

GISB Expedited Data Development Subcommittee Meeting
March 13-14, 2000
Dynegy Offices; Houston, Texas
FINAL MINUTES

1. Theresa Hess opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to the first Expedited Data Development (EDD) meeting. Attendees introduced themselves.
2. Mark Scheel provided housekeeping information.
3. Anti-trust guidelines were given by Theresa.
4. The agenda was adopted as drafted.
5. Theresa gave an overview of the Executive Committee's (EC) formation of this subcommittee. The EC formed EDD to help alleviate the backlog of requests in the Information Requirements Subcommittee. Two topics have been assigned to EDD – Imbalance Netting / Trading and Title Transfer Tracking. The EC assigned a higher priority to the Imbalance Netting / Trading topic and, therefore, EDD will address it first.
6. **R97117 / R97118**
 - The Imbalance Netting / Trading standards, adopted by the Executive Committee on July 15, 1999, were reviewed. The diagram that was developed by the Imbalances Subcommittee was also reviewed to give an overview of the imbalance trading process and the data sets that are available for use during the process.
 - EDD addressed the development of the Imbalance Netting / Trading datasets. The attached draft data dictionaries and code values dictionaries will constitute the bulk of these meeting minutes. Additional information and Sense of the Room votes are noted below.

◆ **Request for Imbalance Trade**

Discussion:

All necessary information is sent in a Request for Imbalance Trade. The confirming trader either accepts or rejects the trade. Other than the contact information and the response code, the confirming trader doesn't send any additional information that was not included in the Request for Imbalance Trade.

See the minutes of the May 19, 1999 Imbalance Subcommittee meeting for the list of possible code value descriptions for the imbalance type data element. This same list will be used for all imbalance type data elements – initiating trader, confirming trader, etc.

TO DO: Meeting participants were requested to provide code value descriptions for the imbalance type. EDD will address the code value descriptions and definitions at the next meeting. At this time, the code value descriptions listed in the attached code values dictionaries are from the Imbalance Subcommittee.

ISSUE TO EBB-Internet Implementation Task Force (EII):

EDD is developing data sets for Imbalance Netting / Trading (R97117 and R97118). Part of this process is the development of 'EBB Usages'. The following issues were raised during the processing of the data sets:

1. Will the Imbalance Netting / Trading data sets include data groupings?
 2. If so, will an order be specified for the data elements in the data groups?
 3. If yes to either of the above, which GISB subcommittee will develop these items for the new data sets? EII or the Imbalance Subcommittee or the Expedited Data Development Subcommittee?
- If it is determined that any of the above items will be developed, EDD will provide the data sets as a package to the appropriate group.
 - EDD assumes that any quick response data sets that are developed will not need to accommodate EBB/EDM and, therefore, will not include EBB usages or data groupings. This is the same convention that has been followed for the existing quick response data sets (Nomination Quick Response, Confirmation Quick Response, Pre-determined Allocation Quick Response). The quick response data sets that are developed for Imbalance Netting / Trading will accommodate EDI/EDM and FF/EDM.
 - EDD recommends that a joint EII and EDD meeting/conference call be held to address the above issues.

Sense of the Room: 11 In Favor; 1 Opposed

TO DO: An issue arose as to how an imbalance quantity is reflected in the data sets. Imbalances can be due to the TSP or due from the TSP. Are negative numbers sent in the EDI data sets? Or is a qualifier required so that a non-negative number can be sent? Meeting participants were requested to research this issue for the next meeting. It was suggested that the existing GISB Shipper Imbalance and the Allocation be reviewed.

♦ **Imbalance Trade Confirmation**

Discussion:

- Is a quick response to the Imbalance Trade Confirmation needed? Or does the Imbalance Trade Notification suffice? Some parties have set up a batch process to

run the day after the Imbalance Trade Confirmation is received (see proposed S11). A quick response would mean that they would need to process Imbalance Trade Confirmations as they are received.

- Proposed S11 is based on receipt of an Imbalance Trade Confirmation, not the Request for Imbalance Trade. If the Request for Imbalance Trade is received and a corresponding Imbalance Trade Confirmation is not received, it is held until the end of the trading period. At the end of the trading period, a Request for Imbalance that does not have a corresponding Imbalance Trade Confirmation is disregarded. An Imbalance Trade Notification is not sent for that Request for Imbalance Trade.

ISSUE to Imbalance Subcommittee:

During the processing of R97117 and R97118, the Expedited Data Development Subcommittee raised the following issues:

1. Proposed GISB Standard No. [S11] reads as follows:

“After receipt of an Imbalance Trade Confirmation, the Transportation Service Provider should send the Imbalance Trade Notification to the initiating trader and the confirming trader no later than noon (central clock time) the next business day.”

This proposed standard supports batch processing during the imbalance trading process. It states that, when an Imbalance Trade Confirmation is received, the Imbalance Trade Notification is sent by noon the next business day. How will a confirming trader be notified of errors in the Imbalance Trade Confirmation?

2. Per the diagram developed by the Imbalance Subcommittee titled “Proposed Imbalance Trading Process – May 27, 1999”, a quick response data set is to be developed as a response to the Request for Imbalance Trade. What is the timing for the return of a ‘Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response’ to the initiating trader?

Sense of the Room: 5 In Favor; 0 Opposed

7. The next meeting is scheduled for April 25 – 26 in Houston. The exact location is to be determined.