

**GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
October 12, 1999  
Williams Gas Pipeline (Transco) – Houston, TX  
FINAL Minutes**

1. Jim Keisler welcomed the group and attendees introduced themselves.
2. Dale Davis provided housekeeping information.
3. Anti-trust guidelines were provided by Jim Buccigross.
4. The agenda was adopted as drafted.
5. The minutes of the September 13 – 14, 1999 meeting were approved as drafted.
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. **The items will be addressed in the order listed until either all items have been addressed or we have run out of time.**

- **R96022A – National Registry of Capacity Rights**

**Request:** Modify several standards from disposition of principle to disposition of standard.

**BPS Action:** (see minutes for the August 19, 1999 BPS meeting)

**IR Implementation:**

For the instructions associated with Standard 1.1.7, IR reviewed all data sets where the Service Provider's Activity Code is used. The usage is 'MA' in all of them.

**MOTION:**

IR reviewed the actions taken by BPS and determined that no further action is needed to implement R96022A.

**Sense of the Room:** 6 In Favor; 0 Opposed

- **R98055 – TransCapacity**

**Request:** Add several Transaction Type code values to the Nomination, Flowing Gas and Invoicing related data sets.

**EITF Action:** (see IR 9/13/99 minutes)

**IR Implementation:** (continued from IR 9/13/99)

The following code value description was discussed at the last IR meeting.

- ◆ Add the following code value description for the Transaction Type in the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, PDA, Allocation, Shipper Imbalance and Transportation/Sales Invoice.

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Flow Day Diversion	An intraday change in the delivery location of a previously scheduled transaction. The change is based upon parameters specified by the transportation service provider.	

Discussion of the above code value description continued. The El Paso representative suggested the new code value description be split into two code value descriptions as below.

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Flow Day Diversion – From	A decrease in scheduled quantity due to an intraday change in the delivery location of a previously scheduled transaction. The change is based upon parameters specified by the transportation service provider.	
Flow Day Diversion – To	An increase in scheduled quantity due to an intraday change in the delivery location of a previously scheduled transaction. The change is based upon parameters specified by the transportation service provider.	

Based on the fact that Transaction Type is part of the key (1.3.27), implementing this as a code value won't work because changing the Transaction Type won't overlay the existing nomination. It would create a new nomination line item. The effect would be that now the shipper would have two nominations for each delivery point and the quantity would be doubled. Based on this discussion, IR considered the possibility of adding a new data element instead of code value descriptions. The requester asked that this be deferred until a subsequent meeting.

- **R98035 – ANR Pipeline**

**Request:** Modify confirmation data sets to accommodate pre-limit quantities.

**EITF Action:**

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a pre-limit quantity code value to the transaction identifier data element in the Request for Confirmation (G850RQCF) and the Confirmation Response (G855RRFC) datasets.

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate the pre-limit quantities in the to be developed Confirmation By Exception dataset.

**IR Implementation:**

IR split the request into 'A' (add pre-limit quantity code value to the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response) and 'B' (add pre-limit quantity to the yet to be developed

Confirmation by Exception data set per R98031). IR will address 'A' now and put 'B' on hold until we do R98031.

In the confirmation process, the requester receives the Request For Confirmation (RFC) and sends the Confirmation Response (CR) back. The pre-limit quantity is sent to the requester in the RFC and they use it in the confirmation process. The pre-limit quantity can be set for as long as a year. The requester uses the pre-limit quantity where they do passive confirmations (i.e., confirmation by exception).

Per the requester, when the RFC is used to transmit pre-limit quantities, all of the required fields in the RFC are populated. The quantity field is used for the pre-limit quantity. The requester wants an indicator in the header to show that the entire document is not being used for confirmation purposes; it is being used for setting pre-limit quantities.

IR is also questioning whether this is appropriate for EDI because the information may only be transmitted once a year. The requester currently provides the ability to submit on-line.

**MOTION:**

Send the following issues to BPS:

1. How does the pre-limit quantity differ from a confirmation quantity that is sent for a date range, where the date range is longer than a confirmation cycle? (See Interpretation 7.3.26)
2. In light of its infrequent use, should the pre-limit quantity be included in an EDI transaction set?
3. If the pre-limit quantity is included in an EDI transaction set, should we add a GISB data element in the Request For Confirmation for the ANSI data element 'purchase order type code' (BEG02)? If so, the code value descriptions could be 'Request for Confirmation' and 'Pre-limit Quantity'.
4. If the pre-limit quantity is included in an EDI transaction set, should we add a GISB data element in the Confirmation Response for the ANSI data element 'transaction set purpose code' (BAK01)? If so, the code value descriptions could be 'Confirmation Response' and 'Pre-limit Quantity Response'.

**Sense of the Room:** 6 In Favor; 0 Opposed

• **R98036 – ANR Pipeline**

**Request:** Modify confirmation data sets to accommodate producer rankings.

**EIITF Action:**

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a producer ranking code value to the transaction identifier data element in the Request for Confirmation (G850RQCF) and the Confirmation Response (G855RRFC) datasets.

**IR Implementation:**

The requester asked that the request be deferred until the Confirmations and Cross-Contract Ranking (XKR) work product is passed to IR for implementation (if necessary). The XKR work product is on the November EC agenda. No objections were noted.

• **R98043 – Duke Energy**

**Request:** Add several data elements to the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response.

**EIITF Action:**

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a status code to Confirmation Response document (GISB Standard 1.4.4) to indicate the status of the entire transaction set to correspond to the similar ANSI X12 business purpose. Additional codes may be needed to address the unsolicited case.

**IR Implementation:**

The request is to add a GISB data element for the ANSI data element ‘acknowledgment type’, which is in the BAK02. Use the existing GISB data element ‘Transaction Status Code’.

**MOTION:**

- ◆ Add the following data element to the header level of the Confirmation Response:

<b>Business Name (Abbreviation)</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Data Group</b>	<b>EBB Usage</b>	<b>EDI / FF Usage</b>	<b>Condition</b>
<i>Transaction Status Code (Txn Stat)</i>	<i>Status of entire transaction set.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>nu</i>	<i>M</i>	

- ◆ Add the following code value descriptions for the Transaction Status Code:

<b>Code Value Description</b>	<b>Code Value Definition</b>	<b>Code Value</b>
<i>One or more quantities not confirmed. Remainder of batch accepted. Detail follows. Pertains only to line items in this Confirmation Response that are designated as ‘solicited’.</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	<i><u>AE</u></i>
<i>All quantities confirmed. Conditions exist that create one or more warnings. Detail follows. Pertains only to line items in this Confirmation Response that are designated as ‘solicited’.</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	<i><u>AK</u></i>
<i>All quantities confirmed as requested. Pertains only to line items in this Confirmation Response that are designated as ‘solicited’.</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	<i><u>AT</u></i>
<i>All line items in this Confirmation Response are designated as ‘unsolicited’. Transaction set status not applicable.</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	

◆ Revise the Sample Paper Transaction for the Confirmation Response as follows:  
Add 'Transaction Status Code' beneath the 'Transaction Identifier'. The value is 'All quantities confirmed as requested.'

◆ Add the following to the TIBP for the Confirmation Response. The language will be added to the end of the second paragraph.

"The **transaction status code** can be found at the beginning of the Confirmation Response. This code informs the receiver of the status of the information on the Confirmation Response."

**Sense of the Room:** 7 In Favor; 0 Opposed

● **R98089 – ANR Pipeline**

**Request:** Add 'RD' code value for the acknowledgment type in the BAK segment of the Confirmation Response.

**EITF Action:**

The request is moved to IR for their consideration.

**IR Implementation:**

**MOTION:**

Send the following issue to BPS:

◆ Currently the Confirmation Response does not provide for the transmittal of header level errors. IR recommends the following implementation:

◆ Add the following code value description for the Transaction Status Code in the Confirmation Response:

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
<i>The entire transaction was rejected due to header level errors.</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	<u>RD</u>

◆ Add the following data element to the header level of the Confirmation Response.

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
<i>Validation Code (Val Cd)</i>	<i>Code that identifies errors/warnings.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>nu</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>Required when Transaction Status Code indicates that header level errors exist.</i>

◆ Add the following code value descriptions for the Validation Code in the Confirmation Response:

<b>Code Value Description</b>	<b>Code Value Definition</b>	<b>Code Value</b>
<i>Invalid Confirming Party</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	
<i>Missing Confirming Party</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	
<i>Invalid Confirmation Requester</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	
<i>Missing Confirmation Requester</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	
<i>Missing Transaction Identifier</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	

**Sense of the Room:** 5 In Favor; 0 Opposed

- **R99040 – Enron Gas Pipeline Group**

**Request:** Add Reduction Reason code value to the Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity and Scheduled Quantity for Operator.

**IR Implementation:**

- ◆ Add the following code value description for the Reduction Reason data element in the Scheduled Quantity, Scheduled Quantity for Operator and Confirmation Response:

<b>Code Value Description</b>	<b>Code Value Definition</b>	<b>Code Value</b>
<i>Processing Affidavit Non-Compliance</i>	<i>A reduction in a nominated quantity as a result of non-compliance with the processing affidavit requirements outlined in TSP's tariff.</i>	

**Sense of the Room:** 6 In Favor; 0 Opposed

**GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting  
 October 13, 1999  
 Williams Gas Pipeline (Transco) – Houston, TX  
 FINAL Minutes**

• **R99021A – ANR Pipeline**

**Request:** Add Validation Codes to the Confirmation Response Quick Response.

**EC Action:**

**Request:** ANR requests the addition of three new code values to the Validation Code in the Confirmation Response Quick Response (1.4.7). These Validation Codes would be error messages at the sub-detail level.

The first error message requested is: Detail line item quantity on the Confirmation Response is greater than the corresponding quantity from the Request for Confirmation. The second error message requested is: Detail line item quantity on the Confirmation Response is less than the calculated elapsed-prorated-scheduled quantity. The third error message requested is: No match for the combination of data elements as provided.

The error messages allow the recipient of a Confirmation Response to indicate that the quantity which was returned is either greater than the requested quantity or less than the elapsed-prorated-scheduled quantity. Additionally, this request allows the recipient of a Confirmation Response to indicate that they could not find a match on the combination of data elements which constitute the recipient's Confirmation business key.

**Triage:** Send R99021A to the Information Requirements Subcommittee. Send R99021B to Business Practices Subcommittee.

**IR Implementation:**

IR decided that there should also be warning codes for these situations. This way, a message can be returned, but the confirmation information can still be used for scheduling purposes.

**MOTION:**

- ◆ Add the following code value descriptions for the Validation Code data element in the Confirmation Response Quick Response.

Add two **errors**.

<b>Code Value Description</b>	<b>Code Value Definition</b>	<b>Code Value</b>
<i>Quantity is greater than corresponding quantity on the Request for Confirmation.</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	
<i>Quantity is less than the elapsed-prorated-scheduled quantity.</i>	<i>[no definition necessary]</i>	

Add two warnings.

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
<u>Quantity is greater than corresponding quantity on the Request for Confirmation.</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>	
<u>Quantity is less than the elapsed-prorated-scheduled quantity.</u>	<u>[no definition necessary]</u>	

**Sense of the Room:** 6 In Favor; 0 Opposed

- **R99041 – Columbia Gas**

**Request:** Allow multiple Reduction Reasons to be sent on the Scheduled Quantity.

**EITF Action:**

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate the mutually agreeable business practice of sending multiple (at least five) occurrences of reduction reasons on the Scheduled Quantity document.

**IR Implementation:**

- ◆ IR doesn't need to make any revisions to the data dictionary or code values dictionary. Revise the fourth paragraph of the TIBP as follows:

“It also includes a one or more reduction reasons which may indicate why a nominated quantity was reduced. In some cases, GISB standards require ~~the~~ a code to indicate the specific reason for a reduction. In other cases, the code may indicate that no such reason is required. The sending of more than one reduction reason is on a mutually agreed basis.”

**Sense of the Room:** 7 In Favor; 0 Opposed

- **R98088 – Koch Gateway**

**Request:** Add confirmation quantity to Scheduled Quantity.

**EITF Action:**

Instruct IR to accommodate the sending of the confirmed quantity in the Scheduled Quantity data set with a mutually agreed usage.

**IR Implementation:** (continued from 9/13/99 IR meeting)

**MOTION:**

- ◆ Add the following data element to the line item level of the Scheduled Quantity:

<b>Business Name (Abbreviation)</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Data Group</b>	<b>EBB Pathed</b>	<b>EBB Non- Pathed</b>	<b>EBB PNT – “T”</b>	<b>EBB PNT – “U”</b>	<b>EDI / FF Usage</b>	<b>Condition</b>
<i>Distributed Confirmed Delivery Quantity (Dist Conf Del Qty)</i>	<i>The confirmed delivery quantity distributed to the level of the scheduled quantity.</i>	<i>DelDG</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>MA</i>	
<i>Distributed Confirmed Receipt Quantity (Dist Conf Rec Qty)</i>	<i>The confirmed receipt quantity distributed to the level of the scheduled quantity.</i>	<i>RecDG</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>MA</i>	

- ◆ Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.61 to add ‘Distributed Confirmed Delivery Quantity’ to the Delivery Data Group, after the ‘Delivery Rank (Priority)’.
- ◆ Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.61 to add ‘Distributed Confirmed Receipt Quantity’ to the Receipt Data Group, after the ‘Receipt Rank (Priority)’.

**Sense of the Room:** 7 In Favor; 0 Opposed

- **R98044 – Duke Energy**

**Request:** Add several data elements to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator.

**EIITF Action:**

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a data element, Estimated Btu, with the usage of sender's option, to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator, GISB Standard No. 1.4.6.

**IR Implementation:**

- ◆ Add the following data element at the same level as the location information in the Scheduled Quantity for Operator:

<b>Business Name (Abbreviation)</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Data Group</b>	<b>EBB Usage</b>	<b>EDI / FF Usage</b>	<b>Condition</b>
<i>Estimated Heating Factor (Est BTU)</i>	<i>Estimated quality information for measurement in MMBTU.</i>	<i>LDG</i>	<i>SO</i>	<i>SO</i>	

- ◆ Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.63 to ‘Estimated Heating Factor’ to the Location Data Group, after ‘Location’.

**Sense of the Room:** 7 In Favor; 0 Opposed

8. The next meeting will be held November 9 – 10, 1999 at ConEdison's offices in New York City.