

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
January 10 – 12, 2000
Dynegy's Offices; Houston, TX
FINAL MINUTES

1. Jim Keisler opened the meeting and welcomed participants.
2. Housekeeping information was provided by Pete Whatley.
3. Anti-trust guidelines were given by Jim K.
4. The agenda was revised to add **R98035A** after **R96056**. The revised agenda was adopted.
5. Review of the December meeting minutes was postponed until Wednesday morning.
6. Address Current Requests for Initiation or Enhancement of GISB Standards and items transferred from other GISB subcommittees – Discussion, Q&A and Sense of the Room for each item.

Monday January 10, 2000

- **R98042 – Duke Energy**

Request: Add Delivery Location Confirmation Status and Receipt Location Confirmation Status to the Scheduled Quantity.

Discussion: On September 13 – 14, Information Requirements (IR) addressed a similar request, **R98057**. The data elements Delivery Scheduling Status and Receipt Scheduling Status were added to the Scheduled Quantity transaction set both with usages of 'MA'. Also, an issue was sent to Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS) stating that IR feels that the resolution of **R98057** suffices for **R98042**. On 12/9/99, BPS approved IR's statement. IR has no additional comments. This request is complete for IR.

- **R96007 / R96008 – Transcapacity**

Request: Develop a transaction set to request allocation information.

Discussion: Hold until the requester arrives at the meeting.

- **R96056 – Exxon**

Request: Develop a Producer Imbalance Statement.

Discussion: The requester should arrive at 1:30. We'll discuss until they arrive. Jim K. reviewed the history of the request. IR last addressed this request in July 1998. Jim K. also distributed the draft data dictionary from that IR meeting, and an updated data dictionary that he prepared, as well.

In the January 2000 data dictionary, the **'Reporting Pressure Base'** and **'Wet/Dry Basis'** data elements were deleted from the prior data dictionary. Jim Keisler cited GISB Standard No. 2.3.9 as rationale, which states in part "Standardize the reporting basis for gas volumes as cubic foot at standard conditions of 14.73 psia, 60 degrees, F and dry." Per Exxon, some Producers use the reporting pressure base per each state's reporting requirements. Kim stated that our options are to either leave the two data elements in the data set or send this issue to BPS. Before we send anything to BPS, Tommie will check on his reporting requirements and report back at a subsequent IR meeting.

Tommie stated that he needs to show Exxon's **mailing address** on the statement. Currently, when the receiver of the document needs to make revisions to the information on the document, they mark it up and mail it back to Exxon. IR added it to the data dictionary.

Tommie also stated that he needs to send **comments**. They currently send a reason for an adjustment. IR determined that the Adjustment Reason data element could fulfill this requirement and should be at the same level as the quantity that is being adjusted.

Regarding 'Location' – what purpose do DRNs serve? GISB has a standard. IHS will set up logical DRNs. What are all of the location types for DRNs?

Assumptions:

- One imbalance per document.
- Use a DRN to identify the "location" of the imbalance. Could be called "Imbalance Location", and would be at the header level.

BPS ISSUE:

For the Producer Imbalance statement, imbalances are held at locations/levels that are purely logical.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Tuesday January 11, 2000

• **R96056 – Exxon**

Request: Develop a Producer Imbalance Statement.

Discussion: Tommy Hartman of Exxon/Mobil provided a number of samples of the Producer Imbalance statement which were prepared by his company, as well as by other companies. He also provided a sample of the Producer Imbalance statement which was developed by COPAS. Discussion centered on the comparison of these samples with the proposed transaction set which was previously developed by IR.

Open Issues:

- a) Is the DRN sufficient to identify the location/facility or is a location type, a state, a county, a field, etc. also required?
- b) Does there need to be a reservoir code and a name, or just a reservoir name?
- c) Are the pressure base and the wet/dry basis data elements required, or will all information be provided at 14.73 dry?

The draft dictionary for the Producer Imbalance was reviewed and changes were made. A Sense of the Room was not taken on the draft dictionary. However, the revised draft dictionary will be posted on the GISB home page as soon as possible. Jim Keisler and Richard Smith will get together off-line and prepare the TIBP for this transaction set, as well as the associated sample paper transaction. An additional conference call will be scheduled in an effort to finalize the data dictionary, and to discuss the TIBP and the sample paper transaction.

• **R96007 / R96008 – Transcapacity**

Request: Develop a transaction set to request allocation information.

Discussion: The requester of these transaction sets – Request for Information and Response to Request for Information – is now present. A final review of the data dictionaries, the TIBPs, and the sample paper transactions was performed.

Motion: Send the data dictionaries, TIBPs, and sample paper transactions for these transaction sets to the Technical Subcommittee for mapping, and send questions which were identified at the November, 1999 Information Requirements meeting to the Business Practices Subcommittee.

Sense of the Room: 8 In favor 0 Opposed

Motion Passed.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Wednesday January 11, 2000

The minutes from December 7-8,1999 were reviewed and approved as modified. Additionally, the attachments to the minutes were reviewed and approved as modified.

In reviewing the attachments, it was discovered that the data element Data Sets Requested was assigned an abbreviation of Data Set Req. However, in an existing transaction set within Capacity Release that same data element was assigned an abbreviation of DS Req. At yesterday's meeting, a motion was passed which sent **R96007** and **R96008** to the Technical Subcommittee. Therefore, a new motion is needed to rectify the aforementioned abbreviation.

Motion: Change the abbreviation of the data element Data Sets Requested within the transaction sets Request for Information and Response to Request for Information to DS Req.

Sense of the Room: 9 In favor 0 Opposed

Motion Passed.

• **R98031 / R98035B – Tennessee/ANR Pipeline**

Request: Develop a Confirmation by Exception Report.

Discussion: A draft data dictionary for the Confirmation by Exception Election transaction set was presented by Jim Keisler. This draft data dictionary was reviewed and changes were made.

The question arose as to the usage of the Confirmation by Exception Election transaction set. If IR creates a new transaction set for Confirmation by Exception Election, then if pipelines perform confirmations by exception, are they required to utilize this new transaction set?

Potential Questions to Business Practices Subcommittee:

- 1) Is the business practice of turning the confirmation by exception on/off election via an EBB used widely and frequently enough to justify an EDI implementation?
- 2) If an EDI implementation is necessary, then is the sending of the confirmation by exception on/off election a mutually agreed business practice?

Questions to Business Practices Subcommittee regarding R98031:

Standard # 105 states: "The data elements should accommodate confirmation by exception. If a Transportation Service Provider chooses to support confirmation by exception, the GISB standard data sets should accommodate it."

In regards to **Standard #105**, an analysis by Information Requirements of the current Confirmation transaction sets indicates that those transaction sets do accommodate the business practice of confirmation by exception. However, IR has the following question:

Is the business practice of sending the election to initiate or terminate confirmation by exception suitable for EDI?

Motion: Send this question to the Business Practices Subcommittee.

Sense of the Room: 9 **In favor** 1 **Opposed**

Motion Passed.

Questions to Business Practices Subcommittee regarding R98035B:

The Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS) at their November 18, 1999 meeting declined **R98035A**. BPS decided that the business practice of sending pre-limit quantities should not be standardized. IR noted in its November 2, 1999 memo that pre-limit quantities are sent infrequently. EII, however, indicated that a pre-limit quantity should be accommodated in the to be developed Confirmation by Exception Election data set.

Since BPS indicated in its response to **R98035A** that pre-limit quantities should not be standardized, should IR address pre-limit quantities pursuant to **R98035B**?

Note: Pursuant to instructions from EII, IR is processing **R98035B** in conjunction with **R98031**.

Motion: Send this question to the Business Practices Subcommittee.

Sense of the Room: 6 **In favor** 0 **Opposed**

Motion Passed.

- **R98033B / R98059 – ANR Pipeline/Transco**

Request: Develop a Scheduled Quantity for Pools Report.

Discussion: Two handouts prepared by Stephanie LeCureaux of ANR Pipeline Company were distributed and reviewed. The discussion focused on whether or not these requests could best be satisfied by developing a new dataset or by making a set of changes to the existing Scheduled Quantity dataset. No decisions were reached; additional discussion is needed at a future IR meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

- **R98036 – ANR Pipeline**

Request: Modify the confirmation datasets to accommodate producer rankings.

Discussion: This request was not addressed.

- **R98041 – Columbia Gas Transmission**

Request: Add data elements to the Nomination to accommodate a “Super-Nomination”.

Discussion: This request was not addressed.

Note : Two documents entitled Data Element Cross Reference – Nominations, Flowing Gas, and Invoicing and Data Element Cross Reference – Capacity Release were included as attachments to the December 7-8, 1999 IR meetings. An off-line review of those documents uncovered a small number of errors/inaccuracies. Those documents have been revised and are included as attachments to this document.