

GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
November 9 – 10, 1999
ConEdison's Offices; New York City
FINAL MINUTES

1. Theresa Hess opened the meeting and welcomed participants.
2. Housekeeping was provided by Theresa & Jim Keisler. Theresa announced that she is stepping down from the position of Chair of IR. Dennis La Tour will co-chair the subcommittee with Jim Keisler. At this point Jim took over facilitation of the meeting.
3. Anti-trust guidelines were provided by Jim.
4. The agenda was adopted as drafted. However, the first request (R98055) will be postponed until the requester arrives (around noon today).
5. The minutes of the October 12 – 13 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.)

• **R99046 – Williams Gas Pipeline**

Request: Add ability to send multiple Charge Types for a Line Number in the Invoice.

BPS Action:

BPS instructs the Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR) to accommodate the mutually agreed business practice of sending one or more occurrences of Charge Type for a line number in the Transportation/Sales Invoice (GISB Standard No. 3.4.1), which moves the Charge Type from its current level to a level below the line number. BPS further instructs IR to add a new data element to the Transportation/Sales Invoice called “Charge Type Rate” to be added at the same level as the Charge Type, and defined as “the rate that is associated with the specified Charge Type,” with usage conditional and condition text “mandatory if Charge Type is present.”

IR Implementation:

MOTION:

- ◆ Add a new data group to the Invoice called Charge Type Data Group (CTDG).

- ◆ Move the Charge Type data element to the level below the line number in the Invoice.

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Model Data Group	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Charge Type (Chrg Type)	Identifies the type of charge rendered under a specific type of service.	TSDG <u>CTDG</u>	MA	

- ◆ Add the following data element to the same level as the Charge Type in the Invoice:

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Model Data Group	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
<u>Charge Type Rate</u> (Chrg Type Rate)	<u>The rate that is associated with the specified Charge Type.</u>	<u>CTDG</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Mandatory when Charge Type is present.</u>

- ◆ Revise the last sentence of the seventh paragraph of the Invoice TIBP:

“For a line number, there may be a single **package ID, quantity, unit price, price tier, transaction type, delivery location, delivery zone, amount due, accounting adjustment method, service code, charge indicator, location indicator, replacement release code, charge type, receipt location, receipt zone, and replacement party identifier.**”

- ◆ Revise the eighth paragraph of the Invoice TIBP:

“A **charge type** may describe one or more rates applied to the same transaction or billable unit of service such as maximum daily quantity, receipt quantity, delivery quantity, or pipeline interconnection facilities. One ~~charge type~~ *charge type* may be applicable to several different types of services. Different rates may be associated with the same ~~charge type~~ *charge type* depending upon service, contract, path, month, rate tier, or other factors. Multiple charge types and their associated charge type rates may be reported for each line number. The charge type rates should sum to the unit price at the line number level.”

Sense of the Room: 7 In Favor; 0 Opposed

- **R99047 – Williams Gas Pipeline**

Request: Add ‘Accounting Period’ to the Invoice.

BPS Action:

BPS instructs the Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a sender’s option data element ‘Accounting Period’ to be provided in the Transportation/Sales Invoice (GISB Std. 3.4.1) so that a transaction may be identified as to the accounting period that the provided information was recorded in the books of the sender.

IR Implementation:

MOTION:

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

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Model Data Group	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
<i>Accounting Period (Acct Per)</i>	<i>The month and year the information was recorded.</i>	<i>BEDG</i>	<i>SO</i>	

- ◆ Revise the last sentence of the second paragraph of the Invoice TIBP:
 “An invoice uniquely identifies a single **invoice date**, **accounting period**, **currency**, **exchange rate**, **effective exchange date**, **account number**, **tax identification code**, **contact person**, **service requester**, **payee**, **billable party (payer)**, **remittance address** and **net due date.**”

Sense of the Room: 7 In Favor; 0 Opposed

- **R98085 – Enron Capital and Trade**

Request: Revise the Nomination to accommodate the sending of upstream/downstream contract without sending upstream/downstream entity.

EIITF Action:

s76 Where a Transportation Service Provider populates the Upstream/Downstream Identifier via its EBB/EDM implementation based upon provision of an upstream or downstream contract identifier at pooling and logical points, an EDI nomination should be provided the same capability.

IR30 Instruct IR to change the usage codes of the Upstream Identifier Code* and Downstream Identifier Code* from Conditional (C) to Business Conditional (BC). IR should craft a revised Condition based upon s76.

IR Implementation:

The following tables reflect the discussion for this request. However, IR decided to send the issue noted below to BPS. Therefore, the information in the Nomination data dictionary tables are shown here as part of the discussion only. Portions of the information in the data dictionary were discussed and the resulting revisions are noted. Some areas, such as the Condition, were not discussed. Therefore, the revisions below only reflect the items that were discussed and do not constitute a complete resolution. A sense of the room was not taken on this information.

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Pathed	EBB Non- Pathed	EBB PNT – “T”	EBB PNT – “U”	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Downstream Identifier Data	This field identifies the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester.	DelDG						

Downstream Identifier Code* (Down ID)		DelDG	M <u>BC</u>	C <u>BC</u>	nu	C <u>BC</u>	C <u>BC</u>	Based on Model Type and Delivery Location/Delivery Location Proprietary Code. Required if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Model Type is Pathed, or ◆ Model Type is Non-Pathed or Pathed Non-Threaded - Unthreaded Segment, and Delivery Location/Delivery Location Proprietary Code is present. <p>Will not be used for Model Type Pathed Non-Threaded - Threaded Segment.</p>
Downstream Entity Name (Dn Name)		DelDG	BC	BC	nu	BC	nu	Used by a transportation service provider when the name is available in the transportation service provider's system.

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Pathed	EBB Non-Pathed	EBB PNT – “T”	EBB PNT – “U”	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Upstream Identifier Data	This field identifies the party who is supplying the quantities to the service requester.	RecDG						
Upstream Identifier Code* (Up ID)		RecDG	M	C	nu	C	C	Based on Model Type and Receipt Location/Receipt Location Proprietary Code. Required if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Model Type is Pathed, or ◆ Model Type is Non-Pathed or Pathed Non-Threaded - Unthreaded Segment, and Receipt Location/Receipt Location Proprietary Code is present. <p>Will not be used for Model Type Pathed Non-Threaded - Threaded Segment.</p>
Upstream Entity Name (Up Name)		RecDG	BC	BC	nu	BC	nu	Used by a transportation service provider when the name is available in the transportation service provider's system.

Discussion:

Per Kim Van Pelt (co-chair of ANSI subcommittee), the new Nomination data set that was approved by ANSI is set up so that a contract number cannot be sent unless a party is present. The new transaction set was submitted to ANSI approximately one year ago and will be published in December 1999. The data is in a looping structure. The upstream/downstream party initiates a loop, with all of the related data under that party (e.g., Package ID, ranks, upstream/downstream contract). The upstream/downstream party is the only information that is mandatory at that level. None of the other data is required, and therefore it is anchored by the party information.

It was noted that the request only applies to pooling and logical points, where the point is located on a single TSP's system. This does not apply at an interconnect between two TSPs.

MOTION:

Send the following issue to BPS:

Was the intention to change the existing Usage and Condition of the Downstream Identifier Code and Upstream Identifier Code if the circumstance in s76 (GISB Standard No. 4.3.77) is not applicable (i.e., the point is not a logical or pooling point). That is, do the existing Usage and Condition no longer apply to physical points?

The current Condition is based upon both Model Type and whether the location is a receipt or a delivery. Therefore, the underlying usage is 'Mandatory'. Was the intent to change this underlying 'Mandatory' usage to 'Business Conditional'?

Sense of the Room: 7 In Favor; 0 Opposed

• **R98055 – Trans Capacity**

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

The requester asked to defer the request until a subsequent IR meeting. There was no objection.

• **R96007 – Trans Capacity**

Request: Develop a transaction set to request allocation information.

• **R96008 – Trans Capacity**

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

BPS Action:

R96007:

2.3.A Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) which provide parties with the ability to:

- a) request statement(s) of allocation via electronic bulletin board or web page; and,
 - b) view such requested statements of allocation via electronic bulletin board or web page;
- and,

c) do not provide such parties with the ability to request a GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 Allocation Statement via at least a fax, phone, or e-mail;

should support the ability of such party (or their agent) to request Allocation Statements via Upload of a Request for Allocation Statement and to receive the Transportation Service Provider's response via a GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 document. Where the conditions in a) and b) above exist and the TSP does provide such parties with the ability to request a GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 Allocation Statement via at least a fax, phone, or e-mail, then the Transportation Service Provider is not required to support the Upload of Request for Allocation Statement.

The period of time (how far back in time a request may specify) should be comparable as between the electronic request/view method and the upload request/receive response method, provided, however, the TSP would not be required to respond with information generated prior to its implementation of GISB Standard No. 2.4.3.

2.3.B Transportation Service Providers which support the ability of a party (or its agent) to:

- a) request GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 document(s) pursuant to GISB Standard No. [number assigned for proposed standard no. 2.3.A] and
- b) receive the GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 document in response to such request;

should provide the response document at the party's designated site by 9:00 a.m. CCT on a business day when the request is received prior to 3:00 p.m. CCT on the prior business day.

As instructions to the Information Requirements Subcommittee:

Instructions to Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR), the Business Practice Subcommittee requests IR to implement the Upload for Request for Allocation Statement in a manner that would permit the party or its agent submitting a request to specify either :

- a) all locations for that party for a particular date-range, or,
- b) a specific location for that party for a particular date-range.

The idea is that the requester could specify either a location or all locations and receive a response. The Information Requirements Subcommittee should not provide further precision.

As language to explain the intended business result, IR should make clear that:

For a request for a given day or date range less than a calendar month to a TSP performing only monthly allocations, the expected business result would be a response for the calendar month(s) in which the date range occurred.

R96008:

2.3.A Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) which provide parties with the ability to:

- a) request imbalance information via electronic bulletin board or web page; and,

- b) view such requested imbalance information via electronic bulletin board or web page; and,
- c) do not provide such parties with the ability to request a GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 Imbalance Statement via at least a fax, phone, or e-mail;

should support the ability of such party (or their agent) to request Imbalance Statements via Upload of a Request for Imbalance Statement and to receive the Transportation Service Provider's response via a GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 document. Where the conditions in a) and b) above exist and the TSP does provide such parties with the ability to request a GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 Imbalance Statement via at least a fax, phone, or e-mail, then the Transportation Service Provider is not required to support the Upload of Request for Imbalance Statement.

The period of time (how far back in time a request may specify) should be comparable as between the electronic request/view method and the upload request/receive response method, provided, however, the TSP would not be required to respond with information generated prior to its implementation of GISB Standard No. 2.4.4.

2.3.B Transportation Service Providers which support the ability of a party (or its agent) to:

- a) request GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 document(s) pursuant to GISB Standard No. [number assigned for proposed standard no. 2.3.A] and
- b) receive the GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 document in response to such request;

should provide the response document at the party's designated site by 9:00 a.m. CCT on a business day when the request is received prior to 3:00 p.m. CCT on the prior business day.

As instructions to the Information Requirements Subcommittee:

Instructions to Information Requirements Subcommittee, the Business Practice Subcommittee requests IR to implement the Upload of Request for Imbalance Statement in a manner that would permit the party or its agent submitting a request to specify either:

- a) all contracts for that party for a particular date-range, or,
- b) a specific contract for that party for a particular date-range.

The idea is that the requester could specify either a contract or all contracts and receive a response. The Information Requirements Subcommittee should not provide further precision.

As language to explain the intended business result, IR should make clear that:

For a request for a given day or date range less than a calendar month to a TSP performing this process on only a monthly basis, the expected business result would be a response for the calendar month(s) in which the date range occurred.

BPS Discussion:

The original work paper was modified to correctly reflect the imbalance statement reference, GISB Standard No. 2.4.4. The references to location were modified to contract references. If a request is made, in which the imbalance is zero, the underlying business practices for sending imbalance information remains the same -- there is no intent to develop an abbreviated form.

IR Implementation:

Is this requiring more or different information than what some parties currently provide on their Web site? [reverse comparability]

Some TSPs only display one **location** at a time, and parties can only “request” one at a time for viewing. However, the instructions to IR state that this would permit parties to request, via EDI, all locations. The concern is that this capability may be placed back on Web sites. The requester stated that this is not the intent.

Which **dates** should be used → statement date or date of the information? It should be the date of the information. Also, parties may want to request only a few dates from a TSP that allocates on a daily basis. One TSP stated that, even though they allocate daily, on their Web site parties can only request an entire month at a time. They cannot request less than a month.

Another daily allocating TSP stated that they send a ‘comprehensive’ Allocation which includes month-to-date. If a party requests (via EDI) one day during the month (e.g., the 15th), the TSP would send a statement showing month-to-date through the 15th. Would this request require the TSP to now display only one day at a time? No. It is OK to display additional lines of information for additional days. However, some parties still had a concern with sending (via EDI) more information than was requested. The requesting party is not expecting to receive that amount of information. These parties suggested that data be requested by month, not by date.

◆ Add a new data set called Request for Information.

Level	Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Detail	Data Sets Requested (Data Set Req)	A code identifying the types of requested data sets.	M	
Detail	Information Requested Begin Date (Info Req Beg)	The requested beginning date of the information.	BC	Used where the Transportation Service Provider allows the requester to specify a date range.
Detail	Information Requested End Date (Info Req End)	The requested ending date of the information.	C	Mandatory when Information Requested Begin Date is present and processed.
Detail	Information Requested Month (Info Req Mth)	The requested month and year of the information.	C	Mandatory when Information Requested Begin Date is not present.
Detail	Location Data	Unique identification of a point.		
	Location Code * ** (Loc)		C	Mandatory when Data Sets Requested is ‘Allocation for a specified location’.

	Location Proprietary Code (Loc Prop)		C	Mandatory when Data Sets Requested is 'Allocation for a specified location' and Location Code is not present.
Header	Request ID (Req ID)	A unique identifier determined by the Requester, which is used to delineate this request from any others sent by the Requester.	SO	
Header	Requester Company Code * (Req Co)	The requesting company.	M	
Detail	Service Requester Contract (Svc Req K)	This is the contract under which service is being requested.	C	Mandatory when Data Sets Requested is 'Shipper Imbalance for a specified service requester's contract'.
Header	Transportation Service Provider * (TSP)	Identifies the party providing the requested service.	M	

* Indicates Common Code

** When a Transportation Service Provider's proprietary location code is employed pursuant to this standard, the parties agree that nominations, confirmations, scheduled quantities, and capacity release documents employing such code should be for one gas day at a time, and used only until there is a verified common code for the point associated with the proprietary location code. This would include daily nominations over a weekend. Within two months following the availability of the location the parties should employ the common code and no longer employ the proprietary code for identifying such location in the data sets related to the identified standards.

- ◆ Add the following code value descriptions for the Data Sets Requested data element in the Request for Information:

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Allocation for a specified location	[no definition necessary]	
Allocation for all locations	[no definition necessary]	
Shipper Imbalance for a specified service requester's contract	[no definition necessary]	
Shipper Imbalance for all of the service requester's contracts	[no definition necessary]	

- ◆ IR determined that there should also be a response document that would work similar to the Response to Upload of Request for Download of Posted Data Sets. This will need to be approved by BPS. IR will complete the data dictionary and then send it to BPS for approval.

- ◆ **Issues to BPS for R96007 and R96008:**

- The proposed standards (2.3.A under R96007 and 2.3.A under R96008) include a data set name. IR recommends the name of the new data set be revised to 'Request for Information'. The language of the revised standards would be as follows:

R96007:

2.3.A Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) which provide parties with the ability to:

- a) request statement(s) of allocation via electronic bulletin board or web page; and,
- b) view such requested statements of allocation via electronic bulletin board or web page; and,
- c) do not provide such parties with the ability to request a GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 Allocation Statement via at least a fax, phone, or e-mail;

should support the ability of such party (or their agent) to request Allocation Statements via ~~Upload of a Request for Allocation Statement~~ *Request for Information* and to receive the Transportation Service Provider's response via a GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 document. Where the conditions in a) and b) above exist and the TSP does provide such parties with the ability to request a GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 Allocation Statement via at least a fax, phone, or e-mail, then the Transportation Service Provider is not required to support ~~the Upload of Request for Allocation Statement~~ *Request for Information*.

The period of time (how far back in time a request may specify) should be comparable as between the electronic request/view method and the upload request/receive response method, provided, however, the TSP would not be required to respond with information generated prior to its implementation of GISB Standard No. 2.4.3.

R96008:

2.3.A Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) which provide parties with the ability to:

- a) request imbalance information via electronic bulletin board or web page; and,
- b) view such requested imbalance information via electronic bulletin board or web page; and,
- c) do not provide such parties with the ability to request a GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 Imbalance Statement via at least a fax, phone, or e-mail;

should support the ability of such party (or their agent) to request Imbalance Statements via ~~Upload of a Request for Imbalance Statement~~ *Request for Information* and to receive the Transportation Service Provider's response via a GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 document. Where the conditions in a) and b) above exist and the TSP does provide such parties with the ability to request a GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 Imbalance Statement via at least a fax, phone, or e-mail, then the Transportation Service Provider is not required to support ~~the Upload of Request for Imbalance Statement~~ *Request for Information*.

The period of time (how far back in time a request may specify) should be comparable as between the electronic request/view method and the upload request/receive response method, provided, however, the TSP would not be required to respond with information generated prior to its implementation of GISB Standard No. 2.4.4.

- IR determined that a data set should be developed to respond to the Request for Information. However, a response data set was not specifically included in BPS' instructions to IR. IR asks for BPS' confirmation that a response data set is consistent with BPS' instructions. The new data set, called Response to Request for Information, is presented below.

Level	Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
Detail	Data Availability Code (Data Avail)	A code indicating the availability of data for each type of data set requested.	M	
Header	Data Process Date (Proc Date)	The date the response was processed.	M	
Header	Data Process Time (Proc Time)	The time the response was processed.	M	
Detail	Data Sets Requested (Data Set Req)	A code identifying the types of requested data sets.	M	
Header	Request ID (Req ID)	A unique identifier determined by the Requester, which is used to delineate this request from any others sent by the Requester.	C	Mandatory when provided in Request for Information.
Header	Requester Company Code * (Req Co)	The requesting company.	M	
Header	Transportation Service Provider * (TSP)	Identifies the party providing the requested service.	M	

* Indicates Common Code

- It should be clarified that the response times specified in 2.3.B under R96007 and 2.3.B under R96008 pertain to the information that was requested and not to the new Response to Request for Information data set. IR suggests the following revision to the proposed standard language:

R96007:

2.3.B Transportation Service Providers which support the ability of a party (or its agent) to:

- a) request GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 document(s) pursuant to GISB Standard No. [number assigned for proposed standard no. 2.3.A] and
- b) receive the GISB Standard No. 2.4.3 document in response to such request;

should provide the ~~response~~ documents *requested* at the party's designated site by 9:00 a.m. CCT on a business day when the request is received prior to 3:00 p.m. CCT on the prior business day.

R96008:

2.3.B Transportation Service Providers which support the ability of a party (or its agent) to:

- a) request GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 document(s) pursuant to GISB Standard No. [number assigned for proposed standard no. 2.3.A] and
- b) receive the GISB Standard No. 2.4.4 document in response to such request;

should provide the response documents *requested* at the party's designated site by 9:00 a.m. CCT on a business day when the request is received prior to 3:00 p.m. CCT on the prior business day.

NOTE: IR developed the following code value descriptions which will be used in the response data set. These will not be included in the issues that are sent to BPS.

- ◆ Add the following code value descriptions for the Data Sets Requested data element in the Response to Request for Information:

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Allocation for a specified location	[no definition necessary]	
Allocation for all locations	[no definition necessary]	
Shipper Imbalance for a specified service requester's contract	[no definition necessary]	
Shipper Imbalance for all of the service requester's contracts	[no definition necessary]	

- ◆ Add the following code value descriptions for the Data Availability Code data element in the Response to Request for Information:

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Data is available	[no definition necessary]	
Data is not available	[no definition necessary]	
Code value in Data Sets Requested is not supported by transportation service provider	[no definition necessary]	

The requester offered to draft TIBP language and the Sample Paper Transaction for both the request and the response data sets. These will be addressed at a subsequent IR meeting.

A sense of the room was not taken on these requests. It will be taken at a subsequent meeting. The issues will be sent to BPS after a sense of the room has been taken on the data dictionary for both the request and response data sets.

- **R99038 – Koch Gateway Pipeline**

Request: Add 'Maximum Rate Indicator' to the Nomination.

EIITF Action:

Instruct the Information Requirements Subcommittee to modify the nominations data set to accommodate the business practice of a Service Requester indicating to a TSP whether the maximum rate will apply. This business practice would be business conditional.

IR Implementation:

MOTION:

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

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Data Group	EBB Pathed	EBB Non-Pathed	EBB PNT – “T”	EBB PNT – “U”	EDI / FF Usage	Condition
<u>Maximum Rate Indicator (Max Rate Ind)</u>	<u>Indicates whether the maximum transportation rate will apply.</u>	<u>TSDG</u>	<u>BC</u>	<u>BC</u>	<u>BC</u>	<u>nu</u>	<u>BC</u>	<u>Used where a transportation service provider requires the service requester to specify whether the maximum rate will apply.</u>

- ◆ Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.54 to add ‘Maximum Rate Indicator’ to the Transaction Specific Data Group, after ‘Associated Contract’.
- ◆ Add the following code value descriptions for the Maximum Rate Indicator:

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
No	[no definition necessary]	
Yes	[no definition necessary]	

- ◆ It was determined that no changes are needed to the TIBP or the Sample Paper Transaction for either the Nomination or the Nomination Quick Response.
- ◆ Add the following code value descriptions for the Validation Code in the Nomination Quick Response:

Error:

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Invalid Maximum Rate Indicator	[no definition necessary]	
Missing Maximum Rate Indicator	[no definition necessary]	

Warning:

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Maximum Rate Indicator not processed	[no definition necessary]	

Sense of the Room: 9 In Favor; 0 Opposed

- **EITF Related**-- Abbreviations and Flat File usage for Capacity Release data sets. A separate document was developed for the maintenance of this information (see attachment).

8. Next Meeting Dates and Locations

The next meeting will be held on December 7 – 8, 1999 in Houston. The exact location is to be determined. CMS offered to host, but will check back with their office before the location is finalized.