R97080

Gas Industry Standards Board
Request for Initiation of Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

TransCapacity Limited Partnership
83 Pine Street, Suite 101
West Peabody, MA 01960
Phone: (508) 535-7500
Facsimile: (508) 535-7744
E-mail: LEGALJB@TCAPSERV.COM

2. Contact Information:

Jim Buccigross, Legal Counsel
Gregory M. Lander, President

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

The request is to add two new data elements to the Confirmation Response document and one data element to the Operator Scheduled Quantity Document. The first data element proposed to be added to the Confirmation Response Document would be called the 'Confirmation Provider's Tracking ID'; the other would be called 'Unsolicited Confirmation Response Indicator'. The data element proposed to be added to the Operator Scheduled Quantity Document ("OSQ")would be called the Confirmation Providers Tracking ID.

In the Confirmation Response Document, the Confirmation Provider's Tracking ID would be provided by the confirmation responder (confirming party) in those cases where the confirming party was sending an "unsolicited" Confirmation Response to the party which had previously (or typically) sent the Request to Confirm. (i.e., a Confirmation Response ("CR") was sent that was <u>not</u> in response to a Request to Confirm ("RTC")). This data element would be conditional based on the fact of this CR being unsolicited. The fact that a CR was an Unsolicited CR would be determined by the value in the Unsolicited Confirmation Response Indicator being "Y(es)". (A technical alternative could be to have the default be "N(o)" and only provide the indicator at all when it was an Unsolicited Confirmation Response.)

In the case where the indicator showed that this was an Unsolicited CR, the Confirmation Provider's Tracking ID would be supplied. It would be an identifier much like the current Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number, except it would only be used in the case of an Unsolicited CR and would be available for use in the Operator Scheduled Quantity to enable the confirming party to track its unsolicited CR line items into the OSQ.

In the Operator Scheduled Quantity Document, the Confirmation Provider's Tracking ID would be provided by the confirmation requester (party sending the OSQ) in those cases where the

confirming party had sent an "unsolicited" Confirmation Response to the party which had previously (or typically) sent the Request to Confirm. This data element would be conditional based on the fact of this line item value having come from (being derived from not necessarily the same value as) the value presented in the Unsolicited CR.

4. Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

As described above, this data element and corresponding indicator would be used in those cases where unsolicited CR's are sent. With the proposed indicator, it could be mapped to the same EDI segment and element where the current Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is mapped in the CR, except of course, it would be the Confirmation *Provider's* Tracking ID.

This is necessary as there would be no original Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number in the case of an Unsolicited CR since there would be no Request to Confirm (and therefore no Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number) to match either the CR or the OSQ back to.

5. Description of Any Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

As noted, in the case of an Unsolicited CR, there would be no corresponding Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number for the confirmation, nor is there an indicator noting for the receiver that the incoming document is an Unsolicited CR. This would result in an ambiguous situation in the case of Unsolicited CR's, first as to whether the CR is in fact Unsolicited, or secondly, simply lacking a tracking number. (Note that the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is mandatory for EDI only and is not required to be present on the EBBs.)

The indicator will allow the receiver of the CR to know definitively that this is an unsolicited CR. The addition of the Confirmation Provider's Tracking ID will then act as an ID for the confirmation, much like the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number functions in the traditional Request/Response confirmation process.

An additional benefit is that the indicator would allow the confirming party to mix solicited and unsolicited confirmations in the same CR document.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Any costs associated with this proposed additional code are minimal.   The request does not propose to increase the volume of data sent, and requires only a small amount of additional processing on the confirmation requester's and confirming party's part. Minor re-mapping of the Confirmation Response is required, but this is a one-time cost. We believe the elimination of ambiguity and additional identification of the type of CR far outweighs the minor costs.

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

None.

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement

TransCapacity is willing and able to undertake testing with any party regarding this proposal.

Contact is: Mike Coombs, Product Leader
     TransCapacity Limited Partnership
     83 Pine Street, Suite 101
     West Peabody, MA 01960
     Phone: (508) 535-7500
     Facsimile: (508) 535-7744

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners:

Not applicable.

10. Attachments

None.