

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
June 12 - 13, 2001, 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Boeing, 1420 South Trenton Street, Seattle

- 1 -

FINAL MINUTES

1. Introductions
 - Participants introduced themselves to the group.
2. Housekeeping
 - Tina Patton familiarized participants with the facilities.
3. Anti-trust Guidelines
 - Anti-trust Guidelines were read to the participants by Theresa Hess.
4. Adoption of Agenda
 - Motion to adopt amended agenda passed unanimously.
5. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes
 - May 15-16, 2001 – Adopted as revised.
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)

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
June 12 - 13, 2001, 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Boeing, 1420 South Trenton Street, Seattle

- 2 -

Response to Issues sent to Business Practices Subcommittee

- Issue #1
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?
 - Response from BPS:
BPS instructs Information Requirements that Contract Begin Time and Contract End Time are not required for transactional reporting and should not be included in any of the transactional reporting data sets.
 - IR Action: This item remains on the BPS June 20, 2001 agenda, therefore, IR will await the outcome of that meeting.

- Issue #2:
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?
 - Response from BPS
BPS reaffirms its previous instructions dated May 10, 2001 to Information Requirements to accommodate the sender's option business practice of sending changes only for firm transactional reporting. Therefore, the "changes only" method should not be made mandatory. There are various implementations that a recipient can use to determine what has changed. There is no requirement that amendments be handled differently between EDI and visual display or for changes to be distinguished on web pages.

 - IR Action: Continue development

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
June 12 - 13, 2001, 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Boeing, 1420 South Trenton Street, Seattle

- 3 -

- **Capacity Release Reporting**
 - Review of data dictionary based on questions from participant's company representatives.

- **Interruptible Transportation Reporting**
 - Review of data dictionary based on questions from participant's company representatives.
 - Participants need to check with company representatives to determine whether Contract Status is necessary for Interruptible Transportation Reporting. This issue will be addressed at the next meeting.

- **Firm Transportation Reporting**
 - Review of data dictionary based on questions from participant's company representatives.
 - During review of FT Reporting dataset, certain inaccuracies with a number of data elements being conditioned upon Rate Reporting Level were discovered, discussed and resolved. Changes were made to the conditionality of a number of data elements and clarification will be added to the TIBP as needed. Conforming changes will be explored in datasets for IT & CR.

- **Recess until ~~0800hrs~~8:00 AM., June 13, 2001**
 - IR will suspend discussion of Transactional Reporting in order to provide participants attending this meeting with the express purpose of discussing the Producer Imbalance an opportunity to do so. Discussion of Transactional Reporting should resume before the meeting is concluded.

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
June 12 - 13, 2001, 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Boeing, 1420 South Trenton Street, Seattle

- 4 -

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)

- Discussion of the Data Dictionary for the Producer Imbalance Statement, requirements for Location Data and Location Type pointed out the need to describe common codes for such entities as Fields and Processing Plants or to develop a new class of location information that would allow the requesting parties to report imbalances where they occur. Exxon representatives have agreed to research the issue with IHS (the entity responsible for setting up DRNs) and others **and report back to Information Requirements Subcommittee** in order to reach an amenable solution.

7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting Date and Location

- July 17-18 (all day), Iroquois, Shelton, CT. Specific location to be determined.
- The second day of the September IR meeting (18th & 19th) conflicts with GISB BOD meeting and Annual Meeting. It has been suggested that September's meeting be 1.5 days. Participants agreed.

9. Adjourn