

GISB Expedited Data Development Subcommittee Meeting
September 21 – 22, 2000
DRAFT Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - Sylvia Munson welcomed the participants
 - Participants introduced themselves
2. Housekeeping
 - Pete Whatley welcomed participants to Dynegy, Conference Room 4505; Houston, Texas and introduced them to the facilities.
3. Anti-trust Guidelines
 - The anti-trust guidelines were recited.
4. Adoption of Agenda
 - Agenda was unanimously adopted as posted.
5. Review and Adoption Prior Meeting Minutes (including attachments)
 - The minutes of the August 29, 2000 meeting were adopted as modified.
6. Development of Title Transfer Tracking datasets and the accompanying documentation.
 - The posted work paper was reviewed. Minor corrections were made.
 - Continue Discussions: (See discussion workpaper from whiteboard tables.)
 - Scenario 5, Option 1
 - There are 4 instances where the 3PAD will be identified in the transaction as either an upstream or downstream party.
 - In this Option, the 3PAD would have no interaction with the TSP; they would be identified as a party in the transaction.
 - There was discussion that this option works as long as the TSP is the TTTSP. However, when the TSP and a 3PAD are both TTTSPs, there is not enough information flowing between the parties based on this single flow of information alone.
 - In Iris's Option (in her company's implementation), the 3PAD (pool operator) provides the ranks to facilitate any cuts. Without communication from the 3PAD, the shipper would receive 'unexpected results'.
 - Scenario 5, Option 2
 - There could be confusion within the TSP when a non-contract holder is identified as the service requester in the nomination that is received by the TSP from the 3PAD on behalf of the transactions inside the 3PAD.

GISB Expedited Data Development Subcommittee Meeting
September 21 – 22, 2000
DRAFT Minutes

- In the 4 records sent to the TSP from the 3PAD, the service requesters are F & G, but F & G are not the contract holders on the TSP.
 1. We are not sure if F&G have a contract that can be nominated under
 2. We are not sure that the 3PAD would have the authority to nominate under this arrangement if the contract did exist.

One way to solve this is to add an element to the nomination from the 3PAD that requires the 3PAD to be identified in the nomination transaction.

- On Scenario 5, Option 3
 - In this scenario the 3PAD nominates the flows into and out of the 3PAD. This addresses the contract issue of the 3PAD with the TSP from option 2.
 - This option takes care of some of the problems of option 2, but does not allow the nominations to be chained together, 2 parties at a time, with the noms received from the 3PAD.
 - Therefore, the chain of nominations when a 3PAD is involved is not a parallel relationship to the chain when a 3PAD is not involved.

NOTE: For purposes of these discussions we will identify the information sent from an account holder to the 3PAD as though it was a nomination. This does not preclude the level of information that may be agreed upon between an account holder and a 3PAD. If we are to try to address every exchange of information between an AH and a 3PAD the number of permutations could be endless.

- Scenario 5, Option 5
 - Similar to Option 4, designed for more movements within the 3PAD than are included within this example.
- Identify Dataset Requirements for each option
 - All of the scenarios and each of the options for that scenario have been reviewed. Each of the datasets will be reviewed to identify steps required to make each of the options work.
 - Option 1
No changes to data elements needed to implement this. Code values and error messages will need to be reviewed.
 - Option 2

GISB Expedited Data Development Subcommittee Meeting
September 21 – 22, 2000
DRAFT Minutes

Either a pipe must be willing to accept nominations for a SR with whom they have no contract or the pipe must establish a contractual relationship with all the parties that the 3PAD might submit on behalf of. The other option is to add a 3PAD identifier to let the nominations being submitted associated with a 3PAD to be identified as belonging to that 3PAD. The element for 3PAD identifier would be business conditional and would only apply to those entities who implement this option.

- Option 3
No changes to data elements needed to implement this. Code values and error messages will need to be reviewed.
- Option 4
No changes to data elements needed to implement this. Code values and error messages will need to be reviewed.
- Option 5
No changes to data elements needed to implement this. Code values and error messages will need to be reviewed.

- Additional Scenarios / Options
 - Some participants voiced concern as to whether or not all scenarios needed to cover the pathed model had been discussed
 - One additional scenario may be to add more buy/sells between F and G in the 5th Scenario.
 - Another was identified to add an additional 3PAD into Scenario 5 to evaluate the impact. There could be two 3PADs (both operating at the same location, but on different transactions), there could be two where the transaction flowed from one to the other and there could be either of those situations where the 3PADs communicate with each other or where they do not.
 - There was discussion that the questions raised in Scenarios 1-5 covers all of the cases and these additional scenarios might add 'enlightenment' but will probably not bring additional questions / issues to light.
 - Anyone who wants to work through additional scenarios outside the meeting is welcome to do so and submit them for subsequent meetings.

- Tomorrow
 - Begin the work on the non-pathed model.

Friday, Sept 22, 2000

GISB Expedited Data Development Subcommittee Meeting
September 21 – 22, 2000
DRAFT Minutes

- Meeting to continue under the Anti-Trust Guidelines from yesterday.
- Continue Discussions: (See discussion workpaper from whiteboard tables.)
 - Non-pathed Model
 - This will also cover the pathed non-threaded (PNT) model for use of the 'U' segments.
 - For the PNT model, there is no reason to use the 'T' segment in TTT because the 'T' segment does not identify the parties.
 - Option 1
 - This option, just like in the pathed model, would require communication from the 3PAD in the instance where there is a cut that needs to be made. There was discussion that this scenario makes it easier to have a broken chain.
 - For Option 2
 - There were no comments other than those for pathed model.
 - For Option 3
 - This treats the 3PAD as a pooling party. The difference between pathed and non-pathed is that there are multiple solutions in the pathed scenario but there is only one solution set in the non-pathed scenario.
 - For Option 4 – no comments
 - For Option 5 – no comments
 - General Discussion:
 - On Option 2
 - This appears to be unworkable within current constraints because of the difficulty of maintaining the list of agency agreements between the parties using the 3PAD and the 3PAD itself.
 - This is especially true since many of those parties may not be service requesters on the TSP's system.
 - We will not move forward with this option.
 - Option 2 is not outside the standards of TTT, however, and a TSP could implement this option, if desired.
 - Review Code Values:
 - Transaction Type
 - R96025
 - Request for Title Transfer Transaction Type code value
 - Jim questioned why we need this and why 'Current Business' isn't adequate.

**GISB Expedited Data Development Subcommittee Meeting
September 21 – 22, 2000
DRAFT Minutes**

- On the other hand, we have ‘pooling’ and other various Title Transfers, so it would be consistent to add it.
- It may be valuable to distinguish nominations received from the 3PAD.
- There are three questions:
 - First, does NRG still need this code value? The request is 4 years old.
 - Second, do they know that we are working on their request?
 - Third, we need a definition!
- There were no other Transactions Types that the group felt were needed.
- Error codes and warnings
 - Because there are no additional data elements being added, the existing error and warning codes are sufficient for the Nomination Quick Response.
- Reduction Reason codes
 - The existing ‘NGD’ and ‘NGU’ code values appear to be sufficient to depict the break in a TTT chain.
 - We need a Reduction Reason code to provide the corollary to ‘PBD’ and ‘PBR’. The group decided that the best solution was to replace the description and definition of the existing ‘PBD’ and ‘PBR’ to include logical locations:

Reduction Reason Codes

Code Value	Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
<u>PBD</u>		<u>Pipeline balancing of deliveries at a location. Reduction of deliveries due to balancing of mismatched nominated quantities across contracts at an on-system location.</u>	
<u>PBR</u>		<u>Pipeline balancing of receipts at a location. Reduction of receipts due to balancing of mismatched nominated quantities across contracts at an on –system location.</u>	

- Was this voted on?
- TIBP
 - Jim Keisler will draft text changes and Kim Van Pelt will review in preparation for the next meeting

GISB Expedited Data Development Subcommittee Meeting
September 21 – 22, 2000
DRAFT Minutes

- No paper samples need to be changed
- No data dictionaries need to be changed
- Executive Summary
 - Jim Keisler and Kim Van Pelt will draft text changes in preparation for the next meeting

- Remaining Issues for next meeting
 - Business Process and Practices
 - Documents that we need to review:
 - Nomination
 - Nomination Quick Response
 - Scheduled Quantity
 - All flowing gas and invoice transaction sets that use Transaction Types.
 - Communication of 3PAD list on TSP system (1.3.73)
Several options were discussed.
 - One is to add this item to the Informational Postings
 - Another is to add this to the list of system wide notices categories
 - We will think about this and review it at the next meeting.
 - Communication of location, contract or both to 3PADs (1.3.67)
 - Several options were discussed.
 - We will be prepared to make a recommendation on this at the next meeting.

- 7. Next meeting dates and locations
 - Tentatively, we will meet again on October 25, pending GISB's approval of that date.

- 8. Adjourn