

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
May 15-16, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Enron, 333 Clay St., Houston, TX

- 1 -

FINAL MINUTES

1. Introductions
 Participants introduced themselves to each other.
2. Housekeeping
 Theresa Hess familiarized the participants with the facilities.
3. Anti-trust Guidelines
 Theresa Hess read the anti-trust guidelines to the group.
4. Adoption of Agenda
 - Remove item #13 under Directives Related to FERC Order 637 and 637a as it has been resolved.
 - Agenda unanimously adopted as amended.
5. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes
 - April 17-18, 2001
 - Adopted as revised; 6 in favor, 0 opposed.
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.)

Directives Related to FERC Order 637 and 637a

- Item #8 (BPS Priority #3): Review award data set codes and structure for firm and interruptible transportation (FT and IT) reporting (Affects GISB Standard No. 5.4.3). (Relevant Minutes: BPS 7/7/00, 8/1-2/00, 8/8-9/00; IR 11/00, 12/00, 1/01, 2/01, 3/01)
- Item #9 (BPS Priority #4): Accommodate visual display web pages for FT and IT reporting. (Relevant Minutes: BPS 7/7/00, 8/1-2/00)
 - Instruction sent to IR from BPS:

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
May 15-16, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Enron, 333 Clay St., Houston, TX

- 2 -

Excerpt from the 5/10/2001 BPS Draft Minutes:

BPS instructs the Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate the sender's option business practice of sending changes only for firm transactional reporting. IR should also ensure that when this business practice is followed, the information necessary to identify the contract is provided and that all parties would provide this information uniformly.

- **Firm Transportation**

- Changes made to FT dataset to enable the above included on attached Firm Transportation Reporting Workpaper.
- Define Key Elements to be used with amendments.
 - Not "key", but minimum display requirements.
 - Selected as minimum to describe a contract in EDI, Flatfile and Web Displays:

Data Element	Usage	Level
Transportation Service Provider	(M)	Hdr
Amendment Reporting	(M)	Hdr
Service Requester Contract	(M)	Detail
Posting Date/Time	(M)	Subdetail
Contract Status	(M)	Subdetail

- Go through remaining data elements and adjust usages and conditions to accommodate "Changes Only".
 - Changes made to FT dataset to enable the above included on attached FT document.
 - Completion of usages and conditions for contract times awaiting response from BPS on the following issue:
 - **Motion** by Kim Van Pelt and seconded by Katheryn Burch to send the following issue to BPS:

Are the Contract Begin Time and Contract End Time necessary for Transactional Reporting or are Contract Begin Date and Contract End Date sufficient to communicate the duration of the contract?

- **Sense of the room:** 5 in favor; 1 opposed.
- TIBP

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
May 15-16, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Enron, 333 Clay St., Houston, TX

- 3 -

- Began review of the draft TIBP for Firm Transportation Reporting prepared by Mr. Keisler. Review will be continued at the next meeting.
- **Capacity Release**
 - Changes conforming to those made to Firm Transportation Reporting were made to Capacity Release Reporting.
- **Interruptible Transportation**
 - Changes conforming to those made to Firm Transportation Reporting were made to Interruptible Transportation Reporting.
 - Some questioned whether Contract Status is necessary in the Interruptible Transportation Reporting. Hold discussion until such time as participants can check with their representatives. Are amendments only a “signed” instrument? What do the terms “new” and “amended” mean in the context of interruptible transportation?
- Discussion continued concerning the combining of FT, IT, and/or Capacity Release datasets.
 - There was agreement that FT, IT, and/or Capacity Release Transactional Reporting datasets shall not be combined. There are enough differences in the data and the structure of the data to warrant keeping them separate.
- An issue was raised surrounding the “Changes Only” versus “All Data” discussion. If a TSP opts to send “All Data”, how would one know what has changed?
- **Motion** by Mark Scheel and seconded by Suzanne Calcagno to send the following questions to BPS:

Question # 1: If a Transportation Service Provider opts to send “All Data” on a contract amendment, how is the recipient to discern what has changed? Should the handling of amendments be different between EDI implementations and visual displays on web pages? For example, should changes be required to be distinguished on the web pages?

Question # 2: Should “Changes Only” be the mandatory method?

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
May 15-16, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Enron, 333 Clay St., Houston, TX

- 4 -

- **Sense of the room:** 7 in favor; 0 opposed.
7. Other Business
 8. Next Meeting Date and Location
 - ◆ June 12-13 (08:00 to 16:00), Boeing, Seattle, WA. Specific location to be determined.
 9. Adjourn