



## 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, Producer Segment Vacancy, Diane McVicker (absent), Norm Walker (absent), Robert McAnally (absent)  
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

**FROM:** Rae McQuade, Executive Director

**RE:** Redlined Draft Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting --  
June 24, 1999

**DATE:** June 28, 1999

---

### GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD

#### GISB BUSINESS PRACTICES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Teleconference Call: June 2~~4~~, 1999

#### DRAFT MINUTES

#### I. Administrative

Mr. Lander chaired the meeting and welcomed the participants. Ms. McQuade identified the participants in a roll call. Mr. Lander gave the antitrust advice. The revised draft agenda was adopted with no changes. The redlined minutes of June 17 were modified during the review and accepted as final.

#### II. Technical Subcommittee Response and Request No. R98091

**R98091** Submitted by 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.

Implementation of this request would provide the benefit of consistency in detail looping by contract.

**Technical R:** Question from BPS (see BPS minutes 4/09/99):

How many different occurrences of contract/date level information can be included with an invoice? If there is a limit, what is it?

Verbal Response Given to BPS (see BPS minutes 4/29/99):

"...there are unlimited different occurrences of contract/date level information that can be included on an invoice."



## 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

---

Formal Written Response (see Technical minutes 4/27-28/99)

The number of occurrences of contract/date level information which can be included with an invoice is ">1", i.e. unlimited.

If there is a need to send more than one date range (Beginning Transaction Date, Beginning Transaction Time, Ending Transaction Date, Ending Transaction Time) per Service Requester Contract, then the contract/date loop should be repeated with the same Service Requester Contract for each separate date range.

sense of the room: recommended (7-0)

Discussion: Mr. Keisler asked that determination of the disposition of this request be delayed until the next BPS meeting to given ANR an opportunity to attend to respond to the Technical Subcommittee's response. All attendees supported this delay.

### III. EDM Requests

**R97071** Request submitted by TransCapacity

Request: The request is to add a new standard or standards language to the current GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards. These proposed standards deal with the use of ISA (Envelope) Sender Identification codes when sending EDI files. We believe the proposed standard language below, while somewhat technical, clearly describes the changes we believe are necessary.

Proposed Standards:

1. Where the sender of an ISA to IEA EDI X.12 envelope is a third party service provider, the ISA Sender ID in the EDI envelope should be the identifier chosen by the third party service provider. Where the receiver of an ISA to IEA EDI X.12 envelope is a third party service provider, the ISA Receiver ID in the EDI envelope should be the identifier chosen by the third party service provider.
2. Where the sender of an ISA to IEA EDI X.12 envelope is a service provider, the ISA Sender ID in the EDI envelope should be the identifier chosen by the service provider. Where the receiver of an ISA to IEA EDI X.12 envelope is a service provider, the ISA Receiver ID in the EDI envelope should be the identifier chosen by the service provider.
3. Where the sender of an ISA to IEA EDI X.12 envelope is a service requester, the ISA Sender ID in the EDI envelope should be the identifier chosen by the service requester. Where the receiver of an ISA to IEA EDI X.12 envelope is a service requester, the ISA Receiver ID in the EDI envelope should be the identifier chosen by the service requester.
4. For entities communicating their business intentions through a third party service provider (i.e., the parties requesting or providing transportation and related services (as applicable)), their ID's are placed at the level associated with the individual activities which are communicated via the EDI X.12 transmission, and these IDs are associated with the applicable service requester or services provider and these IDs may differ from the ID of the entity providing information services.
5. Parties sending or receiving GISB standardized datasets via EDI cannot require a sending or receiving party to employ (in the ISA enveloping



## 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)

---

structure or elsewhere) a common entity code or codes associated with others.

These standards would describe the options available to parties regarding the use of Sender ID and Receiver ID in the EDI ISA enveloping structure. The proposed standards do not have any effect on the underlying data sets or data contained within them.

These standards would be utilized where EDI datasets are transmitted or received using the existing GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanisms. We are asking for these standards (read either separately or together) to allow third-party service providers to communicate with transportation service providers using their own common code entity identifiers, and that when communicating with TSP's via EDI, these third-party service providers are not required to "log-on" or otherwise identify themselves in the ISA envelope as anyone else, namely the entity requesting or providing transportation service.

Naturally, the reverse is true whereby TSP's determine their Receiver ID's when receiving data and their Sender ID's when sending data. The benefit is that the sending and receiving parties are clearly identified using their own common entity codes (per GISB standards) and are not required to utilize other party's (i.e., the service requester's) common entity codes in the ISA envelope surrounding the transmissions. Certainly the entity who is actually requesting or providing the service (one who has rights under a contract) must be identified in the body of the communication. Our request goes only to the enveloping and origination issues. These additional proposed standards are in keeping with current GISB standards surrounding this issue which read as follows:

GISB Standard Number: 4.1.6 "Data providers (transportation service providers) should interface with third party vendors according to GISB standards."

GISB Standard Number: 4.1.7 "Electronic communications between parties to the transaction should be done on a non-discriminatory basis, whether through and agent or directly with any party to the transaction.

Failure to adopt these or similar interpretations will essentially "gut" the above listed standards, as not only do GISB standards require common entity codes, forcing a party to use someone else's codes in a field where their own belongs is discriminatory.

There are no costs associated with these changes. The request does not propose to increase the volume of data sent, nor does it have any effect on the underlying GISB standardized datasets themselves. The request only desires to clarify what data is contained in existing ISA fields and who determines the data contained therein.

Discussion: Mr. Lander described the request and asked that the first three proposed standards in the request be replaced by the following:

- The sender of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and receivers should accept, the ISA Sender ID in the EDI envelope specified by the sender. The receiver of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and senders should support sending of, the ISA Receiver ID in the EDI envelope specified by the receiver.

In further discussion, it was noted that this is to avoid problems that have been



## 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)

---

experienced. After discussion, Mr. Lander offered the following proposed standard in place of the proposed standard number 4 in the request.

- The IDs associated with the applicable service requester or service provider may differ from the ID of the entity sending or receiving the transmission, respectively.

These two above proposed standards were combined and after discussion, clarifying changes were made:

- The sender of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and receivers should accept, the ISA Sender ID in the EDI envelope specified by the sender. The receiver of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and senders should support sending of, the ISA Receiver ID in the EDI envelope specified by the receiver. The IDs associated with the applicable sending or receiving party may differ from the IDs of the entity(ies) identified between the ST and SE segments of the transmission.

Proposed standard number 5 of the request was determined to be superfluous given the changes now represented in the proposed standard above.

### **R97103** Submitted by the Future Technology Task Force

The version and revision level of technology standards\* adopted by GISB and referenced in GISB standards should be clearly stated in the applicable standard(s). Any implementation of GISB standards should, at a minimum, be compatible with this version. Changes to the version and revision level of open standards should be made only through the GISB standards process. \*Note: This refers only to technology standards formulated by other standards organizations such as the Internet Engineering Task Force and the World-Wide Web Consortium.

Discussion: The request will be adopted by either Enron Administrative, TransCapacity or Duke Energy - Texas Eastern. A related standard is EII standard s33, renumbered GISB Standard No. 4.3.59 for version 1.4, which was ratified on Jan 23, 1999. The related standard may be sufficient to consider this request closed.

### **R97104** Submitted by TransCapacity

Request: The request is to add a new standard to the current GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards. This proposed standard deals with testing, and as such can and should be read in conjunction with existing GISB Standard No. 4.3.14 which reads in part: "The industry should use standard policies and guidelines for testing new data sets."

Proposed Standard:

"Testing of new data sets includes testing of the current and/or future electronic delivery mechanisms including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). Standard policies and guidelines should be developed to test these aspects."

While standard 4.3.14 indicates that the industry use standard testing



## 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

methodology for testing of the GISB standardized datasets, this is only a piece of the overall testing, which must take place. TransCapacity believes that this standardized testing methodology should be applied to the underlying communication methodology (Electronic Delivery Mechanisms), security features, and EDI enveloping, as well as to the datasets themselves.

This new standard would apply to testing of the electronic delivery mechanisms and communication procedures. Mere testing of datasets, without the surrounding methods of communication, accomplishes neither the purpose or spirit of the existing standards. Standardized testing methodologies are clearly beneficial to the goal of a seamless electronic marketplace for natural gas. Participants in the GISB standards initiation and adoption process recognized this in enacting the existing GISB standard No. 4.3.14. [The correct reference is GISB Standard No. 4.1.14] However, this standard - as written - is arguably applicable only to the datasets themselves. (Though this is not TransCapacity's view, it can rationalize a reading of the standard in this manner.)

The proposed additional standard language will clarify the issue that standardized testing also applies to the electronic delivery mechanism including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). This will ease implementation for all parties involved and will identify any potential obstacles earlier in the process. Certainly testing has a cost associated with it. However, this testing must be undertaken, and currently is. The only difference is the standardization aspect that this language would add. Therefore, the true incremental cost is marginal, and we believe it will be recovered through a less labor intensive (and smoother) implementation down the line.

Discussion: After discussion, it was determined to delete the last sentence of the proposed standard and make other clarifying changes:

- Testing of EDI/EDM data sets between trading partners includes testing of the current and/or future electronic delivery mechanisms including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security).

The intent of this proposed standard is not to define standard testing procedures, but to include testing of enveloping and security when trading partners test EDI/EDM data sets. It was discussed that trading partners should be notified when changes are expected in addition to the need for testing those changes.

#### IV. Agenda for next meeting

There was no need highlighted for a face to face meeting on July 22. The next teleconference meeting, to be held on July 1, from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. central, will review the following requests for discussion and possible vote, unless otherwise noted:

Invoicing Request No. R98091

EDM Request Nos. R97071

R97103 (possibly for discussion only depending upon whether Texas Eastern is sponsoring the request), and

R97104 (for discussion only).

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 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](http://www.gisb.org)

---

### V. Meeting Attendees & Voting Record

| Name              | Company                    | Email Address            | Voting | GISB Member |
|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-------------|
| <b>PIPELINES:</b> |                            |                          |        |             |
| Susan Croley      | Duke - Texas Eastern       | spcroley@duke-energy.com | Yes    | Yes         |
| Theresa Hess      | Enron - Northern Border    | thess@enron.com          | Yes    | Yes         |
| Cade Burks        | Enron - Transwestern       | cburks@enron.com         | Yes    | Yes         |
| Julie Unruh       | Koch Gateway               | Unruhj@kochind.com       | Yes    | Yes         |
| Jim Keisler       | Transco                    |                          | Yes    | No          |
| Dale Davis        | Williams Gas Pipeline      | Dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com | Yes    | Yes         |
| <b>SERVICES:</b>  |                            |                          |        |             |
| Greg Lander       | TransCapacity              | exec@tcapserv.com        | Yes    | Yes         |
| Randy Young       | Koch Midstream             | Young0r@kochind.com      | Yes    | Yes         |
| Donna Scott       | Enron Administrative Corp. | Dscott2@ect.enron.com    | Yes    | Yes         |