

**GISB Information Requirements Meeting  
El Paso Energy - Travis Place  
Houston, Texas  
July 29, 1997  
Final Minutes**

**1. Welcome and Introductions:** Theresa Hess called the meeting to order at 8:30. Introductions were made.

**2. Housekeeping:** By Charlie Bass.

**3. Anti-trust warning:** By Jim Buccigross.

**4. Adoption of agenda:**

Agenda modified by removal of Request No. R97016 and correction of R97082 to R97092. Agenda then adopted as revised.

**5. Adoption of prior meeting minutes:**

February 19, 1997 Market Settlement Task Force - adopted as drafted.

**6. Address Current Requests:**

**R97010, R97015, R97016, R97052 & R97053**

Capacity Release Rate Structures, *et al.*

During previous implementation of these requests, the IR group made the changes per BPS instructions to the Capacity Release UPPD, UPPD Validation and Offer datasets. The IR group noticed that the issues also may apply to the Bid, Award, and UPPD Notification datasets and asked BPS for clarification regarding this issue. BPS has indicated that the Bid, Award and UPPD Notification datasets are applicable. The following discussion pertains to that further implementation.

**Previous IR Decisions on these requests:**

**Capacity Release Datasets:**

New data element: **Total Surcharges**

Usage Code: Conditional. Required when Surcharge Indicator specifies that a total of all applicable surcharge(s) is provided.

Definition: Contains the total of all applicable surcharge(s).

**Surcharge Indicator**

Usage: Mandatory

Indicates whether Surcharges are applicable, and if so, where surcharge information is located.

**Code Values:**

1 = Rate(s) stated include all applicable surcharges, no surcharge detail or surcharge total provided

2 = Rate(s) stated include all applicable surcharges, surcharge detail provided, no surcharge total provided

3 = Rate(s) stated include all applicable surcharges, no surcharge detail provided, surcharge total provided

4 = Rate(s) stated include all applicable surcharges, surcharge detail and surcharge total provided

5 = Rate(s) stated include only rates, no surcharges applicable to this release

6 = Rate(s) stated do not include any applicable surcharges, surcharge detail provided, no surcharge total provided (Choice applicable only to UPPD and UPPD Notification. Choice not applicable to Offer, Bid or Award)

7 = Rate(s) stated do not include any applicable surcharges, no surcharge detail provided, surcharge total provided

8 = Rate(s) stated do not include any applicable surcharges, surcharge detail and surcharge total provided.

**Current (additional) IR Implementation:**

**Surcharge Identification Code:**

A code which identifies a specific surcharge.

Usage: Conditional. Required when Surcharge Indicator specifies that surcharge detail is provided.

**Working Matrix:**

Dataset	Rate ID	Surch ID	Surch Ind	Total Surch	To/Fr
Offer	M	C	M(7)	C	SO
UPPD	M	C	M(8)	C	BC
Bid	M	C	M(7)	C	SO
Award	M	C	M(7)	C	SO
UPPD Notify	M	C	M(8)	C	C**
UPPD Validation	C*	C*	C(8)*	C*	C*

\* Mandatory when Validation Codes regarding the corresponding data element in the UPPD are returned in the UPPD Validation.

\*\* Mandatory when present in the UPPD and supported by the TSP.

All data elements are added to the capacity release documents, as specified above, with conditionality as noted.

**R97015:** Add additional rate identification codes and surcharge identification codes specified in Request No. R97015 to the UPPD Notification datasets. These were previously added to the Offer, Bid, Award, UPPD, and UPPD Validation datasets. We are now proposing to add them to the UPPD Notification datasets.

These will all be implemented in a consistent manner for all datasets regarding implementation of R97015. (see IR Conference Call minutes of July 17, 1997 for one recommended implementation).

This involves the addition of new data elements for implementation of these additional rate codes (i.e., the "Reservation Transportation: From" zone and "Reservation Transportation: To" zone. (Noted in the table above as To/Fr.)

Discussion as to implementing the "to/from" data elements within the existing zone data elements at the point level. IR recommends to technical that, if possible, they should implement the to/from in a consistent manner (i.e., same structure) as in existing zone information in the capacity release datasets, or if necessary to add the zone data elements. (See Standard No. 5.4.4 Replacement Capacity dataset for implementation and R96064.) If this solution is not possible or practical, technical will refer the issue back to IR and it will be addressed at the August 18-19, 1997 IR meeting. IR could then respond to technical in time for the August 22, 1997 Technical Subcommittee meeting.

**Motion:** Implement all as specified above.  
Sense of the Room: 9 For 0 Against

**R97009B - Panhandle Eastern Corp.**

Add a comment segment to the Withdrawal Upload and Withdrawal Download datasets (Note: Discussion of questions from Technical Subcommittee surrounding implementation details of IR's recommendation.)

Technical raised an issue regarding the necessity of a separate 864 Notes document in addition to an NTE segment in the relevant datasets. This would require a REF segment in the EDI to indicate where these comments are contained within the dataset (as implemented in the other capacity release datasets).

In addition there were questions regarding the conditionality of the Bid Number in the Notes/Special Instruction. Bid Number: Conditional, Mandatory for Bid Review, Award Notice, and UPPD Notification. Offer Number: Conditional, Mandatory when sent in the related transaction set. UPPD Number: Conditional, Mandatory when sent in the related transaction set.

Requester (PanEnergy) states that they do not need the 864 document, only the NTE segment. Discussion as to whether we should do it consistent with the other documents (i.e., Add the ability to add an 864 document), or leave it as NTE segment only.

**Motion:** NTE segment only or NTE segment and 864 Document:

NTE segment only: 6 For

NTE and 864 document: 5 For

Recommendation from IR is modified and now states that the Withdrawal Upload and Withdrawal Download will only have the option to put comments only in an NTE segment, and not a separate 864 document. Recommendation will be prepared as a "No" recommendation by IR. Discussed and determined that this recommendation will be fully staffed at that point.

### **R97044 - El Paso Natural Gas**

Modify the Reduction Reason codes for the Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity.

Note: This was discussed and recommended at the July 15-16, 1997 IR meeting. The sole issue is whether these reduction reason codes should also be added to the Scheduled Quantity for Operators SQOP document.

**Motion:** Modify 'Capacity Constraint' in the SQOP by changing it to 'Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint' as defined below.

Add 'Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Receipt Location' as defined below to SQOP

Add 'Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Delivery Location' as defined below to SQOP

Modify 'Pipeline Capacity Constraint' in the SQOP by adding the definition below

Pipeline Capacity Constraint – A constraint on the Transportation Service Provider's system.

Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint – A constraint on the Confirming Party's system.

Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Receipt Location – A reduction of the nominated receipt quantity due to a constraint on the Confirming Party's system

Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Delivery Location – A reduction of the nominated delivery quantity due to a constraint on the Confirming Party's system.

Sense of the Room: 9 In Favor; 0 Opposed

### **R97051 - Transco**

Remove the data element "Service Provider's Activity Code" from the transaction key defined in GISB Standard 1.3.27

Dale Davis of Transco defined the reason for the request and the reason for it. There was also discussion that this was a change to a standard only - not an implementation issue. As such, does it properly belong at the BPS level. IR decided that since this had been properly triaged to IR and that that decision had been affirmed by the EC, we would prepare the recommendation.

**Motion:** Strike the words "service provider activity code (where mutually agreed)" from GISB Standard No. 1.3.27. No further implementation or technical changes are necessary to implement this request.

Sense of the Room:        10 For    0 Against

### **R96130 - Northern Border**

Add transaction type indicators to delineate receipt deficiency and tender deficiency nominations.

**BPS Recommendation:** The Business Practices Subcommittee recommends that: All data sets support the ability of service requesters and service providers to communicate receipt deficiencies, defined as the service provider's inability to provide full level of contracted firm service, and tender deficiencies, defined as a service requester's un-scheduled firm quantities.

IR discussed the BPS discussion surrounding whether this is properly a transaction type issue or a capacity type indicator. Point was brought up that in some cases a receipt deficiency may require information from the capacity type indicator too, so we probably don't want to use the same data element.

Discussion as to what documents currently contain data element transaction type, and so to what documents these proposed transaction type codes would be added. Discussion centered around the invoice, and per the results of R97029 (see IR minutes of June 24-25, 1997) the transaction type data element is contained in the Invoice.

### **IR Implementation:**

**Receipt Deficiency:** The service provider's inability to provide full level of contracted firm service

**Tender Deficiency:** The service requester's un-scheduled firm quantities.

**Motion:** Add transaction types 'Receipt Deficiency' and 'Tender Deficiency' (as defined above) to the following documents:

Nomination

Scheduled Quantity  
Imbalance  
Invoice

Sense of the Room: 9 For 0 Against

**R97018 - NorAm**

Add error codes to the Nominations Quick Response dataset

This was split into two discussions and two recommendations from BPS, R97018(A) and R97018(B).

**BPS Recommendation R97018(A):** Transfer the portion of the request on 'HPR Exceeded by Nomination' to IR noting that BPS supports this part of the request. Add error codes 'HPR Exceeded by Nomination' - to indicate where the historical production rate for a meter has been exceeded.

**IR Implementation:**

**Motion:** Add an error code to the Nomination Quick Response:

HPR Exceeded by Nomination:

Definition: Indicates where the historical production rate for a meter has been exceeded.

Level: Point level detail

**BPS Recommendation R97018(B):** Transfer the request to the Information Requirements Subcommittee with the following instructions:

Add an error code to the nominations quick response transaction, with the name "Receipt point not valid for pool nominated", and description for the code as "the code is used to indicate where a nomination for a receipt point does not belong to the nominated pool."

**IR Implementation:**

**Motion:** Add an error code to the Nomination Quick Response:

Receipt point not valid for pool nominated:

Definition: Indicates a nomination for a receipt point which does not belong to the nominated pool.

Level: Point level detail

Sense of the room on *both* of the above motions:

9 For 0 Against

**R97038 - NorAm**

Add additional reduction reason codes to the Scheduled Quantity dataset – no delivery nomination, no supply

**BPS Recommendation:** The following statement will be used by Information Requirements Subcommittee as instructions in adding the code: A "No corresponding nomination" code could be sent by the confirming party to respond to a request to confirm or by a Transportation Service Provider in a scheduled quantity document where the confirming party had no corresponding nomination.

Discussion as to why additional codes are needed, as existing codes for no supply and no market exist. Further discussion as to the applicability of this code to the scheduled quantity for operators. Discussion as to how the process works currently. Concern was raised that we were potentially further proliferating the large number of reduction reason codes on the scheduled quantity document.

There was long discussion on whether no corresponding nomination meant that no nomination at all had been sent which matched the nomination, or whether one had been sent which didn't match as to quantity and that this code would be applicable to that situation. The conclusion of the group was that the former case was the one we were discussing and the group spent time attempting to clarify this intention in the definitions of the reduction reason code.

**IR Implementation:**

Add three reduction reason codes to the Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity and Scheduled Quantity for Operators document:

1. No Corresponding Nomination: A nomination does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.
2. No Corresponding Nomination at Receipt Location: A nomination at the receipt location does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.
3. No Corresponding Nomination at Delivery Location: A nomination at the delivery location does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.

**Motions:**

**Option A:** Add reduction reason codes 1, 2 and 3 to the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, and Scheduled Quantity for Operators documents.

**Option B:** Add only reduction reason codes 2 and 3 to the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, and Scheduled Quantity for Operators documents.

**Option C:** Add only reduction reason code 1 to the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, and Scheduled Quantity for Operators documents.

Sense of the Room: Option A: 6 For  
Option B: 2 For  
Option C: 0 For

**R96125(B)** - As discussed at the July 15-16, 1997 IR meeting. Technical realized an issue with the conditionality of the PDA Submitter's Tracking ID in the PDA Quick Response.

Discussion: PDA Submitter's Tracking ID will not be sent in the PDA Quick Response if no errors or warnings occur in the PDA.

Motion: The usage of PDA Submitter's Tracking ID in the PDA Quick Response should be conditional (not mandatory). Condition is "Sent when errors or warnings occur at the PDA Submitter's Tracking ID Level."

Sense of the Room: 8 For 0 Against

Meeting adjourned for the day at 5:15 P.M.

**GISB Information Requirements Meeting  
El Paso Energy - Travis Place  
Houston, Texas  
July 30, 1997  
Final Minutes**

**1. Welcome and housekeeping:** By Theresa Hess. Anti-trust still in effect from yesterday (no new attendees).

**2. Continuation of addressing of current requests:**

**R97084 - Enron**

Add several code values to the Adjustment Type data element in the Measurement Information Statement (2.4.5) document. These same code values were added to the Measured Volume Audit Statement as ratified by GISB on February 28, 1997 (R96112).

The data element exists, but no codes exist for the element.

Proposed Adjustment Type codes and definitions are as follows:

Invalid Gas Sample  
Quality data received late  
Incorrect chromatograph assignment / data  
Measured change not received  
Volume estimate - no data received  
Estimate replaced with actual: late  
Mechanical field equip. failure  
Late notification of station turn on  
EFM communication failure  
Incorrect EFM station configuration  
Integration/Scan process incorrect  
Invalid calculation type  
Incorrect gas quality  
Data / entry error  
Audit review - no adj. necessary  
Missing data, no volume estimate

Discussion that parties may not need all of these codes and can continue to use only the codes that they desire, even if these codes are added. Group was in agreement on this point.

Note that there is a separate process underway to add data element Adjustment Type to the Measured Volume Audit Statement.

As definitions were not available at this time, and the group believed that definitions were necessary for the code values (as requested by the EC), the group felt that this whole

request should be addressed at the next IR meeting. Requester (Enron) will provide proposed definitions for the requested codes.

**R97092 - Transco**

Add a mandatory data element Accounting Period to the Measurement Information Statement document.

Jim Keisler from Transco discussed the request. Discussion as to whether this needed to be added to other documents, but Jim said that at this time this was the only document Transco was requesting this data element be added to at this time.

Discussion as to usage code of this data element. Some expressed concern as the mandatory usage code, and suggested sender's option or mutually agreeable. SO garnered support, as this would allow those TSP's who desire to use it the ability to.

Brief discussion as to whether Accounting Period was the correct data element, or whether we should have a new data element called "Business Period." After discussion that this data element would have basically the same definition as Accounting Period, we left it as Accounting Period.

**Motion:** Add a data element, as described below, the Measurement Information Statement:

Data element: Accounting Period:  
Usage code: Sender's Option  
Definition: The month and year the information was recorded.  
Level: Header

Sense of the Room: 8 For 0 Against

**R97095 - Transco**

Add a data element, Payment Method Code, to the data dictionary for the Payment Remittance dataset (Standard No. 3.4.2)

Discussion that this data element already carries a Usage Code of Mandatory (M) in the ANSI X12 portion of the Implementation Guide, but it is not a discrete data element. Transco is only proposing that the data element be added to the data dictionary with a usage code of mandatory.

**Motion:** Add the following data element to the Payment Remittance document:

Data element: Payment Method Code  
Usage code: Mandatory  
Definition: Identifies the method of payment  
Level: Header

<u>Code Value:</u>	<u>Definition:</u>
Check	N/A
Wire Transfer	N/A
Automated Clearing House	N/A

Sense of the Room: 11 For 0 Against

Second part of the request was the proposal to change Remittance Address to conditional, mandatory where the Payment Method Code indicated payment by check. Discussion that current usage code on is business conditional, so the TSP may require Remittance Address already. Discussion as to whether the address should be on the remittance, or whether it is adequate on the Invoice. Will this data actually be used? Transco said yes, they would use it.

Consensus of the group was to leave things the way they are at this time.

### **R97069 - Texaco**

Standardize the dekatherm abbreviation to Dth in all GISB standards.

Brief discussion that ANSI code used in the EDI documents is for MMBtu (million Btu), but this is not relevant to this request. The instant request asks for only a standard abbreviation of Dth for dekatherm, not any other abbreviation. Further discussion as to whether this is something we want to do now - or wait for further implementation manual cleanup.

IR recognized that approval of this request will not necessarily cause the implementation manuals to be re-published as a result, but at the next publication this consistency in abbreviations will occur.

Further discussion as to whether we should expand this request to MCF, MMBtu, gigajoule, etc. Discussion that this was outside the scope of this request and we would stick to the current request.

**Motion:** Standardize the abbreviation for dekatherm in all GISB related documents to Dth and GISB should replace all other abbreviations of dekatherm with "Dth"

Sense of the Room: 10 For 2 Against

Segment Check:

For:	8 Pipelines	1 Services	1 Producers	0 LDC's	0 End Users
Against:	2 Pipelines	0 Services	0 Producers	0 LDC's	0 End Users

### **R96056 - Exxon**

Develop the Producer Imbalance Statement

**Motion:** Transfer this to BPS.

As this is development of a new document, IR believes that the business practice issues should be determined by BPS prior to development of the datasets. This is consistent with treatment of prior requests of this type.

Sense of the Room: 11 For 0 Against

**R97025 - Market Settlement**

Modify the language of standard 3.3.5.

The task force recommends that Standard 3.3.5 "Differentiate between sales, transportation, and storage transactions through charge codes" should be reworded to "Differentiate between sales, transportation, and storage transactions through service codes."

Charge code is not a data element on the invoice. Charge Type is a data element, but it is not a mandatory data element. Service Code is the only mandatory data element on the Invoice that provides sufficient support for the standard.

There was reluctance to specify codes to a specific level so that if data element names change, we don't need to change all of the standards. Michael Hanson brought up the suggestion that we simply say as the standard language: "Differentiate between sales, transportation, and storage transactions through codes." However, there was reluctance to change a standard (even by this one word) since this would require TSP's to re-file their tariffs to incorporate the new standard.

**Motion 1:**

Option A: Make some change (change TBD) to the standard 0 For  
Option B: Do not make any change to the standard 6 For

**Motion 2:**

Do we file an interpretation on this: 2 For 4 Against

IR to file a recommendation declining this request.

**3. Next meeting dates and locations**

August 18-19, 1997 (Monday and Tuesday).

Eastern Utilities Associates Headquarters - One Liberty Square, Boston, MA

8:30 AM - 4:00 PM

#### **4. Other Business**

Dennis LaTour brought up the question of what happened to R96036? It is assigned to TS on the log, but it should actually be in IR. We will rectify this, and put it on the September agenda. R97084 will be on the August agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 AM.