

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

**FINAL MINUTES**

1. **Introductions** – participants introduced themselves
2. **Housekeeping** – provided housekeeping information
3. **Anti-trust Guidelines** – Dale Davis read the anti-trust guidelines
4. **Adoption of Agenda** – The agenda was adopted as modified to change GISB references to NAESB.
5. **Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes and Attachments**
  - September 10-11, 2002
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.)

**High Priority Item from Executive Committee**

- **Annual Plan Item #10** - Develop standards as necessary to implement the FERC orders as a result of Docket Nos. RM96-1-019 (Partial Day Recalls) issued March 12, 2002

**And**

- **Request No. R02002** - Modify NAESB Standards 5.3.6 and 5.3.7 to incorporate changes to FERC regulation 284.12 (b) (1) (v); and that new standards be developed to address FERC regulation 284.12 (c) (1)(ii) (B)

(Relevant Minutes: BPS 7/23/02; EC 7/29/02; and BPS 8/7/02; IR 8/20/02; EC 9/30/02)

The purpose of this item is to address the following instruction from the EC Meeting of September 30, 2002:

Instruct IR to develop a set of examples for the TIBP document regarding the Elapsed Prorata Capacity for intraday day recalls based on the recommendation for R02002 as adopted by the EC on September 30, 2002.

**IR Discussion:**

Attached workpaper reflects the examples developed.

It was discussed that the instructions from the EC were to place the examples in a TIBP. IR discussed the fact that there is no associated data set, so there is no TIBP in which to include the examples. It was determined that the better placement of the examples would be to put it in

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

the Business Process and Practices area within the Capacity Release book. The following verbiage should be added at the end of the Section A – Overview section that says:

A Releasing Shipper may include recall rights as a condition of a capacity release. If the Releasing Shipper invokes such recall rights, they do so by providing notification to the Transportation Service Provider. A notification of recall may be provided at any applicable recall notification cycle. Set forth below are examples of capacity recall notifications for each of the recall notification cycles and the resulting quantities available for use by the Releasing Shipper and Replacement Shipper(s).

NOTE: When the final recommendation is developed, the examples from the attached workpaper will be inserted at this point.

The IR Chair will explain to the NAESB WGQ EC at its October 17, 2002 meeting that its instruction to IR indicated that these examples should be in the TIBP. The IR group reviewed the documents and determined that the more appropriate place for the examples is within the Business Process and Practices of the Capacity Release book. Assuming the NAESB WGQ EC concurs, the above-proposed implementation will be finalized at the next IR meeting.

**Flowing Gas Requests**

• **R98081 – Williams**

**Request:** Develop a means of requesting and sending RTU alarm data.  
(Relevant Minutes: EIITF 12/2/98; IR 9/00, 10/01, 4/16/02, 8/20/02; BPS 10/9/02)

And

• **R98082 – Williams**

**Request:** Develop a means of requesting and sending RTU event data.  
(Relevant Minutes: EIITF 12/2/98; IR 9/00, 10/01, 4/16/02, 8/20/02; BPS 10/9/02)

**IR Discussion:**

Following are the questions IR sent to BPS and the responses received from BPS:

**IR Question #1 to BPS:** Send the following question to BPS:

As a result of processing request R98081 and R98082, Information Requirements (IR) is developing the Measurement Events/Alarms dataset. As a part of this, IR is developing EDI/FF and EBB usages. Should there be data groupings and/or data element ordering for this new mutually agreeable dataset?

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

**BPS Response 10/9/02:**

In response to IR's Question #1 regarding R98081 and R98082, BPS has determined that it is not necessary to develop data groupings or data ordering for the proposed Measurement Events/Alarms data set.

**IR Question #2 to BPS:** Send the following question to BPS concerning R98081 & R98082:

In the processing of R98081 & R98082, Information Requirements (IR) is developing a mutually agreed upon dataset, Measurement Events/Alarms. 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.

In R96009, BPS has proposed to delete NAESB WGQ Standards 2.3.36 through 2.3.39 and replace them with proposed NAESB WGQ Standards 2.3.z1, 2.3.z2 and 2.3.z3. These proposed standards set forth guidelines for the support of the Request for Information and timeframes for replying to such requests.

Should there be similar guidelines for Measurement Events/Alarms information?

**BPS RESPONSE 10/9/02:**

In response to IR's Question #2 regarding R98081 and R98082, BPS has determined that it is not necessary to develop guidelines for the proposed Measurement Events/Alarms data set similar to those proposed in NAESB WGQ Standards [2.3.z1, 2.3.z2 and – 2.3.z3] as reflected in the recommendation for R96009.

**Motion:**

Adopt the following as set forth on the attached workpapers:

- Proposed NAESB WGQ Standard 2.4.z – Measurement Events/Alarms TIBP, Sample Paper, Data Dictionary and Code Values Dictionary, and
- Proposed changes to NAESB WGQ Standard 2.4.7 – Request for Information TIBP, Data Dictionary and Code Values Dictionary

Vote	Balancing			Balanced			Balanced		
	For	Against	Total	Determinant	For	Against	Total	Total	
End									
Users	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	
LDCs	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	
Pipelines	8	0	8	2	2.00	0.00	2	2	
Producers	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	
Services	1	0	1	1	1.00	0.00	1	1	
	9	0	9	3	3.00	0.00	3	3	

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

**EIITF Capacity Release Requests**

- **R99020 – Enron**  
**Request:** Modify the capacity release data sets to accommodate the Releasing Shipper's ability to specify whether Gas Transaction Points can be changed after the capacity has been awarded. This modification will affect the Offer Upload, Offer Download, Award Download and Offer Upload Notification data sets.  
**AND**
- **R99032: Williams**  
**Request:** Add data element to the Capacity Release Offer Upload (5.4.7) to allow the Releaser to specify whether contractual point changes by the Replacement Shipper are permitted on this offer. The new indicator would also need to be added to the Offer Download (5.4.1) to communicate to parties the terms as proposed by the Releaser  
**AND**
- **R02005: ANR**  
**Request:** Add data element 'Rights to Amend Primary Points' and associated code values to Capacity Release data sets. The element will be used to indicate if the Releasing Shipper will allow the replacement shipper to re-locate the primary point.  
**AND**
- **R01001 – Enron**  
**Request:** Add data element 'Change Gas Transaction Points Terms' to the header level of the Offer Upload (5.4.7), Offer Upload Notification (5.4.9), Offer Download (5.4.1) and the Award Download (5.4.3). It is also requested that Validation Codes be added to the Offer Upload Quick Response (5.4.8).

(Relevant Minutes:

R99020 & R99032: EIITF 2/25/99, 4/6/99 – IR Instruction 48 as replaced by IR Instruction 53;  
R02005: BPS 5/8/02;  
R01001: BPS 3/29/01;  
All 4 requests – IR 9/10/02)

**IR Discussion:**

Added 5.4.3 – code values not reflected in draft minutes from 9/02/02

The Enron representative indicated that the proposed implementation satisfies the Enron request R01001.

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

**MOTION:**

Modify the following NAESB WGQ Standards Data Dictionaries and Code Values Dictionaries as indicated below

- **Standard 5.4.7 – Offer Upload** – add the following data element at the detail level

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<u>Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Data</u>	<u>An indicator used to identify whether the Replacement Shipper may amend the contract to change the primary point(s) after the capacity is awarded.</u>			
<u>Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator (RAPP)</u>		<u>BC</u>	<u>BC</u>	<u>Used when the Transportation Service Provider supports the ability for the Releasing Shipper to indicate whether the Replacement Shipper(s) can amend the primary points after the capacity is awarded.</u>  <u>For EBB, when this condition is met at least one of Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator or Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Description is required.</u>

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<a href="#">Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Description (RAPP Desc)</a>		<a href="#">BC</a>	<a href="#">nu</a>	<p><a href="#">Used when the Transportation Service Provider supports the ability for the Releasing Shipper to indicate whether the Replacement Shipper(s) can amend the primary points after the capacity is awarded.</a></p> <p><a href="#">For EBB, when this condition is met at least one of Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator or Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Description is required.</a></p>

- **Standard 5.4.1 – Offer Download**
- **Standard 5.4.9 – Offer Upload Notification**  
add the following data element at the detail level

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<a href="#">Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Data</a>	<a href="#">An indicator used to identify whether the Replacement Shipper may amend the contract to change the primary point(s) after the capacity is awarded.</a>			
<a href="#">Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator (RAPP)</a>		<a href="#">C</a>	<a href="#">C</a>	<p><a href="#">Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload.</a></p> <p><a href="#">For EBB, when this condition is met at least one of Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator or Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Description is required.</a></p>

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)  
 October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)  
 Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<a href="#">Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Description (RAPP Desc)</a>		<u>C</u>	<u>nu</u>	<a href="#">Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload.</a>  <a href="#">For EBB, when this condition is met at least one of Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator or Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Description is required.</a>

- **Standard 5.4.3 Award Download**– add the following data element at the detail level

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<a href="#">Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Data</a>	<a href="#">An indicator used to identify whether the Replacement Shipper may amend the contract to change the primary point(s) after the capacity is awarded.</a>			
<a href="#">Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator (RAPP)</a>		<u>SO</u>	<u>SO</u>	
<a href="#">Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator Description (RAPP Desc)</a>		<u>SO</u>	<u>nu</u>	

- Modify the Code Values Dictionaries for the following data sets:
  - 5.4.1 Offer Download
  - 5.4.3 Award Download
  - 5.4.7 Offer Upload
  - 5.4.9 Offer Upload Notification

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

**Right to Amend Primary Point Indicator**

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
<u>Yes, conditionally</u>	<u>The primary point can only be changed by the initial replacement shipper(s).</u>	
<u>Yes, unconditionally</u>	<u>The primary point can be changed by the initial replacement shipper(s) and by any and all re-release replacement shipper(s).</u>	
<u>No</u>	<u>The primary points cannot be changed by the replacement shipper(s).</u>	

- Modify the Code Values Dictionary for the following data set:  
5.4.8 Offer Upload Quick Response

**Validation Code (Sub-detail)**

Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
<u>E</u>	<u>Invalid Right to Amend Primary Point Indicator.</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>
<u>E</u>	<u>Missing Right to Amend Primary Point Indicator.</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>
<u>W</u>	<u>Right to Amend Primary Point Indicator not used.</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>

No changes necessary to the following documentation for the data sets being modified:

- TIBPs
- Sample Papers
- Executive Summary
- Business Process and Practices

Vote	Balancing			Balanced			Balanced		
	For	Against	Total	Determinant	For	Against	Total	Determinant	
End									
Users	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0		
LDCs	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0		
Pipelines	10	0	10	2	2.00	0.00	2		
Producers	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0		
Services	1	0	1	1	1.00	0.00	1		
	11	0	11	3	3.00	0.00	3		

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)  
 October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)  
 Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

- **R99043 Williams**

**Request:** Add data element 'Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Code' to the Offer Upload (5.4.7) and the Offer Download (5.4.1) datasets. (Relevant Minutes: EIITF 7/14/99; IR 9/10/02)

**IR Discussion:**

Reviewed the work from September IR meeting and made modifications

**MOTION:**

Modify the following NAESB WGQ Standards Data Dictionaries and Code Values Dictionaries as indicated below:

- **Standard 5.4.7 – Offer Upload** – add the following data element at the detail level

<b>Business Name (Abbreviation)</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>EBB Usage</b>	<b>EDI/FF Usage</b>	<b>Condition</b>
<u>Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Indicator (Min Vol Pct Eval)</u>	<u>Indicates whether the Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage will be used in the evaluation of bids.</u>	<u>BC</u>	<u>BC</u>	<u>Used when the Transportation Service Provider allows the Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage to be used in the bid evaluation process and when the following conditions are met:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>the Rate Form/Type Code indicates volumetric and</u></li> <li>• <u>the Bid Evaluation Method Indicator is 'Net Revenue' or 'Present Value'.</u></li> </ul>

- **Standard 5.4.1 – Offer Download and**
- **Standard 5.4.9 – Offer Upload Notification**  
add the following data element at the detail level

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)  
 October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)  
 Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<u>Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Indicator (Min Vol Pct Eval)</u>	<u>Indicates whether the Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage will be used in the evaluation of bids</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload.</u>

- Modify the Code Values Dictionaries for the following data sets:
  - 5.4.1 Offer Download
  - 5.4.7 Offer Upload
  - 5.4.9 Offer Upload Notification

**Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Indicator**

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
<u>Yes</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>	
<u>No</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>	

- Modify the Code Values Dictionary for the following data set:
  - 5.4.8 Offer Upload Quick Response

**Validation Code (Detail)**

Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
<u>E</u>	<u>Invalid Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Indicator.</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>
<u>E</u>	<u>Missing Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Indicator .</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>
<u>W</u>	<u>Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage Evaluation Indicator not used.</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>

No changes necessary to the following documentation for the data sets being modified:

- TIBPs

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)  
 October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)  
 Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

- Sample Papers
- Executive Summary
- Business Process and Practices

Vote				Balancing	Balanced			
	For	Against	Total	Determinan t	For	Against	Total	
End								
Users		0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
LDCs		0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
Pipelines		9	0	9	2	2.00	0.00	2
Producers		0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0
Services		1	0	1	1	1.00	0.00	1
		10	0	10	3	3.00	0.00	3

**7. Other Business**

None

**8. Next Meeting Dates and Location**

November 13-14, 2002 – Houston, TX @ Gulf South Pipeline  
 20 Greenway Plaza

Note: this is a Wednesday/Thursday meeting

December 10-11, 2002 – Brooklyn, NY @ Keyspan @ the Metrotech Center  
 January 14-15, 2003 – Salt Lake City @ Williams Gas Pipeline – West

**9. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

**NAESB WGQ Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting**  
**October 15, 2002 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**October 16, 2002 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. (Arizona Time)**  
**Phoenix Arizona – Arizona Public Service**

**Meeting Attendees and Voting Record**

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>10/14/02</b>	<b>10/15/02</b>	<b>NAESB Member?</b>
<b><u>Pipelines:</u></b>				
<b>Dale Davis</b>	Williams Gas Pipeline	√	√	√
Christopher Burden	Williams Gas Pipeline	√ (nv)		√
Donna Scott	Transwestern	√	√	√
Randy Young	Gulf South Pipeline LP	√	√	√
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	√	√	√
Bill Griffith	El Paso Western Pipes	√	√	√
Iris King	Dominion Transmission	√	√	√
Mike Stender	El Paso Natural Gas	√	√	√
Tom Gwilliam	Iroquois Gas Transmission	√	√	√
Jon Keeler	Great Lakes Gas	√	√	√
Kathryn Burch	Duke Energy – Texas	√	√	√
	Eastern			
Kim Van Pelt	CMS – Panhandle Eastern	√	√	√
<b><u>Services:</u></b>				
Greg Dodson	Dominion Resource Services	√	√	√
<b><u>Producers:</u></b>				
<b><u>End Users:</u></b>				
<b><u>LDCs:</u></b>				
<b><u>Associations:</u></b>				

Bold signifies a BPS Chair

nv – not voting