



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page www.gisb.org

November 13, 1997

TO: GISB Members

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

**RE: ERRATA TO: FULL TEXT OF THE STANDARDS AND INTERPRETATIONS
ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ON JULY 10, AUGUST 12 AND
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997**

It has come to our attention that some of the standards language contained errors. Below is a correction to the full text of the language of the standards adopted by the Executive Committee on July 10, August 13 and September 12, 1997, currently out for membership ratification. If you have already returned your ballot and this changes your vote, please notify the GISB office immediately. If this correction does not effect your vote, no further action is required. Because of the late notification of this errata, the period for returning ballots has been extended to November 24.

The corrections can be downloaded from the GISB home page (www.gisb.org), We sincerely apologize for any inconveniences that this mistake may have caused. Thank you for your help in this matter.

With Regards,
Rae McQuade

cc: Dennis Holbrook
Laurie Paulson



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
NOVEMBER 12, 1997

The corrected language for **C97011** should read:

C97011

Request

From what date does the six-month period limitation on prior period adjustments begin? Is it from the date of adoption of GISB Standards? or is it with the Transportation invoice which is issued during the sixth month prior to adoption of the GISB Standards? Can a pipeline which became GISB compliant on April 1, 1997, include in its September 1997 transportation invoice a prior period adjustment for May 1996 production?

Proposed Interpretation:

"GISB Standard 3.3.16 refers to the prior period adjustments being reported by production date. Prior to the date of adoption of the GISB Standards by the subject party(ies), whatever convention they followed previously would be and would continue to be in effect for the invoices related to production and transportation related transactions occurring up through the day prior to adoption of the GISB Standards."

"For example, a Transportation Service Provider adopting the GISB Standards effective April 1, 1997, a March 31st, 1997 (or earlier) transaction would not be governed by the GISB Standards 3.3.15 or 3.3.16; and a transaction occurring on or after April 1, 1997 would be governed by the GISB standards. Thus, a September 1997 invoice could have prior period adjustments for any production month (pursuant to the previously effective convention for those transactions occurring prior to or on March 31, 1997). Likewise, the latest date (six months from the initial transportation invoice) that an April, 1997 production month (invoiced in May, 1997) would be subject to a prior period adjustment, (consistent with the relevant standards and [interpretation C97010 -- replace with applicable designation when known]), would be the last business day of November, 1997."

"With respect to the three month rebuttal period, this rebuttal period attaches to the reporting of the prior period adjustment. A rebuttal period is the time during which the rebuttal should be submitted, and unless submitted within this period, (consistent with the relevant standards and [interpretation C97010 -- replace with applicable designation when known]), the prior period adjustment would be deemed accepted. The rebuttal period does not itself extend the reporting period of the prior period adjustment, it may however extend the ultimate resolution. For example, if a prior period adjustment for May 1997 production was posted in October 1997, the three month rebuttal period (the period during which the rebuttal should be submitted and after which (consistent with the relevant standards and [interpretation C97010 -- replace with applicable designation when known]), the prior period adjustment would be deemed accepted) would end on the last business day of January, 1998. For example, if a prior period adjustment for May 1997 production month was posted in November 1997, its rebuttal period (again the period during which the rebuttal should be submitted and after which (consistent with the relevant standards and [interpretation C97010 -- replace with applicable designation when known]), the prior period adjustment would be deemed accepted) would extend through the last business day of February, 1998.

"With respect to the prior period adjustment time frame, the purpose for choosing the last business day of the sixth month following the initial transportation invoice is to account for differences in the actual date that an invoice may be rendered, and making it clear that the timing of holidays, weekends, and delays to invoices in one or another month would not engender disputes as to whether the six month period was a period of exact



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
NOVEMBER 12, 1997

days, (182 or 183 depending on the year) or the coincidence of a weekend with the expiration of a particular date, or the tardiness of the sixth-month's invoice relative to the original invoice, etc."

"Likewise, with respect to the rebuttal period time frame, the purpose for choosing the last business day of the third month following the submittal of the prior period adjustment is to account for differences in the actual date that a prior period adjustment may be submitted, and making it clear that the timing of holidays, weekends, and delays to prior period adjustments (contained in invoices) in one or another month would not engender disputes as to whether the three month period was a period of exact days, (90, 91 or 92 days depending on the initial month) or the coincidence of a weekend with the expiration of a particular date."



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

The corrected language for **R96083** should read:

R96083

Request:

Modify the statement of account transaction usage code for date element.

Proposed Standard:

For the Statement of Account, maintain the current mapping of the *Invoice Date* data element to the ANSI mandatory field ADJ05. The explanatory Text for the invoice date data element is modified to: "For GISB, this element is Sender's Option. The value is Invoice Date, if applicable, or if not applicable, repeat the value of data element Due Date."

Proposed Mapping -- ADJ Segment

<u>GISB Usage</u>	<u>ANSI Field</u>	<u>GISB Field or Value</u>	<u>ANSI Usage</u>
Must Use	ADJ01	'L'	Mandatory
Must Use	ADJ02	Amount Due	Mandatory
Must Use	ADJ03	Invoiced Amount - For GISB, this element is Sender's Option. Send zero if not applicable.	Mandatory
Must Use	ADJ04	Due Date	Mandatory
Must Use	ADJ05	Invoice Date - For GISB, this element is Sender's Option. The value is Invoice Date, if applicable, or if not applicable, repeat the value of the data element Due Date.	Mandatory
	ADJ10	Paid Amount - For GISB, this element is Sender's Option.	Optional



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

The corrected language for **R96125B** should read:

R96125B

Request:

Add a data element to the PDA, PDA Quick Response and Allocation Statement data sets to identify the level of allocation. (Standard 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.2)

Proposed Standard:

Add data element statement type code to the Service Requester at a receipt or delivery location. Add code values to the statement type code. Both additions as shown in the tables below.

Pre-determined Allocation 2.4.1

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
<i>PDA Submitter's Tracking ID</i>	<i>This is created by the originator of the process. It is line item specific and is used by the originator of the process to tie the PDA Quick Response to the PDA. It is not validated by the receiver of the process nor is it a key in the receiver of the process' data base. The receiver of the process will not track this identifier but merely echo it back in the response document. This identifier is used for EDI only and will not be added to EBBs. This data element contains alpha-numeric data.</i>	M	

* Indicates Common Code

Pre-determined Allocation - Quick Response 2.4.2

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
<i>PDA Submitter's Tracking ID</i>	<i>This is created by the originator of the process. It is line item specific and is used by the originator of the process to tie the PDA Quick Response to the PDA. It is not validated by the receiver of the process nor is it a key in the receiver of the process' data base. The receiver of the process will not track this identifier but merely echo it back in the response document. This identifier is used for EDI only and will not be added to EBBs. This data element contains alpha-numeric data.</i>	C	<i>Sent when errors or warnings occur at the PDA Submitter's Tracking ID level.</i>

* Indicates Common Code



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
NOVEMBER 12, 1997

R96125B Continued

Code Values

Pre-determined Allocation - Quick Response, 2.4.2

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Validation Code	C	EPDQR528	Missing PDA Submitter's Tracking ID	N/A



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
NOVEMBER 12, 1997

The corrected language for **R97016** should read:

R97016

Request:

Modify the mapping of the rate segment in capacity release

Proposed Standard:

"In the capacity release process, some business practices allow the use of more than 25 rates and/or surcharges within one line item*. The ANSI X12 limit for the segment containing these rates and/or surcharges (SAC segment) is 25. To accommodate more than 25 rates and/or surcharges within one line item, multiple PO1 loops must be created for the additional SAC segments. These PO1 loops are tied together by the value of the PO101 element, which must match in these multiple PO1 loops. The first occurrence of the PO1 loop of a line item must contain the applicable data elements per GISB's specified usage. The subsequent corresponding PO1 loop(s) would only contain the PO101 and the additional SAC segments. No other segments (other than PO1 and SAC) would appear in the subsequent corresponding PO1 loop(s). Since multiple line items may occur, it is necessary to differentiate one line item from another. This is accomplished by assigning a unique PO101 value for each unique line item. For the purposes of this explanation, a line item consists of all GISB data dictionary data elements that appear in the detail and sub-detail."

Add the above language to the existing text of the Technical Implementation of Business Process in the Offer 5.4.1, Bid Review 5.4.2, Award Notice 5.4.3, UPPD 5.4.7, UPPD Notification 5.4.9.



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

The corrected language for **R97029** should read:

R97029

Request:

Add transaction type to the invoice as a mandatory data element including a description the technical implementation and the addition of three codes for the data element--gathering, unauthorized overrun, and capacity release

Proposed Standard:

Add mandatory data element Transaction Type to the Invoice dataset.

Data Dictionary Changes

Nomination 1.4.1, Scheduled Quantity 1.4.5, Shipper Imbalance 2.4.4

NOTES:

Revise Transaction Type definition for use in all documents listed above.

Usage for Transaction Type is M in Nomination 1.4.1 and Scheduled Quantity 1.4.5, MA in Shipper Imbalance 2.4.4; usage changes are not being proposed.

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Transaction Type	"This field identifies the specific type of scheduling transaction. This field will be populated with GISB approved transaction types. For example: authorized overrun, imbalance payback to pipeline, imbalance payback from pipeline, plant thermal reduction, current business, pooling, injection, withdrawal. The default value is current business."	M/MA (see NOTES above)	

*Indicates Common Code

Transportation/Sales Invoice 3.4.1

NOTES:

Add Transaction Type data element to Invoice (included code values are listed in Code Values below).

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Transaction Type	"This field identifies the specific type of transaction. This field will be populated with GISB approved transaction types. For example: authorized overrun, imbalance payback to pipeline, imbalance payback from pipeline, plant thermal reduction, current business, pooling, injection, withdrawal. The default value is current business."	M	

*Indicates Common Code



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
NOVEMBER 12, 1997

R97029

Continued

Code Value Changes

Transportation/Sales Invoice 3.4.1

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Transaction Type	M	49	<i>Gathering</i>	<i>Describes a transaction which exclusively involves the activity of gathering gas.</i>
		50	<i>Unauthorized Overrun</i>	<i>Describes a transaction assigned during allocation process in which allocated quantity exceeds contractual limits and no authorized overrun has been granted.</i>
		51	<i>Capacity Release</i>	<i>Describes a transaction assigned during the invoicing process that relates to capacity release.</i>

Shipper Imbalance 2.4.4

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Transaction Type	MA	49	<i>Gathering</i>	<i>Describes a transaction which exclusively involves the activity of gathering gas.</i>
		50	<i>Unauthorized Overrun</i>	<i>Describes a transaction assigned during allocation process in which allocated quantity exceeds contractual limits and no authorized overrun has been granted.</i>

Business Process Description Changes:

Standards Book: Invoicing Related Standards

NOTE: Add as fifth paragraph in existing text (note bolding). Also add 'transaction type' (bolded) to the list in the current sixth paragraph.

Language: On an invoice line, the **transaction type** may result from the nomination process, or may result from a process subsequent to the nomination (e.g., scheduling, allocations, imbalance settlement and invoicing).

NOTE: Add Transaction Type to Sample Paper Transaction for Invoice (3.4.1)



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

The corrected language for **R97044** should read:

R97044

Request:

Modify the reduction reason codes of the Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity for consistency

Proposed Standard:

Modify/Add code values for the "Reduction Reason" data element in the Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity transactions. Confirmation Response document (Standard 1.4.4): For data element "Reduction Reason"

Revise existing code value for "Capacity Constraint" to "Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint" and add the definition: "A constraint on the Confirming Party's system."

Scheduled Quantity document (Standard 1.4.5): For data element "Reduction Reason", Add code value "Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint" with the definition "A constraint on the Confirming Party's system".

Add code value "Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Receipt Location with the following definition: "A reduction of the nominated receipt quantity due to a constraint on the Confirming Party's system."

Add code value "Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Delivery Location with the following definition: "A reduction of the nominated delivery quantity due to a constraint on the Confirming Party's system."

Add definition only to the existing code value "Pipeline Capacity Constraint" as follows: "A constraint on the Transportation Service Provider's System."

Data Dictionary Changes

Confirmation Response 1.4.4

Business Name	Usage	Code Values	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Reduction Reason	SO	CAP	Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint	A constraint on the Confirming Party's system.

Scheduled Quantity 1.4.5

Business Name	Usage	Code Values	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Reduction Reason	SO	PCC	Pipeline Capacity Constraint	A constraint on the Transportation Service Provider's system.
		PCR	Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Receipt Location	A reduction of the nominated receipt quantity due to a constraint on the Confirming Party's system.
		PCD	Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Delivery Location	A reduction of the nominated delivery quantity due to a constraint on the Confirming Party's system.



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

R97044

Continued

Scheduled Quantity for Operators 1.4.6

Business Name	Usage	Code Values	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Reduction Reason	SO		<i>Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint</i>	<i>A constraint on the Confirming Party's system.</i>
			<i>Pipeline Capacity Constraint</i>	<i>A constraint on the Transportation Service Provider's system.</i>
			<i>Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Receipt Location</i>	<i>A reduction of the nominated receipt quantity due to a constraint on the Confirming Party's system.</i>
			<i>Confirming Party's Capacity Constraint at Delivery Location</i>	<i>A reduction of the nominated delivery quantity due to a constraint on the Confirming Party's system.</i>



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

The language for **R97050** should read:

R97050

Request:

Add all data elements in the Nominations transaction key to the data dictionary for the Invoice Data Set

Proposed Standard:

Add the following data elements to the Invoice Statement (Standard No. 3.4.1) with a usage of mutually agreeable (MA):

- Capacity Type Indicator
- Downstream Contract Identifier
- Downstream Identifier Code
- Upstream Contract Identifier
- Upstream Identifier Code

For X12 implementation, the data elements are at sub-detail level.

Data Dictionary Changes

Transportation/Sales Invoice 3.4.1

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Capacity Type Indicator	Type of capacity being requested. For example: primary to primary, secondary to secondary, primary to secondary, secondary to primary, interruptible.	MA	
Downstream Contract Identifier	This field identifies the contract of the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester.	MA	
Downstream Identifier Code*	This field identifies the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester.	MA	
Upstream Contract Identifier	This field identifies the contract of the party who is supplying the quantities to the service requester.	MA	
Upstream Identifier Code*	This field identifies the party who is supplying the quantities to the service requester.	MA	

* Indicates Common Code



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

R97050

Continued

Code Values Changes

Transportation/Sales Invoice 3.4.1

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Capacity Type Indicator	MA	PP	Primary to Primary	Undefined
		PS	Primary to Secondary	Undefined
		SP	Secondary to Primary	Undefined
		SS	Secondary to Secondary	Undefined
		IT	Interruptible	Undefined
		TP	Tertiary to Primary	Specifies tertiary receipt capacity to primary delivery capacity
		TS	Tertiary to Secondary	Specifies tertiary receipt capacity to secondary delivery capacity



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
NOVEMBER 12, 1997

The Language for **R97055** should read:

R97055

Request:

Rename the data element "Nominator's Tracking Number" to "Nominator's Tracking ID" for the Nomination, Nomination Quick Response and Scheduled Quantity, transactions and clarify that the data element value contains alpha-numeric data

Proposed Standard:

Globally replace "Nominator's Tracking Number" with "Nominator's Tracking ID" and change the word "number" to "identifier" when referring to "Nominator's Tracking ID".

Data Dictionary Changes

Nomination 1.4.1

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Nominator's Tracking ID	This is created by the originator of the process. It is line item specific and is used by the originator of the process to tie quick response and scheduled quantities to nominations. It is not validated by the receiver of the process nor is it a key in the receiver of the process' database. The receiver of the process will not track this <i>identifier</i> but merely echo it back in the response document. This <i>identifier</i> is used for EDI only and will not be added to the EBBs. <i>This data element contains alpha-numeric data.</i>	M	

* Indicates Common Code

Nomination Quick Response 1.4.2

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Nominator's Tracking <i>ID</i>	This is created by the originator of the process. It is line item specific and is used by the originator of the process to tie quick response and scheduled quantities to nominations. It is not validated by the receiver of the process nor is it a key in the receiver of the process' database. The receiver of the process will not track this <i>identifier</i> but merely echo it back in the response document. This <i>identifier</i> is used for EDI only and will not be added to the EBBs. <i>This data element contains alpha-numeric data.</i>	C	Sent when errors occur at the Transaction Tracking <i>ID</i> level.

* Indicates Common Code



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

R97055

Continued

Scheduled Quantity 1.4.5

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Nominator's Tracking <i>ID</i>	This is created by the originator of the process. It is line item specific and is used by the originator of the process to tie quick response and scheduled quantities to nominations. It is not validated by the receiver of the process nor is it a key in the receiver of the process' database. The receiver of the process will not track this <i>identifier</i> but merely echo it back in the response document. This <i>identifier</i> is used for EDI only and will not be added to the EBBs. <i>This data element contains alpha-numeric data.</i>	C	Mandatory when submitted in the original nomination.

* Indicates Common Code

Code Values Changes:

Nomination Quick Response, 1.4.2

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Validation Code	M (C)	ENMQR501	Missing Nominator's Tracking <i>ID</i> (SLN02)	N/A

Business Process Language Changes:

Standards Book: GISB Nominations Related Standards - GISB Nomination, Nomination Quick Response, and Scheduled Quantity "Technical Implementation of Business Process" and "Sample Paper Transactions."

Language:

Global replacement of "Nominator's Tracking Number" with "Nominator's Tracking ID" and change the word "number" to "identifier" when referring to this data element.



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

The language for **R97056** should read:

R97056

Request:

Rename the data element "confirmation requester's tracking number" to "confirmation requester's tracking number" in the Request For Confirmation and Confirmation Response Transactions and clarify that the data element contains alphanumeric data

Proposed Standard:

Change data element name 'Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number' to 'Confirmation Requester's Tracking ID' in the Request For Confirmation, Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity for Operators data dictionaries, including where mentioned in the Condition of any other data elements. Add the following language to the end of the definition: "This data element contains alpha-numeric data."

Data Dictionary Changes:

Request for Confirmation 1.4.3

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Confirmation Requester's Tracking ID	This is created by the originator of the process. It is line item specific and is used by the originator of the process to tie request for confirmation to confirmation response. It is not validated by the receiver of the process nor is it a key in the receiver of the process' database. The receiver of the process will not track this <i>identifier</i> but merely echo it back in the response document. This identifier is used for EDI only and will not be added to the EBBs. <i>This data element contains alpha-numeric data.</i>	M	

* Indicates Common Code

Confirmation Response 1.4.4

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Confirmation Requester's Tracking ID	This is created by the originator of the process. It is line item specific and is used by the originator of the process to tie request for confirmation to confirmation response. It is not validated by the receiver of the process nor is it a key in the receiver of the process' database. The receiver of the process will not track this <i>identifier</i> but merely echo it back in the response document. This <i>identifier</i> is used for EDI only and will not be added to the EBBs. <i>This data element contains alpha-numeric data.</i>	C	Required if provided in original request for confirmation.

* Indicates Common Code



Gas Industry Standards Board

ERRATA: PROPOSED STANDARDS LANGUAGE CORRECTION
 FOR STANDARDS BALLOT SENT OUT OCTOBER 14, 1997
 NOVEMBER 12, 1997

R97056

Continued

Scheduled Quantity for Operator 1.4.6

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Confirmation Requester's Tracking ID	This is created by the originator of the process. It is line item specific and is used by the originator of the process to tie request for confirmation to confirmation response. It is not validated by the receiver of the process nor is it a key in the receiver of the process' database. The receiver of the process will not track this <i>identifier</i> but merely echo it back in the response document. This <i>identifier</i> is used for EDI only and will not be added to the EBBs. <i>This data element contains alpha-numeric data.</i>	C	Mandatory when present in the confirmation process.

* Indicates Common Code

Business Process Documentation:

Standards Book:

GISB Nominations Related Standards - GISB Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity for Operators, "Technical Implementation of Business Process" and "Sample Paper Transactions."

Language:

Global replacement of "Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number" with "Confirmation Requester's Tracking ID" and change the word "number" to "identifier" when referring to this data element.