

## NOTES FOR AUGUST 5th STANDARDS CONFERENCE CALL

### ATTENDEES:

Kelly Daly	Arizona Public Service	
Becky Cantrell	ECT	
Gary Payne	ECT	
Julie Dennis	Koch Gateway	dennisj@kochind.com
Lanyard Sledge	Tennessee	
Jerry Hahn	Texaco	
Catherine Calpotura	PG&E	
Shelly Corman	Florida Gas Transmission	
Rick Ishikawa	Socal Gas	
Betty Barnum	PEPL	babarnum@duke-energy.com
Janice Devers	Algonquin	

### ISSUES NOT YET RESOLVED IN OUR GROUP:

- 1) “Minimum” language - explicitly outlining the concept.
  - Proposed Language
  - where to put it in the Standards; Principles or Standards sections

#### GROUP RESPONSE:

Order 587 contains FERC thoughts on exceeding the standard. FERC clearly states that a pipeline may not adopt a procedure that they consider superior if it violates uniformity. Catherine Calpotura’s notes regarding Order 587 will be posted.

- 2) Language capturing the bumping constraint concept clearly and accurately, but without becoming a policy-sounding mandate. Review received proposals.

#### GROUP RESPONSE:

See DRAFT 5 language 1.3.2.I - language agreed upon, will present as stated to larger group

- 3) What numbers to assign to the principles, keeping with existing standards nomenclature.
  - <1.1.something>
  - P.1 = 1.1.18            New language - see DRAFT 5
  - P.4 = 1.1.17            Last sentence - hold for discussion in larger group.
  - P.2 = dump              Concepts are very explanatory, and reflect mechanics of applying compromise model. Do not include as principle. However, the language may prove useful when presenting the model.
  - P.3 = dump              same as P.4

### ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED BY LARGER GROUP:

- 1) “Should all intraday’s processed outside the timeline be done on a no-bump basis” - the issue here is whether or not such a decision would be considered a policy decision (of the kind we’ve been trying to avoid making) or a needed clarification similar to the constraints already imposed on bumping in the compromise model. (Chair issue D)  
SEE RESOLUTION PROPOSAL BELOW.
- 2) “Impact to Capacity Release” - this is still unresolved regarding the timeline and other issues. (Chair issue C).

- 3) Date Range versus Rollover concept - decision between the two methods lies in the larger group, including a discussion of the merits. (Chair issue E) SEE PROPOSALS BELOW
- 4) Batch Process handling; Simultaneous vs. Time Stamp - the issue here is whether or not a mandate either way would represent a policy decision similar to the one being avoided about bumping (it refers to character of service), or if it would be a fundamental necessity to standardization. (Chair issue F) ALSO; service versus processing concept should be fleshed out (Shelly Corman).

#### PROPOSALS FOR RESOLUTION OF ISSUES FOR LARGER GROUP:

- 1) Regarding the date range/rollover issue, we can propose the Date Range model (Chair issue E), HOWEVER the group did not come to a consensus on which approach to take.

This also becomes a system's issue; how is the nomination handled in each TSP.  
Also, there is a need to not waffle back and forth on this issue, as it costs \$\$\$ each time.

Also, 1.3.13 can be seen to conflict with 1.3.5.

The strikes at 1.3.5 and 1.3.13 were based on the assumption that "rollover" was resolved in favor of date range. If this is not true, these strikes must be reconsidered.

- 2) Regarding the non-grid bumping, we would like to see an attempt to capture the concept of not allowing non-grid bumps to affect the grid (by virtue of the lesser of rule). Although to be addressed by the CONFIRMATIONS group, we want to emphasize the need to address this concept.

#### FYI - CONCLUSIONS TO BE PRESENTED TO LARGER GROUP:

- 1) All Standards modifications as seen in DRAFT 4, including recommended strikes and new language.
- 2) Approach to new standards should be: Keep existing standards and modify, add or delete from them as necessary to portray the compromise model concepts. Do not delete current intraday standards en masse in favor of a giant new one. (Chair issues A & B)
- 3) ~~Continuous interfaces with batch - how? Generally, continuous pipes will hold the grid-bound noms until synchronization time. In the meantime, they can continue to process on system non continuously. (Chair issue F)~~
- 4) TSP Bumping election proposal - TSP's make election in compliance filings. This concept should be explicitly covered in Standards language. However, the exact language of this concept is an outstanding issue (Chair issue G).