

**GISB Technical Subcommittee
Conference Call
Final Meeting Minutes
November 24, 1998
2:00 - 4:30**

1. Welcome and Introductions

Denise Breeden called the meeting to order. Introductions were made.

2. Anti-Trust Warning

Reviewed by Denise Breeden

3. Adoption of Agenda

Agenda adopted as drafted.

4. Adoption of Meeting Minutes

November 10-11, 1998

Adopted as drafted.

5. Finalize Technical's Proposed Revision to EITF Standard s25

From our last meeting:

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.

Discussion:

When there are significant leading zeros, one of the spreadsheet packages will allow you to specify a format that preserves leading zeros. With the Time field, the leading zero will be lost if it is not specified as Time format. When the fields are properly formatted, there are no quotes in the resulting flat file but the leading zeros are preserved.

Some participants don't like the idea of forcing quotes on numeric fields with leading zeros unless necessary.

However, when these files are uploaded back into a spreadsheet, the spreadsheet application didn't know to not drop the leading zeros.

Neither of these issues is a show-stopper, so we'll leave them as stated in the proposed standard.

Discussion about the column headers in the file being standard abbreviations:

Are we going to assume that all columns are data or are we going to allow comment columns? If the receiver is only checking for the columns they need and ignoring the rest, it would be easy to make a mistake with a period or blank in the column header to make it appear that it is not data. Does every column have to match up? What is done with columns that don't match to expected data for the receiver?

Is there no GISB approved abbreviation for a comment or blank column?
There is currently no provision for comments. Every column needs to be data.

Before the file gets to the pipeline's back-end, there needs to be some assurance that all the fields meant to be data are interpreted as data.

Assumption: Anything less than an exact match results in an error.
This means that no fields can be ignored. If there is a column where the column header is not recognized, then the file should be rejected.

Do we need to modify the following proposed standard to mention non-standard GISB abbreviations?

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.

No changes required. We think non-standard column headers used for Mutually Agreeable data elements added by the pipelines are covered by standards s21 and s48.

Do we see a danger to add elements to the Flat Files that are not in EDI? Could things get out of sync? You would modify your EDI/EDM at the same time you modify your FF/EDM so that for any particular pipeline, the files received via FF/EDM would contain the same data elements as those received via EDI/EDM.

Objections from some participants to the standard that addresses the order of flat files:

Objection that this is not worded correctly to set a standard

Need a definitive order of the data

The pre-processor needed to handle this is going to be very difficult to write, but others feel this is a more simple approach and the programming is not a problem.

Was the task of testing with trading partners discussed? No, it wasn't discussed.

Some participants spoke up that at first their companies didn't like it this approach, but after considering it further, they think it is acceptable.

Would each company have to keep a master list of the abbreviations? Yes. These would be updated via GISB publications and GISB final actions.

The issues and proposed standards that address the order of the flat files will be presented to EII noting that there are still objections to the agreed upon standard language, and that it was voted differently at each meeting depending on who was there. Technical will let those people with concerns hash them out at EII.

GISB mutually agreeable data elements within the flat file: would these need to be recognized by the pipelines/receivers as GISB fields, so that the upload would not be rejected?

Or, would MA fields not used by the receiver be simply ignored? Some participants don't like the idea of ignoring data.

Difference between EDI & FF ignoring MA fields: EDI requires no change, FF requires adding the data element to the list of valid GISB data elements and to recognize that it would be ignored (if we go with the approach to recognize all column headers or reject)

Discuss at our next meeting:

Issue: what data elements does the receiver expect to see in the first row of the flat file?

Only data elements supported by the receiver (whether GISB approved or not)?

Only valid GISB data elements plus any MA specified by that receiver?

Only valid GISB data elements plus any additional MA specified by any receiver?

What is done if the condition is not met? Reject? Ignore additional elements?

Do we need standard language around our resolution?

Need to make sure that Dynegy and National Fuel are able to participate in this meeting since they are the most vocal supporters of the variable order.

Back to s25, this is acceptable with the following modification:

after the Time bullet, add another bullet

- * Date/Time fields should be formatted as YYYYMMDD HH:MM or YYYYMMDD HH:MM:SS when date and time are expressed in one GISB data element.

sense of the room: recommended (6-0)

Modify our previous recommendation as follows (additional text is italicized):

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 *and data types* to meet business requirements.

What about qualifiers for Location Code, for example? We would have different column headers for GISB FF/EDM. Are there other qualifiers that need to be sent? For example, Measurement Basis in the Nomination? Do we need a qualifier for Dekatherms?

Issue to send to EII: All data elements in the EDI files that are not associated with a GISB data element need to be examined to determine if they need to be added to the Flat File data dictionary. Two examples are Acknowledgment Type (BAK02) in the Confirmation Response and Measurement Basis in the Nomination related data sets (indicating Dekatherms, Gigajoules, or Gigacalories).

6. Finalize Bid Upload and Bid Upload Quick Response (R97111), as time permits

Bid Upload

Transaction Set Tables

"NTE Segments (Heading)" table:

For data element "Special Terms and Miscellaneous Notes", change usage from "MA" to "MA1". Add "MA1" note under the Usage section that reads: "Mandatory when the Special Terms and Miscellaneous Notes indicates the terms are in a corresponding NTE segment (REF01 = 'L1'/REF02 = 'NTE')"

X12 Mapping

Sub-detail TD1 Segment (position 490): mark TD102 and TD105 as "Must Use"

Bid Upload Quick Response

Detail PID Segment: add "ANSI definition required" to PID07 in Offer Upload Quick Response for all code values not currently defined by ANSI.

Offer Upload Quick Response:

Detail PID Segment: add "ANSI definition required" to PID07 in Offer Upload Quick Response for all code values not currently defined by ANSI.

sense of the room: recommended (4-0)

7. Other Business

none at this time

8. Next Meeting Date and Location

December 7-8, 1998

Houston, TX

Duke Energy

December 7 - Flat files for half a day

IR requests

9:30 - 4:30 on Monday

9:00 - 4:30 on Tuesday

9. Adjourn

Conference Call Attendees:

Denise Breeden	Tennessee Gas Pipeline
Dennis LaTour	CIG
Andy Sicignano	Enron Capital and Trade
Kim Van Pelt	Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation
Jim Keisler	Transco
Anita Houghton	ANR