

**Joint GISB Technical Subcommittee & ANSI Compliance Team Meeting  
Duke Energy  
Final Meeting Minutes  
January 11, 1999**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

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

**2. Housekeeping**

Reviewed by Kim Van Pelt

**3. Anti-Trust Warning**

Reviewed by Kim Van Pelt

**4. Adoption of Agenda**

Agenda adopted as drafted.

**5. Adoption of Meeting Minutes**

December 7-8, 1998

Adopted as drafted.

**6. Address Current Requests for Initiation or Enhancement of GISB Standards**

R97127

R98060

**R97127** - Columbia Gas - Add "Inactive" error messages to Nomination Quick Response for Entities and Locations so that there will be more descriptive messages than "Invalid".

Nomination Quick Response (1.4.2)

Transaction Set Tables

"Errors and Warnings (Heading)" table:

Add the following errors after ENMQR114:

ENMQR115     Inactive Service Requester

ENMQR116     Inactive Transportation Service Provider

"Errors and Warnings (Sub-detail)" table:

Add the following errors after ENMQR577:

ENMQR578     Inactive Delivery Location

ENMQR579     Inactive Receipt Location

ENMQR580     Inactive Downstream Identifier Code

ENMQR581     Inactive Upstream Identifier Code

Sense of the room: recommended (5-0)

**R98060** - Columbia Gas - Give the functional acknowledgment a Transaction Set ID.

This request was discussed at the 1/6/99 Triage meeting, with a recommendation to send it to the Technical Subcommittee. These recommendations from Triage have not yet been approved by the EC, but they will be considered at the January EC meeting. Since Technical's agenda is not full today, Technical will go ahead and discuss this request, but not submit a recommendation until it has been formally approved by the EC to be passed to Technical.

In the EDI EDM HTTP envelope, the “transaction-set” is a mutually agreed data element. This data element is defined in the data dictionary for EDM. The values for this data element are the 8 character codes used by GISB in the footer of the Implementation Guides, but there is no concise list anywhere. Since the 997 Functional Acknowledgement does not have any GISB business data elements associated with it, it does not have a GISB standards number and is not mapped in the GISB Implementation Guides. It is only mentioned in the Related Standards section. So, we need to give this transaction set a 8 character GISB code.

Code chosen:

G997FNAK Functional Acknowledgement

This code will be designated for use in the HTTP envelope for all Functional Acknowledgments regardless of which transaction set or version is being acknowledged. The X12 version is noted in the ISA.

Note that the code for the Measured Volume Audit Statement should be G867MAUS. It is incorrectly noted as G867MSAU in the footer of the Business section tab (Technical Implementation of Business Process, Sample Paper Transaction and Data Dictionary) for the Measured Volume Audit Statement in the Implementation Guides. Kim will send an email to the GISB office to note this correction.

Technical will compile a list of the codes to be used in the HTTP transaction-set data element for all the datasets. Technical recommends that this information be placed in the Related Standards tab for each of the books.

Currently, the information in the Related Standards tab is identical in all the books except for the EDM book. The EDM book Related Standards tab has an additional section for HTTP. Technical recommends that this section be added to the Related Standards tab in all of the books, since HTTP is a relevant standard for all of the EDI datasets. Technical recommends that the Related Standards section of all the books be identical.

Technical recommends the following table for these code values (with introductory language to be determined) be added as a sub-section to the HTTP section at the end of the Related Standards tab.

HTTP transaction-set Code Values	GISB standard number	Transaction Set Description
G850NMST	1.4.1	Nomination
G855NMQR	1.4.2	Nomination Quick Response
G850RQCF	1.4.3	Request for Confirmation
G855RRFC	1.4.4	Confirmation Response
G865SQTS	1.4.5	Scheduled Quantity
G865SQOP	1.4.6	Scheduled Quantity for Operator
G855CRQR	1.4.7	Confirmation Response Quick Response
G860PDAL	2.4.1	Pre-determined Allocation
G865PDQR	2.4.2	Pre-determined Allocation - Quick Response
G865ALLC	2.4.3	Allocation
G811IMBL	2.4.4	Shipper Imbalance
G867MSIN	2.4.5	Measurement Information
G867MAUS	2.4.6	Measured Volume Audit Statement
G811TSIN	3.4.1	Transportation/Sales Invoice
G820PYRM	3.4.2	Payment Remittance
G822STAC	3.4.3	Statement of Account

HTTP transaction-set Code Values	GISB standard number	Transaction Set Description
G811SRCA	3.4.4	Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice
G840CROF	5.4.1	Offer Download
G843CRBR	5.4.2	Bid Download
G843CRAN	5.4.3	Award Download
G832CRRC	5.4.4	Replacement Capacity
G843CRWD	5.4.5	Withdrawal Download
G840UPWD	5.4.6	Withdrawal Upload
G840UDOF	5.4.7	Offer Upload
G843UDVL	5.4.8	Offer Upload Quick Response
G840UDRC	5.4.9	Offer Upload Notification
G843UDBC	5.4.10	Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation
G824UDCV	5.4.11	Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation Quick Response
G567UDFD	5.4.12	Offer Upload Final Disposition
G840OAUC	5.4.13	Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity
G846UPRD	5.4.14	Upload of Request for Download of Posted Datasets
G846RURD	5.4.15	Response to Upload of Request for Download of Posted Datasets
G864SWNT	5.4.16	System-Wide Notices
G864CRNS	5.4.17	Note/Special Instruction
G843BDUP	5.4.18?	Bid Upload
G843BDQR	5.4.19?	Bid Upload Quick Response
G997FNAK	N/A	Functional Acknowledgement

Note that the Bid Upload and Bid Upload Quick Response have not yet been given a GISB standard number, and the names of most of the Capacity Release transactions in the table above are the new names as reflected in recommendation R97111. After R97111 is considered by the Executive Committee, we will update the table as needed.

Once this request formally gets passed to the Technical Subcommittee, we will send this table to FTTF and recommend that they write some introductory text explaining the use of these codes in the "transaction-set" data element. Technical recommends that this text and table appear as a subsection under the "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP)" section (similar to how ISA is a subsection under the ANSI ASC X12 Standards section) in the Related Standards tab of all the books. We will review this one final time after FTTF completes it to make sure that the EC has approved all our transaction set names and standard numbers in the table.

Sense of the room: recommended (5-0)

## **ANSI Compliance Team**

### **7. Review X12J Comments re: GISB X12 Requests and Formulate Written Responses**

Denise gave a quick overview of what happened at the X12J (Technical Assessment) Subcommittee meeting that Kim, Jim and Denise attended on December 9, 1998.

We will prepare responses to each of these issues, will make corresponding revisions to our proposed 873 and 874 datasets, and will review our responses and new datasets with X12H before re-submitting this to X12J.

Comments from DISA on our new development of the 873 and 874 that we need to address with written responses:

#### **1. Consider designing the sets (873 & 874) as one bi-directional set.**

Discussion: John Lutz (chair of X12J) suggested leaving these as separate transaction sets so that we can assign them different functional groups. The functional groups are indicated at the GS level. Separate functional groups (CU for 873, CQ for 874) will allow these documents to be routed to internal systems at the receiving company before the X12 is translated. In addition, some members of ACT didn't want to combine all of our business transactions into one X12 document, since we will already be using the 873 for 5 different business transactions.

#### **ACT Response to X12J:**

\* We need the Commodity Movement Services (873) transaction set and the Commodity Movement Services Validation Response (874) transaction set to be assigned different functional groups so that they can be routed differently depending on the GS01.

\* These two transaction sets have different purposes. The information in the Commodity Movement Services Validation Response (874) transaction set does not repeat the information sent in the originating Commodity Movement Services (873) transaction set. It simply communicates the status of the transaction set and identifies errors and/or warnings for specific line items.

\* When considering the concept of bi-directional, our proposed datasets are already bi-directional with the Nomination and Scheduled Quantity (both in the 873) going different directions. However, the Nomination Quick Response (in the 874) is a different function than the Nomination or Scheduled Quantity, and therefore, we believe it belongs in a separate transaction set. We are already using both the 873 and 874 for multiple transactions, with all those in the 873 having a similar purpose, and all those in the 874 a similar purpose. We believe these two classes of functionality do not fit well into one document.

**2. Take off "Natural Gas" in DE 346 to make codes more generic. Give consideration to adding these codes to DE 640 instead.**

**5. Evaluate existing beginning segments (BGN, BLS, BCO) instead of creating BNG segment.**

**6. If keeping BNG, use DE 640 instead of 346 and DE 306 instead of 587. Review codes in DEs 640 and 306 for required functionality.**

**8. Data elements 353 & 306 may meet code needs instead of adding codes to DE 587.**

Discussion:

BLS - we do not want to use the BLS because the name and purpose are specific and it is only used in one transaction set. We do not want to use a segment that is used in only one other

transaction set. If we are going to use an existing segment, we would rather use one that is used in multiple transaction sets.

BCO - we do not want to use the BCO because the name and purpose are specific and it is only used in one transaction set. We do not want to use a segment that is used in only one other transaction set. If we are going to use an existing segment, we would rather use one that is used in multiple transaction sets. Also, BCO04 is specified in the semantic notes as a Contract Number. We would not be using this as a contract number

B2A - B2A is frequently not used as the beginning segment. It is used in conjunction with another segment in 8 of the 10 occurrences where the B2A is used. We are concerned about why it is used this way. If we used this segment, we would be using the 346 instead of the 640 (X12J wanted us to use the 640), but we would have to add the 306 and the 127.

BGN - this segment will work for us:

BGN01: 353 is mandatory - that's okay

BGN02: 127 is mandatory - that's okay

BGN03: mandatory date. All our existing noms datasets have a mandatory date in the beginning segment. This is not required per GISB, but it doesn't do any harm to send this date.

BGN04: optional time

Date/Time Options:

1. pick a segment without a date in the BGN, but this may cause problems for people using the ANSI date for business purposes (but, they should request a GISB data element if they need it);
2. we could move the Time Stamp and Statement Date/Time into the BGN, but is there a problem with splitting one GISB data element (datetime) into two ANSI elements (date and time)?
3. we could leave this mandatory date in the BGN as we have in our datasets today and use a DTM in the header for the GISB data elements.

We are picking option 3 at this time to allow for more flexibility, to allow for future growth, and to prevent the business data element of date/time from being split into two elements.

BGN05: optional time code; this would not be used by GISB

BGN06: We need another 127 in the header, we could use BGN06 instead of adding a REF to the header level for future use; if so we would want ANSI to delete the BGN06 semantic note that references a previous transaction; Instead, we will just leave the note alone and leave the REF in the header that we have added; therefore BGN06 will not be used for GISB.

BGN07: 640 - we'll take X12J's suggestion and use the 640 for our purposes instead of the 346. We will add the code values we were previously going to add to 346.

- G1 Natural Gas Nomination
- G2 Natural Gas Request for Confirmation
- G3 Natural Gas Confirmation Response
- Q1 Natural Gas Scheduled Quantity
- Q2 Natural Gas Scheduled Quantity

We will have to modify the code values we were going to add for the 874.

V1 is currently being used. So, we will change our request to:

- V2 Natural Gas Nomination Quick Response
- V3 Natural Gas Confirmation Quick Response
- V4 Natural Gas Pre-determined Allocation Quick Response

BGN08: Only thing we are missing is the 587, but the 306 is here, so we need to look at their suggestion to use the 306 instead of the 587.

“U - Reject” can be used for our “RD - Reject due to header level errors”

“AC - Acknowledge” may be used for our “AE - errors or warnings occurred”

“WQ - Accept” could be used for our “AT - entire transaction accepted”

For the PDA, there is an additional failure related code in the beginning segment, but this doesn't have a GISB data element name and needs to be cleaned up by IR. We will bring this up at the IR meeting in January.

If we still need it, we could use:

“FA - Fail”

### **ACT Response to X12J:**

We liked your suggestion to use data element 640 instead of 346, and 306 instead of 587. We can use current code values in data element 306. For data element 640, we agree with the suggestion to remove the “Natural Gas” language from our code values. So we are changing our request to the following:

data element 640:

G1	Nomination
G2	Request for Confirmation
G3	Confirmation Response
Q1	Scheduled Quantity
Q2	Scheduled Quantity for Operator
V2	Nomination Quick Response
V3	Confirmation Response Quick Response
V4	Pre-determined Allocation Quick Response

By using 640 and 306, we can now use the BGN beginning segment instead of creating our own.

### **9. Is there a code source for the proposed code DR in DE 66?**

Discussion: This is the new code value for DRN. We previously requested DRN for PI, and did not specify a code source since it was not GISB and the existing code source for PI had a lot of detail about PI Grid codes, and was not correct for DRN. Now, since we are no longer using the “Petroleum Information Data Reference Number (DRN)” and since GISB will be the owner of the data in the future, we will note GISB (293) as the code source.

### **ACT Response to X12J:**

Yes, we will modify our code value request slightly and assign GISB as the code source.

We are changing our request to the following:

data element 66:

DR Gas Industry Standards Board Data Reference Number (DRN) (See Code Source 293)

(note: the above code value name was approved by Rae)

### **10. Suggest replacing proposed code CNR in DE98 with existing code R6.**

Discussion: CNR was our chosen code for Confirmation Requester. This was requested along with our other names of Parties within our documents. X12J suggested using “R6 - Requester” instead of adding a new code value, since in the Confirmation related documents, the only Requester would be the Confirmation Requester. We do not want to do this, because as we

continue to develop the datasets we need, we believe we might want to use R6 to specify the Requester in another dataset.  
If they still object, we can agree to use R6 at the X12J meeting.

**ACT Response to X12J:**

We do not want to do this, because as we continue to develop the transaction sets we need, we believe we will need to use R6 to specify the Requester in a transaction set where a party is requesting information. This may be used in one of our Confirmation related transaction sets as well. To avoid confusion with the Confirmation Requester party, we are still requesting CNR for data element 98.

**Additional issue:**

In our current mapping, we have the Contract Number mapped at the Detail level in the REF, with max use of the REF >1. This could be a problem if someone chooses to send more than one Contract number by repeating the REF. This does not follow what the published GISB standard would be, but the structure of the transaction set would not prevent it. It would then become ambiguous as to what Contract Number any sub-detail level data belonged to. X12J was concerned about our allowing this situation to occur.

So, we need to fix the transaction set so that you cannot send more than one Contract Number in a particular Detail section.

We will use the "CS - Contract Summary" to send the main Contract Number.

**CS** Contract Summary - to provide information about a contract; optional, max use 1  
CS01 (367) Contract Number - GISB data element Service Requester Contract; mark as must use for GISB  
CS04 (128) Reference Identification Qualifier- request new qualifier "NMT - Nomination Model Type", mark as must use for GISB  
CS05 (127) Reference Identification - GISB data element Model Type; mark as must use for GISB

We will keep the REF in the 873 for future use. In the 874, the REF may be used if a pending request goes through to add an identifier to the detail level that would be sent in the Nomination and echoed back in the Nomination Quick Response. Will this cause us the same problem in the Nomination Quick Response with multiple REFs? We needed max use for the REF to be >1 in the Nomination for the Contract Number and Model Type. But, if we put the Contract Number in the CS and Model Type in the CS04/CS05 or in the REF, we can limit the REF to max use of 1.

Now, to the issue of starting the Detail loop. X12J did not want us to start the loop with the LX, and X12H had the same suggestion. We might want to start the loop with the DTM.

When moving on to our mapping for the Confirmation Related Datasets, we have a similar problem since the Location is the main item at the detail level, and it too can be sent more than once (same issue as with the Contract Number in the Nomination).

We looked for other segments that we could use for the Location (we looked at all the segments that contained the data element 66 and 67), and the only one that looks like it might work is the "LCD - Place/Location Description". However, the LCD has a mandatory LCD01 element. We would need the LCD01 to be optional for this to work, or we would have to fill it with non-business data. The LCD seems to be perfect, otherwise

(it has data elements 98, 66, 67), but is only used in two datasets. Our other option is to continue to use the N1 for the Location, and risk the same problem in the Confirmation datasets as we had in the Nomination ones with the key elements being able to be sent with more than value within one Detail level.

Proposed Structure:

	Noms/SQ		Conf/SQO	
	Usage	Data Element(s)	Usage	Data Element(s)
DTM	M	dates	M	dates
CS	M	K #, Model Type	BC	Conf K#
REF		not used		not used
LQ		not used	O	Reduction Reason
LCD		not used	M	Conf Location
N1 loop		not used	BC	Conf ID

If we decide to use the LCD for Locations, we would need to be consistent and use it in all places where we communicate Locations and no longer use the N1. The reason we don't like the N1 is because it is listed as a Name segment to be used for Entities (Parties). However, we would have to get the LCD changed so that LCD01 is no longer mandatory.

We will discuss this more at the next meeting.

Back to answering the questions from X12J:

We will consult with Sarita, industry participants, and X12H for the following HL related questions:

3. Evaluate using the HL construct in table 2. (Start table 2 with HL; do not use LX).
4. Add appropriate TS notes to define usage for all the loop levels in the HL hierarchy.
7. Look at BHT as beginning segment. DE 1005 could be used in beginning segment to define the hierarchy to follow. DE 587 or 306 could be added to the BHT segment to explain what types of loops to expect.

**8. Create Plan to Bring all Invoice Related Standards to Year 2000 Compliance**

We will work on this at the first meeting after we get our 4020 books (hopefully January 29). These will be presented at the March EC meeting (there is no February EC meeting) for approval.

**9. Other Business**

none at this time

**10. Next Meeting Date and Location**

January 29, 1999  
Houston

## 10. Adjourn

### Meeting Attendees:

Denise Breeden	Tennessee Gas Pipeline
Kim Van Pelt	Panhandle Eastern
Jim Keisler	Transco
Dennis LaTour	CIG
Andy Sicignano	Enron Capital and Trade Resources

By Conference Call:	
Theresa Hess	Enron