

**GISB ANSI Compliance Team Meeting  
Final Meeting Minutes  
CMS Energy  
January 28, 2000**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Kim Van Pelt called the meeting to order. Introductions were made.

**2. Housekeeping**

Reviewed by Kim Van Pelt.

**3. Anti-Trust Warning**

Reviewed by Kim Van Pelt.

**4. Adoption of Agenda**

Agenda adopted as drafted.

**5. Adoption of Draft Meeting Minutes**

December 13, 1999 - adopted as modified - see GISB home page for final version

**6. Review of Issues from DISA Ballot for DM 107199, Transaction Set 874**

The following seven comments were received on the 874 transaction set. We will prepare responses and work with Sarita to determine our next steps in this process.

Most of the comments were in regard to the segment collision between the N9 segment that begins the loop in Table 2, and the N9 segment within the sub-detail loop in Table 2. If an N9 occurs after the SLN segment, it is unclear whether the N9 is simply the N9 within the SLN loop, or is the beginning of another N9 detail loop.

To resolve this we will change the N9 within the SLN sub-detail loop (N9 position 2/0800) to a REF. We will leave the N9 that begins the Table 2 detail loop (N9 position 2/0100) as is. Since we no longer have any meaningful GISB data element for this position, in the GISB Implementation guide we will specify that N901 = "2H" which means "Assigned by transaction set sender." N902 would be mandatory and would contain a value specified by the sender, but with no business meaning. We considered starting the Table 2 loop (position 2/0100) with an LX segment since it does not contain any meaningful data, but decided to leave the N9 segment for flexibility in case we get a tracking number at this level in any future datasets.

This takes care of all the disapproval comments except for Peter L. Randlev. Following are his comments:

**Comment:**

*I am confused by the title of the transaction set. Is this transaction set to provide a validation of the data contained in TS 873 Commodity Movement Services? If so, doesn't a TS 997 do that for you? Is this to be a response to a validation message?*

**ACT response:**

The ballot comment asked if TS 874 was a response to a validation message, and also if the TS 997 was sufficient for this purpose. We propose changing the title to "Commodity Movement Services Response". This transaction set is not a response to a validation, but rather the validation itself. A TS 997 is not designed to convey the information required for the TS 874. While the TS 997 is designed to convey the results of the syntactical analysis of the transaction set, the TS 874 conveys validation and other information regarding the semantic meaning of the information encoded in the transaction set, that can only be determined by the back-office system. For example, the TS 874 will report whether a contract is valid for the party submitting the transaction, but the TS 997 would not include this information.

[Note: we will check with Sarita to see if changing the title of the 874 will cause any problems in the approval process or will cause a revote.]

**Comment:**

*In the purpose and scope of TS 873 it says "this standard can be used to convey request and response information for commodity movement services". Most of the segments being used in TS 874 already appear in TS 873. If necessary, the additional segments from TS 874 can be added as optional in TS 873. Thus, it does not appear that this new transaction set is required.*

*I have read your answer to question #1 from the Technical Assessment Subcommittee. You certainly do put in different data for each instance of a transaction set. X12 has a rule 2.1.3 which, to me, would say you must use TS 873 for the purpose you have outlined for TS 874.*

*You say that you need a separate transaction set because you need different functional groups so that you may route them differently. It is not intended that a functional group header shall specify the routing of a transaction set. Thus, I do not agree with your response as being adequate to identify the need for this new transaction set. I believe you may do all you need to accomplish in TS 873 without the addition of TS 874.*

**ACT response:**

Paragraphs two, three, and four of the ballot comment asked if the TS 873 can be used instead of creating a new TS 874 since the purpose of the TS 873 includes "can be used to convey request and response information" and since some of the segments being used in TS 874 already appear in TS 873. The TS 873 is used for a business purpose of sending a request, and its business response of whether the request can be fulfilled. For example, the TS 873 can be used to request to move a commodity (gas) on a pipeline, and the TS 873 is used by the pipeline to communicate whether the gas can be scheduled for movement. In contrast, the TS 874 is used to send error notification, including the specific error code and optional text message. For example, when the TS 873 is used to request to move gas on a pipeline, the TS 874 would be sent to communicate whether there were any errors in the request, such as invalid contract or invalid date range, but not whether the request to move gas can be fulfilled. Additional segments required in the TS 873 to accommodate the TS 874 functionality would make the TS 873 transaction set unwieldy for its original intent.

**Comment:**

*You state in the subcommittee response to the Technical Assessment comments that you are using both TS 873 and 874. It is not a good practice to use a transaction set before it is approved as an X12 standard.*

**ACT response:**

The ballot comment stated that it is not good practice to use a transaction set before it is approved as an X12 standard. We did not mean to imply that we have already implemented the TS 873 and TS 874. We simply meant that in our design, we intend to use the TS 873 and TS 874 for multiple business related documents. We will not implement either of these transaction sets until they are approved and published by DISA.

## **7. Continue development of ANSI compliant transaction set for Shipper Imbalance**

At the last meeting, we analyzed the structure of the Shipper Imbalance to see if it was mapped correctly, and to see how it fit into the 811. We will begin this meeting with looking at the other documents we were going to consider: 873, 821.

### **873 - Commodity Movement Services:**

Header:

All Shipper Imbalance segments can be mapped to the segments in the Header of the 873. The only difference is that the PER in the 873 is within the N1 loop, but this is the correct mapping of the data element Contact Person anyway. Also, there is only one DTM in the 873, but we can put the Statement Date/Time in the beginning

segment.

Detail:

The 873 will not work, because it starts the detail loop with a DTM segment, and there are no mandatory date data elements in the Shipper Imbalance

So, the 873 will not work for the Shipper Imbalance.

## **821 - Financial Information Reporting**

Header:

The 821 does not have an N1 loop in the header, but the N1 segments can be repeated. This would mean that the PER would not be within the N1 loop, but it wasn't mapped this way in the original Shipper Imbalance anyway.

There is no 640 data element in the BIG beginning segment. This is where we would put the Transaction Type Code.

The DTM segment has transaction set notes regarding its use. One DTM is required for the "Period Ending Date". Other uses of the DTM are for Period Starting Date and Statement Issued Date.

There is another note for the N1 segment that would be a problem for us.

Detail:

The detail starts with an ENT loop. This is a problem for us because the ENT should be used to provide numeric identification of the originating financial institution and the receiving corporate entity. We do not have any such entities in the Shipper Imbalance.

So, the 821 will not work for the Shipper Imbalance.

Therefore, our only two options left are to create a new transaction set or use the 811.

From our last meeting, we determined that the Name and Purpose of the 811 are close enough for our needs, and we also determined that the structure will work with a few additional segments here and there. Therefore, we will focus on using the 811 for the Shipper Imbalance

(see IMBLwork.doc workpaper)

Next Agenda:

Start with the sub-detail of the Shipper Imbalance  
Review Results of DISA meeting

## **8. Other Business**

none at this time

## **9. Next Meeting Date and Location**

Technical Subcommittee

February 23

Houston

ACT Subcommittee  
February 29  
Houston

## 10. Adjourn

### **Attendees:**

Denise Breeden	Tennessee Gas Pipeline
Kim Van Pelt	CMS Trunkline Gas Company
Jim Keisler	Williams Gas Pipeline
Andy Sicignano	Enron North America