

**GISB Technical Subcommittee
Final Meeting Minutes
CMS Energy
January 19, 2000**

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 modified to defer adoption of meeting minutes until after item #6.

5. Adoption of Meeting Minutes

November 30, 1999 - deferred until after item #6 and then until a future meeting

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

R97071 - TransCapacity - add new standards to EDM regarding parties contained in ISA and N1 segments

proposed standard from BPS:

"The sender of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and receivers should accept, the ISA Sender ID in the EDI envelope specified by the sender. The receiver of an ISA to IEA EDI X12 envelope should specify, and senders should support sending of, the ISA Receiver ID in the EDI envelope specified by the receiver. The IDs associated with the applicable sending or receiving party may differ from the IDs of the entity(ies) identified between the ST and SE segments of the transmission."

proposed changes from Technical:

In the "Related Standards" section of the EDI Implementation Guides:

In the "ISA contents" section, second paragraph, third sentence:

The Interchange Sender ID/Interchange Receiver ID is ~~published~~ **specified** by both the sender and receiver, **respectively**, for other parties to use as the sender/receiver ID to route data to them.

In the "Party Roles" section of the EDI Implementation Guides:

First paragraph:

In all of the transaction sets, there are multiple parties that may be involved in the transaction. There are, **for example**, the Transportation Service Provider (a.k.a. Pipeline or Transporter), the Service Requester (a.k.a. Shipper), Service Requester Agent (a.k.a. Shipper's Agent) and Third Party Service Provider (a.k.a. Third Party Agent). It is important to distinguish between the role of the Service Requester Agent and the Third Party Service Provider.

[the modifications to this last paragraph will wait until we discuss with FTTF]:

In EDI implementation, the party that is authorized to send and receive transactions will be the party identified in the transmission envelope (ISA Header Segment). If the sending party is a Service Requester, Service Requester Agent or Third

Party Service Provider, their appropriate identifiers will appear here. In all cases, the Transportation Service Provider, Service Requester and Service Requester Agent (if applicable) will be identified in the body of the transaction (N1 Name Segment).

Discussion regarding changes to the last paragraph:

Different parties involved in a transaction:

Internet 3rd Party communication
3rd party provider
Service Requester Agent
Service Requester

Different levels of parties within an X12 EDI transaction:

HTTP - internet 3rd party? 3rd party provider?
ISA - 3rd -party provider?
N1 - EDI Trading Partner? SR agent (or SR if no agent)

Who is the "Sender" (as specified in the new standard), who is the "party authorized to send" (as specified in the above language from Party Roles section)? Is this the same as the "Sender" specified in the HTTP?

We will ask to be put on FTF's agenda for their Feb 15 meeting to discuss this issue jointly between FTF and Technical. We will consider modifications to the last paragraph in the Party Roles section at their meeting.

sense of the room for changes already proposed: recommended (5-0)

R98042 - Duke Energy - add data elements to Scheduled Quantity

already handled by a previous request (R98057)
No Technical changes needed

sense of the room: recommended (5-0)

R98089 - ANR Pipeline - add code values to Transaction Status Code in the Confirmation Response and add a new data element Validation Code with new code values

Confirmation Response (1.4.4)

Data Element Xref to X12:

add a new PID segment after the BAK segment as follows: PID C Validation Code

Sample X12:

no changes needed

X12 Mapping:

Header BAK segment (position 020);

BAK02: add code value "RD" with code value note "The entire transaction was rejected due to header level errors."

add new segment Header PID (position 190): add segment note: "For GISB, this segment is conditional. It should be sent when BAK02 = 'RD'."

PID01: mark as Must Use; code value "S"

PID02: mark as not used

PID03: mark as Must Use: code value "AP"

PID04: mark as Must Use: add note "Validation Code"; skip a blank line and then add note "Refer to "Errors and Warnings (Heading)" table for usage and values."

PID05 - PID09 (end): mark as not used

Transaction Set Tables:

Add new table "Errors and Warnings (Heading)" as the first table in the Transaction Set Tables section with the following two columns: "Validation Code (PID04)" and "Description"; add the following code values and code value descriptions to the table:

- ERRFC100 - Invalid Confirming Party
- ERRFC101 - Missing Confirming Party
- ERRFC102 - Invalid Confirmation Requester
- ERRFC103 - Missing Confirmation Requester
- ERRFC104 - Missing Transaction Identifier

sense of the room: recommended (5-0)

R98055 - TransCapacity - add a code value to "Transaction Type" data element in some Nominations, Flowing Gas and Invoicing documents.

new Transaction Type:

Flow Day Diversion - assign new code value of "56"

Nomination (1.4.1), Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5), Pre-determined Allocation (2.4.1), Allocation (2.4.3)

Transaction Set Tables:

"SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)" table: For data element Transaction Type, add following code value and code value description in numerical order by code value: 56 - Flow Day Diversion

Shipper Imbalance (2.4.4)

Transaction Set Tables:

"SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-sub-detail)" table: For data element Transaction Type, add following code value and code value description in numerical order by code value: 56 - Flow Day Diversion

Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1)

Transaction Set Tables:

"SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail - HL03 = '9')" table: For data element Transaction Type, add following code value and code value description in numerical order by code value: 56 - Flow Day Diversion

sense of the room: recommended (5-0)

R96007/R96008 - TransCapacity - add two new documents

(This recommendation is still in progress by IR, but we will begin preliminary work)

For all new datasets from this point on that come to us as requests, we will implement new datasets in an ANSI compliant fashion in the latest or most appropriate X12 version, rather than continue to develop new datasets in X12 version 3040. This will prevent us from having to do duplicate work for the same datasets as we move all datasets to be ANSI compliant. This will also prevent companies from having to implement the same dataset twice.

Summary of requirements for a transaction set that would meet our needs:

Header:

- Request ID
- Party identifiers
- Contract
- Location

Detail:

- Code indicating data set requested
- Dates
- code indicating allocation transaction type

After briefly reviewing all the transaction sets in the X12 book, the following transaction sets need more analysis to see if they might work:

- 219 - Logistics Service Request
- 242 - Data Status Tracking
- 511 - Requisition
- 814 - General Request, Response or Confirmation
- 840 - Request for Quotation
- 869 - Order Status Inquiry

219 - Logistics Service Request - This set can be used by a shipper to transmit data to a logistics related organization to provide order detail relevant to upcoming transportation requirements.

* There is no N1 segment or other segment in the Header to communicate the party information. Therefore, this transaction set will not work.

242 - Data Status Tracking - This management transaction set is the vehicle by which the transmission status information is conveyed by a service request handler to the interchange sender, interchange receiver, or both; it can be used to provide status information regarding interchange as it flows from an interchange sender through one or more service request handlers to an interchange receiver during its transmission cycle. It can be used by the interchange sender or interchange receiver to request from a service request handler ad hoc or periodic reports containing status information regarding interchanges.

* - There is no Table 2 in this transaction, and although the Header level contains an HL loop that could be used to generate the detail level, it contains only a single N1 segment, therefore the HL or STS loop would need to be repeated for each party in the header. This does not fit well with our requirements. Therefore, this transaction set will not work.

511 - Requisition - This transaction set can be used to requisition needed material and equipment from a supply distribution system for immediate consumption or stockage against projected requirements. The originator can also use this transaction set to amend or terminate the original requisition. This transaction set may be used to convey a description and quantity of the required material, delivery and billing information, and other logistics information necessary to evaluate and meet the material needs of the originator. This transaction set is not used to establish a contractual relationship between trading partners, and may precede the use of a purchase order.

* There is an N1 loop in the header that could communicate the parties, the contract and request id could go in the BR beginning segment. The Detail contains segments for codes and dates, but not really anything appropriate for the Location. If do not find anything else, we may consider requesting a LCD segment to be added.

814 - General Request, Response or Confirmation - This standard can be used to request actions to be performed, to respond to a request for actions to be performed or to confirm information related to actions performed.

* There is an N1 loop in the header for the party information; there is a REF that could be used for the Contract and the Request ID could go in the BGN segment; there is no place in the header to put a Location other than the N1 loop. In the Detail, there is a DTM segment for the dates, but there really no place for the code values except the REF segment, which is not the best fit.

840 - Request for Quotation - The transaction set can be used to provide potential buyers with the ability to solicit price, delivery schedule, and other items from potential sellers of goods and services.

* N1 loop in the header for the party information; plenty of segments for the Contract and Request ID, but no place for the Location other than the N1.

The detail has a DTM segment for the dates, but no perfect places for the code values.

Also, the BQT segment is mandatory in the header and has several mandatory elements that we would not use.

Due to the other transaction sets that might work, this one is not worth considering further.

846 - Inventory/Inquiry Advice - The transaction set can be used in the following ways: (1) for a seller of goods and services to provide inventory information to a prospective purchaser, with no obligation to the purchaser to acquire these goods or services; (2) for a representative of a seller of goods and services to supply inventory information to that seller; (3) for one location to supply another location with inventory information; and (4) for an inquiry as to the availability of inventory with no obligation on the seller of goods and services to reserve that inventory.

* The header has an N1 loop and REF segments, but no place for the Location.

The detail has a DTM segment and a LQ segment that can be used for the code values.

At this time, we realized that the header/detail layout of the new data dictionaries may not be the best design for the requirements specified by BPS, so we have crafted the following questions to send back to IR:

Questions for IR:

1. Should more than one code value for Data Sets Requested be allowed in a single Request For Information transaction? In other words, can both an Allocation and Shipper Imbalance be requested in a single Request For Information transaction?

2. Should more than one combination of Service Requester/Service Requester Contract and the requested date range be allowed in a single Request For Information transaction? Should more than one combination of Statement Recipient ID/Location and the requested date range be allowed in a single Request For Information transaction?

3. Since the BPS instructions state that a party is permitted to request one or all locations for a particular date range, should the Statement Recipient ID/Location be at the same level as the date range? The current layout of header and detail in the data dictionary implies that multiple date ranges can be requested for a single location. Since the BPS instructions state that a party is permitted to request one or all contracts for a particular date range, should the Service Requester/Service Requester Contract be at the same level as the date range? The current layout of header and detail in the data dictionary implies that multiple date ranges can be requested for a single contract.

We will send these questions to IR and adjourn our meeting at the end of the first day. We do not want to do any more work on these new transaction sets until we get some resolution from IR.

The approval of prior meeting minutes will be deferred until the next meeting or an interim conference call.

9. Other Business

none at this time

10. Next Meeting Date and Location

Technical Subcommittee

February 22-23, 2000

Houston

ACT

January 28, 2000

Houston

CMS Energy

11. Adjourn

Attendees:

Denise Breeden	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	01/19 X
Kim Van Pelt	CMS Trunkline Gas Company	X
Jim Keisler	Williams Gas Pipeline	X
Andy Sicignano	Enron North America	X
Theresa Hess	Enron - Transwestern	X