

**GISB Technical Subcommittee
Final Meeting Minutes
October 29, 1998
9:00am-1:45pm
October 30, 1998
9:00-4:00pm**

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 amended with the following changes:

- * End the first day of the meeting at 1:45
- * Add at the beginning of the meeting tomorrow: take about 30 minutes to review the purpose and scope of the new datasets that are due at X12 tomorrow.

5. Adoption of Meeting Minutes

October 6-7, 1998

6. Discussion of Flat File format standards/issues and determination of course of action (referral from EIITF)

At the last meeting, we reviewed Proposed Standards from EIITF as of October 2, 1998 to see which ones might apply to Technical's work on Flat Files. Those that we decided might apply are noted in the table below. The text below is updated per the October 16 EIITF meeting. (Note that the d4 listed below may change slightly because FTTF is going to recommend a modification proposed at their October 19 FTTF meeting.)

Standard #	Group and #	Language
4.2.A.ii.a	d4	"GISB FF/EDM" is the term used to describe a standardized flat file computer-to-computer electronic data interchange of information in files as mapped from the x.4.z GISB standards. GISB FF/EDM is communicated between trading partners over the Internet using the GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism.
28	p6	There should generally be a one-to-one relationship between data elements used for EDI and/or flat files and the data displayed on Customer Activities Web pages.
4.3.O	p12	When standardized, all elements used in standard EBB/EDM, EDI/EDM and FF/EDM should be defined in the related GISB x.4.z standard. [An example and note are associated for illustrative purposes and can be found in the minutes.]
51.2	p13	For GISB FF/EDM, the content and usage of flat files should reasonably correspond to the GISB data sets used for GISB EDI/EDM.
5.1.6	p14	If GISB FF/EDM is implemented, flat files should be exchanged via the GISB EDI/EDM site or Customer Activities Web site.

Standard #	Group and #	Language
33	s16	Where they exist for the same business function, flat files and EDI should use the same nomenclature for data set names, data element names, code values and/or code value descriptions, abbreviations and message text. Corresponding Web pages should use data set names, data element names, code value descriptions, abbreviations and message text that correspond to those used in flat files and EDI, where they exist.
4.3.A/L	s21	A Transportation Service Provider which determines to provide new features utilizing existing transaction sets via GISB EBB/EDM, for each transaction upon inception of support for such service, should: If GISB EDI/EDM or FF/EDM standards exist for the transaction set, provide the service via EDI/EDM, or FF/EDM or both, utilizing modifications defined by the Transportation Service Provider to the existing file structures; and, submit a request for modification or enhancement of the transaction set to GISB including details of the interim EBB/EDM, EDI/EDM and/or FF/EDM implementation.
51.1	s25	GISB FF/EDM flat files should be ASCII comma separated value (.csv) format.
51.3	s26	Provisions to provide 'comment' rows within the GISB FF/EDM flat files should be made. These rows should be ignored for processing purposes.
51.4	s27	The order of elements within GISB FF/EDM flat files should be that identified within the standards.
51.8	s28	Each transaction (e.g. nomination) within a GISB FF/EDM flat file should be represented by a single row layout.
53	s30	The industry should use common codes for location points and legal entities when communicating via EDI/EDM, EBB/EDM and/or FF/EDM. The corresponding common code name should also be used in EBB/EDM.

Discussion:

At the last meeting, we completed discussion on all of the above proposed standards except for s25 and s28. A volunteer was going to research CSV file format in reference to s25, but we were unable to get the results of his research and he is not in attendance today.

The following instructions from EII were discussed at the last meeting.

4.2.A.iib:

GISB FF/EDM is transmitted as an ASCII file for a GISB x.4.x standard and is comprised of rows and columns set up with a standard delimiters with GISB Field Names (data elements associated with the GISB x.4.x standards) as the first record in the file. Determine if there should be no requirement imposed by a recipient of a file that the sender provide the file in any particular field order or a particular field size that should not exceed the corresponding ANSI ASC X12 field size.

Vote: AS INSTRUCTIONS ONLY

Send a request to Technical Subcommittee and the Future Technology Task Force and Information Requirements Subcommittee to investigate flat file format and electronic delivery mechanism and those subcommittees should refer to the transcript for pertinent discussion.

For this meeting, below are a list of topics for discussion:

- Comma separated files, or another delimiter?
- Products that can support the format determined?
- Order of elements within the file?
- Comment rows?
- “single data row” concept?

Order of elements within the file?

Testimony for a specified order:

Most of the files that are exchanged between pipelines and customers go from the pipeline to the customer. A customer receiving a different file format from each pipeline is not very friendly to the customer. Mike Novak and others who want the order to be specified by the sender were probably not thinking about it from this point of view...he was probably thinking about it from the point of view of him being the customer sending nomination files.

Actual fields populated will vary from pipeline to pipeline and customer to customer. What has been discussed about this? The feeling was that fields not used would still be sent as empty fields. If all fields must be accounted for, then a fixed order is fine. If only required fields are sent, with the fields sent determined by the header record, then using a fixed or variable order is irrelevant.

Would a fixed order cause a problem with s21? If multiple TSPs added fields that have not yet been approved, presumably at the end of the record, this would create two different formats for these two TSPs.

Perhaps the concept Mike Novak had in mind was to provide something simple for an end user to do using a spreadsheet. However, we are discovering that it is not really that simple, especially when you look at files going the other direction. There is going to have to be programming on both sides to accomplish this. From our investigation, there is going to have to be some type of translation interface to get the files into the format each side wants. Mike probably did not want a customer to have to do macro programming in order to accomplish this.

Using “File Save As” is not going to accomplish this simple spreadsheet idea, but by adding Macro programming this can be accomplished. Delivering Mike’s vision is going to be difficult:

- * all spreadsheets don’t save files in the same way
- * files going both directions will not allow this to work: you can’t have all of the programming on one side (such as the pipeline) and none on the other; otherwise the rules for sending files would be different for each side (receiver and deliverer)

Testimony for a specified order:

To make this really simple, we need to get rid of the header rows and the comment rows and institute a fixed order so that it is simple for both sides.

Discussion about having all mandatory fields at the beginning and mutually agreed at the end. This creates a maintenance problem if we add mandatory fields to the standard. Would these go at the end or within the middle of the file at the end of the mandatory fields? What about having related fields grouped together, such as beginning dates and ending dates, if the ending dates are added to the standard later?

If we do determine that a specified order is needed, this will have to be defined for all x.4.z standards.

Proposed: Alphabetical order within usage type. This is a problem because data elements are not logically grouped together by business use. An ordering that is not grouped logically will be much more difficult for a small customer to use.

Why does it have to be so unsophisticated? Maybe we can assume the use of macros.

Proposed: have a fixed order, and leave it up to the customer to order the file correctly before saving it. Whether they enter the file in the correct order, or enter it in their own order and use a macro to switch the order before saving, or enter it in their own order and drag the columns into the correct order before saving it.

Per s27, we need to define the order.

Options for a fixed order that have been discussed so far:

- Alphabetic order
- Alphabetic within Usage codes
- Ordering loosely based on EII's grouping with initial data elements

Motion:

For each dataset, we will begin with EII's standards regarding ordering and grouping, if any, and then assign an order for any remaining data elements so that the entire row has a specific standardized order.

Sense of the room: recommended unanimously (7-0)

This would mean that data elements that are not used would still be present as an empty field in the file. In the resulting flat file, an empty field should result in two delimiters next to each other. However, the receiving application would need to be aware that sometimes blank spaces could be present in these "empty" fields without the sender realizing that there are blanks in the field and they are not truly empty.

Empty columns in a spreadsheet may cause problems for macro programming. Terry Lehn will investigate this issue.

"single data row" concept?

currently standard s28

Most of the group believes that this is the way to go for the flat files. We definitely don't think it is the most efficient, but if small customers need to be able to use spreadsheets, most of the group believes all the data for a transaction needs to be in one row. The idea is that if customers want to have files structured hierarchically, they should use X12.

"single data row" will reduce macro programming required, but not definitely eliminate it.

Is Technical happy with the s28 standard passed at the October 16 EII meeting?

Each transaction (e.g. nomination) within a GISB FF/EDM flat file should be represented by a single row layout.

We don't think the word "layout" adds any clarity, and in fact, adds confusion. So, Technical will recommend the following change, to remove the word layout.

Motion:

Proposed standard s28: Each transaction (e.g. nomination) within a GISB FF/EDM flat file should be contained in a single row.

Sense of the room: recommended unanimously (8-0)

Further discussion about how a nomination quick response would be handled:

If there are multiple errors/warnings for one nomination, they would be sent with one error/warning per row in the flat file. Each row in the flat file will contain only one error or warning, and will be considered a single transaction. Therefore, you could have multiple nomination quick response transactions corresponding to one nomination transaction.

Comment rows?

Now that we have agreed to the single row concept, how do comment rows fit into this? We don't think they do. Technical believes comment rows should be stripped out before saving the file for transmission.

There are a couple of problems that having comment rows within the flat files will cause. There would be no limit to the number of comments that someone can put in a file. This makes it more difficult to set file-size limits which are aimed at catching improper files (i.e. upload of files saved in a spreadsheet format rather than a flat file text format). In addition, comments within a file make it more difficult to troubleshoot and see what it is about a particular file that is causing problems in someone's system.

If comment rows were sent to the pipeline, certainly the pipeline would have the expertise to ignore comment rows. For files going back to the customer from the pipeline, comment rows probably would not exist, but if they did, they would probably be difficult for the customer to handle.

Another option is to mutually agree to accept comment rows. If we agree that it is to be mutually agreed, would we need a standard to address it? Possibly we would if we wanted to standardize the way in which they are mutually agreed. We would need to have a way to delineate this comment row to separate it from real data. If we had a first column value to specify comments, we would also need a first column value to specify the real data rows.

If the customer wants to have comments, there are ways to use macros to strip them out before sending the files.

With comments included in the file, there is always the danger of real data rows being misinterpreted as comments and ignored. Not all transactions have response documents, so it may not be apparent that the data was ignored.

Motion:

Technical recommends the deletion of standard s26. We will provide the following reasons for eliminating comment rows from the flat files:

1. file size
2. troubleshooting difficulties
3. problem with data being interpreted as a comment and ignored

We believe this feature could be handled by relatively simple macro programming on the customer's end, which would automatically remove the comments before saving the file.

Sense of the room: recommended unanimously (7-0)

Comma separated files, or another delimiter?
Products that can support the format determined?

The last two issues go hand in hand. The choice of delimiters will directly affect the products which will support this implementation.

We will discuss this at our next meeting.

Friday, October 30

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

R98009	Exxon	
R98010	Exxon	
R97111	Transcapacity	(continuation)

R98009 - Exxon on behalf of ACT - Add 'Remit to Party' data element, to header level of Payment Remittance and Statement of Account, as detailed below"

Payment Remittance (3.4.2)

Add new data element "Remit to Party", usage C;

Technical Implementation: map to Header N1 segment loop where Remittance Address is sent within loop (in N3 and N4)

Data Element Xref to X12

Header N1 segment: change "Remittance Address" to "Remit to Party"; change usage from BC to C (in N1 segment only, not in N3 orN4)

X12 Mapping

Header N1 Segment (position 070): N104: change "Remittance Address" to "Remit to Party"

Transaction Set Tables

"N1 Segment (Heading)" table: change "Remittance Address" to "Remit to Party"; change usage from BC1 to C1; under the table, change to BC1 to C1 and change condition to "Mandatory when Remittance Address is sent."

Sense of the room: recommended unanimously (7-0)

Statement of Account (3.4.3)

Add new data element "Remit to Party", usage C;

Technical Implementation: map to Header N1 segment loop where Remittance Address is sent within loop (in N3 and N4)

As we prepared to map this in the Header N1, we noticed that this is the only party in the header of this document, and the Header N1 is Mandatory. Since this data element is C, we cannot map it into the Mandatory Header N1. We will send this request back to IR for them to consider making this data element mandatory.

Sense of the room: recommended unanimously (7-0)

R98010 - Exxon on behalf of ACT - Add 'Payment Remittance Total Amount' data element, to header level of Payment Remittance and modify the definition of 'Paid Amount' in both Payment Remittance and Statement of Account

Payment Remittance (3.4.2)

Add new data element "Payment Remittance Total Amount", usage M;

Technical Implementation: map to Header BPR segment

Data Element Xref to X12

Header BPR segment: add another line above data element "Payment Method Code" as "M Payment Remittance Total Amount"

Sample X12 Transaction

BPR segment: change 0 in BPR02 to 35.01. Resulting BPR will be "BPR*C*35.01*C*CHK"

X12 Mapping

Header BPR (position 020): BPR02: delete element note: "For GISB, send zero"; add note: "Payment Remittance Total Amount"

No changes for data element "Paid Amount"

No changes to Statement of Account

Sense of the room: recommended unanimously (7-0)

6b. Review/Development of purpose and scope for new development X12 work

We need to review the purpose and scope for the two new documents we are submitting to DISA to ensure our purposes are clear and are different for the two documents. The two new documents have been assigned numbers by DISA and new names.

The document we are using for the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity for Operator is:

873 - Commodity Movement Services

Purpose and Scope:

This Draft Standard for Trial Use contains the format and establishes the data contents of the Commodity Movement Services Transaction Set (873) for use within the context of an Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) environment. This standard can be used to convey request and response information for commodity movement services. This transaction is not to be used for product sales or purchases.

The document we are using for the Nomination Quick Response, Confirmation Response Quick Response is:

874 - Commodity Movement Services Validation Response

Purpose and Scope:

This Draft Standard for Trial Use contains the format and establishes the data contents of the Commodity Movement Services Validation Response Transaction Set (874) for use within the context of an Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) environment. This standard can be used to return validation information in response to the Commodity Movement Services Transaction Set (873).

These will be submitted to DISA today on our request forms.

7. Address Current Requests for Initiation or Enhancement of GISB Standards (cont.)

R97111 Transcapacity (continuation)

At the last meeting, we left off after updating the Data Element Xref to X12 for the Offer Upload Notification. We will continue by reviewing the X12 section for all data elements in the Offer Upload Notification, and then on to the Bid Upload and Bid Upload Quick Response.

Offer Upload Notification (5.4.9)

X12 Mapping

Header BQT segment (position 020):

BQT02: Change "UPPD Number" to "Offer Tracking Identifier"

Header NTE Segment (position 030):

NTE01: code value ADD: Change "Not a Stand Alone Offer Terms and Conditions" to "Not a Stand-alone Offer Terms and Conditions"

NTE01: Change "Not a Stand-Alone Offer Terms and Conditions" to "Not a Stand-alone Offer Terms and Conditions"

Header PID Segment (position 190):

PID08: change "Stand-Alone Offer Indicator" to "Stand-alone Offer Indicator"

PID08: for code value N, change to "Offer is not stand-alone. Parties should read the Offeror's Not a Stand-alone Offer Terms and Conditions."

Detail PO1 segment (position 010):

remove Must Use designation on last two elements that are marked as Must Use (i.e. mark as Used)

Detail REF Segment (position 100):

REF02: change "Percentage or Dollar Denominated Bids Indicator" to "Bidder Designation of Bidding Basis"

Detail SAC Segment (position 130):

SAC08: Delete the following data element names from the list:

"Minimum Acceptable Rate", "Minimum Acceptable Percentage of Maximum Rate", "Minimum Acceptable Volumetric Commitment Percentage", "Minimum Acceptable Volumetric Load Factor Percentage"

Detail SDQ Segment (position 190):

SAC08: Delete the following data element names from the list: "Minimum Acceptable Total Volumetric Quantity"; mark the last element pair as Not Used (i.e. probably will be SDQ09 and SDQ10)

cleanup item for separate recommendation:

Detail DTM Segment (position 200):

DTM01: delete the data element names from code value 448 notes

DTM07: replace "/" with a comma ", " to separate the data element names

Transaction Set Tables:

"REF Segments (Heading)" table:

For data element "Recall/Reput Indicator", change usage from "M" to "M1"; add a M1 entry to the Usage section under the table as the first entry as follows: "M1 If the Recall/Reput Indicator is not sent, the value defaults to "NO" (Capacity not recallable)"

For data element Indemnification Clause, change usage from C2 to C1;

For data element Releasing Shipper's Contingency Indicator, change usage from C1 to C2; in "REF03", for code value "Y", change "not used" to "864 [and on next line] "NTE"; in "Description" column after "REF03" column, add "see n1"; add "Notes:" section below Usage section below table, with one entry "n1 This element will contain '864' when the terms are in the corresponding 864 transaction or the element will contain 'NTE' when the terms are in a NTE segment of this transaction."

In the Usage section below the table:

For condition C1, change to "Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the Offer Upload and when provided in the Offer Upload document to which this pertains."

For condition C2, change to “Mandatory when present in the original Offer Upload.”

item for a separate recommendation:

“DTM Segments (Heading)” table:

in “Element Name” column, replace all “/” with “, “ to separate the data element names

“DTM Segments (Heading)” table:

In the Usage section under the table, change C1 to “Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload, or when this document is sent by the transportation service provider and the Biddable Deal Indicator indicates biddable (BQT07 = '03).”

In the Usage section under the table, change C2 to “Mandatory when present in the original Offer Upload.”

“LIN 235/234 Pairs (Heading)” table:

In the Usage section under the table, change C1 to “Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload.”

For data element Replacement Capacity Indicator, change usage from BC to C1.

For data element Replacement Capacity Indicator, for code value 1, change “Description” column to “Bidder may substitute replacement capacity gas transaction points for the gas transaction points originally identified in this offer.”; for code value 2, change “Description” column to “Bid must be based solely on those gas transaction points originally identified in this offer.”

“PO1 235/234 Pairs (Detail)” table:

For data element “Rate Schedule”, change usage from M to C1; add “Usage:” section below table (above Notes section) with the following entry: “C1 Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload or when this document is sent by the transportation service provider.”

For data element “Discount Indicator”:

for code value 1, change “Description” column to: “The rates associated with the capacity being released include rates discounted by the transportation service provider which could result in additional charges **to the replacement shipper** if other than the gas transaction points used to describe this capacity are utilized by the replacement shipper.”

for code value 2, change “Description” column to: “The rates associated with the capacity being released **do not include** rates discounted by the transportation service provider.”

add code value 3 with “Description” column “The rates associated with the capacity being released include rates discounted by the transportation service provider which could result in additional charges **to the releasing shipper** if other than the gas transaction points used to describe this capacity are utilized by the replacement shipper.”

add code value 4 with “Description” column “The rates associated with the capacity being released **include** rates discounted by the transportation service provider. However, the releasing shipper has not specified who would be responsible for any additional charges if other than the gas transaction points used to describe this capacity are utilized by the replacement shipper.”

Rearrange code values and descriptions in table so that the order of the code values is 2, 1, 3, 4.

For data element “Discount Indicator”: delete additional “Note” language in “Element Name” column. (only the “Discount Indicator” should be in this column)

“REF Segments (Detail)” table:

Add “Usage:” label under the table before the C1 note. Change C1 to “Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the Offer Upload and when provided in the Offer Upload document to which this pertains.”

In "Element Name" column, change "Percentage or Dollar Denominated Bids Indicator" to "Bidder Designation of Bidding Basis"; change "REF01" column from "99" to "98"; for code value "A", change "Description" column to "Absolute dollars and cents per unit basis"; for code value "P", change "Description" column to "Percentage of maximum tariff rate"

"SAC Segments (Detail)" table:

Delete the rows for the following data elements:

"Minimum Acceptable Rate", "Minimum Acceptable Percentage of Maximum Rate", "Minimum Acceptable Volumetric Commitment Percentage", "Minimum Acceptable Volumetric Load Factor Percentage"

For data element "Rate Bid", change usage from "C2" to "C1";

For data element "Maximum Rate", change usage from "M" to "C2"

For data element "Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage", change usage from "C4" to "C3"

For data element "Percentage of Maximum Rate Bid", change usage from "C5" to "C1"; move up in table so that the row appears after row for "Rate Bid"

In the Usage section under the table, change "C1" to "Mandatory when present in the original Offer Upload."

change "C2" to "Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload or when this document is sent by the transportation service provider."

change "C3" to "Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload."

delete entries for existing C4 and C5

renumber "C6" to "C4", change "Required" to "Mandatory"

renumber "C7" to "C5", change "Required" to "Mandatory"

In the SAC04 section under the table, for data element "Surcharge Identification Code", change usage from "C6" to "C4"; for data element "Total Surcharges", change usage from "C7" to "C5"

"SDQ 67/380 Pairs (Detail)" table:

In the Usage section under the table, change "C1" to "Mandatory when present and processed in the original Offer Upload."

Delete the row for "Minimum Acceptable Total Volumetric Quantity"

We'll defer changes to the EDI Sample until we look at all the EDI samples at our next meeting.

Offer Download (5.4.1), Offer Upload (5.4.7)

Transaction Set Tables:

"REF Segments (Heading)" table:

For data element "Recall/Reput Indicator", change usage from "M" to "M1"; add a M1 entry to the Usage section under the table as the first entry as follows: "M1 If the Recall/Reput Indicator is not sent, the value defaults to "NO" (Capacity not recallable)"

Award Download (5.4.3)

Transaction Set Tables:

"REF Segments (Heading)" table:

For data element "Recall/Reput Indicator", change usage from "M" to "M1"; add a Usage section under the table with a M1 entry as follows: "M1 If the Recall/Reput Indicator is not sent, the value defaults to "NO" (Capacity not recallable)"

Replacement Capacity (5.4.4)

X12 Mapping:

Detail REF Segment (position 040):

change segment notes to read "For GISB, this segment is mandatory. If this segment is not sent, the Recall/Reput Indicator defaults to "NO" (Capacity not recallable)."

REF03: After "Recall/Reput Terms", skip a blank line and add the note "For GISB, this element is conditional."; continue with existing note on next line.

sense of the room: recommended unanimously (4-0)

Bid Upload (new document)

First, we have to pick a transaction set to map this to.

Offer Upload is in the 840, Offer Upload Quick Response is in the 843

Bid Download is in the 843.

ANSI names:

840 - Request for Quotation

843 - Response to Request for Quotation

We'll map the Bid Upload into the 843 since that is where the Bid Download is, and since both the Bid Download and Bid Upload serve the same purpose (to communicate the terms of the Bid), it's just that one goes to the pipeline and one from the pipeline.

843 - Bid Upload. We'll start with the current mapping of Bid Download per this request (R97111) as a guide, and then map the remaining elements from the Bid Upload.

first, we'll note the segment and element within the segment in which to map the data elements. We'll verify that the ANSI usage does not conflict with the GISB usage.

Later, we'll add the appropriate notes to the segments and elements regarding the usage.

Header

ST - same mapping as in Bid Download

BQR - Stand-alone Bid Indicator

same mapping as in Bid Download, except BQR01 will only have one code value of "00 - Original", and Offer Number will not be mapped here

NTE - Special Terms and Miscellaneous Notes, Not a Stand-alone Bied Terms and Conditions

same mapping as in Bid Download

REF - Bidder Lesser Quantity Indicator, Special Terms and Miscellaneous Notes, Bidder's Contingency Indicator

same mapping as in Bid Download, with the exception that Bid Number is not part of the Bid Upload

DTM - Bidder's Release Term Start Date, Bidder's Release Term End Date

same mapping as in Bid Download (DTM01 = "098")

N1 - Transportation Service Provider, Releaser Company Code, Bidder Affiliate Indicator

same mapping as in Bid Download with the addition of Bidder Company Code (N101 = KD)

PER - Bidder Contact Name (in PER02), Bidder Contact Phone Number (in PER04), Bidder Contact Fax Number and Bidder Contact E-mail Address (PER06)

same mapping for PER01, PER03 and PER05 as in Bid Download

Detail

PO1 - Location/Quantity Type Indicator, Rate Form/Type Code, Reservation Rate Basis

same mapping as in Bid Download

REF - Bidder Designation of Bidding Basis, Surcharge Indicator

same mapping as in Bid Download

SAC - Rate Identification Code, Surcharge Identification Code, Total Surcharges, Minimum Volumetric Commitment Percentage, Rate Bid, Percentage of Maximum Rate Bid

same mapping as in Bid Download

SDQ - Measurement Basis, Bid Quantity - Contract, Bid Minimum Quantity - Contract, Minimum Volumetric Commitment Quantity

same mapping as in Bid Download

DTM - Seasonal Start Date, Seasonal End Date

same mapping as in Bid Download

Sub-detail

N1 - Segment Indicator, Gas Transaction Point 1 Description, Gas Transaction Point 2 Description, Gas Transaction Point 1 Code, Gas Transaction Point 2 Code

same mapping as in Bid Download

TD1 - Bid Quantity - Location, Bid Minimum Quantity - Location

same mapping as in Bid Download

CTT - same mapping as in Bid Download

SE - same mapping as in Bid Download

Now, we'll map the remaining data elements from the Bid Upload

Associated Contract - map to header REF with REF01 = AK

Authorization Code - map to header REF within header N1 loop with REF01 = AU; This will be mapped to the N1 loops for both the Return Addressee and Bidder (as in the Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation)

Bid Tracking Identifier - map to header BQR02

Offer Number - map to header REF, with REF01 = RE (as in the Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation)

Detail Level Identifier - map to detail PO101

Replacement Shipper Contract Number - map to detail REF (REF01 = RK)

Return Addressee Company Code - map to header N1 (N101 = 40)

Return Addressee Contact E-mail Address, Return Addressee Contact Fax Number, Return Addressee Contact Name, Return Addressee Contact Phone Number - map to header PER within header N1 loop for Return Addressee Company Code (same code values in PER as for other contact information)

Bid Upload Quick Response (new document)

We considered using the 824 as in the Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation Quick Response, but there were not any N1s at the sub-detail to use for the Gas Transaction Points, so this document will not work.

So, we'll stick with using the 843 for the Quick Response.

Header

ST - same as in every other document

BQR - Bid Tracking Identifier (BQR02), Transaction Status Code (BQR06); BQR01 = 27

REF - Bid Number (REF02 = BD), Offer Number (REF02 = RE)

PID - Validation Code (PID04), Validation Message (PID05)

N1 - Transportation Service Provider (N101 = SJ)

Detail

PO1 - Detail Level Identifier (PO101)

PID - Validation Code (PID04), Validation Message (PID05), Rate Identification Code (PID07), Surcharge Identification Code (PID07), Total Surcharges (PID07) (mapped as in Offer Upload Quick Response)

Sub-detail

N1 - Segment Indicator (N101), Gas Transaction Point 1 Code (N104), Gas Transaction Point 2 Code (N104) (same mapping as in Offer Upload Quick Reponse)

REF - Validation Code (REF02), Validation Message (REF03)

CTT - same as in every other document

SE - same as in every other document

At the next meeting, we'll do the EDI Sample Transactions, compare our change log to IR's final recommendation for R97111, and we'll review draft EDISIM mappings of the Bid Upload and Bid Upload Quick Response.

8. Other Business

none at this time

9. Next Meeting Date and Location

November 10 - 11, 1998

Houston, TX

Duke Energy

10. Adjourn

Meeting Attendees:		10/29	10/30
Denise Breeden	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	X	X
Kim Van Pelt	Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation	X	X
Jim Keisler	Transco	X	X
Donna Scott	Enron Admin Services Group	X	X
Andy Sicignano	ECT	X	
Terry Lehn	EDS/Enron	X	
Jesse Cline	Panhandle Eastern	X	
Theresa Hess	Enron		X
By Conference Call:			
Dennis LaTour	ANR Pipeline	X	X
Jim Buccigross	TransCapacity		X