

GISB Title Transfer Tracking - Pilot Test - Task Force
Tuesday - February 4, 1997
El Paso Energy (don't call it the old Tenneco building!)
Houston, Texas

1. Welcome by Jim B.
2. Antitrust Statement by Jim B.
3. Agenda adopted.

Laverne Tilson volunteered to take minute until Fred Norwood, Norm, or Jerry arrived.
Fred Norwood arrived, will chair meeting.

Jim B. now to take minutes.

Changes to January 8, 1997 minutes - see hard copy handout.
Fred asked to change agenda to move final adoption of base case to after everyone (i.e. Norm) gets here.
Group agreed, will get update from groups then move to base case.

4. Updates from the Groups:

Group 2: Michael Novak noted that Group 2 update was not available today. Will have a handout for tomorrow (second half of the meeting)

Group 3: Gene Nowak - Handed out update on base case number 3. Incorporated all transactions from base case, updated assumptions. Incorporated additional transactions at Point Delta from change to base case adopted at Jan 8 meeting.

Removed roles from "hockey rinks" in his diagram (p. 7 of Group 3 Update) as discussed last meeting.
All companies buying/selling are consistent regardless of role.

Commented that tracking of title in this model is on the downstream TSP, his schematics were updated to show this.

Gene went through his update by page to explain significant changes.

Pages 15 - 25 are the transaction flows from the agreed upon diagrams. Gene noted it was important that the flows balance on the TSP so match-ups can be done and correct confirmations can be done.

Fred asked whether base case is adequate to test complexity of the "real world?" Gene suggested it is a fairly simple model, but is adequate.

Floor was opened to questions.

Group 12: Jim Buccigross noted that the base case was updated, it is not currently available on the home page, but he will post it. Mass balance will be completed in the next couple of days, and be posted on the home page. Jim noted that he has the base case in soft copy if anyone wants it. If anyone wants the base case or mass balance in electronic copy they can send Jim and e-mail and he'll send it to them.

Group 13: Norm was not available for an update on Group 13.

Group 14: Laurie McCauly - No significant update. Group was unable to meet (see nos. 2 and 12). There will be a group meeting to update for next scheduled TTT-PT-TF.

5. Adopt Base Case Business Example

There were some questions as to whether we have not in fact set the base case, and whether everyone is in agreement that these transactions will be rippled through all of the models, that is, that the exact same case be used. Group was in agreement with this approach.

Suggestion that the remainder of the afternoon be used for break-out sessions for the work groups. There was apparent agreement as to this approach.

Jerry Hahn questioned as to whether the deliverables for the groups have been adequately determined. No real discussion on this, decided that breaking into sub-groups will be the way to go for this afternoon.

When/if Norm arrives, we will determine whether and why to meet for tomorrow afternoon.

Criteria for evaluations of the different models was brought up. Do we need to nail this down now, or is it premature at this point. Suggestion that we may not in fact be able to pick a winner, that we will end up reporting all of them, so as not to "pick winners." Mike Novak brought up the fact that to some extent all of these models are working to some extent in the "real world." We may not be able to pick a single individual model and recommend that to the EC.

Mark Scheel disagreed to the extent that this group should probably at least rank the different models in the report to the EC, as opposed to just reporting them all without comment.

Jerry added that "we may not know until we get there what the final report (recommendation?) will look like. In the future, when comparisons are being made between the models, then a solution may fall out.

What is the goal of this group: We may find all solutions work, we may find that some solutions do not work. This may not be determinative until we complete the evaluation. If at the end it is clear that one model is clearly superior, that may happen. If we don't, then that doesn't mean we haven't accomplished anything.

Jerry reviewed the deliverable from prior meetings that the group had agreed upon (10/25/96 minutes, p.6).

2:30 PM, whole group adjourned and sub-groups met on their own.

Attendees:

Jim Buccigross	TransCapacity
Heather Gnez	TransCanada Pipeline
Laurie McCauley	Transco
Lanyard Sledge	Tenneco
Michael Novak	National Fuel
Laverne Tilson	Defense Fuel Supply Center
Jim Studebaker	Enron - FGT
Gene Nowak	NGPL
Angie Buckspan	Wesco
Debbie Beaver	Wesco
Fred Norwood	El Paso
Lisa Hassold	Valero/PGE
Jay Story	PGT
Mark Gracey	Tennessee
Mark Scheel	NGC