

**GISB Technical Subcommittee
ANSI Compliance Team
Final Meeting Minutes
April 21-22, 1998**

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kim Van Pelt called the meeting to order. Introductions were made.

2. Housekeeping

Reviewed by Mary Draemer.

3. Anti-Trust Warning

Reviewed by Kim Van Pelt.

4. Adoption of Agenda

Move Next Meeting Date and Location immediately after Adoption of Meeting Minutes
Adopted as amended.

5. Adoption of Meeting Minutes

March 26, 1998 - adopted as drafted

10. Next Meeting Date and Location

EC has moved their May meeting to May 20 and 21. IR is meeting May 18 and 19. Since we do not have EC approval on our migration plan yet, we cannot do any X12 compliance work until after the next EC meeting. The last week in May is really the only time we can meet since the next EC/IR meetings are the second week in June.

Next meeting for ACT
Wednesday and Thursday,
May 27 and 28
Duke Energy, Houston, TX
Wednesday, 9:00 - 5:00
Thursday, 10:30 - 4:30

6. Update of Presentation to Executive Committee

Bob Wallenhorst gave a brief update of ACT's presentation to the EC. ACT's two GISB requests for new data elements were triaged to IR. A majority of the EC meeting was spent on other agenda items, so ACT's presentation was pushed to the end without sufficient time for discussion. Bob and Kim gave the presentation. Greg Lander raised the concern that this would be a lot of work and he wanted the EC to be aware of the amount of work it would be before ACT got started. Dale Davis asked the question of how the GISB Implementation Guide publication schedule in the Annual Plan lined up with our Migration Plan. Donna Scott raised the question of how companies will manage different X12 versions of the datasets.

Since ACT did not have sufficient time to address all the questions, we will be first on the agenda at the next EC meeting. We will probably need to prepare clear responses to address all of the above issues again.

Additional discussion about new documents that will probably be required by the FERC Order. We will need to present this to the EC so that they are aware of the time implications of developing new documents that are X12 compliant. We probably will not have time to get these new documents through X12 by the deadlines imposed by FERC. Bob suggested that the Technical Chairs have a meeting/conference call with the chairs of all the Subcommittees/Task Forces to review the impact of the Order on GISB's workload.

7. Map Invoice to 4010 (for Y2K issues only)

We are only moving the Invoice to 4010 for Y2K issues, so we'll try to leave everything where it is, if possible. In cases where the field lengths are increased, we will limit them to the GISB version 1.2 (ANSI X12 3040) length. The following changes noted are to be made in the EDISIM only unless otherwise specified.

Transportation/Sales Invoice

The structure of the heading in the 4010 811 is the same as in 3040.

Are the segments the same (for GISB purposes)?

ST - same

BIG - same (except Invoice Date is now Y2K compliant)

CUR - same (except Effective Exchange Date is now Y2K compliant), limit CUR03 to max 6 (version 1.2 is max 6, 4010 is max 10)

REF - same

PER - same, limit PER02 to max 35 (version 1.2 is max 35, 4010 is max 60)

ITD - same, (except Net Due Date and Electronic Funds Transfer Due Date are now Y2K compliant)

N1 - same, limit N104 to max 17 (version 1.2 is max 17, 4010 is max 80)

N3 - same, limit N301 to max 35 (version 1.2 is max 35, 4010 is max 55)

N4 - same, limit N403 to max 9 (version 1.2 is max 9, 4010 is max 15)

REF - same

The structure of the detail (first HL loop) in the 4010 811 is the same as in 3040.

Are the segments the same (for GISB purposes)?

HL - same

LX - same

SI - same, limit SI03 to max 30 (version 1.2 is max 30, 4010 is max 48)

DTM - different: element 1250 moved from DTM06 to DTM05; element 1251 moved from DTM07 to DTM06:

DTM01 - same

DTM05 - D8 and DT (same as version 1.2 DTM06)

DTM06 - data element names (same as version 1.2 DTM07)

The structure of the Sub-detail (second HL loop) in the 4010 811 is different than the 811 in the 3040 in that the N1 segment is now an NM1 segment. Also, the position numbers will be different for these segments. They will no longer start at position 670 with the HL, the position numbers will be greater than 750.

Are the segments the same (for GISB purposes)?

HL - same

LX - same

SI - same, limit SI03, SI05, SI07, etc. to max 30 (version 1.2 is max 30, 4010 is max 48)
ITA - same, limit ITA07 to max 9 (version 1.2 is max 9, 4010 is max 15)
IT1 - same, limit IT104 to max 14 (version 1.2 is max 14, 4010 is max 17)

N1 segment has been changed to NM1: change N1 to NM1 throughout segment notes:

NM101: same as N101 (data element 98). Mark as Must Use

NM102: (ANSI mandatory) we will use "3 - Unknown"; Mark as Must Use; The group discussed using different codes for locations/zones versus entities, but decided against it since it doesn't add any business value and since locations/zones don't really belong in the NM1 anyway. This will be readdressed when we map the X12 compliant version of the Invoice.

NM108: same as N103 (data element 66). Mark as Must Use

NM109: same as N104 (data element 67) - limit N104 to max 17 (version 1.2 is max 17, 4010 is max 80). Mark as Must Use.

These changes need to be made in the Data Element Xref to X12 (change N1 to NM1 in sub-detail), the Sample X12 transaction for NM1 segment, in the EDISIM (as specified above), and in the Transaction Set Tables (change N1 in name of table to NM1 (at sub-detail level); change N101 to NM101, change N103 to NM108).

For the N1 to NM1 change, we considered moving the non-entity data elements to the REF within the IT1 loop, since they do not belong in the NM1 (used to identify an individual or organization), but decided not to make that change at this time since it would be a significant mapping change. We will consider this type of change when we map the X12 compliant version of the Invoice.

The structure of the second Detail (third HL loop) in the 4010 811 is the same as in 3040. Are the segments the same (for GISB purposes)?

HL - same

ITA - same, limit ITA05 to max 6 (since Line Number is mapped to ITA05 in this instance and LX in another instance and LX has max length of 6); and limit ITA07 to max 9 (version 1.2 is max 9, 4010 is max 15)

DTM - different: element 1250 moved from DTM06 to DTM05; element 1251 moved from DTM07 to DTM06:

DTM01 - same

DTM05 - CM, D8, RD5, RD8 (same as version 1.2 DTM06)

DTM06 - data element names (same as version 1.2 DTM07)

The structure of the Summary in the 4010 811 is the same as in 3040.

Are the segments the same (for GISB purposes)?

TDS - same, limit TDS01 to max 10 (version 1.2 is max 10, 4010 is max 15)

CTT - same

SE - same

Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice

Header level data elements and mapping are the same as in the Transportation/Sales Invoice.

Detail level data elements and mapping are the same as in the Transportation/Sales Invoice for the second Detail level.

Summary level data elements and mapping are the same as in the Transportation/Sales Invoice.

So, for each of these levels we need to make the same changes identified for the Transportation/Sales Invoice.

Sense of the room for both Invoice documents: Recommended (4-0) (unanimous)

8. Revision of X12 Migration Plan Report based on March EC Meeting

Jim Keisler noted that the publication schedule in the Annual Maintenance Plan was put together based on the BPS rounds without considering that fact that then the requests have to go through IR, Technical, ACT, etc. If we feel the publication schedule does not address processing of the requests by all relevant subcommittees, we should propose an alternate timeline.

Items we need to address:

- Donna's concerns - versioning
- Dale's concerns - Timeline/Publication - modify timeline
- Technical Mapping Issue - 3040 v. new versions
- Remind the EC of why we're here
- DMR timeline - this was only implied in our first presentation

Versioning:

Need to put people's fears to rest. The X12 versioning issue is not any different than the GISB versioning issue we already have. So far, we have only mapped in one X12 version (3040), but we do have multiple GISB versions (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, etc.). In the future, when we go to another X12 version (such as 4010), it will be published in a different GISB version (1.4 for example). You cannot separate the X12 version from the GISB version. If a company chooses to support multiple GISB versions, then that is their choice that they must work out with their customers. The X12 version(s) a company supports will be whichever one(s) used for the GISB version(s) they are supporting. The issue of different X12 versions is not a different issue than supporting multiple GISB versions.

Why we are here:

- Same as our previous presentation
 - request from Texaco
 - ANSI compliance for ANSI accreditation
 - good for gas industry participants because of consistent business use of similar documents across other industries

Reminder that we're presenting the migration plan, but the choice to update our X12 mappings to be ANSI compliant (or not) needs to be made by the EC. If the choice is made to update our X12 mappings to be ANSI X12 compliant, then this migration plan is our proposed plan to go about it.

Greg's point: a lot of work, so EC needs to be sure this is the direction we want to go before sending ACT to do all the work.

DMR timeline & Technical mapping issue:

EC needs to understand that when we do something new, it takes time to get through the X12 process.

January may be a better time for GISB publications (instead of July) because it would better coincide with X12's approval and publication schedule (December publication)

Need to meet with the other subcommittees and make sure they understand our deadlines per DISA and the fact that if they do not get things to us by the deadlines that we need, then it simply will not get completed in time to be published.

X12 compliance is no longer a separate project if we incorporate all changes from BPS/IR into the ANSI compliant version, because companies would no longer have an option to implement new business rules in their existing maps (in 3040).

Question for EC: Does the EC want all future publications to be ANSI X12 compliant?

Perhaps when they asked us to show how our migration plan fits with the Publication Schedule, they made the assumption that all new publications would be X12 compliant.

Once we start implementing changes in new X12 versions, this will prevent people from implementing GISB changes early (from the change log, for example).

First Proposed schedule (revised later in the meeting):

Flowing Gas & Invoicing completed by BPS in 98
DMRs submitted by Feb 1999
DMRs approved by Oct 1999
DISA publishes in Dec 1999
GISB publishes in Jan 2000

Noms & Capacity Release completed by BPS in 99
DMRs submitted by Feb 2000
DMRs approved by Oct 2000
DISA publishes Dec 2000
GISB publishes Jan 2001

Suggestion that GISB should move their publication schedule to January to coincide with DISA schedule (this would entail postponing current version 2 schedule by 6 months)

ACT proposed GISB publication schedule (revised later in the meeting):

July 1998	version 1.3 (all - none ANSI compliant)
Jan 1999	ANSI compliant PYRM & STAC; Y2K compliant Invoice suite
Jan 2000	ANSI compliant Flowing Gas and Invoicing
Jan 2001	ANSI compliant Noms

Issues that could cause problems with this schedule:

If title tracking gets to IR by August, we would have to map it in 3040 (out for comment in October) so that it can be published in January 2000.

Suggestion of how to handle this: Anything that comes to us from the BPS rounds will go in

the new ANSI version; anything special (like TTT) that comes to Technical will be mapped in the current GISB version.

Maybe it's premature to force GISB business changes into the new X12 version... maybe we should continue to map business changes to 3040 but also work on X12 compliant versions so that when we are ready to go to X12 compliant versions, we have already published our new documents, changes, whatever in X12 so that it won't be all brand new. This would remove some of the uncertainty as to what the new implementation will be. This would also allow things to still be fully staffed when they go to the EC.

Second Proposed Revised Timeline (this is the one we will present to the EC):

1998	May	ACT	ANSI compliance work on Nomination Related Standards begins Nomination ANSI compliance work
	May	GISB	30 day comment period begins for Y2K Transportation/Sales Invoice and Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice
	June	GISB	EC consideration of Y2K Transportation/Sales Invoice and Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice for approval
	June	ACT	Nomination Quick Response ANSI compliance work Scheduled Quantity ANSI compliance work
	July	GISB	GISB version 1.3 is published Both Invoices are Y2K All books published in 3040 - non ANSI compliant
	July	ACT	Request for Confirmation ANSI compliance work
	August	ACT	Confirmation Response ANSI compliance work Confirmation Response Quick Response ANSI compliance work
	Sept	ACT	Scheduled Quantity for Operator ANSI compliance work <i>Review of proposed changes (work May - Sept) with X12 representative</i>
	Oct/Nov	ACT	Final review of Invoice Related Standards to comply with latest ANSI X12 release (Payment Remittance & Statement of Account to 4020)

	Nov	GISB	30 day comment period begins for ANSI compliant Payment Remittance and Statement of Account
	Dec	GISB	EC consideration of ANSI compliant Payment Remittance and Statement of Account for approval
	Dec	ANSI/ DISA	DISA Publication of X12 version 4020 (including ACT DMRs for Payment Remittance and Statement of Account)
1999	January	GISB	Proposed publication of GISB version 1.4 (Payment Remittance, Statement of Account ANSI compliant & Y2K) Both Invoices X12 4010 (non ANSI compliant) Payment Remittance X12 4020 (ANSI compliant) Statement of Account X12 4020 (ANSI compliant)
	February	ACT	ANSI compliance work on Flowing Gas and Invoicing Related Standards begins Shipper Imbalance ANSI compliance work
	February	ACT	Nomination Related Standards DMRs submitted to DISA (latest deadline date for December publication)
	Mar/Apr	ACT	Measured Volume Audit Statement ANSI compliance work
	May	ACT	Measurement Information Statement ANSI compliance work
	June	ACT	<i>Review of proposed changes (work Feb - May) with X12 representative</i>
	June/July	ACT	Transportation/Sales Invoice ANSI compliance work Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice ANSI compliance work
	July	GISB	Publication of GISB version 2 (Flowing Gas and Invoicing business changes) Flowing Gas - X12 3040 (non ANSI compliant) Invoices - X12 4010 (non ANSI compliant) Payment Remittance - X12 4020 (ANSI compliant) Statement of Account - X12 4020 (ANSI compliant)
	August	ACT	Pre-determined Allocation ANSI compliance work
	Sept	ACT	PDA Quick Response ANSI compliance work

	Sep/Oct	ACT	Allocation ANSI compliance work
	Oct/Nov	ACT	<i>Review of proposed changes (work Jun - Oct) with X12 representative</i>
	Dec	ANSI/ DISA	DISA Publication of X12 version 4030? (including ACT DMRs for Nomination Related Standards)
2000	Jan/Feb	ACT	Final review of Nominations Related Standards to comply with latest ANSI X12 release
	February	ACT	Flowing Gas Related Standards DMRs, (and if needed) additional Invoice Related Standards DMRs submitted to DISA (latest deadline date for December publication)
	March	ACT	ANSI compliance work on Capacity Release begins (Likely to take 24 months to complete what are expected to be extensive modifications to the 17 Capacity Release transaction sets. A monthly schedule is not being proposed at this time)
	April	GISB	30 day comment period begins for ANSI compliant Nominations Related Standards
	May	GISB	EC consideration of ANSI compliant Nomination Related Standards for approval
	July	GISB	Publication of GISB version 2 (Nominations, Capacity Release) Nomination Related Standards - X12 4030 (ANSI compliant) Capacity Release Related Standards - X12 3040 (non ANSI compliant)
	Dec	ANSI/ DISA	DISA Publication of X12 version 4040?? (including ACT DMRs for Flowing Gas Related Standards and DMRs for Invoicing Related Standards (if necessary))
2001	Jan/Feb	ACT	Final review of Flowing Gas Related Standards and Invoicing Related Standards (if necessary) to comply with latest ANSI X12 release
	April	GISB	30 day comment period begins for ANSI compliant Flowing Gas Related Standards and Invoicing Related Standards (if needed)

May	GISB	EC consideration of ANSI compliant Flowing Gas Related Standards and Invoicing Related Standards (if needed) for approval
2001 ?	July GISB	Publication of GISB version 3? (Flowing Gas, Invoicing 4040) Flowing Gas - X12 4040 (ANSI compliant) Invoicing - X12 4020 (4040 if needed) (ANSI compliant)
2002 ?	July GISB	We need to get on a GISB January publication schedule to be in line with the ANSI X12 publication schedule

In our presentation, we won't specifically address any issues that we mentioned at the beginning of this meeting other than why we are here and the timeline. We hope all other concerns/issues will be answered by the timeline, but we'll address questions if they are not.

9. Other Business

none at this time

11. Adjourn

Attendees:

Denise Breeden	Tennessee Gas Pipeline
Kim Van Pelt	Texas Eastern
Bob Wallenhorst	Exxon
Jim Keisler	Transco
Mary Draemer	Enron Transportation and Storage
Andy Sicignano	ECT
Tammy Lee-Jaquet	Enron Transportation and Storage