

**GISB Expedited Data Development Subcommittee Meeting
May 9-10, 2000
Koch Gateway Pipeline; Houston, Texas
FINAL MINUTES**

1. Theresa Hess opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to the second Expedited Data Development (EDD) meeting. Attendees introduced themselves.
2. Randy Young provided housekeeping information.
3. Anti-trust guidelines were given by Theresa.
4. The agenda was adopted with modifications.
5. The minutes from the March 13 - 14 meeting were adopted with a minor revision to the attached data sets. An asterisk (*) was added to the Authorizing Party data element in the Authorization to Post Imbalances data set to indicate that it is a common code.

NOTE: There was a brief discussion of the timeline for delivering these work products. While we think that we'll be able to finish our work in the next two-three meetings, the work must then go through the Technical Subcommittee to be fully staffed. We do not think all of that work could be completed in time for the August EC meeting. The group was not given a finite deadline for delivery of this work product to the EC. Jim Keisler noted that we need to be aware that the Technical Subcommittee now has a backlog of work. Mark Scheel questioned whether we are limited to one meeting a month. If not, then he feels that we should consider having more frequent meetings.

6. R97117 / R97118

◆ **Response from Imbalance Subcommittee**

As a result of the March EDD meeting, issues were sent to the Imbalances Subcommittee and the EII Task Force. At their April meeting, the Executive Committee determined that both issues should be addressed by the Imbalance Subcommittee. The draft minutes of the May 4 Imbalance Subcommittee meeting have not been posted. Dennis LaTour provided his rough draft of the minutes.

- In Response to EDD's issue regarding the Imbalance Trade Notification and the timing of the Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response, the Imbalance Subcommittee approved the following:

- The Imbalance Subcommittee instructs the EDD to accommodate the notification to the Confirming Trader of errors in the Imbalance Trade Confirmation via the Imbalance Trade Notification, specifically using the data element Trade Reduction Reason Code.
- As a response to EDD question number 2, during the hours of 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM Central Clock Time (CCT), when a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) receives a Request for Imbalance Trade document from an Initiating Trader by the conclusion of a given quarter hour period, the TSP will send to the Initiating Trader's designated site a corresponding Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response by the conclusion of the subsequent quarter hour period. When the Request for Imbalance Trade is received during other hours, the TSP will send to the Initiating Trader's designated site a corresponding Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response document by 9:00 AM the next business day.

The quarter hour periods will be defined to begin on the hour and at 15, 30, and 45 minutes past the hour. A given quarter hour will contain all transactions whose receipt time is less than the beginning of the subsequent quarter hour.

- In Response to EDD's issue regarding data groupings for the Imbalance Netting / Trading data sets, the Imbalance Subcommittee approved the following:
 - The Imbalance Subcommittee instructs EDD to develop data groupings for Imbalance Netting / Trading. No specific order for the data elements within the data groupings is needed.

◆ **Issues/Questions on Current Draft Data Dictionaries (including Trade Reduction Reason from Imbalance Subcommittee)**

Parties were asked to present their issues and suggested revisions to the current draft dictionaries. See the draft data dictionaries (attachments to these minutes) for modifications that were made during this meeting.

There was agreement that the labels for the entity elements in the **Request for Imbalance Trade** were correct, so we moved to the **Authorization to Post Imbalances**. There were several options discussed regarding the perspective of the submitter of the Authorization and which party is the authorizing party versus the agent versus the contract holder.

MOTION:

Option A: Imbalance Holder or Agent is SO, Contract Holder is M, with contact information being conditional on whether the SO field is populated.

Option B: Imbalance Holder or Agent is M, Contract Holder is C with contact information having the same condition as the element.

Option C: Authorizing Party is M, Contract Holder is C, and one contact, not a contact for each. And a separate element for Agent of which, Authorizing Party is either.

After discussion, Option C was withdrawn.

Sense of the Room:

Option A	9
Option B	4

The group decided to revert back to the Authorization to Post Imbalances data set as it was sent to us from the Imbalances Subcommittee, with a few minor changes.

Some parties feel that there should be a 'quick response' document to the Authorization data set. Otherwise, the submitter will not know if the transaction was accepted. The issue arose as to whether the Authorization should be developed for EDI or whether it should be developed for EBB only. This subcommittee does not have the authority to determine whether or not an EDI version should be created. This must be sent to the Imbalance Subcommittee to make the determination.

Issue to the Imbalance Subcommittee:

The EDD subcommittee believes that the Authorization to Post Imbalances is not suitable for EDI development because of the small number of data elements in the data set and the infrequency of its use. EDD requests the Imbalance Subcommittee to affirm this direction. For your information, attached is the working data dictionary.

Sense of the Room: 12 In Favor; 1 Opposed

MOTION:

Adopt the revisions to the Authorization to Post Imbalances working data dictionary, as per the attached.

Sense of the Room: 13 In Favor; 0 Opposed

Posted (Available) Imbalances Download

The discussion of what data set will be used to 'request' this download was postponed until later. Two options are the existing Upload of Request for

Download of Posted Datasets and the proposed Request for Information (R96007 / R96008).

Regarding the "Posting Date" data element, there was discussion as to whether this date is an 'as of' date. We must recognize that some TSPs will continually process the Authorization to Post Imbalances data set, but they may not continually process the imbalance trades. So the net change in the data set from day to day will vary dependent upon how often the TSP processes the imbalance trade transactions.

Regarding the name of the data set - the current name does not indicate that the download only reflects the imbalances authorized for posting. The group agreed to change the name back to "Posted Imbalances Download".

Day 2 of meeting (Continued discussion of Posted Imbalances Download):

It was suggested that the 'Imbalance Period' should allow parties to specify an entire month or a particular day within a month. The group agreed to send instructions to the Technical Subcommittee regarding the Imbalance Period data element.

MOTION:

Change the definition of Imbalance Period by striking the words "month and year" and replacing them with "period". Also, send instructions to Technical to provide for the following expressions of the period: CCYYMM, CCYYMMDD, CCYYMM-CCYYMM, CCYYMMDD-CCYYMMDD.

Sense of the Room: 14 In Favor; 1 Opposed

Code Values for the Imbalance Type data element

The group added definitions for the code values that were provided by the Imbalance Subcommittee. Several attendees brought additional code values with them to the meeting, as was requested at the prior meeting.

Some parties in the room felt that adding a greater level of granularity (such as zone) to the trade transaction would restrict the trade. There was concern that the additional information would be used for restrictive purposes.

There was extensive discussion on whether the Imbalance Type element is adequate or whether another element would be appropriate to further describe the imbalance. There were several parties who strongly felt that the Imbalance Subcommittee took a position on this and that we should not re-trade their decision, while there were others who felt that another element would be effective.

A discussion was held regarding whether a qualifier needs to be defined for Operational Impact Area - as in Zone, Segment, Point, etc. Since this is a TSP's designation, not necessarily a single location, it was decided that this should not be a common code.

MOTION:

Adopt the revisions to the Posted Imbalances Download working data dictionary, as per the attached.

Sense of the Room: 9 In Favor; 1 Opposed

Request for Imbalance Trade

The data set was discussed and revisions were made.

MOTION:

Adopt the revisions to the Request for Imbalance Trade working data dictionary, as per the attached.

Sense of the Room: 9 In Favor; 0 Opposed

Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response

The data set was discussed and revisions were made.

MOTION:

Adopt the revisions to the Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response working data dictionary, as per the attached.

Sense of the Room: 8 In Favor; 0 Opposed

Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade

The data set was discussed and revisions were made.

MOTION:

Adopt the revisions to the Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade working data dictionary, as per the attached.

Sense of the Room: 9 In Favor; 0 Opposed

Issue to the Imbalance Subcommittee:

The EDD subcommittee believes that the Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade dataset is not suitable for EDI development because of the infrequency of

its use. It is further believed that the EBB is a much more efficient mechanism to accomplish this task. EDD requests the Imbalance Subcommittee to affirm this direction. For your information, attached is the working data dictionary.

Sense of the Room: 8 In Favor; 0 Opposed