

ASC X12H, Materials Management  
Mary K. Blantz  
Chair  
(216)622-5946  
Kim Van Pelt  
(713) 989-7354

ASC X12S/99-214  
January 28, 2000

TO: X12 Members Who Cast a Ballot on DM 107199 Commodity Movement Services Validation Response  
Transaction Set (874)  
Ballot Closing Date December 13, 1999

SUBJECT: Ballot Comment Response Letter

This ballot requested your approval of a new Transaction Set, DM 107199, Commodity Movement Services Validation Response (874). Of the 690 ballots mailed, 143 ballots were returned: 49 approved, 7 disapproved with comment and 46 abstained.

Thank you for providing your comments. The chair of the subcommittee has delegated responsibility for responding to comments to the Gas Industry Standards Board (GISB), and our responses are provided below.

MEMBER(S): Association of American Railroads/Railinc  
GSA/Federal Supply Service  
Johns Hopkins University/Applied Physics Lab  
Logistics Management Institute  
Norfolk Southern Corporation  
Telcordia

VOTE: Disapprove

RESPONSE:

The ballot comments noted a segment collision between the N9 segment in Table 2 positions 2/0100 and 2/0800. To resolve the segment collision, we will change the N9 within the SLN sub-detail loop (N9 position 2/0800) to a REF. We will leave the N9 that begins the Table 2 detail loop (N9 position 2/0100) as is.

MEMBER: Peter Randlev, I.M.

VOTE: Disapprove

RESPONSE:

The ballot comment asked if TS 874 was a response to a validation message, and also if the TS 997 was sufficient for this purpose. We propose changing the title to "Commodity Movement Services Response". This transaction set is not a response to a validation, but rather the validation itself. A TS 997 is not designed to convey the information required for the TS 874. While the TS 997 is designed to convey the results of the syntactical analysis of the transaction set, the TS 874 conveys validation and other information regarding the semantic meaning of the information encoded in the transaction set, that can only be determined by the back-office system. For example, the TS 874 will report whether a contract is valid for the party submitting the transaction, but the TS 997 would not include this information.

Paragraphs two, three, and four of the ballot comment asked if the TS 873 can be used instead of creating a new TS 874 since the purpose of the TS 873 includes "can be used to convey request and response information" and since some of the segments being used in TS 874 already appear in TS 873. The TS 873 is used for a business purpose of sending a request, and its business response of whether the request can be fulfilled. For example, the TS 873 can be used to request to move a commodity (gas) on a pipeline, and the TS 873 is used by the pipeline to communicate whether the gas can be scheduled for movement. In

contrast, the TS 874 is used to send error notification, including the specific error code and optional text message. For example, when the TS 873 is used to request to move gas on a pipeline, the TS 874 would be sent to communicate whether there were any errors in the request, such as invalid contract or invalid date range, but not whether the request to move gas can be fulfilled. Additional segments required in the TS 873 to accommodate the TS 874 functionality would make the TS 873 transaction set unwieldy for its original intent.

The ballot comment stated that it is not good practice to use a transaction set before it is approved as an X12 standard. We did not mean to imply that we have already implemented the TS 873 and TS 874. We simply meant that in our design, we intend to use the TS 873 and TS 874 for multiple business related documents. We will not be implementing either of these transaction sets until they are approved and published by DISA.