

**GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
February 7 - 9, 2000
Salt River Project's Office; Phoenix, AZ
FINAL MINUTES**

1. Jim Keisler opened the meeting and welcomed participants.
2. Jim K provided housekeeping information.
3. Jim Buccigross gave anti-trust guidelines.
4. The agenda was adopted without modification.
5. The January meeting minutes were adopted without modification.
6. Address Current Requests for Initiation or Enhancement of GISB Standards and items transferred from other GISB subcommittees – Discussion, Q&A and Sense of the Room for each item.

Monday February 7, 2000

• **EITF Related**

Develop EBB usages and create “indented” data elements for the Capacity Release data sets. The data sets will be addressed in the order that they appear in the Capacity Release Related Standards manual.

Discussion: After a brief discussion, it was decided that the document entitled Data Element Cross Reference – Capacity Release would be utilized to determine what “indented” data elements need to be added, and what EBB usages should be assigned to all of the Capacity Release data elements.

IR Implementation

When an “indented” data element is added, the following guidelines, based upon previous implementations, were used as a starting point to determine the usages to be applied to the “indented” data elements:

Data Element is an Entity Common Code

Code	Name	Code	Name
EDI/FF Usage	EDI/FF Usage	EBB Usage	EBB Usage
C	nu	C *	C *
M	nu	M	M
SO	nu	SO	C **

* Condition is identical to the condition applicable to the Data Element.

** Generic Condition is: “Mandatory when (data element) is present.”

Data Element has code values

Code	Description	Code	Description
EDI/FF Usage	EDI/FF Usage	EBB Usage	EBB Usage
BC	nu	BC	BC
C	nu	C *	C *
M	nu	C **	C **
MA	nu	MA	MA
SO	nu	SO	SO

* Condition is identical to the condition applicable to the Data Element.

** Generic Condition is: "For EBB, at least one of (data element) or (data description) is required."

Note: There are no Location Common Code data elements, which require the addition of "indented" data elements.

The following data elements were identified as requiring the addition of "indented" data elements (for names and descriptions):

- Allowable Re-release Indicator
- Bid Evaluation Method Indicator
- Biddable Deal Indicator
- Bidder Company Code
- Bidder Designation of Bidding Basis
- Bidder Lesser Quantity Indicator
- Bidder's Contingency Indicator
- Capacity Marketing Indicator
- Capacity Type
- Confirmation Response Code
- Critical Notice Indicator

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Tuesday February 8, 2000

• **EITF Related**

Develop EBB usages and create "indented" data elements for the Capacity Release data sets. The data sets will be addressed in the order that they appear in the Capacity Release Related Standards manual.

Discussion: The following additional data elements were identified as requiring the addition of "indented" data elements (for names and descriptions):

- Disclose Indicator
- Discount Indicator
- Disposition Response Code
- Gas Transaction Point 1 OBA Indicator
- Gas Transaction Point 2 OBA Indicator
- IT Indicator

Lesser Rate Indicator
Location/Quantity Type Indicator
Measurement Basis
Notice Status
Notice Type
Permanent Release Indicator
Prearranged Bid Indicator
Prearranged Deal Indicator
Pressure Base Indicator (without 'default' in definition)
Pressure Base Indicator (with 'default' in definition)
Previously Released Indicator
Production Area Indicator
Rate Form/Type Code
Rate Identification Code
Recall/Reput Indicator
Release Type
Releaser Company Code
Releaser Designation of Acceptable Bidding Basis
Releasing Shipper's Contingency Indicator
Releasing Shipper Lesser Quantity Indicator
Replacement Capacity Indicator
Required Response Indicator
Reservation Rate Basis
Response Reason Code
Return Addressee Company Code
Shorter Term Indicator
Stand-alone Bid Indicator
Stand-alone Offer Indicator
Surcharge Identification Code
Surcharge Indicator
Transportation Service Provider
Withdrawal Type Indicator
Withdrawing Company Code

EBB usages do not need to be assigned to data elements within the following transaction sets, as these transaction sets are unique to file transfers and are not displayed on EBBs:

Offer Upload Quick Response (Standard 5.4.8)
Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation Quick Response (Standard 5.4.11)
Upload of Request for Download of Posted Datasets (Standard 5.4.14)
Response to Upload of Request for Download of Posted Datasets (Std. 5.4.15)
Note/Special Instruction (Standard 5.4.17)
Bid Upload Quick Response (Standard 5.4.19)

For the data element Bid Tracking Identifier, an EBB usage of "BC" was assigned within the Bid Upload transaction set.

For the data element Detail Level Identifier, an EBB usage of “SO” was assigned within the Offer Upload and the Bid Upload transaction sets.

It was determined that since there are existing data elements for Gas Transaction Point 1 Description and Gas Transaction Point 2 Description, then “indented” data elements do not need to be created for Gas Transaction Point 1 Code and Gas Transaction Point 2 Code.

For the data element Offer Tracking Identifier, an EBB usage of “BC” was assigned within the Offer Upload, Offer Upload Notification, Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation, and Offer Upload Final Disposition transaction sets.

The data element Segment Indicator will not be used on EBBs.

For other data elements, not specifically mentioned above, the EBB usage will be the same as the EDI/FF usage.

Issue to Business Practices Subcommittee regarding the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator:

During IR’s development of the EBB usages for the Capacity Release data sets, it was determined that the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator could not be implemented on an EBB since no GISB code values are available.

The current EDI/FF implementation cannot be effectively mirrored in an EBB implementation. It provides one ANSI code value to describe four bidder affiliate possibilities. Those possibilities are specified by the location within X12 of that ANSI code. The single existing ANSI code value can not specify the four possibilities in an EBB implementation.

Therefore, IR recommends the addition of the following table to the Code Values Dictionary, for EBB only, for the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator:

<u>Code Value Description</u>	<u>Code Value Definition</u>	<u>(Suggested) Code Value</u>
Bidder is affiliated with the TSP	[no definition necessary]	TSP
Bidder is affiliated with the Releasing Shipper	[no definition necessary]	RS
Bidder is affiliated with the TSP And the Releasing Shipper	[no definition necessary]	Both
Bidder is affiliated with neither the TSP nor the Releasing Shipper	[no definition necessary]	None

In the Offer Upload and the Bid Upload, the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator is Business Conditional. In order to make this EBB implementation consistent with the EDI/FF implementation, if the TSP requires the submission of the bidder affiliate

information and the bidder is not affiliated with either the TSP or the Releasing Shipper, then the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator is not populated with a code value. The data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator is also used within the Offer Download, Bid Download, Award Download, and Offer Upload Notification data sets.

The addition of this table to the Code Values Dictionary does not in any way affect the EDI/FF implementation associated with this data element.

Please affirm IR's proposed EBB implementation for the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator.

MOTION: Send this issue to the Business Practices Subcommittee.

Sense of the Room: 14 In favor 0 Opposed

Motion Passed

The modifications to the document Data Element Cross Reference – Capacity Release will be incorporated into the individual Capacity Release data sets and all applicable documents will be posted for review and approval at an upcoming IR meeting.

- **R96007 – Transcapacity**

Request: Develop a transaction set to request allocation information.

- **R96008 – Transcapacity**

Request: Develop a transaction set to request shipper imbalance information.

Discussion: This request was sent to the Technical Subcommittee. However, the Technical Subcommittee Chairs have returned 3 questions regarding the request.

Question 1: Should more than one code value for Data Sets Requested be allowed in a single Request for Information transaction? In other words, can both an Allocation and Shipper Imbalance be requested in a single Request for Information transaction?

Answer to 1: No. An Allocation and a Shipper Imbalance must be requested separately.

Question 2: Should more than one combination of Service Requester/Service Requester Contract and the requested date range be allowed in a single Request for Information transaction? Should more than one combination of Statement Recipient ID/Location and the requested date range be allowed in a single Request for Information transaction?

Answer to 2a: No. If a Shipper Imbalance is requested for an individual Service Requester Contract, then unique date ranges must be requested separately.

Answer to 2b: No. If an Allocation is requested for an individual Location, then unique date ranges must be requested separately.

Question 3: Since the BPS instructions state that a party is permitted to request one or all locations for a particular date range, should the Statement Recipient ID/Location be at the same level as the date range? The current layout of header and detail in the data dictionary implies that multiple date ranges can be requested for a single location. Since the BPS instructions state that a party is permitted to request one or all contracts for a particular date range, should the Service Requester/Service Requester Contract be at the same level as the date range? The current layout of header and detail in the data dictionary implies that multiple date ranges can be requested for a single contract.

Answer to 3a: Yes. The Statement Recipient ID, the Location, and the date range should be at the header level.

Answer to 3b: Yes. The Service Requester, the Service Requester Contract, and the date range should be at the header level.

IR Implementation

In the Request for Information, the following data elements must be moved from the detail level to the header level:

- Data Sets Requested
- Information Requested Begin Date
- Information Requested End Date
- Allocation Transaction Type Code

Therefore, all data elements within the Request for Information transaction set will be at the header level.

In the Response to Request for Information, the following data elements must be moved from the detail level to the header level:

- Data Availability Code
- Data Sets Requested
- Information Requested Begin Date
- Information Requested End Date
- Allocation Transaction Type Code

Therefore, all data elements within the Response to Request for Information transaction set will be at the header level.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Wednesday February 9, 2000

The data element Information Requested Month is being deleted from both the Request for Information and the Response to Request for Information transaction sets.

The definitions for the data elements Information Requested Begin Date and Information Requested End Date are being modified to indicate that these dates represent a century, month, and year.

In the Request for Information transaction set, the usage for the data element Information Requested Begin Date will be changed to “M”, and the condition will be dropped. Also, the usage of the data element Information Requested End Date will be changed to “SO” with a condition of “Used when more than one month of information is requested”.

In the Response to Request for Information transaction set, the usage for the data element Information Requested Begin Date will be changed to “M”, and the condition will be dropped. Also, the usage of the data element Information Requested End Date will be changed to “C” with a condition of “Mandatory when provided in Request for Information”.

The TIBP and the Sample Paper Transaction for both the Request for Information and the Response to Request for Information were reviewed and modified.

The revised Data Dictionaries, the TIBPs, and the Sample Paper Transactions for both the Request for Information and the Response to Request for Information have been included as attachments to these minutes.

MOTION: Respond to the Technical Subcommittee with answers to the questions enumerated above, and, as a result of the answers, modify the Data Dictionaries, the TIBPs, and the Sample Paper Transactions for the Request for Information and the Response to Request for Information transaction sets.

Sense of the Room: 15 In favor 0 Opposed

Motion Passed

• **R98033B / R98059 – ANR Pipeline/Transco**

Request: Develop a Scheduled Quantity for Pools Report.

Discussion: Two handouts prepared by Stephanie LeCureaux of ANR Pipeline Company were distributed and reviewed.

- **R99049 – Williams Gas Pipeline**

Request: Submitted on behalf of the ANSI Compliance Team. Add a data element ‘Remit to Party’ to the Invoice.

Discussion: This data element was added to the Transportation/Sales Invoice, as well as the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice as follows:

IR Implementation

<u>Business Name</u>	<u>Definition</u>	<u>Model</u> <u>Data</u> <u>EDI/FF</u>	<u>Group</u> <u>Usage</u>	<u>Condition</u>
Remit to Party* (Remit to Pty)	Party to which payment of an invoice should be sent.	BEDG	C	Mandatory when Remittance Address is sent.

In both the Transportation/Sales Invoice and the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice, this data element should be sent at the same level as the Remittance Address.

In the Transportation/Sales Invoice TIBP, this data element will be listed in the second paragraph immediately preceding the data element Remittance Address.

In the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice TIBP, this data element will be listed in the third paragraph immediately preceding the data element Remittance Address.

No changes to either Sample Paper Transaction are necessary.

MOTION: Adopt the changes to the Data Dictionary and the TIBP for the Transportation/ Sales Invoice and the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice, as detailed above.

Sense of the Room: 12 In favor 0 Opposed

Motion Passed.

- **R99050 – Williams Gas Pipeline**

Request: Submitted on behalf of the ANSI Compliance Team. Modify the definition for the data element ‘Tax Identification Code’.

Discussion: The current definition for this data element is “Code assigned by government recognizing a business entity”. The proposed revised definition is “The tax identification code assigned by a government to the Remit to Party”.

IR Implementation

The definition of the data element Tax Identification Code will be “Code assigned by a government to the Remit to Party.” This data element occurs in the Transportation/Sales Invoice and the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice.

MOTION: Adopt the proposed change to the definition of the data element Tax Identification Code.

Sense of the Room: 12 In favor 0 Opposed

Motion Passed

- **R99051 – Williams Gas Pipeline**

Request: Submitted on behalf of the ANSI Compliance Team. Change the usage of 7 (seven) data elements from BC to SO.

Discussion: The usages of the following data elements were modified in the Transportation/Sales Invoice, as well as the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice:

IR Implementation

The usage for the following data elements in the Transportation/Sales Invoice will be changed from “BC” to “SO”:

- Currency
- Effective Exchange Date
- Electronic Funds Transfer Address
- Electronic Funds Transfer Due Date
- Exchange Rate
- Price Tier
- Tax Identification Code

The usage for the following data elements in the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice will be changed from “BC” to “SO”:

- Currency
- Effective Exchange Date
- Electronic Funds Transfer Address
- Electronic Funds Transfer Due Date
- Exchange Rate
- Tax Identification Code

All text in the condition column of the Data Dictionaries for these data elements for the Transportation/Sales Invoice and the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice will be deleted.

No changes to any of the TIBPs or the Sample Paper Transactions are required.

MOTION: Adopt the changes to the Data Dictionary for the Transportation/Sales Invoice and the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice, as detailed above.

Sense of the Room: 12 In favor 0 Opposed

Motion Passed

- **R99050 – Williams Gas Pipeline (Revisited)**

Request: Submitted on behalf of the ANSI Compliance Team. Modify the definition for the data element ‘Tax Identification Code’.

Discussion: Upon further review, it was discovered that there is now some confusion as to whether the Tax Identification Code should be a “code assigned by a government to the Remit to Party” or a “code assigned by a government to the Payee”. Therefore, IR’s proposed implementation of Request **R99050**, as documented above, will be held for discussion at a future IR meeting. The requester will be contacted in the interim in order to provide assistance on this request.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.

- **R98041 – Columbia Gas Transmission**

Request: Add data elements to the Nomination to accommodate a “Super-Nomination”.

Discussion: This request was not addressed.

- **R98061 – Colorado Interstate Gas**

Request: Allow No-Notice Transportation (NNT) shippers to request authorization for overrun deliveries under their NNT contracts by adding new data elements (see request for specifics) or through the addition of new nominations related data sets.

Discussion: This request was not addressed.

- **R98062 – Colorado Interstate Gas**

Request: Allow a Park and Loan shipper to submit a request for a specific Park/Loan deal by adding new data elements (see request for specifics) or through the addition of new nominations related data sets. Accommodate related response documents as needed.

Discussion: This request was not addressed.

7. No other business was discussed.

8. The next meeting will be held on March 7 – 8, 2000 in Houston. The exact location is to be determined.