



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

**TO:** Business Practices Subcommittee Chairs: Greg Lander (absent), Producer Segment Vacancy, Diane McVicker (absent), Norm Walker (absent), Robert McAnally (absent)  
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

**FROM:** Rae McQuade, Executive Director

**RE:** Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting

**DATE:** May 6, 1999

---

### I. Administrative

With no chairs present, Mr. Buccigross volunteered to chair the meeting. Ms. McQuade read the list of attendees. Mr. Buccigross gave the antitrust advice. The agenda was adopted as posted to address Request Nos. R98091, R97090, R97094, and R98030. The minutes of April 22, 1999 were adopted as final with changes noted both in the meeting and posted prior to the meeting.

### II. Review of Requests & Vote on Recommended Standards

**R98091** Request submitted ANR.

**Request:** ANR would like to submit the following request for change to the GISB Invoicing Implementation Guides related to the ANSI ASC X-12 structure of the invoice:

Add a DTM segment to the sub-detail level of the GISB Transportation/Sales Invoice (G811TSIN) to reduce the number of detail loops required for each contract when multiple date ranges are needed to reflect volume or rate changes for different dates.

Currently, the DTM segment is only at the detail level which requires multiple occurrences (detail loops) of the same contract when different date ranges are needed. Since the "hierarchical level" is based on the contract, it is felt each contract should appear only once in the detail looping. A DTM segment in the sub-detail level will allow one detail loop per contract.

**Discussion:** After introduction by Ms. LeCureaux, she requested that the request be forwarded to the Technical Subcommittee.

**Motion:** Transfer Request No. R98091 to the Technical Subcommittee to review and determine the manner in which multiple occurrences of Beginning Transaction Date, Beginning Transaction Time, Ending Transaction Date and Ending Transaction Time data elements are sent for a Service Requester contract in the Transportation/Sales Invoice. It is not the intent that these data elements be provided at multiple levels in the document.

**Action:** The motion passed unanimously (Voting record shown in the attendance list as M1).



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

---

**R97090** Request submitted by Transco.

**Request:** Transco proposes that the data element Service Requester Contract be added to the data dictionary for the Statement of Account (Standard 3.4.3) dataset with usage code Mutually Agreeable (MA). This data element is currently sent by Transco to identify the contract under which charges on the Statement of Account were incurred. Our ability to use this data element in EDI exchanges is necessary to maintain our current level of service. The data element Service Requester Contract is currently a mandatory data element on the Invoice (Standard 3.4.1) dataset. There should be a means of sending this data element on the Statement of Account as a link to the Invoice. Currently, the only link between the Statement of Account and the Invoice is the Invoice Identifier; the Service Requester Contract is more recognizable than the Invoice Identifier, and therefore serves as a better link between the datasets

**Discussion:** Mr. Keisler notified the group that the request has been withdrawn by Transco.

**Action:** No action required – the request is withdrawn.

**R97094** Request submitted by Transco.

**Request:** Transco proposes that two (2) data elements be added to the Payment Remittance (Standard 3.4.2) dataset to provide a means of communicating the ABA Number (bank identification code) and the bank account number to which payment was made. These fields should carry a Usage Code of Conditional [C] and be required when the Payment Method Code (new data element, see previous Transco request) indicates that the payment is being made by means of the Automated Clearing House or as a Wire Transfer.

**Discussion:** Mr. Keisler explained the request. Ms. Hess noted that the information is static, and not all customers would want to send this information -- she would support a usage of BC or MA. Mr. Keisler supported a usage of BC. BC usage indicates that these data elements -- ABA Number (bank identification code) and the bank account number -- would only be used if the payment method is Automated Clearing House or as a Wire Transfer and it is supported.

**Motion:** Instruct the Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate the sending of the ABA Number (bank identification code) and the bank account number (to which payment was made) as business conditional in the Payment Remittance transaction. These data elements will only be used when the Payment Method Code indicates that the payment is being made by means of the Automated Clearing House or as a Wire Transfer.

**Action:** Passes unanimously (Voting record shown in the attendance list as M2).

**R98030** Request submitted by Texaco.

**Request:** Reference is made to the above subject implementation guide which utilizes the consolidated service invoice/statement (transaction set 811) of the ASC X12 standard. The existing GISB Implementation Guide does not include a sample sales invoice and



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

---

sample ASC X12 transaction for the sales invoice. Texaco Natural Gas Inc is implementing process improvements to send/receive sales invoices in the GISB EDI standards and developed the attached sample sales invoice and ASC X12 mapping for inclusion in the GISB Implementation Guide. In our review of the GISB Implementation Guide, we identified minor enhancements to the guideline to support natural gas sales invoices.

Discussion: Mr. Buccigross summarized the issues from the last meeting:

Issue 1: Should there be a way to distinguish, at the outset, if the invoice is transportation or sales?

Issue 2: Is there a further need to know if the invoice is a credit, debit, or other invoice type (6 are defined for the invoice in the request)?

Issue 3: Should it be implemented at the invoice level or at a lower level of detail so that both debits and credits can appear on the same invoice?

Ms. Van Pelt asked that the request be broken into parts, separating the transportation invoice specific items from the sales invoice specific items.

For issue 1, after discussions, several participants concluded that a new data element may be needed at the header level in the EDI envelope to indicate the transaction set. Mr. Keisler observed that he had not heard reasons why sales invoice would need to be distinguished from transportation invoices. For EDI, Mr. Loesch agreed and said that he would determine if the transaction is sales or transportation through the assignment of a separate Receiver ID in the GS segment. Ms. Van Pelt noted that a data element may be needed for processing flat files. Mr. Loesch noted that this issue was not part of his request and others agreed. Ms. Van Pelt did not agree with the conclusion of the group that issue 1 will not be addressed as part of R98030. Mr. Keisler noted that we may come to a different conclusion after we have addressed more of the details of this request. He recommended that this issue be deferred for resolution until later in the processing.

For issue 2, Mr. Loesch noted that knowing the type of invoice – credit, debit, consolidated, corrected, debit memo, credit memo – would streamline the processing. As an example, he explained that processing for a credit invoice is different than processing for a corrected invoice.

Action: Further discussion will be held at the meeting for May 27.

### III. Agenda for next meeting

The next meeting, to be held on May 13, from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. central, will review the following requests for discussion and possible vote:

Agenda items will be defined by the chairs and posted prior to the meeting scheduled for May 13. Request No. R98030 and prioritization of requests to be added to the agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m. central.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

## IV. Meeting Attendees & Voting Record

Name	Company	Email Address	Voting Participant	GISB Member	M 1	M 2
<b>PIPELINES:</b>						
Mike Culver	Algonquin	Mwculver@duke-energy.com	Yes	Yes		Y
S. LeCureaux	ANR	Stephanie.lecureaux@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway	Unruhj@kochind.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Randy Young	Koch Midstream		Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	Graceym@epenergy.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Hanh Duong	Texas Eastern	Htduong@duke-energy.com	Yes	Yes		Y
Bill Griffith	CIG	William.griffith@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Kelly Adolf	Williston Basin	Brookr@wbip.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Jim Keisler	Transco	Jim.e.keisler@wgp.twc.com	Yes	No	Y	Y
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	Dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Theresa Hess	Enron – Transwestern	Thess@enron.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Kim Van Pelt	CMS Energy - Trunkline	Kvanpelt@emsenergy.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Betty Barnum	CMS Energy - Panhandle	Babarnum@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
<b>PRODUCERS:</b>						
Don Loesch	Texaco	Loescdr@texaco.com	Yes	Yes	A	Y
<b>SERVICES:</b>						
Jim Buccigross	National Registry	Legaljb@tcapserv.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Steve Hinton	TransCapacity	Operations@tcapserv.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y

Votes were taken on: M1 Request No. R98091  
M2 Request No. R97094

Vote Key: Y In Favor of Motion  
N Opposed to Motion  
A Abstained  
[blank] Not present when vote was called