



# 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

---

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**  
**Interpretations Subcommittee Meeting -- Telephone Conference**  
**10:00 a.m. to Noon, October 12, 1998**

**FINAL MINUTES**

**I. Introductory Items**

Mr. Lander welcomed the attendees and the antitrust advice was given. The roll was called. The agenda was adopted with no changes. The minutes of September 14 were adopted with no changes. The Interpretations Subcommittee impromptu meeting that took place during June 11 Executive Committee meeting are noted in the EC minutes of that meeting with the results of the impromptu meeting. The notes within the EC meeting minutes will suffice as meeting minutes of that impromptu Interpretations Subcommittee meeting. There was no disagreement to this course of action.

**II. Interpretations**

**C98008**

Clarification is requested as to the intended meanings of the Transaction Set Purpose Codes "original" and "change" as used in the Offer, Bid and Award Data Sets. The present definition of the Transaction Set Purpose Code in the Implementation Guide states that the code "denotes the status of an Offer, Bid or Award"

**Request:**

Submitted by: TransCapacity Limited Partnership

Affects GISB Standard Number(s): 5.4.1, 5.4.2, and 5.4.3 and associated EDI Implementation Guide instructions

Clarification is requested as to the intended meanings of the Transaction Set Purpose Codes "original" and "change" as used in the Offer, Bid and Award Data Sets. The present definition of the Transaction Set Purpose Code in the Implementation Guide states that the code "denotes the status of an Offer, Bid or Award".

Clarification or interpretation request:

When a Transportation Service Provider has posted a particular Offer, Bid, or Award (as identified by its "number") and then any one or more of the values, contained within: a) the quantity(ies) data elements, b) rate data elements, c) any of the date/time elements (i.e., effective begin/end dates, award dates, bidding period dates, etc.), d) location data elements, or e) data elements containing codes for the parties to that Offer, Bid or Award, is different in a subsequent posting of information on that Offer, Bid, or Award, shouldn't the Transaction Set Purpose Code be the code associated with "change" (Offer) or "re-submission" (Award)?

Possible interpretations or clarifications, if Known:

Yes, it should be denoted as a "change" (Offer or Bid) or re-submission, (Award). In the GISB Implementation Guides, the possible values (i.e., code values) which can populate the Transaction Set Purpose data element for both the Offer and Bid datasets are as



# 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

---

follows: "BQT\*00\*", or "BQT\*04\*". For both the Offer and Award data sets the "00" denotes a status of "original" and the "04" denotes a status of "change".

Likewise, in the GISB Implementation Guides, the possible values (i.e., code values) which can populate the Transaction Set Purpose data element for the Award dataset are as follows: "BQR\*06\*", or "BQR\*15\*". For the Bid data set the "06" denotes a status of "confirmation" and the "15" denotes a "re-submission".

It is misleading and not clear to communicate information concerning a posted capacity release transaction within a 5.4.X data set with a Transaction Set Purpose code value of "original" (or "confirmation" as applicable) but to actually have changed pertinent information within that transaction from that which was previously posted. As a result, when there is a change to a value within a significant data element (i.e., a quantity, type of quantity, rate, rate form, rate basis, date/time, minimum criteria, location, or party) for a particular Offer, Bid, or Award the code value within the Transaction Set Purpose data element should be "change" or re-submission respectively.

#### The Problem:

Some Transportation Service Providers are sending transaction sets with changed data but not identifying the fact that the Transaction set has in fact changed. The "00" or "original" transaction set code value is in the Transaction Set Purpose field even though there has been a change to one or more of the following data elements: a quantity amount in a field, the award rate and/or award type, a location, a party's code, or the value of a date/time element have been changed. This makes the information ambiguous and unreliable. When there is a change it should be identified.

#### Discussion:

Ms. Hess provided revisions to the draft interpretation as presented on September 14. The below draft interpretation reflects the discussion and changes to the draft interpretation. The proposed language is more encompassing than the original proposed interpretation of any change that may be made to posted capacity release offers, bids or awards.

Ms. Davis explained an example where there were a series of rate changes that may cause confusion if the proposed interpretation were accepted: (1) original award is posted, (2) first change to the award changes the rate through a rate case settlement and is posted, and (3) second change to the award changes the rate back to the original as a result of an order on rehearing and is posted. Both Ms. Hess and Mr. Lander were unaware of business practices that would require the re-posting of the retroactively changed award transaction as a result of rate settlements and subsequent hearings.

It was discussed that GISB may need to add a data element rather than use the provided X12 data element. Concern was raised that GISB is interpreting the intended use of an X12 data element "Transaction Set Purpose Code". Ms. Van Pelt explained the efforts currently underway with the ANSI X12 Committee and the use of industry specific segments, and the removal of some of the ANSI administrative data elements. Mr. Lander noted that while actions are in underway to resolve this ambiguity in the future through the X12 Committee, we should not delay our efforts to wait on actions from the X12 Committee. He recommended that we take action today to remove the ambiguity.

#### Draft Interpretation:

Clarification or interpretation request:

When a Transportation Service Provider has posted a particular Offer, Bid, or Award (as identified by its "number") and then any one or more of the values, contained within: a)



# 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

the quantity(ies) data elements, b) rate data elements, c) any of the date/time elements (i.e., effective begin/end dates, award dates, bidding period dates, etc.), d) location data elements, or e) data elements containing codes for the parties to that Offer, Bid or Award, is different in a subsequent posting of information on that Offer, Bid, or Award, shouldn't the value of the ANSI X12 Transaction Set Purpose Code data element be the code associated with "change" (Offer) or "re-submission" (Award)?

#### Interpretation Text:

It is misleading and unclear to communicate information that was previously posted, and has been subsequently revised and re-posted, with a code value that states that the information is "original". Once a capacity release transaction has been posted, where there is a change to any value contained in particular offer, bid, or award, and the revised transaction has been posted, the value of the ANSI X12 Transaction Set Purpose Code data element should denote that the data set contains a revision(s).

In the GISB Capacity Release Related Implementation Guides, the following values are available to populate the ANSI X12 data element Transaction Set Purpose Code:

Data Set	Segment Value	ANSI X12 Code	Description
Offer (5.4.1)	BQT	00	Original
Offer (5.4.1)	BQT	04	Change
Bid (5.4.2)	BQR	00	Original
Bid (5.4.2)	BQR	04	Change
Award (5.4.3)	BQR	06	Confirmation
Award (5.4.3)	BQR	15	Re-submission

#### Vote:

The motion was made to accept the interpretation as shown above. Of the three members present, two voted in favor, and one requested a notational ballot. A notational ballot will be sent to the members absent.

#### C98009

Request clarification related to the use of only central clock time values in the date/time data elements for all Capacity Release related datasets (e.g. Offers, Bids, Awards, Upload to Pipeline of Prearranged Deal, UPPD Validation, Bidder Confirmation, Final Disposition, Operational Available, Unsubscribed FT, and Critical Notices). Should all time values be provided as central clock time?

#### Request:

Submitted By: TransCapacity Limited Partnership

Affects GISB Standard Number(s): 1.3.1, 5.3.2, and 5.4.X

Clarification or interpretation request:

Request clarification related to the use of only central clock time values in the date/time data elements for all Capacity Release related datasets (e.g. Offers, Bids, Awards, Upload to Pipeline of Prearranged Deal, UPPD Validation, Bidder Confirmation, Final Disposition, Operational Available, Unsubscribed FT, and Critical Notices). Should all time values be provided as central clock time?

Possible Interpretations or Clarifications, if Known:



# 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

---

Yes, all values contained within date/time data elements should be central clock time values. GISB Standards version 1.2 et. seq. removed the time zone qualifier for all date/time data elements. GISB Standard 5.3.2 expresses that the time deadlines in Capacity Release data sets should be in central clock time. GISB business standards universally express that central clock time should be used. There are no longer any time zone qualifiers within the datasets and therefore only time values which are central clock time should be present. In addition, GISB Standard 1.3.1 expresses that the standard time for gas day should be expressed in central clock time (e.g., 9 a.m. - 9 a.m. CT).

#### The Problem:

Some Transportation Service Providers are sending time values in their local time in their EDI documents. They are not sending central clock time values. In addition, they are also sending a time zone qualifier which is no longer supported in the GISB EDI standards which has the effect of making data interpretation ambiguous. Worse, it requires a Transportation Service Provider specific exception handling process to accept the time zone qualifier and then Transportation Service Provider specific data manipulation through coding to convert the time value that is presented to that of the GISB Standards, namely central clock time.

#### Discussion:

Ms. Hess noted two minor changes which are reflected below in the proposed interpretation.

#### Draft Interpretation:

Clarification or interpretation request:

Request clarification related to the use of only central clock time values in the date/time data elements for all Capacity Release related datasets (e.g. Offers, Bids, Awards, Upload to Pipeline of Prearranged Deal, UPPD Validation, Bidder Confirmation, Final Disposition, Operational Available, Unsubscribed FT, and Critical Notices). Should all time values be provided as central clock time?

#### Interpretation Text:

Yes, all values contained within date/time data elements should be central clock time values. GISB Standards version 1.2 et. seq. removed the time zone qualifier for all date/time data elements. GISB Standard No. 5.3.2 expresses that the time deadlines in Capacity Release data sets should be in central clock time. GISB business standards universally express that central clock time should be used. There are no longer any time zone qualifiers within the datasets and therefore only time values which are central clock time should be present. In addition, GISB Standard No. 1.3.1 expresses that the standard time for gas day should be expressed in central clock time (i.e., 9 a.m. - 9 a.m. Central Clock Time).

#### Vote:

The motion was made to accept the interpretation as shown above. Of the three members present, all three voted in favor. A notational ballot will be sent to the members absent.

### III. Adjourn

The meeting concluded at 11:05 a.m. The next meeting for the Interpretations Subcommittee will be scheduled and the members notified as new interpretation requests are received.



# 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

## IV. Attendees

### **Committee Members Present at Meeting** **C98008** **C98009**

Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	NV <sup>1</sup>	✓
Greg Lander	TransCapacity	✓	✓
Shelley Corman	Enron Pipelines - Northern Natural	✓	✓

### **Committee Members Absent (Notational Votes will be recorded)**

Kelly Daly	Arizona Public Service
Mark Scheel	NGC Corp.
Bob Wallenhorst	Exxon
Laverne Tillson	Defense Fuel Supply Center
Mary Jane McCartney	ConEd
Bill Boswell	Peoples Natural Gas
Jerry Hahn	Texaco

### **Participants:**

		<b>Members</b>
Betty Barnum	Duke - Texas Eastern	✓
Mark Wilke	Duke - Panhandle Eastern	✓
Kim Van Pelt	Duke - Trunkline	✓
J. R. Thompson	Duke - Algonquin	✓

### **GISB Office:**

Rae McQuade	GISB
-------------	------

<sup>1</sup> Ms. Davis will vote notationally on the issue.