

**GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee Meeting
December 7-8, 1999
CMS Energy's Offices; Houston
FINAL MINUTES**

1. Jim Keisler opened the meeting and welcomed participants.
2. Housekeeping information was provided by Betty Barnum.
3. Anti-trust guidelines were given by Jim Buccigross.
4. Theresa Hess suggested that **R98035A** be added to the agenda. This item will be slotted immediately after request **R98056**. The agenda was approved as modified.
5. The minutes of the November 9-10 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.)

- **R98089 – ANR Pipeline**

Request:

Add a code value of "RD" to the ANSI data element Acknowledgment Type in the BAK Segment of the Confirmation Response (Standard 1.4.4) transaction set.

IR Action on 10/13/99:

On Request **R98043**, a GISB data element Transaction Status Code was added to the header level of the Confirmation Response transaction set. This data element will be mapped to the ANSI data element Acknowledgment Type in the BAK segment.

Relative to request **R98089**, then, IR recommended that an additional code value description of "RD" (Reject with Detail) be added to the data element Transaction Status Code. Additionally, it was recommended that the data element Validation Code (Val Cd) be added to the header level of the Confirmation Response. Usage for the data element is C. Five code value descriptions were assigned to the data element Validation Code: Invalid Confirming Party, Missing Confirming Party, Invalid Confirmation Requester, Missing Confirmation Requester, and Missing Transaction Identifier. All of these recommendations were returned to BPS for their approval.

Following is the exact IR implementation which was proposed at the October 12-13, 1999 IR meeting:

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

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
The entire transaction was rejected due to header level errors.	{no definition necessary }	RD

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

Business Name (Abbreviation)	Definition	Model Data Group	EDI/ FF Usage	Condition
<i>Validation Code (Val Cd)</i>	<i>Code that identifies errors/warnings.</i>	<i>N/A</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:

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Invalid Confirming Party	{no definition necessary }	
Missing Confirming Party	{no definition necessary }	
Invalid Confirmation Requester	{no definition necessary }	
Missing Confirmation Requester	{no definition necessary }	
Missing Transaction Identifier	{no definition necessary }	

BPS Action:

BPS approved of the proposed IR implementation during their 11/4/99 meeting.

IR Implementation:

MOTION:

- ◆ Implement as IR proposed at the October 12-13, 1999 IR meeting.
- ◆ Additionally, add the following language to the end of the second paragraph of the Confirmation Response TIBP: The **validation code**, which is also found at the beginning of the Confirmation Response, informs the receiver of errors that apply to the entire Request for Confirmation.

Sense of the Room: 11 In Favor; 0 Opposed

- **R98055 – Trans Capacity**

Request:

Add four code values to the data element Transaction Type in the nomination, invoicing (as appropriate), and flowing gas (as appropriate) related data sets. The code values are: Suspense gas, No-notice service, Flow day diversion, and Authorized point overrun.

IR Action on 9/13/99, 10/12/99, and 11/9/99:

The requested code value descriptions “Suspense Gas” and “No-Notice Service” are taken care of per the resolution of **R98066** and **R98067**, respectively.

The requested code value description “Authorized Point Overrun” already exists in all appropriate Nomination, Flowing Gas, and Invoicing transaction sets.

Previous IR discussions have centered on the code value “Flow day diversion”. Specifically, do we need to add one code value for “Flow day diversion”, or do we need to add two code values for “Flow day diversion – to” and “Flow day diversion – from”? It was determined that only the code value “Flow Day Diversion” was required.

IR Implementation:

Code Value Description	Code Value Definition	Code Value
Flow Day Diversion	An intraday diversion of previously scheduled gas from one delivery location to another, on the same contract. The acceptance of the diversion is based upon parameters specified by the transportation service provider.	

MOTION:

Add the above code value description to the data element Transaction Type in the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, PDA, Allocation, Shipper Imbalance, and Transportation/Sales Invoice.

Sense of the Room: 10 In Favor; 0 Opposed

• **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.

IR Implementation:

Two new transaction sets have been developed to handle both the request for allocation information and the request for shipper imbalance information. These transaction sets are: 1) Request for Information, and 2) Response to Request for Information. There are four attachments to this document which contain the two data dictionaries, as well as the two TIBPS. Note that the TIBP attachments also contain the sample paper transactions.

At this meeting, both data dictionaries were discussed and consensus was reached. Additionally, the TIBP and the sample paper transaction for both the Request for Information and the Response to Request for Information were reviewed, and all identified changes were made.

At the next meeting, one final review for errors and omissions will occur. Upon completion of the review, the issues which were identified at the November 9-10, 1999 IR meeting will be sent to the Business Practices Subcommittee.

- **EIITF Related** -- Abbreviations and Flat File usage for Capacity Release data sets.

IR Implementation:

At a previous IR meeting, abbreviations were created for all of the data elements within the Offer Download and the Bid Download. It was decided that the remaining data elements would be addressed in alphabetic order. The assignment of abbreviations was completed for all data elements within Capacity Release. A document entitled Data Element Cross Reference - Capacity Release was developed for the maintenance of this information (see attachment). This document will be used to update the Capacity Release Data Dictionaries.

The usage of each data element within Capacity Release was examined by utilizing the aforementioned Data Element Cross Reference document. It was determined that the Flat File usage for each data element would be identical to the existing EDI usage.

MOTION:

Approve the abbreviations which were assigned to each data element within Capacity Release, and to conclude that the Flat File usage and the EDI usage for each data element within Capacity Release would be identical.

Sense of the Room: 7 In Favor; 0 Opposed

The document entitled Data Element Cross Reference – Nominations, Flowing Gas, and Invoicing has also been updated, and has been included as an additional attachment to this document.

7. No other business was discussed.
8. The next meeting will be held on January 11-12, 1999 in Houston. The exact location is to be determined.
9. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.