

**Meeting Coordination Task Force Conference Call -  
June 18, 2002  
Final Minutes**

**Administrative**

Mr. Zavodnick called the roll and welcomed all attendees

Mr. Sappenfield reviewed the anti trust guidelines

The agenda was presented and adopted

**Discussion and Adoption of May 24 Minutes**

Mr. Zavodnick suggested changes to the spelling of two names; Eric Ackerman and Suzanne Calcagno and requested that participant affiliation be added to the list of attendees

After Ms. Hess verified that she made the comments in question, the question marks appearing after her name under item five were removed.

The minutes were then adopted as modified.

**Discussion of Proposal for Customs and Traditions for Meeting Coordination**

Discussion of whether webcasting and videoconferencing are currently available technologies that are ready for NAESB use or whether suggesting use of these technologies. Mr. Sappenfield says that most common browsers support these technologies and proposed to move these items from potential for future consideration to the Proposal for Customs and Traditions.

Ms. Hess suggested that there should be just one list of proposed items for meeting coordination. It was decided that there would be one list and each of the three items under possible items for future consideration will be moved to the Customs and Traditions list.

Ms. Hess discussed having a page where Chairs can go to look at the calendar of meetings and possibly add/schedule meetings themselves. Ms. Hess thinks it should be looked into immediately. Ms. Davis suggests that all the items on the list need to be identified by what can be done now as opposed to what requires more time and resources.

Ms. Arnaout requested clarification on where the minutes were located.

Mr. Young stated that we seem to be coming up with meeting coordination guidelines and that this might be a better term.

He also suggested using Central Time and Houston as an example. This proposal was accepted.

Ms. Kahn raised the issue that meetings should have a facilitator. Mr. Young also suggested that using a meeting facilitator is a little out of scope for what we are trying to accomplish. Mr. Whatley suggested that part of the Chair's role was to take care of facilitation. Ms. Khan suggested the facilitator's role was to act as a time-keeper, enforcer of the schedule. Ms. Davis suggested that facilitators might indeed be out of the scope of this task force. Mr. Whatley wants to add that depending on the function of the committee, they could be run completely differently and therefore shouldn't be dictated to. Mr. Zavodnick agrees that a facilitator is more of an internal concern, rather than how to coordinate meetings. Mr. Sappenfield, does think that the function of facilitator is necessary in order to keep meetings from overlapping where multiple meetings occur consecutively on the same day. Ms. Davis says that when there are back-to-back meetings, usually there is a small buffer between meetings and that it is the chair's responsibility to get the meeting ended timely. Mr. Zavodnick suggests that it be stated that this is the chair's responsibility. Ms. Khan thinks that Mr. Sappenfield has a valid point especially in light of experience at the Seattle EC meeting. Ms. Kahn stated that her original intent was that the overall meeting times run long if someone doesn't keep them on track. She suggested that the facilitator would be more effective if it is someone other than the chair because it is easier if it is a second person concentrates solely on time. Mr. Zavodnick agrees with Ms. Davis that meetings should adhere to their time periods and that there be a buffer time should be stated in the task force's proposal. Ms. Arnaout says that it is stated in NAESB agendas that the chair has the right to extend the time period of the meeting. Mr. Sappenfield says that there needs to be this time flexibility in order to accomplish what needs to be done. Ms. Hess likes Ms. Davis' idea of chair's trying to stick to the beginning and ending times. Mr. Zavodnick relayed a prior discussion with Mr. Buccigross and said one of the reasons that the team originally picked 'customs and traditions' was to give flexibility to the proposal, the original intent was not to be a regulation type document.

The discussion shifts to the subject of the term 'Customs and Traditions'. Mr. Young doesn't have a problem with 'Customs' but 'Traditions' is what he had a problem with (some people thinking traditions are very rigid). Thinks 'Customs and Guidelines' has more flexibility. Ms. Hess says that the list was prepared initially as a way to explain these things that have been used in GISB throughout the years, but since we're discussing new things maybe 'Customs and Guidelines' will be better. These lists were generated in a brainstorming session and not set in stone. Mr. Young was hoping that the outcome of this meeting would be a report. The suggestion is to replace 'Customs and Traditions' with 'Guidelines' resulting in the document reading 'Proposal for Meeting Coordination Guidelines'. This is accepted.

Mr. Zavodnick returns to topic of facilitator. Ms. Davis states that it should be something along the lines of 'meeting chairs should be held responsible for keeping meetings on schedule and keeping in mind other meetings scheduled on the same day'.

Ms. Davis wants to discuss the no meetings on Mon or Fri suggestion. We need to keep in mind that the increasing need to control costs may require travel on weekends. She suggests the proposal should be more along the lines of be mindful of participants availability on Mon and Fri. Ms. Hess points out that cost savings are possible without weekend travel. Ms. Davis acknowledges that was not her intent to force weekend travel. Mr. Whatley suggests that these proposals apply more to standing subcommittees. However if there is just one or two meetings or one with a wide audience these suggestions might apply. If it is a standing committee the committee will most likely arrange their own schedules. Mr. Zavodnick suggests that all the 'shoulds' and 'should nots' should be toned down. Mr. Sappenfield suggests that it would be good to say that the meeting participants can schedule the meetings so that it best serves the meeting attendees (applicable to standing committees). Mr. Zavodnick asks if we want to draw the distinction between one time meetings and standing committee. Mr. Whatley suggests that we say there is a difference and more consideration needs to be paid to meetings with a wide audience that occur infrequently. The feelings and preferences of the members of individual standing committees should be considered more than these guidelines we are putting out.

Mr. Young suggests that it might be hard to decide which of these rules apply. (For example a conflict between convenient location and hosted by a member). Suggests that it is hard to reconcile some of these rules. Mr. Zavodnick suggests that by focusing on the fact that these are guidelines takes care of this issue, and they are not requirements. Ms. Hess agrees with Mr. Whatley that the standing committees know what works for them and has no problem with them keeping their own arrangements, but that for the newer, larger groups they might adhere more to guidelines. Ms. Khan thinks this is a good point. Mr. Zavodnick asks if there are some specific line items that we might want to call guidelines and some things that are given a lower standing. Ms. Hess thinks this is a good idea. Mr. Whatley was under the understanding that we were discussing coordination of meeting times as opposed to where meetings are held. Ms. Davis says that historically this became a problem when two or three meetings were scheduled on one day in different cities and people need to be at more than one. This is part of meeting coordination. Mr. Whatley suggests that the focus be on big location conflicts, as opposed to meetings being close to public transportation. Ms. King suggests that the proposal say meetings should be easily accessible by train station or airplane. Ms. Hess doesn't want to lose the point about public transportation.

Ms. Davis shifts the focus of the discussion to requiring teleconference capability at all meetings. She states that there are instances in which teleconferencing does not work, and she would hate to be forced to provide it in these instances. The example of the Information Requirements Subcommittee was given where there are a lot of visuals necessary for meetings. We need to recognize that in limited situations such as this, that teleconferencing may not be appropriate. The suggestion was made that "when applicable" be added to that statement.

If a meeting is going to require travel then more than several days will be required for the agendas to be distributed. Suggests maybe two weeks for a face to face. Ms. Hess states

that these time-tables are already laid out in the GISBOPS. If we do put anything in writing we need to make sure we're not conflicting with current NAESB operating procedures. We need to look at those to make sure there are no conflicts. Suggests this happen between now and next meeting. There was general agreement that if same day travel was possible, that meetings should begin later. While if prior day travel would be required, then the meetings should begin earlier. Agendas for face to face meetings should be distributed far enough in advance to allow participants to decide to attend and to take advantage of 7 or 14-day prior purchase airline tickets.

There was general discussion about including or excluding activities of other groups like AGA, EEI, NARUC and others on the NAESB calendars. It was agreed that the activities shown on NAESB calendars be limited to NAESB activities only. Ms. Arnaout was concerned about not including NAESB meetings hosted by AGA. It was clarified that any meeting held under the auspices of NAESB, whether hosted by another entity or not, would be shown on the NAESB calendar. Mr. Anthony suggests that all future scheduled EC meetings and Board meetings be made available on calendar (website). Mr. Whatley further suggested that the calendars posted on the website should go as far into the future as any meeting are scheduled.

Mr. Zavodnick asked if there was any further discussion on any items related to the proposal. Hearing no further discussion, the meeting moved on to the next agenda item.

### **Other Business**

Hearing no discussion on other business the meeting moved on to the next agenda item.

### **Next Steps**

Mr. Zavodnick and Ms. McMillan will revise the initial proposal by softening some of words and taking the discussion into account. A revised proposal will then be sent to the task force members for review and comment to be followed by another and hopefully final meeting to approve the proposal.

Mr. Anthony questioned whether we should draft this proposal into something that looks more like NAESB guideline.

Hearing no objection Mr. Zavodnick agreed.

Ms. Hess reminded the task force that we should look at existing GISBOPS/NAESBOPS to make sure there are no conflicts.

Discussion of next meeting time.

Mon. July 1, 2002 10:00am – 12:00pm CST (11:00 – 1:00EST)

Meeting adjourn at 2:20p Central Time.

Attendees

Jeff Anthony  
Mariam Arnaout  
Dale Davis  
Theresa Hess  
Misty Khan  
Iris King  
Meghan McMillan  
Keith Sappenfield  
Pete Whatley  
Randy Young  
Steve Zavodnick

Affiliation

Wisconsin Electric – Wisconsin Gas  
AGA  
Williams Gas Pipeline  
Reliant Energy Retail Services  
Telerrx  
Dominion Transmission, Inc.  
NAESB  
EnCana Energy  
Dynergy Marketing and Trade  
Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP  
Baltimore Gas & Electric