

**GISB Imbalance Subcommittee Meeting**  
**July 6, 2000**  
**Conference Call**  
**FINAL MINUTES**

1. Jim Buccigross opened the meeting and welcomed participants.
2. Jim B. gave the anti-trust guidelines.
3. The agenda was reviewed. A motion was made to modify the agenda to include an issue, which was sent by the Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS) to the Imbalance Subcommittee. This issue came from the June 29, 2000 BPS meeting. The motion passed, and the revised agenda was adopted.
4. The minutes from the May 4, 2000 meeting were reviewed. These minutes were approved, as modified.

The purpose of this meeting is to address two issues, which were sent to the Imbalance Subcommittee from the Expedited Data Development (EDD) Subcommittee, and one issue, which was sent to the Imbalance Subcommittee from the BPS.

The first EDD issue is as follows:

**ISSUE to Imbalance Subcommittee (from EDD Subcommittee, May 9 - 10, 2000):**

The EDD subcommittee believes that the Authorization to Post Imbalances is not suitable to 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.

The second EDD issue is as follows:

**ISSUE to Imbalance Subcommittee (from EDD Subcommittee, May 9 - 10, 2000):**

The EDD subcommittee believes that the Withdrawal of Request for Imbalance Trade is not suitable to 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.

A brief discussion occurred regarding the two EDD issues. One participant noted that both issues included language, which provided reasons why the two datasets were not appropriate for EDI development. According to the participant, the language was deemed unnecessary and could potentially prejudice subsequent EDI development decisions.

As a result of the discussion, the following motion was made:

**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.**

The BPS issue is as follows:

**ISSUE to Imbalance Subcommittee (from BPS, June 29, 2000):**

At their April 6, 2000 meeting, BPS requested information from EDD. Below is the motion adopted by BPS:

**Motion:** BPS requests that EDD inform BPS as to how the Shipper Imbalance Statement and the datasets under development in EDD, having to do with Imbalance Netting and Trading, will enable users of the respective data sets to tie together information with respect to the zone where the imbalance is reported in the respective documents.

Response from EDD:

EDD discussed this item at their June 6 – 7, 2000 meeting and crafted the following response to BPS:

**Motion:** The Imbalance Subcommittee voted to remove the Zone Identifier from the Imbalance Netting / Trading datasets at their May 19, 1999 meeting. The EDD work does not include the Zone Identifier data element. With respect to zone, there is no explicit linkage between the Shipper Imbalance dataset and Imbalance Netting / Trading datasets. If an association needs to exist, this is a business practice issue and is not appropriate for resolution by EDD.

The following motion was passed at the June 29, 2000 BPS meeting:

**Motion:** BPS should send its question and EDD's response to the Imbalance Netting and Trading Task Force to be added to its agenda for when they see fit.

The group decided that this issue would be discussed in its entirety, but that a vote would **not** be taken until a subsequent Imbalance Subcommittee meeting.

At the May 19, 1999 Imbalance Subcommittee meeting, there was considerable discussion regarding whether Zone Identifier should be included in the Imbalance Netting / Trading datasets. At that time, some participants at the meeting were concerned that by including the data element Zone Identifier in the Imbalance Netting / Trading datasets, the Zone Identifier could be used to limit certain types of imbalance trades. Per the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, only the data element Operational Impact Area can be used to limit imbalance trades.

Since that May 19, 1999 meeting, however, in conjunction with EDD's development of the Imbalance Netting / Trading data sets, these concerns have been allayed. Additionally, pipeline representatives have always maintained that the use of Zone Identifier was **never** intended to limit imbalance trades, but rather to explicitly identify the bucket of gas, which was to be traded.

Therefore, a suggestion was made to add the data element Zone Identifier to the Imbalance Trade Notification. After some discussion, another suggestion was made to add the data element to the Posted Imbalances Download.

The conditionality of the data element Zone Identifier was discussed. One participant noted that for some pipelines the Zone Identifier would be identical to the Operational Impact Area; therefore, the data element Zone Identifier could be "conditional", with the condition "mandatory when supported by the transportation service provider and when different from the Operational Impact Area". It was noted, however, that for some pipelines there may or may not be a relationship between the Zone Identifier and the Operational Impact Area.

After some additional discussion, an all-encompassing suggestion was made to include the data element Zone Identifier in the Request for Imbalance Trade, the Request for Imbalance Trade Quick Response (QR), the Request for Confirmation of Imbalance Trade (mutually agreed dataset), and the Imbalance Trade Confirmation. It was noted that if the Operational Impact Area and the Zone Identifier data elements appear at the same level in the dataset, then the Zone Identifier would not necessarily be required in the Request for Imbalance Trade QR.

Greg Lander of CapacityCenter.com volunteered to prepare a draft work paper regarding the previous all-encompassing suggestion. The next meeting, assuming there are no conflicts on the GISB calendar, will be another conference call to be held from 9:00 AM (CDT) to 10:00 AM (CDT) on Thursday, July 20, 2000.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM. (CDT)

### **Imbalance Conference Call Attendance**

#### **SERVICES:**

##### **Jim Buccigross**

Greg Lander

Sylvia Munson

Mark Scheel

Debra Stubblefield

##### **National Registry**

CapacityCenter.com

Altra

Dynegy Inc.

Corcoran Law Office

#### **PIPELINES:**

##### **Dennis LaTour**

Pam Albers

Sandra Barnett

Charlie Bass

Vickie Coen

##### **ANR Pipeline (ANR )**

Williston Basin

Koch Gateway

Tennessee Gas Pipeline

Flo Comini	ANR
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline
Bill Griffith	Colorado Interstate Gas
Theresa Hess	Transwestern
Tammy Hopkins	Enron – Northern Natural
Pete Howells	ANR Pipeline Company
Jim Keisler	Williams Gas Pipeline
Mary Sue McNeal	El Paso Natural Gas
Cari Sloan	ANR
Sherry Wake	ANR