_X_Modification
___Interpretation
___Withdrawal

___Principle (x.1.z)
___Definition (x.2.z)
_X_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:** Modify GISB Standard No. 4.3.16 and delete GISB Standard No. 4.3.35.

**STANDARDS LANGUAGE:**

**GISB Standard No. 4.3.16:**
The documents identified in GISB Standard 4.3.6 should be made available in HTML or RTF format, except with respect to the Index of Customers document which may be displayed in HTML or RTF and which should be downloadable in a defined, tab-delimited ASCII text file, with provisions for title information and footnote capability, as set forth in Code of Federal Regulations Part 284, Section 223. (Reference Order Number 637~~581~~, Docket No. RM98-10-000~~RM 95-4-000~~, issued February ~~2~~9, 2000~~1996~~, "Appendix A, Instruction Manual for Electronic Filing of the Index of Customers" issued *pursuant to* ~~with~~ the above referenced order.)

**GISB Standard No. 4.3.35:**
~~The header information should be displayed at the top before the columnar information. The column headings for the posting of "Index of Customers" should be displayed as follows:~~
~~Rate Schedule~~
~~Customer~~
~~Contract Effective Date~~

~~Contract Termination Date~~
~~Maximum Daily Quantity~~
~~Rollover Period~~
~~Footnotes (when applicable)~~

~~These columns should appear in this order from left to right. The data should be sorted in ascending order by rate schedule and then by customer name within rate schedule. Footnote text should be displayed below the columnar information.~~

## 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

**a. Description of Request:**

Correctly reflect the FERC order reference and section number (GISB Standard No. 4.3.16) and data element ordering (GISB Standard No. 4.3.35).

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Business Practices Subcommittee, July 13, 2000**
**Review Index of Customer for discussion and possible vote:**
Correctly reflect the FERC order reference and section number (GISB Standard No. 4.3.16) and data element ordering (GISB Standard No. 4.3.35).

On June 29, 2000, in Docket RM98-10, the FERC issued the new format for the Index of Firm Customers. There was discussion on the possible changes to GISB Standards 4.3.16 and 4.3.35 as a result of this order.

Ms. Davis made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Love:
**Motion**:
Modify GISB Standard 4.3.16 as follows:
The documents identified in GISB Standard 4.3.6 should be made available in HTML or RTF format, except with respect to the Index of Customers document which may be displayed in HTML or RTF and which should be downloadable in a defined, tab-delimited ASCII text file, with provisions for title information and footnote capability, as set forth in Code of Federal Regulations Part 284, Section 223. (Reference Order Number 637~~581~~, Docket No. RM98-10-000~~RM 95-4-000~~, issued February ~~29~~, 2000~~1996~~, "Appendix A, Instruction Manual for Electronic Filing of the Index of Customers" issued pursuant to ~~with~~ the above referenced order.)

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

**The motion passed unanimously on a balanced vote.**

Mr. Love made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Buccigross:

**Motion**:

Delete GISB Standard 4.3.35.

| Segments | Vote For | Balanced For | Vote Against | Balanced Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End Users | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| LDCs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Producers | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pipelines | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

**The motion passed unanimously on a balanced vote.**

**c. Business Purpose:**

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