

**Title Transfer Tracking Meeting
March 27, 1998
Travis Place - Houston, Texas
DRAFT Minutes**

1. Administrative

Welcome - Jerry Hahn
Anti-trust Advice
Introduction of co-chairs
Introduction of meeting attendees

Agenda was adopted without objection.
Co-chairs were unanimously confirmed.

Meeting minutes from July, 1997 were adopted without objection as final.

2. Review of Base Case for Title Transfer Tracking

Explanation of Diagram

Explanation of Deliverables

1. Base Business Case
2. Description of Model being tested (word definition)
3. Description of Model being used (pictorial definition as per Example A)
4. Transactional Flow Chart (pictorial definition as per Example B)
5. Energy Balance by Point (spreadsheet model as per energy balance example)
6.
 - a. Summary of transactions by type
 - b. Roles & Responsibilities (who sends / receives)
 - c. Use type of formatting 'B'
7. Comparison of Strengths / Weaknesses
8. Proposed Data Elements & Dictionary (Usage Codes, Time Requirements, Timeline Implementations)
9. Error Tests (per 12/18/96 posting on home page)*
10. List of proposed standards

*Test plan issues: Failure to communicate
(for item #9) Gaming issues
 Garbled transmissions, etc.

3. Review of NOPR and Statement of Policy, Docket No. RM96-1-007

Jim Buccigross reviewed the NOPR section dealing with TTT. Jim added his opinion that nothing in the NOPR prima facie contradicts any of TTT's remaining proposed models.

Jerry Hahn added his belief that GISB should continue to work forward with the present business cases as none have been eliminated.

Greg Lander felt that some contentious issues from previous TTT meetings have been resolved in effect by the Commission. Examples: He believes that the NOPR resolves the issue as to whether GISB would **require** pipelines to perform TTT. He believes pipelines would not be required to perform TTT.

He feels it also resolves the question of whether third parties can offer TTT and believes that they can. He also feels it resolves the question as to how third-party TTTSPs would interact with TSPs.

Mark Scheel noted that this is a NOPR only, and does not feel that these issues have necessarily been resolved by the Commission. He believes that GISB can still come out with whatever model it wants (including requiring pipelines to perform TTT) as GISB standards assuming it is approved and ratified.

Tom Ehinger shared Mark's opinion, noting similar issues regarding the NOPR. He believes that GISB should continue to work on all various models, including that where the pipeline does TTT. He noted his belief that the Commission did not adequately address the value of TTT, believing this was important to the whole TTT discussion. He believes that GISB must make clear why TTT is important and how it can be accomplished most effectively.

Bob Wallenhorst echoed the previous comments and noted that the group still needs to address the question as to who will actually make the TTT nominations. If there is not a requirement, where will the incentive to make the TTT nominations come from? He believes that if this question is not answered, we may not be able to implement whatever model, if any, that we come up with.

There were a number of questions and responses from various members of the audience.

Chuck Beaver posed the following question for later discussion: The NOPR states "Pipelines must continue to ensure that shippers on their systems have title to the gas they intend to ship. To perform this function, the Commission sees no reason to require pipelines to establish a computerized title transfer tracking service to account for the purchase and sale of gas between shippers independent of transportation." He then posed the question (for later discussion) as to how a third-party could possibly meet the first requirement of the NOPR proposal without some type of electronic communication between that third party and the TSP.

Tom Ehinger noted that his view of third party TTT services involves third parties doing TTT on behalf of the TSPs. That is, TSPs would be required to perform TTT, but they may choose to have third parties perform the actual function (i.e., via an RFP).

Mark Scheel indicated that it is important to continue in the original direction taken by TTT-PT-TF, that is to study the cases selected without a directed outcome by the FERC or anyone else.

-- Lunch Break --

Given flight schedules of some of the chairs, Diane McVicker announced that the meeting would conclude at 3:30 p.m. There was no objection.

4. Review of Base Cases Nos. 2, 3, 12, 13 and 14

Case No. 12 Description: Both the TSP and TTTSP's provide the TTT service (a) on one side of the nominatable point; (b) on both sides of the nominatable point; and, (c) at the point.

Greg Lander reviewed Case 12 (due to the fact that Jim Buccigross was acting in his chair capacity as well as taking minutes). This included a base review of the relevant transactions, both transportation and title transfer, and their relevant roles in TTT.

The "deliverables" regarding Model 12 are contained in the bcase12.pdf file contained on the GISB home page.

Greg reviewed the process of nominating title transfers, the reason the "Operator" model was chosen as the relationship between TTTSPs and TSPs, comparability issues, and timing considerations of utilizing this model.

Case No. 13 Description: One third-party providing TTT for the natural gas industry.

Jerry Hahn reviewed Model 13. He reviewed the model description and discussed this situation as it applies to refined liquids (The "Harbinger" Model).

Jim noted that if anyone desires to join any of the model teams, that most of the models had team members listed in their proposals, and attendees should feel free to contact any one of the team members if they are interested in contributing to any model.

Case No. 3 Description: Transportation Service Providers (TSP) provide Title Transfer Tracking (TTT) at all types of nominatable receipt points only.

Jerry Hahn reviewed Case No. 3 on behalf of its team members who could not be present. It was difficult to get into too much detail as team members who developed and staffed the model were not present.

There was discussion and general Q&A as to various aspects of the model.

Case No. 14 Description: One, and only one, third party TTTSP at any nominatable point, on the receipt side only, on a TSP.

Jim Buccigross reviewed the model on behalf of team members who were not available. There was discussion and general Q&A as to various aspects of the model. Jim was asked a question which will be answered at a later date. It was "Does Case 14 preclude a TSP from doing TTT?"

Case No. 2 Description: At one point, a TSP having multiple TTTSP's providing TTT at a) one side of a point and b) both sides of a point.

Jerry Hahn reviewed Case No. 2 on behalf of its team members who could not be present. Discussion was brief due to the limited development of this model and the unknown future of this case being retained since the team working on it may support collapsing this effort into Case 12.

Case No. 12 (b) Description, Account Model Discussion:

Ken Schubert noted that the nomination (account) model vs. the confirmation (operator) model discussion is potentially applicable to all of the models discussed.

He then diagrammed and compared/contrasted the confirmation model with the Account Model. He answered questions on implementation and timelines regarding this model. The questions centered around timing and timing issues regarding the pipeline doing it versus third parties doing it on an account.

A motion was made from Laura Moseley, and seconded, that: "From this point forward focusing the TTT-PT-TF would focus its efforts on the Operator and the Account Models in conjunction with the existing business cases thereunder:

Sense of the Room:	Yes:	18
	No:	4
	Abstain:	2

Segment Check:	Pr	PL	LDC	EU	Svs
Yes:	0	13	1	1	3
No:	2	0	1	0	1
Abstain:	1	1	0	0	0

5. Identification of Parameters/Questions to be applied to the cases

A document was posted which set out framework questions to be applied to the various models. If anyone desires to add additional framework questions, they should forward these to Veronica Thomason at the GISB Office (e-mail: gisb@aol.com) before the next meeting in Washington.

6. Reconvene teams for further development of each case

Ken Schubert was asked to convene an additional team to prepare a packet of deliverables for the Account Model, as was done on the other business cases, for presentation at the next meeting on April 17, 1998 in Washington.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

**Title Transfer Tracking
Sign up Sheet - March 27, 1998**

First Name	Last Name	Company	Segment	Phone / Fax	E-Mail Address
Betty	Barnum	Trunkline Gas Co	Pipeline	713-627-5618 / 5769	babarnum@duke-energy.com
Chuck	Beaver	Transenergy Mgt.	Services	713-693-2205 / 2101	cbeaver@transenergy.com
Jim	Buccigross	National Registry	Services	978-535-7500 / 7744	legaljb@tcapserv.com
Jackie	Butler	Panhandle Eastern	Pipeline	713-627-5033 /	mjbutler@duke-energy.com
Melissa	Casey	Texas Gas	Pipeline	713-215-2906 / 4537	melissa.k.casey@wgp.twc.com
Dale	Davis	Williams Gas Pipelines	Pipeline	713-215-2396 / 3946	dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com
Tom	Ehinger	Amoco	Producer	281-355-4559 / 5090	thomas_g_ehinger@amoco.com
Mark	Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company	Pipeline	713-757-2644 / 3294	graceym@epenergy.com
Jerry	Hahn	Texaco Natural Gas Inc	Producer	713-752-7769 / 4026	hahnge@texaco.com
Lisa	Hassold	PG&E Gas Transmission - Texas	Pipeline	210-528-4282 / 4302	hassoldl@pge-texas.com
Keith	Higginbotham	Enron - Transwestern	Pipeline	713-853-5466 / 713-646-2551	khigginbotham@enron.com
Tammy	Hopkins	Enron - Northern Border Pipeline	Pipeline	713-853-5818 /	thopkins@enron.com
Frazier	King	Enron - FGT	Pipeline	713-853-7228 / 5425	fking@enron.com
Greg	Lander	TransCapacity	Services	978-535-7500 / 7744	exec@tcapserv.com
Laurie	McCauley	Transco	Pipeline	713-215-4473 / 4537	laurie.l.mccauley@wgp.twc.com
Allison	McLean	Mobile Bay P/L	Pipeline	713-229-5631 / 6012	mcleana@kochind.com
Diane	McVicker	Salt River Project	Enduser	602-236-4315 / 4322	dbmckvick@srp.gov
Laura	Moseley	Enron - FGT	Pipeline	713-518-1707 / 6756	lmoseley@enron.com
Sheila	Nacey	Enron - Northern Natural Gas	Pipeline	713-853-5146 / 713-646-2551	snacey@enron.com
Mike	Oberleitner	Baltimore Gas & Electric	LDC	410-291-4785 / 4601	michael.s.oberleitner@bge.com
Bill	Oppenheim	PECO Energy	LDC	610-832-6414 / 6499	woppenheim@peco-energy.com
Mark	Scheel	NGC Corporation	Services	713-507-6787 / 6834	masc@ngccorp.com
Mike	Schisler	Natural Gas Pipe Line	Producer	713-963-3589 / 3085	mike_schisler@kenergy.com
Ken	Schubert	TransCanada Pipe Lines	Pipeline	403-267-8606 / 8632	ken_schubert@tcpl.ca
Donna	Scott	Enron Admin Corp	Services	713-853-6136 /	dscott2@ect.enron.com
Julie	Unruh	Mobile Bay P/L		713-229-5438 / 6012	unruhj@kohcind.com
Bob	Wallenhorst	Exxon	Producer	713-656-5230 / 4144	robert.p.wallenhorst@esson.sprint.com
Dave	Weathers	Texas Eastern / Algonquin	Pipeline	713-627-4773 / 713-989-1534	daweathers@duke-energy.com