

**GISB ANSI Compliance Team  
Conference Call  
Final Meeting Minutes  
September 2, 1999  
11:00am - 12:30pm**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

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

**2. Anti-Trust Warning**

Reviewed by Denise Breeden.

**3. Adoption of Agenda**

Agenda adopted as drafted.

**4. Discuss X12 Ballot Results for 873 Commodity Movement Services Transaction Set**

The following three comments were received on the 873 transaction set. We will prepare responses and work with Sarita to determine our next steps in this process.

**1. Company: Johns Hopkins University/Applied Physics Lab**

Voter: XVR: Karen T. Goldee

Vote: Approve w/ Comment

DM 106199

Development history indicates codes V2, V3, V4 to be added to DE 640, but these do not appear in the DM

**ACT's Response:**

These code values were submitted with DM 107199 (the 874 Commodity Movement Services Validation Response transaction set) since that is where they will be used. The Subcommittee Response comments included with DM 106199 were for both DM 106199 and DM 107199 since both DMs were initially addressed at the same time.

**2. Company: St. George Consulting**

Voter: XVR: John H. St. George

Vote: Disapprove

DM 106199 Disapprove

In adding codes to DE 1270, some of those codes seem to have a related code source reference, because the Code Source added in this DM refer to those codes. However, the DM to DE1270 does not include the code source reference with the codes. Thus there is no way to associate those codes with the appropriate code source as seems to be intended.

**ACT's Response:**

We do not see what Mr. St. George is talking about. On the DM 106199, it includes both the new codes for 1270 (pages 9 and 10 of the DM) with the corresponding code source reference listed for each code value, and it includes the Code Source 293 as he mentioned (page 11 of the DM). Since he refers to "the DM to DE1270", we feel this implies that it is a separate DM, which we do not have.

Sarita also cannot tell what he is talking about, so she will get his phone number and we will attempt to contact him. Sarita thinks we may be able to get him to change his vote since it's possible that he is mistaken or was looking at something else. After talking with a few other people that Sarita contacted, it appears that some of the electronic versions of the ballots did not properly display the code source references, but they were correctly noted on the paper copies. We will communicate this to Mr. St. George.

**3. Company:**           **Telcordia**  
Voter:                   XVR: Linda J. Newerla  
Vote:                     Disapprove

Transaction set 873 – Disapprove

While the proposed transaction set is probably technically correct, there seems to be much repetition of codes and reference numbers and segments N1, QTY and LCD that would make the HL structure a better solution. Having worked only a tiny bit with the submitters, it appeared that more varied data would need to be included in the transaction set that might be difficult to add at a later date without re-structuring. There are no transaction set notes so it is difficult to differentiate among the various codes and reference numbers and also for the uses of the N1, QTY and LCD – I would suggest adding notes. The example provided was technically correct but did not provide much insight into the type of example this was (considering that the 873 is bi-directional and covers several functions. In the example, the QTY, without the use of DE 355, does not imply decatherms – it could be anything.

**ACT's Response:**

We will address each of Ms. Newerla's comments separately:

Concern: While the proposed transaction set is probably technically correct, there seems to be much repetition of codes and reference numbers and segments N1, QTY and LCD that would make the HL structure a better solution.

Response: The Gas Industry Standards Board (GISB) has spent many hours over the past three months reviewing the applicability of the HL structure to our needs. We have concluded, as a result of this extensive study, that an alternate structure is more convenient and workable. This alternate structure is technically correct and better accommodates our needs.

Concern: Having worked only a tiny bit with the submitters, it appeared that more varied data would need to be included in the transaction set that might be difficult to add at a later date without re-structuring.

Response: GISB has reviewed its data needs carefully and thoroughly. Segments have been included in this structure to accommodate growth in our data needs and requirements.

Concern: There are no transaction set notes so it is difficult to differentiate among the various codes and reference numbers and also for the uses of the N1, QTY and LCD – I would suggest adding notes.

Response: All this type of information will be specified in the GISB Implementation Guide. Adding notes at this point would reduce the "generic" nature of the document and limit the applicability of it to other industries.

Concern: In the example, the QTY, without the use of DE 355, does not imply decatherms – it could be anything.

Response: QTY03 was inadvertently left off of the example provided to DISA. In the implementation of the document by GISB, QTY03 will be required.

Sarita also mentioned that we might call Linda and see if we can get her to change her vote. We do not feel

she will, but may call her to discuss anyway. Sarita thinks our responses to Linda's issues are acceptable, and she also noted that Linda mentions in her first sentence that the proposed transaction set is technically correct. Linda cannot force us to use the HL, so we should be fine.

Our comments need to be turned in at the X12 meeting. Since we have disapprovals, we can hold an Open Forum at the next X12 meeting (for Subcommittee H in October) to address concerns and answer questions. Since we have less than 3% disapprovals, we do not need to send this out for another vote (reballot).

Our next steps: Send Mary Kay an email that indicates we want to publish under the 3% rule and that we want to have an Open Forum to address Linda's concerns. We need to prepare the Ballot Response Letter to address each of the comments and submit the Vote Change Form (assuming we get Mr. St. George to change his vote). When we come to the X12 meeting we will also need to bring the Transmittal form with Mary Kay's initials.

We will email or mail a vote change form to Mr. St. George and have him sign it, send to us, and then we'll send to Shirley Carter at DISA (as specified on the 45 day ballot report).

We will need to include the following in our comments and also communicate to Mr. St. George:  
"We got information from the Secretariat that some electronic versions did not properly display the code source references, but they were correctly noted on the paper copies. "

We will work on completing the proper documentation at the beginning of our September 10 ACT Meeting.

**5. Other Business**

none

**6. Next Meeting Date and Location**

ANSI Compliance Team Meeting

September 10, 1999

CMS Energy

Technical Subcommittee Meeting

September 21-22, 1999

CMS Energy

**7. Adjourn**

**Attendees:**

Kim Van Pelt	CMS - Trunkline Gas Company
Denise Breeden	Tennessee Gas Pipeline
Sarita Leassear	API
Jim Keisler	Transco
Andy Sicignano	ECT