

NOTES

STANDARDS LANGUAGE MEETING

10/27/97

ATTENDEES

1.. Kelly Daly	Arizona Public Service	End User
2.. Joel Greene	SRP	End User
3.. Terry Fitch	Transco	Pipe
4.. Rick Ishikawa	SOCAL	LDC
5.. Bob Wallehorst	Exxon	Producer
6.. Gary Payne	Enron Administrative Services	Services
7.. Donna Scott	Florida Gas	Pipe
8.. Marian Hundt	BR	Producer
9.. Mark Gracey	Tennessee	Pipe
10.. Paul Love	NGPL	Pipe
11.. Randy Young	Koch Gateway	Pipe
12.. Tammy Jaquet	Transwestern	Pipe
13.. Lanyard Sledge	East Tennessee & MGT	Pipe
14.. Katherine O'Hara	TETCO	Pipe
15.. Shiela Macy	NNG	Pipe
16.. Mike Wells	PEPL	Pipe
17.. Becky Cantrell	ECT	Services
18.. Kim Van Pelt	Trunkline	Pipe
19.. Tom Ehinger	Amoco	Producer
20.. Jerry Hahn	Texaco	Producer
21.. Chuck Beaver	TransEnergy	Services
22.. Greg Lander	National Registry	Services
23.. Jim Buccigross	TransCapacity	Services

GENERAL

1.3.22.iv

“Elapsed-prorated-scheduled quantity means that portion of the scheduled quantity that would have theoretically flowed up to the effective time of the intraday nomination being confirmed, based upon a cumulative uniform hourly quantity for each nomination period affected.

The following statements are partial examples demonstrating the intent of this proposed standard.

More detailed examples are needed for inclusion in the GISB implementation guides. Example: A nomination starting at 9am and changing at 5pm could not be reduced below 8/24ths; A nomination starting at 5pm and changing at 9pm could not be reduced below 4/16ths.”

Vote for using the truncated examples listed above (as opposed to a longer, numeric walk-through):

12 = Y

5 = N

Language passed.

S.5

Unanimous vote to accept:

“During the confirmation process, the Confirmation Requester and the Confirming Party compare information for the purpose of confirming nominations at a location.”

S.6

13 = Y

1 = N

5 = A

adopt as proposed:

“A Confirmation Requester is a Service Provider (including a Point Operator) which is seeking to confirm a quantity of gas via the information outlined in GISB Standard 1.4.3 with another Service Provider (the Confirming Party) with respect to a nomination at a location”.

S.7

12 = Y

1 = N

8 = A

adopt as proposed:

“A Confirming Party is a Service Provider (including a Point Operator) which provides a confirmation for a quantity of gas via the information outlined in GISB Standard 1.4.4 to another Service Provider (the Confirmation Requester) with respect to a nomination at a location.”

S.8

Adopted as proposed

20 = Y

0 = N

0 = A

see language (no changes from proposal)

S.9

Adopted as proposed

14 = Y

3 = N

A = 5

“The Explicit Confirmation (“EC”) process requires that the Confirming Party respond to a Request for Confirmation or initiate an unsolicited Confirmation Response.”

Vote on whether or not Explicit should be the default, with the ability to override with mutual agreement:

16 = Y

2 = N

0 = A

Vote on whether to constrain the true intraday processes to only Explicit confirmation methodology:

1 = Y

12 = N (don't constrain; allow all time periods to be open to mutual interpretation)

5 = A

NOTE: With Confirmation by Exception being allowed now for the intraday cycles, the “no response” language in 1.3.22.i,ii,iii becomes inappropriate. New language is needed to clarify it means “no response while in Explicit mode”, since no response in Exception mode result in confirmation.

Also accepted as language for S.9:

“Absent mutual agreement to the contrary, Explicit Confirmation is the default methodology.”

S.10

Adopted as proposed

16 = Y

0 = N

3 = A

“Confirmation by Exception means that the Confirming Parties agree that one party deem that all requests at a location are confirmed by the other party (the Confirmation by Exception (“CBE”) party) without response communication from that party. The CBE party can take exception to the request by so informing the other party within a mutually agreed upon time frame.”

S.11

Start with this section next session.

NOTES
STANDARDS LANGUAGE MEETING
10/28/97

ATTENDEES

1.. Bob Wallehorst	Exxon	Producer
2.. Jerry Hahn	Texaco	Producer
3.. Joel Greene	Salt River Project	End User
4.. Kelly Daly	Arizona Public Service	End User
5.. Mark Scheel	NGC	Services
6.. Paul Love	NGPL	Pipe
7.. Rick Ishikawa	SOCAL	LDC
8.. Becky Cantrell	ECT	Services
9.. Shiela Nacy	NNG	Pipe
10.. Tammy Lee Jaquet	Transwestern	Pipe
11.. Shelly Corman	Northern Border	Pipe
12.. Donna Scott	ECT	Services
13.. Marian Hundt	BR	Producer
14.. Lanyard Sledge	East Tennessee & MGT	Pipe
15.. Kim Van Pelt	Trunkline	Pipe
16.. Katherine O'Hara	TETCO	Pipe
17.. Mike Wells	PEPL	Pipe
18.. Julie Dennis	Mobile Bay	Pipe
19.. Randy Young	Koch Gateway	Pipe
20.. Tom Ehinger	Amoco	Producer
21.. Chuck Beaver	TransEnergy	Services

GENERAL

S.11

Change language and move to 1.3.2 preamble:
"All TSP's should support the Standard nomination timelines as follows:"

Also append to 1.3.2 as a new sentence.

"Any additional confirmation and flow-time synchronization is on a mutually agreed basis between confirming parties."

Vote to accept such changes to Draft:

Vote by dissention, none seen. Accepted by dissention.

S.12

Accept last sentence as new definition.

[1.2.X] "The daily grid-wide synchronization times for scheduled flow are 9am, 5pm, and 9pm."

This is based on concept I.o: Note that identifying that the sync times occur with respect to a single gas day is accomplished by including "daily" above. The concept of minimum applying to 9/5/9 is given, as all adopted standards are minimums.

N = 2

All others = Y

Accepted as proposed.

Other concepts in I.o are also found expressed elsewhere:

- identification of scheduled quantities document as a daily document is under 1.4.5 data dictionary.

S.13

Skip for now.

[ISSUE FOR LARGER GROUP]

Time ran out before the group could get back to this issue. This issue also relies on the completion of the “Nomination Intent Analysis”, which is now to be conducted in the larger group.

S.14

Concept I.q: provide shippers a scheduled quantities document when changes initiated by TSP (or any entity other than themselves) occur to their account.

This is to be incorporated into language in S.15, since we changed it’s concept to be “send all”, which is the point of S.14.

In the end, the concept was captured in adding the word “accepted” before “Shippers and Operators” in the language in 1.3.2ii,iii,iv.

S.15

The concept of S.15 is outlined in 1.3.3, so it was proposed that 1.3.3 get amplified to include intraday timeframes. But was dropped.

Scheduled Quantities flavors and strength of TSP commitment to get the data out:

Current	Current	Proposed
4:30 (day prior)	End of Day (day of flow)	Intraday (10pm, 1pm, 9pm)
Received by	Provide (if EDI, then send required unless receiver wades if EBB then posting required).	As voted: PROVIDE Where: EDI = send but receiver may waive. EBB = post
All	All	All/Change: although we won’t decide either way, we did decide that only one method should be mandated in the end.

Where:

Received by = Push, or TSP required to provide to shippers actively

Make Available = Come and get (post on EBB)

Provide = must be qualified by communication type: EDI then means send out, EBB then means posted on EBB.

Where:

All = send all shipper data in total

Clarity, uniformity, heavy bandwidth use

Changes = send only changes

Ambiguous, non-uniform, light transmit load

FOR EC: Vote was unanimous (with 2 abstentions) that as a principle, the intraday task force believes that we should move our standards in a direction between sending scheduling qty documents that contain all data versus changes only.

Regarding debate on change versus send all, there was noted interest in biasing towards change-processing for the Scheduled Quantity documents for shippers. Same documents for Operators may not be similarly affected. There was no vote taken on the consensus about Change versus Send All. The only direction being offered on the subject at this point is the letter to the EC above, showing a direction to indicate to the industry.

Modify 1.3.2.ii,iii,iv replacing “for receipt of” with “to provide”, and adding a sentence at the end to define “provide” explicitly as follows:

Add to the end of newly modified 1.3.3 – “TSP’s should provide scheduled quantities resulting from intraday nominations at the times pursuant to 1.3.2. With respect to the implementation of this process via the 1.4.x scheduled quantity related standards, TSP’s should send these scheduled quantity documents. The receiver of these scheduled quantity documents may waive the obligation of the sender to send.”

Regarding the addition of a data element for indicating which cycle the scheduled quantities document applies to, the issue is considered a data set issue and is **punted back to larger group** (Intraday Task force).

S.17

Issues of holding nominations and holding or not holding capacity are too large to be considered in the standards group.

LANGUAGE NOT ADOPTED.

[ISSUE FOR LARGER GROUP]

CYCLE NAMES:

Joel Greene volunteered to spearhead the non-committee-time effort of gathering a final version and consensus of the cycle names.