

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)**  
**Houston, TX - Dynegey**

**FINAL MINUTES**

1. **Introductions** - Participants introduced themselves.
2. **Housekeeping** – Pete Whatley welcomed everyone to Dynegey's' offices and gave a brief run-down of the facilities.
3. **Anti-trust Guidelines** – Dale Davis read the anti-trust statement.
3. **Adoption of Agenda**
  - Add R97070 Authorized Point Overrun (After R96009)
  - Add R98041 Supernom (Before R96056)
  - Add R99037 As first item on 05/15/02; Questions from Technical Subcommittee re errors reported on Confirmation Response Quick Response @ detail or subdetail level; error(s) could occur @ header level
  - Agenda adopted as amended.
5. **Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes and Attachments**
  - April 16-17 2002
    - Minor modifications made to the Revised Draft Minutes.
    - No changes made to attachments
  - Minutes and attachments adopted as amended.
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. (The items will be addressed in the order listed until either all items have been addressed or we have run out of time.)
  - **R98041 Update**
    - Question from IR to BPS from April 11, 2000:

At its meeting on April 10 - 11, 2000, the Information Requirements (IR) subcommittee discussed request **R98041** from Columbia Gas Transmission relating to Super Nominations, and determined to send questions regarding the request to BPS.

In the processing of the request, IR discussed the following items:

      1. **GISB Principle 1.1.3:** "There is a need for an infrastructure that would support seamless nominations across transportation service providers. However, transportation service providers would not be required to accept super-nominations nor would a shipper be required to supply one. A super-nomination

Formatted

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)**  
**Houston, TX - Dynegy**

- is a nomination that contains all the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burnertip.”
2. EII Task Force proposed Standard **s66 (104)**: “The data elements should accommodate super-nominations. If a Transportation Service Provider chooses to support super-nominations, the GISB standard data sets should accommodate it.”
  3. EII Task Force Instruction **IR2**: “The request was transferred to Information Requirements Subcommittee for implementation.”

As a result of the discussion of these items, IR requests a clarification of the intent of the term ‘Super-Nomination’.

Is a “Super-Nomination” a nomination that contains:

1. **All** of the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burner tip;  
or
  2. **All or some** of the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burner tip; or
  3. **All or some** of the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burner tip **within a given corporate family**.
- BPS discussed this issue at its May 8, 2002 meeting and sent the following response:  
In response to the Information Requirements Subcommittee’s (IR) question, BPS instructs IR to refer to interpretation 7.3.47 contained in NAESB WGQ Version 1.5.
  - **Std. 7.3.47 – Adopted EC - 8/24/00**

**Interpretation Request:**

“Please interpret the meaning and intent of what a ‘super-nomination’ is. Also, please clarify whether a Transportation Service Provider permitting (and not requiring) a shipper to nominate across pipelines in the same family is exceeding the GISB standard”

**Proposed Interpretation response:**

“The infrastructure exists within, and using, the GISB standards for a Service Requester to move gas from wellhead to burner-tip. In particular, the last sentence of GISB Standard 1.1.3 which states:

‘A super-nomination is a nomination that contains all the nominations describing the path from the wellhead to the burner-tip.’ should be interpreted to mean:

‘A super-nomination is a transmittal that contains all the line items describing the path from the receipt point to the delivery point.’

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)**  
**Houston, TX - Dynegy**

Given this interpretation of the last sentence of GISB Standard 1.1.3, the infrastructure does exist for a Service Requester to send multiple Transportation Service Provider (TSP) nominations to a party receiving multiple TSP nominations for retransmission to the applicable TSPs.

Lastly, a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) which permits (but does not require) a Service Requester to submit a nomination or nominations **(line item or line items)** which traverse multiple TSPs (including those TSPs in the same corporate family) is exceeding the GISB standard.”

- This item will be added to the next agenda.

**Flowing Gas Requests**

- **R96056 – Exxon**

**Request:** Develop a Producer Imbalance Statement.

(Relevant Minutes: IR 7/97; BPS 4/9/98; IR 6/98, 7/98, 1/00, 06/01, 10/01, 11/01, 12/01, 2/19/02, 4/19/02)

- Response from BPS
  - Question from IR to BPS from April 19, 2002:  
As a result of processing requests **R96056**, Information Requirements (IR) is developing the Producer Imbalance Statement dataset. As a part of this, IR is developing EDI/Flat File and EBB usages. Should there be data groupings and/or data element ordering for this new dataset?
  - BPS discussed this issue at its May 8, 2002 meeting and sent the following response:  
BPS instructs Information Requirements Subcommittee that for the Producer Imbalance Statement in R96056, data groupings and data element ordering is not necessary at this time.
- Modifications made to the Data Dictionary (see workpaper)
- Modifications made to Sample Paper Transaction (see work paper)
- Modifications made to Executive Summary (see work paper)
- Vote on proposed changes
  - **Motion:**  
Adopt the attached Producer Imbalance Statements documents as follows:
    - Data Dictionary
    - Code Values Dictionary
    - Technical Implementation Of Business Process
    - Sample Paper Transaction
    - Modifications to the Executive Summary section of the Flowing Gas book.

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)  
 Houston, TX - Dynegy**

- Modifications to the Business Process and Practices section of the Flowing Gas book.
- **Balanced Vote Results:**

Vote				Balancing	Balanced	Balanced	Balanced		
	For	Against	Total	Determinant	For	Against	Total	Abstain	
End Users	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
LDCs	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
Pipelines	3	0	3	2	2	2.00	0.00	2	0
Producers	1	0	1	1	1	1.00	0.00	1	0
Services	1	0	1	1	1	1.00	0.00	1	0
	5	0	5	4	4	4.00	0.00	4	0

**Nominations Requests**

- **R96009 – TransCapacity**

**Request:** Development of the Request for Scheduled Quantity

(Relevant Minutes: Market Settlement Task Force - 1/97; IR - 7/15/97; BPS – 8/20/97, 10/23/97, 12/4/97, 1/7/98, 2/1/98; EIITF – 10/2/98, IR 4/19/02)

- Question from IR to BPS from April 19, 2002:

In the processing of **R96009**, IR has determined that the best implementation would be to utilize the Request for Information that was developed for requesting Allocation information and/or Shipper Imbalance information. It should be noted that the Request for Information for requesting Allocation information and/or Shipper Imbalance information. It should be noted that the Request for Information had been developed at the time that R96009 was submitted.

Formatted

Standards 2.3.36 through 2.3.39 set forth guidelines for the support of the request for Information for requesting Allocation Information and/or Shipper Imbalance information and timeframes for replying to such requests.

Should there be similar guidelines for Schedule Quantity information?

- BPS discussed this issue at its May 8, 2002 meeting and it is still pending.

- 

- **R97070 – El Paso Natural Gas**

**Request:** Add 3 new transaction type codes for Nominations, Quick Response, and Scheduled Volumes for Shippers.

(Relevant Minutes: BPS - 6/1/00, 6/10/00 and 6/22/00, IR – 3/19/02, 4/16.02)

- **Motion:**

Formatted

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)  
 Houston, TX - Dynegy**

- Modify the motion adopted by IR at its March 19,2002 meeting to remove the addition of "Authorized Point Overrun" as a Code Value for the data element Transaction Type in the Transportation Sales Invoice (3.4.1) as it already exists and should not be duplicated.
- Balanced Vote results:

Vote				Balancing	Balanced	Balanced	Balanced		
	For	Against	Total	Determinant	For	Against	Total	Abstain	
End Users	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
LDCs	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
Pipelines	3	0	3	2	2	2.00	0.00	2	0
Producers	1	0	1	1	1	1.00	0.00	1	0
Services	1	0	1	1	1	1.00	0.00	1	0
	5	0	5	4	4	4.00	0.00	4	0

**EIITF Capacity Release Requests**

• **R99024 – Tennessee Gas Pipeline**

**Request:** Modify data elements in Capacity Release to be more consistent with the names of data elements in other data sets. Also adjust the presentation of the Location information so that it more closely matches conventions used in other GISB data sets.

- Change the name of "Bidder Company Code" to "Bidder" and modify the definition accordingly.
- Change the name of "Releaser Company Code" to "Releaser."
- Change the name of "Return Addressee Company Code" to "Return Addressee" and modify the definition accordingly
- Change the name of "Gas Transaction Point 1 xxx" to "Location xxx" and modify the definition accordingly
- Delete "Gas Transaction Point 2 xxx".
- Change the name and definition of "Segment Indicator" so that it more correctly represents the use of the data element, and define the code values that are in the X12 mapping as GISB code values.

(Relevant Minutes: EIITF – 3/9/99, IR – 4/16/02)

**Discussion prior to modification of data sets:**

- **'Gas Transaction Point 1' & 'Gas Transaction Point 2' replaced by 'Location'**
  - Discussion revealed two existing definitions for the term 'Location', neither of which accurately describes the function of location in the documents being considered.
  - Suggested additional definition for 'Location':



**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)**  
**Houston, TX - Dynegy**

(Relevant Minutes: Cross Contract Ranking – 8/9/99, EC – 11/11/99, IR – 3/19/02,4/16/02)

- **Issue from Technical:**

Errors are reported on the Confirmation Response Quick Response at the detail or subdetail level. Error(s) could occur at the header level.

Confirmation Role is at header level

Invalid Confirmation Role reported at detail

- **Discussion:**

- Confirmation Role should be at the detail level in the Request for Confirmation (1.4.3), Confirmation Response (1.4.4).
- Errors & Warnings in the Confirmation Response Quick Response (1.4.7) should be at the detail level; not at the header
- see following motion:

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)  
 Houston, TX - Dynegy**

**Motion:**

- Replace the motion from the April 16, 2002 meeting with the following:
- Add the following data elements to:

**Request for Confirmation: Standard 1.4.3**

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Cor
Confirmation Role (Conf Role)	Designates the role of the Confirming Party.	LDG	SO	SO	

**Confirmation Response: Standard 1.4.4**

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Cor
Confirmation Role (Conf Role)	Designates the role of the Confirming Party.	LDG	BC	BC	If th con the If th Res Rol uns bas the

**Scheduled Quantity for Operator: Standard 1.4.6**

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Cor
---------------------------------	------------	---------------	--------------	-----------------	-----

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)  
 Houston, TX - Dynegy**

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Cor
Confirmation Role (Conf Role)	Designates the role of the Confirming Party.	LDG	C	C	Ma pro pro

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)  
 Houston, TX - Dynegy**

- Add the following to the Code Values Dictionary for:  
 Request for Confirmation (1.4.3)  
 Confirmation Response (1.4.4)  
 Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6)

Confirmation Role

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Operator	[no definition necessary]	
Upstream/Downstream Party	[no definition necessary]	

- Add the following to the Code Values Dictionary for:  
 Confirmation Response (1.4.4)

Reduction Reason

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Invalid Confirmation Role	[no definition necessary]	

- Add the following validation error code to the Confirmation Response Quick Response (1.4.7)

Validation Code (Detail)

Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
	Invalid Confirmation Role	[no definition necessary]
	Missing Confirmation Role	[no definition necessary]

- Add the following validation warning code to the Confirmation Response Quick Response (1.4.7)

Validation Code (Detail)

Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
	Confirmation Role not processed	[no definition necessary]

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)**  
**Houston, TX - Dynege**

- Modify Standard 1.3.60 as follows:  
1.3.60 On the confirmation data entry screen, fields in the data groups should appear in the following order:
  - Business Entity Data Group:
    - Confirmation Requester
    - Confirming Party
  - Contracts Data Group:
    - Confirmation Service Contract
    - Confirmation Service Identifier Code
  - Dates Data Group:
    - Beginning Date
    - Beginning Time
    - Ending Date
    - Ending Time
  - Location Data Group:
    - Location
    - Confirmation Role
  - Transaction Specific Data Group:
    - Contractual Flow Indicator
    - Upstream Identifier Code/Downstream Identifier Code
    - Upstream Contract Identifier/Downstream Contract Identifier
    - Service Requester
    - Service Requester Contract
    - Package ID
    - Quantity
    - Reduction Reason (Confirmation Response Only)
    - Receipt Rank (Priority)/ Delivery Rank (Priority)
    - Upstream Package ID/Downstream Package ID
    - Associated Contract
    - Confirmation Tracking Identifier
    - Solicited/Unsolicited Indicator (Confirmation Response Only)
    - Confirmation Subsequent Cycle Indicator
    - Confirmation Intraday Identifier
    - Confirmation User Data 1
    - Confirmation User Data 2
  
- Modify Standard 1.3.63 as follows:  
1.3.63 On the scheduled quantity for operator Web page, fields in the data groups should appear in the following order:
  - Business Entity Group:
    - Preparer ID

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)  
 Houston, TX - Dynegy**

- Statement Recipient ID
- Statement Date/Time
- Contracts Data Group:
  - Confirmation Service Contract
  - Confirmation Service Identifier Code
- Dates Data Group:
  - Beginning Date
  - Beginning Time
  - Ending Date
  - Ending Time
- Location Data Group:
  - Location
  - Confirmation Role
- Transaction Specific Data Group:
  - Contractual Flow Indicator
  - Upstream Identifier Code/Downstream Identifier Code
  - Upstream Contract Identifier/Downstream Contract Identifier
  - Service Requester
  - Service Requester Contract
  - Package ID
  - Quantity
  - Scheduling Status
  - Reduction Reason
  - Upstream Package ID/Downstream Package ID
  - Confirmation Tracking Identifier
  - Confirmation Subsequent Cycle Indicator
  - Confirmation Intraday Identifier
  - Confirmation User Data 1
  - Confirmation User Data 2

- **Balanced Vote results:**

Vote				Balancing	Balanced	Balanced	Balanced		
	For	Against	Total	Determinant	For	Against	Total	Abstain	
End Users	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
LDCs	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
Pipelines	4	0	4	2	2.00	0.00	2	2	0
Producers	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Services	1	0	1	1	1.00	0.00	1	1	0
	5	0	5	3	3.00	0.00	3	3	0

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**May 14 -15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Central)**  
**Houston, TX - Dynegy**

- **Back to R99024**
  - Completed modifications to 5.4.1 through 5.4.12. (See Work paper)
  - Will begin next time with 5.4.13- Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity
  
- 7. Other Business**
  - 2002 Meeting Schedule
  
- 8. Next Meeting Dates and Location**
  - June 11 – 12, 2002, 07:30 a.m. – 3:30 a.m. @ Boeing in Seattle
  - July 25 – 26, 2002 @ Iroquois in Connecticut
  
- 9. Adjourn**