

**GISB Technical Subcommittee
Duke Energy
Final Meeting Minutes
November 10 - 11, 1998**

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

October 29-30, 1998

Adopted as amended. See GISB home page for final version.

At the last meeting, when we recommended the deletion of standard s26, we listed three reasons why we did not think comment rows were a good idea. We want to add one more reason.

4. difficulty for customers to receive comment rows

Following is the new motion of what will be recommended to EII.

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
4. difficulty for customers to receive comment rows

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 to add reason number 4: recommended (10-0)

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

At the last meeting, we completed discussion on the following topics:

- Order of elements within the file?
- Comment rows?
- "single data row" concept?

The following topics were not completely addressed, so we will discuss these today:

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

Before discussing the delimiter issue, some meeting participants wanted to go back to discuss the order of the data elements within the file.

Discussion of Order:

Purpose of what we are trying to accomplish (Mike Novak): from pipeline to customer, a standard order makes sense. We have to think about who the small customer is. Small customer is usually only dealing with one or two pipelines and may have a separate spreadsheet or page within a spreadsheet for each pipeline. These are customers trying to enter a bunch of noms at the same time, but not trying to communicate computer to computer electronically.

Don't make it overly complex by looking at every possibility (for both delimiters and order).

Mike proposes letting the order be TSP specific. He says that even if a customer has multiple TSPs, it wouldn't be that difficult to have different file formats for each pipeline.

Pete Whatley thinks that if we define standard file formats, then GISB will have a lot of work to maintain these formats as the GISB standards change. He thinks we should stick with the instructions from EII and have a header row that defines the content and order of the fields. This will have to be programmed once for the TSP to pull the fields out of the file and put them in the correct order for the TSP, but then no maintenance will be required to this process except when new fields are added that the pipeline wants to use. Pete believes his approach is very simple, but standardizing the order would be very complex.

This is not really a "format", but a "format methodology". Mike believes a strict file format has its place, but this is not it.

Question: why did EII send this to Technical if they had already figured out how they wanted it done?
EII sent this to Technical to ensure that there are no problems with this suggestion from a technical perspective. An acceptable response from Technical would be to do nothing, seeing that we have not found any technical problems with this method (although some members of Technical don't think it is the best method).

We referenced d4, p12 and p13 in crafting the following language.

Motion:

(for Technical to support this as a proposed standard to send to EII)
For a GISB FF/EDM flat file, the first record of the file should be comprised of the standard abbreviations for GISB data elements in the order in which the corresponding data is to appear in all subsequent records. The data element order is at the option of the sender.

sense of the room: recommended (9 in favor, 0 opposed, 4 abstentions)

At our last meeting, we proposed a change to standard s28:
Each transaction (e.g. nomination) within a GISB FF/EDM flat file should be contained in a single row.

We will modify this to be in the same sentence structure as other GISB EII standards.

Motion:

For GISB FF/EDM flat files, each transaction (e.g. nomination) should be contained in a single row.

Sense of the room: recommended unanimously (12-0)

Recommendation:

In response to the following instructions from EII regarding field size (part of 4.2.A.iib):
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.

The Technical Subcommittee recommends that a particular field size for GISB FF/EDM should not exceed the corresponding ANSI ASC X12 field size. However, since these field lengths are defined by X12 and not by GISB, we also recommend that GISB define standard data element field lengths to meet business requirements.

sense of the room: recommended unanimously (13-0)

Comma separated files, or another delimiter?

Products that can support the format determined?

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

At our October 6 meeting, we looked at the proposed standard s25: "GISB FF/EDM flat files should be ASCII comma separated value (.csv) format." We did some testing with spreadsheet programs and suggested a modification to the standard:

GISB standard flat files should be formatted as ASCII comma separated value (CSV) files. This means that fields within the file are separated by commas. If a field contains a comma or a double-quote, the field is surrounded by double-quotes. If a double-quote exists within the field, an additional double-quote should be present immediately after each double-quote within the field.

Other items to note:

For numeric data containing a decimal, a decimal is required to be sent in the flat file (note that this decimal is not always required in X12 EDI depending on the ANSI type of X12 element)

Any negative numbers will need to have the negative sign preceding the number.

We then decided to do further research into this issue outside of the meeting.

At our October 6-8 meeting, we determined that all spreadsheets do not import/export CSV files in the same manner.

Quotes around commas (the delimiters) or quotes within the data are handled differently by different spreadsheets.

Have we considered tabs instead of commas?

Tabs are much less likely to appear in data fields than commas, but they are somewhat of a concern because they are invisible in the resulting flat file. In addition, tabs within a field are difficult to identify.

It seems that macro programming is going to have to be used for some cases, regardless of the delimiter chosen.

The two spreadsheet products tested both upload files with commas as delimiters and text fields (or fields containing a comma) enclosed in double-quotes correctly. The issue we discovered at our previous meeting was a problem with double-double quotes (i.e. "").

What about the idea of restricting data from containing double-quotes?

current s25: GISB FF/EDM flat files should be ASCII comma separated value (.csv) format.

Motion:

Proposed revision to standard s25:

GISB FF/EDM flat files should be formatted as ASCII comma separated value (CSV) files. This means:

- * Rows are separated by a carriage return/line feed (CRLF).
- * Fields are separated by commas.
- * When a field contains a comma, the field should be enclosed by double-quotes.
- * Double-quotes should not be used within any data field.
- * When numeric data is negative, the minus sign should precede the number.
- * When numeric data contains decimal precision, the decimal point should be included within the field.
- * When a numeric field contains one or more significant leading zeros, the field should be enclosed by double-quotes.
- * Date fields should be formatted as YYYYMMDD.
- * Time fields should be specified in a 24 hour format, formatted as HH:MM or HH:MM:SS, as applicable.
- * The maximum amount of data to be placed in a field should be limited to 256 characters.

We will all take this back and check it out at our offices. This will be finalized at a conference call scheduled before the EII December meeting.

sense of the room: recommended (9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention)

Motion:

Modification to standard previously approved to change “record” to “row” for consistency:
For a GISB FF/EDM flat file, the first row of the file should be comprised of the standard abbreviations for GISB data elements in the order in which the corresponding data is to appear in all subsequent rows. The data element order is at the option of the sender.

sense of the room: no opposition to this change

Motion:

recommend clarification of s27

“The order of elements within GISB FF/EDM flat files should be that identified within the standards.”

The phrase “within the standards” needs to be clarified. How does this standard work in conjunction with the new and revised standards proposed by Technical?

sense of the room: recommended (10-0)

Wednesday, November 11

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

R97111

Transcapacity

(continuation)

At the last meeting, we completed the initial review of all datasets and created a draft mapping of the Bid Upload and Bid Upload Quick Response.

At this meeting, we will complete the mapping of the Bid Upload and Bid Upload Quick Response, update the Sample EDI Transactions for all the datasets, and do a final review of the changes we have made compared to the Final Data Dictionaries passed to Technical from IR.

Bid Upload (new document) - abbreviation BDUP

review and update of draft X12 mapping

creation of Data Element Xref to X12, Transaction Set Tables, and Sample ASC X12 Transaction based on Paper Sample from IR

Please see attachments to the minutes posted on GISB home page for the results of these updates and the final draft Bid Upload

Suggestion for IR:

In the IR paper sample for Bid Upload, the mandatory data element "Bidder Lesser Quantity Indicator" needs to be added with a value of No, and the line for "Bid Minimum Quantity - Contract" needs to be deleted. If IR doesn't make this change, we will still leave our Sample EDI as if they had because the example paper has the Lesser Quantity equal to the Bid Quantity, which really implies that the Bidder Lesser Quantity Indicator is No. However, this results in the Minimum Quantity existing in the paper sample and not in the EDI sample, and the Mandatory data element Bidder Lesser Quantity Indicator is missing, so it would probably cause less confusion if they make the change as stated above.

sense of the room: recommended unanimously (3-0)

Bid Upload Quick Response (new document) - abbreviation BDQR

Transaction Status Code

New data element that needs new code values. This X12 element is 379, but there are not enough code values listed in the X12 book for our needs. We already made up our own code values for this data element in the Offer Upload Quick Response, so we will make up the following code values for the Bid Upload:

UA	Request passed edits. Bid Upload accepted.
UW	Request passed edits. Bid Upload accepted with warnings.
UR	Request did not pass edits. Bid Upload not accepted.

creation of Data Element Xref to X12, Transaction Set Tables, and Sample ASC X12 Transaction based on Paper Sample from IR

Errors and Warnings:

We will assign the code values in order on IR's document

Header level errors: EBDQR100 - EBDQR142

Header level warnings: WBDQR100 - WBDQR118

Detail level errors: EBDQR300 - EBDQR341
Detail level warnings: WBDQR300 - WBDQR302
Sub-detail level errors: EBDQR500 - EBDQR510
Sub-detail level warnings: WBDQR500 - WBDQR502

plus EBDQR999 and WBDQR999 at every level

We'll also add the following X12-only related errors, all with a definition of [no definition necessary.]:

Header:

EBDQR143 Invalid identification code qualifier (N103)

Detail:

EBDQR342 Invalid product/service id qualifier (PO1, 235 element)

EBDQR343 Invalid service, promotion, allowance, or charge information (SAC01/SAC13)

EBDQR344 Invalid identification code (SDQ, 67 element)

Sub-detail:

EBDQR511 Invalid identification code qualifier (N103)

Please see attachments to the minutes posted on GISB home page for the results of these updates and the final draft Bid Upload Quick Response.

sense of the room: recommended unanimously (3-0)

Update of Sample ASC X12 Transactions based on changes to Paper Samples by IR

Offer Upload (5.4.7)

Sample ASC X12 Transaction

For BQT line, in BQT02, change "UPPD00001" to "OFFTRK001" for Offer Tracking Identifier

For LIN line, add an additional pair to the end of the line as follows for Prearranged Deal Indicator: "**SH*1" so that resulting line is "LIN**SV*2*SH*1"

After the "REF*99*A" line, add another REF segment as follows for Bidder Designation of Bidding Basis: "REF*98*A"

For PO1 line, add an additional pair to the end of the line as follows for Reservation Rate Basis: "**F5*MO"

Increase the SE01 count by 1. SE01 should be 29

Transaction Set Tables:

cleanup item:

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

For data element "Maximum Offer Quantity - Contract", in "Elem 67" column, change "MQ" to "MO" (this was inadvertently changed from version 1.2 to 1.3)

Offer Upload Quick Response (5.4.8)

Sample ASC X12 Transaction

For BQR line, in BQR02, change "UPPD00001" to "OFFTRK001" for Offer Tracking Identifier

Offer Upload Notification (5.4.9)

Sample ASC X12 Transaction

For the PER line, add to the end "*FX*583-693-5542" for Releaser Contact Fax Number

For BQT line, in BQT02, change "UPPD00001" to "OFFTRK001" for Offer Tracking Identifier

For PO1 line, add an additional pair to the end of the line as follows for Reservation Rate Basis:
"*F5*MO"

For the REF line, where "REF*99*A", change REF02 from "99" to "98" for Bidder Designation of Bidding Basis

Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation (5.4.10)

Sample ASC X12 Transaction

For BQR line, in BQR02, change "UPPD00001" to "OFFTRK001" for Offer Tracking Identifier

Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation Quick Response (5.4.11)

Sample ASC X12 Transaction

For BGN line, in BGN02, change "UPPD00001" to "OFFTRK001" for Offer Tracking Identifier

Offer Upload Final Disposition (5.4.12)

Sample ASC X12 Transaction

For BC line in both examples, in BC04, change "UPPD00001" to "OFFTRK001" for Offer Tracking Identifier

sense of the room: recommended (3-0)

Review of Final Data Dictionaries and code values passed to Technical from IR to ensure that our work based on the final drafts was complete.

Bid Download (5.4.2)

Transaction Set Tables

"SAC Segments (Detail)" table:

In the SAC04 section under the table, for data element "Surcharge Identification Code", for code value description "GRI Demand", change the code value from "RI" to "GRI"

Note/Special Instruction (5.4.17)

Data Element Xref to X12

Add another N1 segment for Bidder Company Code after the last header N1 as follows:

"N1 C Bidder Company Code"

No other changes noted.

sense of the room: recommended (3-0)

8. Other Business

none at this time

9. Next Meeting Date and Location

Conference Call for Flat Files finalization:

November 30, 1998

tentatively 2:00

December 7-8, 1998

Houston, TX

Duke Energy

10. Adjourn

Meeting Attendees:

		11/9	11/10
Denise Breedon	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	X	X
Kim Van Pelt	Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation	X	X
Dennis LaTour	CIG	X	X
Pete Hollyer	Altra Energy	X	X
Theresa Hess	Enron	X	X
Jim Keisler	Transco	X	
Andy Sicignano	Enron Capital and Trade	X	
Ed Przywara	ANR Pipeline	X	
Pete Whatley	Dynegy Marketing and Trade	X	
Elena Ilina	Dynegy Inc.	X	
By Conference Call:			
Joe Kardas	National Fuel Supply	X	
Mike Novak	National Fuel Distribution	X	
Terry Lehn	EDS/Enron	X	