

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
January 13-14, 2004 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Mountain)
Albuquerque, NM - PNM**

FINAL MINUTES

1. **Introductions:** Participants introduced themselves
2. **Housekeeping:** Patrick Hickey provided the housekeeping
3. **Anti-trust Guidelines:** Dale Davis read the anti-trust guidelines
4. **Adoption of Agenda:** It was noted that the agenda is effectively in two parts – the larger requests for new data sets and the routine maintenance items. Day 1 of two-day meetings or the first half of one-day meetings will be to go as far as possible in the first section and into the routine maintenance items if there is time available. On Day 2 of two-day meetings or the second half of one-day meetings, the focus will shift to the routine maintenance items. In so doing, IR can try to work through some of the smaller backlogged items. The agenda as posted was adopted with no opposition.
5. **Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes & Attachments**
 - December 9, 2003:
The draft minutes for December 9, 2003, as modified, and the attachments, as posted, were adopted as final with no opposition.
6. **Address Current Requests for Initiation or Enhancement of NAESB Standards and items transferred from other NAESB subcommittees** -- Discussion, Q&A and a balanced vote for each item. (The items will be addressed in the order listed until either all items have been addressed or we have run out of time.)

EIITF Related Requests

- **R98040 / R98050 Columbia Gas / TransCapacity/Skipping Stone - Storage Report**
Review and update proposed implementation for recent changes resulting from the EC adoption of the recommendations for R98057B and R99024 (adopted by the EC June 5, 2003) and AP03006 (adopted by the EC 10/9/03 and modified by IR 10/21/03 subject to EC approval). There will also be discussion on the appropriateness of addressing Northern Natural's request **R03030** along with the storage report that would mean processing it out of the normal course of business cycle.

(Relevant Minutes: EIITF – 11/4/98, 12/1/98, 1/20/99; IR – 4/11/00, 5/16/00, 6/13/00, 9/12/00; BPS – 11/30/00; IR 12/12/00; Technical 10/8/01; IR 10/9/01, 7/10/03, 8/5/03; EC 10/9/03; IR 10/21/03, 11/13/03, 12/9/03; BPS 1/8/04)

IR Discussion:

Participants reviewed the game plan outlined at the December 9, 2003 IR meeting. BPS sent the following response to IR's memo of December 29, 2003 (from the December 9, 2003 IR meeting):

NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
January 13-14, 2004 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Mountain)
Albuquerque, NM - PNM

Question to BPS:

As a result of processing request R98040/R98050, Information Requirements (IR) is developing the Storage Report data set. IR has determined that the best implementation for requesting this dataset would be to utilize the Request for Information – NAESB WGQ Standard 2.4.7.

NAESB WGQ Standards 2.3.51 through 2.3.53 set forth guidelines for the support of the Request for Information for various data sets and the timeframes for replying to such requests.

Should there be similar guidelines for the new Storage Report data set? If so, IR recommends the following change to NAESB WGQ Standard 2.3.51:

NAESB WGQ Standards 2.3.52 and 2.3.53 apply to the following Statements:

NAESB WGQ Standard No. 0.4.z1 Storage Report
NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.5 Scheduled Quantity
NAESB WGQ Standard No. 2.4.3 Allocation
NAESB WGQ Standard No. 2.4.4 Shipper Imbalance

Answer from BPS (BPS meeting 1/8/04 – memo 1/13/04):

In response to IR memo of December 29, 2003 regarding R98040 / R98050, BPS instructs IR to develop a method for requesting the new data set for a storage report. In addition, NAESB WGQ Standard 2.3.51 should be modified as follows to accommodate the Storage Report:

NAESB WGQ Standards 2.3.52 and 2.3.53 apply to the following Statements:

NAESB WGQ Standard No. 0.4.z1 Storage Report
NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.5 Scheduled Quantity
NAESB WGQ Standard No. 2.4.3 Allocation
NAESB WGQ Standard No. 2.4.4 Shipper Imbalance

The subcommittee reviewed the data element levels for correctness. One question was what happens in an activity report if multiple line items for a transaction where all but one data element is identical. It was determined that because this is a daily summary type of report by transaction type, all the identical transaction types for a given day are totaled and reported as a single number (e.g. if there are 10 transfers in, each of which is for 10 units on that given day, a total of 100 is shown and not all of the ten individual transfers). Effectively you have a single line item per day per transaction type.

The discussion then shifted to the use of location and the ending storage balance data elements. Some storage reports are provided at a contract level without sending the location. Other storage reports are provided at a contract / location level. In either case, the flexibility is provided such that the corresponding storage rate schedule can be sent. For reporting of ending balances, if the report is sent at a contract level, the Ending Storage Balance is sent. If the report is at the contract / location level, then the Location Ending Storage Balance, Location Ending Storage Balance – Firm or Location Ending Storage Balance - Interruptible is sent. In addition to sending the location and location balances at the contract / location level, the Ending Storage Balance may be sent for the contract.

The Request for Information (NAESB WGQ Standard 2.4.7) and the Response to Request for Information (NAESB WGQ Standard 2.4.8) were modified.

The name of the data set was changed from 'Storage Report' to 'Service Requester Storage Information'.

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
January 13-14, 2004 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Mountain)
Albuquerque, NM - PNM**

See the attached workpaper for the changes made during the meeting.

Routine Maintenance Items:

- **The following two requests will be discussed together**

- **1999 Annual Plan – Cross Contact Ranking**

- Request:** Change the condition of upstream rank and downstream rank in the Data Element Cross Reference Table to “NU” for the pathed and non-path models.

- (Relevant Minutes: EC 11/11/99, IR 12/10/02, 1/14/03, BPS 11/19/03)

AND

- **R03015 TransCanada**

- Request:** Request that the usage of the Downstream Rank (Priority) data element in the threaded (“T”) segment of the pathed non-threaded model in the NAESB Wholesale Gas Quadrant Nomination Dataset (standard 1.4.1) be changed from Not Used (NU) to Mutually Agreeable (MA).

- NOTE:** BPS adopted a different implementation than what was stated in the request.

- (Relevant Minutes: EC 7/31/03; BPS 10/2/03, 11/19/03)

1999 Annual Plan – Cross Contact Ranking

IR Discussion:

IR reviewed the following response from BPS to IR’s memo of May 23, 2003:

BPS Answer (BPS meeting 11/19/03, BPS memo 1/13/04):

BPS Discussion:

Now that the R03015 request has been resolved and a new data element has been added to accommodate the ranking needed by TransCanada, it was determined that upstream and downstream ranks are not need for the threaded segment of the Pathed Non-threaded nomination model. A brief discussion was held as to how an upstream and downstream rank would be used for the Pathed and Non-pathed nomination models. It was generally felt that the data elements would not be used for the pathed and non-pathed models. It was determined that we should go ahead and modify the upstream rank and downstream rank data elements in the pathed and non-pathed nomination models from MA to nu.

Motion

In response to the Information Requirements memo, dated May 23, 2003, regarding Upstream and Downstream Rank, the Business Practices Subcommittee confirms that IR should change the usage of the data elements Upstream Rank (Priority) and Downstream Rank (Priority) in the nomination process from MA to nu (not used).

Motion passes

NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
January 13-14, 2004 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Mountain)
Albuquerque, NM - PNM

IR reviewed its actions from December 2002 regarding the instructions from XKR to change the usage of the data elements Upstream Rank (Priority) and Downstream Rank (Priority) in the nomination process from MA to nu (not used). Modifications were made to the TIBP.

MOTION:

- Modify the NAESB WGQ Standard 1.4.1 (Nominations) as follows:

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
 January 13-14, 2004 – 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. (Mountain Time)
 Public Service of New Mexico
 Alvarado Square
 Albuquerque, NM 87158-2608**

Standard 1.4.1

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Pathed	EBB Non- Pathed	EBB PNT - “T”	EBB PNT - “U”	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Downstream Rank (Priority) (Dn Rank)	This is the scheduling rank (priority) assigned to the quantities on the downstream side of the delivery location. If it is a physical location, it can be thought of as the downstream side of the flange. Priority 1 means the highest priority. Priorities 2, 3, etc. are in descending order of priority. Quantities assigned the same rank will be scheduled on a pro rata basis.	DelDG	<u>MA</u> nu	<u>MA</u> nu	nu	SO	C	Sender's option when the model used is 'Pathed Non-Threaded—Unthreaded Segment' and may be mutually agreed to for 'Pathed' or 'Non-Pathed' models.
Upstream Rank (Priority) (Up Rank)	This is the scheduling rank (priority) assigned to the quantities on the upstream side of the receipt location. It can be thought of as the upstream side of the flange. Priority 1 means the highest priority. Priorities 2, 3, etc. are in descending order of priority. Quantities assigned the same rank will be scheduled on a pro rata basis.	RecDG	<u>MA</u> nu	<u>MA</u> nu	nu	SO	C	Sender's option when the model used is 'Pathed Non-Threaded—Unthreaded Segment' and may be mutually agreed to for 'Pathed' or 'Non-Pathed' models.

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
 January 13-14, 2004 – 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. (Mountain Time)
 Public Service of New Mexico
 Alvarado Square
 Albuquerque, NM 87158-2608**

- Modify the 7th paragraph of the Technical Implementation of Business Processes for the NAESB WGQ Standard 1.4.1 (Nominations) as follows: (builds off of changes in R03015)

The **pathed non-threaded model** consists of two components. The components are the threaded segment (model type 'T') and the unthreaded segment (model type 'U'). The threaded segment defines the receipt location to delivery location path of gas, with its associated contract, receipt and delivery location, quantity type and package id for a specified effective date range. The unthreaded segment functions similar to the non-pathed model above with the exception of the usage of ranks. In the unthreaded segment, the upstream and downstream ranks are sender's option and the receipt and delivery ranks are not used, while in the non-pathed model the upstream and downstream ranks are not used and the receipt and delivery ranks are sender's option. ~~and the upstream and downstream ranks are mutually agreed upon.~~

Vote				Balanced	Balanced	Balanced
	For	Against	Total	For	Against	Total
End Users	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
LDCs	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
Pipelines	6	0	6	2.00	0.00	2
Producers	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
Services	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
	6	0	6	2.00	0.00	2

MOTION PASSES

R03015 - TransCanada

Instruction from BPS 11/19/03:

The Business Practices Subcommittee instructs the Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate the ability to send the Threaded Rank data element in the nomination process as a mutually agreed business practice for the Threaded segment of the Pathed Non-Threaded nomination model. The suggested definition is "This is a supplemental rank (priority) assigned to the quantities on the threaded segment of the Pathed Non-Threaded nomination model. Priority 1 means the highest priority. Priorities 2, 3, etc. are in descending order of priority. Quantities assigned the same rank will be applied on a pro-rata basis.

IR Discussion:

The attached workpaper was developed. It builds off of the changes made above for the Cross Contract Ranking issue.

MOTION:

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
January 13-14, 2004 – 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. (Mountain Time)
Public Service of New Mexico
Alvarado Square
Albuquerque, NM 87158-2608**

Adopt the attached workpaper.

Vote				Balanced	Balanced	Balanced
	For	Against	Total	For	Against	Total
End Users	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
LDCs	1	0	1	1.00	0.00	1
Pipelines	7	0	7	2.00	0.00	2
Producers	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
Services	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
	8	0	8	3.00	0.00	3

MOTION PASSES

The following two requests will be discussed together:

- **R99031 – TransCapacity and ANR**

Request: Add a new data element "Confirmation Intraday Indicator" to Request for Confirmation (1.4.3), Confirmation Response (1.4.4), Confirmation Response Quick Response (1.4.7) and Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6).

(Relevant Minutes: BPS – 9/7/00, 9/14/00 and 9/28/00, IR – 3/19/02, 4/16/02; BPS - 8/21/023; IR - 9/4/03)

AND

- **R03008 - ANR**

Request: Add a new data element "Nominations Intraday Indicator" to the Nominations data set.

(Relevant Minutes: BPS 8/14/03, 8/21/023; IR 9/4/03)

IR Discussion:

IR reviewed the proposed implementation for R99031 from April 16, 2002. The following instruction from BPS for R03008 was reviewed:

The Business Practices Subcommittee instructs the Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR) to accommodate the mutually agreed business practice of sending a nomination intraday indicator data element in the Nominations related data sets. This request is similar in nature to Request R99031, which implemented a confirmation intraday indicator data element. IR should investigate the possibility of implementing consistent code values for industry standard nomination cycles.

A discussion ensued on the different uses of a cycle indicator in the nomination, scheduling and confirmation processes to determine if there is enough commonality to have one data element that works for all three processes or if multiple data elements are needed.

NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
January 13-14, 2004 – 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. (Mountain Time)
Public Service of New Mexico
Alvarado Square
Albuquerque, NM 87158-2608

Nominations Process

Purpose: Allows the SR to indicate in which nom cycle (effective flow time) the nom is applicable recognizing that it provides the SR the ability to instruct the TSP to hold the nomination until some future cycle. In some cases, the TSP has established additional nomination cycles that have the same effective time as the NAESB standardized cycle (i.e.. the TSP has established an additional cycle that is like a “late noms” for a given NAESB cycle.). This latter practice is based on the TSP’s being willing to accept “late noms” for a given cycle.

Level: Date level = contract level = Detail level

Scheduled Process

Purpose: In the scheduled quantity, this allows the TSP to indicate to the SR the applicable cycle for the quantities shown. In the scheduled quantity for operator this allows the TSP to indicate to the confirming party the applicable cycle for the quantities shown.

Level: Date level = contract level = Detail level

Confirmation Process

Purpose: Allows the confirmation requester to indicate the applicable cycle to the confirming party. This data element could also be used by a confirming party to send a solicited or an unsolicited confirmation response in advance of the ‘normal’ confirmation time for a particular cycle, be they the NAESB standardized cycles or additional cycles the TSP has agreed to provide on its system. In the latter situation, the confirming party does not have to confirm quantities for any cycle other than the next available NAESB standardized cycle. In this case, if the confirming party chooses not to respond until the next available standardized cycle, the confirmation may not be useful.

Level: Date level = contract level = Detail

Based on a review of the above, it was determined that a single ‘cycle indicator’ data element would work for all three processes with the definition “Associates information to applicable nomination cycle”. One way to handle the issue of having both standardized code values for the NAESB standardized nomination cycles and also have user defined code values is to create two data elements – ‘Cycle Indicator’ and ‘Cycle Indicator User Defined Text’.

Cycle Indicator could have the following code values:

<u>CV</u>	<u>Description</u>
T	Timely
E	Evening
ID1 `	Intraday 1
ID2	Intraday 2
UD `	See “Cycle Indicator User Defined Text”

The data element ‘Cycle Indicator User Defined Text’ would be conditioned on if the code in the Cycle Indicator is ‘UD’.

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
January 13-14, 2004 – 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. (Mountain Time)
Public Service of New Mexico
Alvarado Square
Albuquerque, NM 87158-2608**

7. Other Business

None

8. Next Meeting Dates and Location

Next Meeting: February 27, 2004
 Location: Houston, TX
 Host: Panhandle Eastern Pipeline

 March 31 – April 1, 2004
 Location: Richmond, VA (Tentative)
 Host: Dominion

9. Adjourn

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
 January 13-14, 2004 – 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. (Mountain Time)
 Public Service of New Mexico
 Alvarado Square
 Albuquerque, NM 87158-2608**

Meeting Attendees and Voting Record

Attendee	Organization	1/13/04	1/14/04	NAESB Member?
<u>Pipelines:</u>				
Christopher Burden	Williams Gas Pipeline	√ (nv)	√ (nv)	√
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	√	√	√
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	√	√	√
Tom Gwilliam	Iroquois Gas Transmission System	√	√	√
Tran Kimbel	Dominion Transmission	√	√	√
Janie Nielsen	Kern River Gas Transmission	√	√	√
Micki Schmitz	Northern Natural	√	√	√
Ken Schubert	TransCanada Pipeline	√	√	√
Kim Van Pelt	Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line	√	√	√
Randy Young	Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP	√	√	√
<u>Services:</u>				
<u>Producers:</u>				
<u>End Users:</u>				
<u>LDCs:</u>				
Patrick Hickey	Public Service Company of New Mexico		√	
<u>Associations:</u>				

Bold signifies Chair

nv – not voting