

Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions or
Request for Enhancement of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Page 2

R98003

Gas Industry Standards Board

Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

or

Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions

Date of Request: January 27, 1998

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Enron Capital & Trade Resources Corporation
1400 Smith Street
Houston, Texas 77002
Attn: Donna L. Scott, EB2522B

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name :	Donna L. Scott	Name :	Diane Biegel
Title :	Director Electronic Commerce	Title :	EDI Coordinator
Phone :	713.853.6136	Phone:	713.583.3216
Fax :	713.646.8827	Fax :	713.646.4799
E-mail :	dscott2@ect.enron.com	E-mail:	dbiegel@enron.com

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

The current GISB Transportation Invoice provides quantities that are used in the computation of each amount by charge type within point and contract. The quantity is repeated for each charge type (e.g., ACA, GRI, Commodity) with the rate in order to calculate the amount.

The current Sample Paper Transaction in the GISB Implementation Guide for the Invoice shows the gas Quantity, Unit Price and Amount Due for each line item.

For the line item level, the sample shows the following:

<u>Line</u>	<u>Location Code</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Amount Due</u>
001	R11111111	150	.1234	\$18.51
002	D11111111	100	.1234	\$12.34
003	D22222222	50	.1234	<u>\$ 6.16</u>
				\$37.01

The GISB X12 mapping of the Invoice parallels this example. The mapping also includes the data element Charge Type, which is a MA data element. The Charge Type is mapped such that there can be only one Charge Type per line item.

Under the current standard, the quantity cannot be accumulated to compute the total quantity for a point and contract. The current standard only provides the invoice recipient the quantity used for calculation purposes; there is no discrete element that provides the quantity of gas delivered/received.

ECT proposes that the Transportation Invoice be revised in one of the following ways:
 Method 1: The Transportation Invoice should use the ITA12 element in the ITA segment to send the quantity that may be accumulated by the shipper to arrive at a total quantity for a point within a contract. The ITA12 field is a real number quantity element that could be used to communicate the quantity that should be accumulated by the Shipper. I recommend that this be a mandatory field. The quantity currently being sent in the IT102 remains as the quantity used for the basis for the dollar amount calculation.
 Method 2: Create a new ITA segment and map the charge type, price tier and a new data element Charge Type Rate to this lower level of detail; these would be mandatory data elements.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

Method 2: In actual practice, many TSP invoices show the Unit Price for each line item, and also show as detail for that Unit Price the various Charge Types and their associated prices, as follows:

<u>Line</u>	<u>Location Code</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Amount Due</u>
001	R11111111	150	.1234	\$18.51
	<u>Charge Type</u>	<u>Charge Type Rate</u>		
	ACA	.0019		
	GRI	.0088		
	Transport	.1127		
002	D11111111	100	.1234	\$12.34
	GRI	.0088		
	Transport	.1146		
003	D22222222	50	.1234	\$ 6.16
	ACA	.0019		
	Transport	.1215		
				\$37.01

Since multiple Charge Types can make up one Unit Price at the line item level, it seems that the Charge Type, and the rate associated with it, need to be mapped at a lower level of detail than the line item level. By allowing all of the Charge Types to be presented for each line item, the mapping would parallel the presentation that is now current practice for many TSP's.

Note that in the course of this analysis, we have uncovered a data element that seems to have been left out of the data dictionary, which is the Charge Type Rate; this is the rate that applies to the detail charge. The Charge Type Rate is typically presented on paper invoices with the Charge Type, as shown in the "Current Practice" example above.

In addition, we have moved the data element Price Tier to the new lower level. This allows the volume to be priced at different rates for different quantities. If, for example, the first 100 dekatherms were price at \$0.05 and the remaining quantity were priced at \$0.04, there would be two charge detail records sent as follows:

<u>Charge Type</u>	<u>Charge Type Rate</u>	<u>Price Tier</u>
Transport	.05	100
Transport	.04	<i>blank</i>

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

Adding this level of detail will allow Shippers the ability to verify quantities and rates within the Transportation Invoice. It also will provide the necessary information to reconcile the monthly activity for payments without the aid of a paper invoice from the TSP. Overall, the current manual efforts to reconcile the invoiced quantities should decrease, streamlining the settlement process for both the Transporter and Shipper.

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

Implementing this recommended change entails minor changes to the Transporter Invoicing system and the Transporter EDI map.

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations: N/A

8. If this Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standard or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts): N/A

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

Method 1 is currently being used by Northern Natural Gas Company, Transwestern Pipeline Company and Florida Gas Transmission.

10. Attachments (such as : further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

Attachment - Suggested Mapping Approach for Method 1

010	HL	Hierarchical Level - Line Detail
020	LX	Line Number
030	SI	Service Code Location Indicator Charge Indicator (R/D) Adjustment Type Package ID Replacement Release Code Associated Contract
180	ITA	Amount Due * Quantity
210	IT1	**Quantity Unit Price
340	N1	Delivery Location
340	N1	Receipt Location
340	N1	Delivery Zone
340	N1	Receipt Zone
340	N1	Replacement Party Identifier

*The Quantity provided in the ITA*12 is conditional and populated only if this Quantity is to be included in the total quantity for this point. The ITA*12 Quantity is not provided if the Quantity is not to be used to sum to the total quantity for this point.

**The IT1 Quantity is always provided as currently the practice which allows the Quantity x Price = ITA Amount Due.

Attachment - Suggested Mapping Approach for Method 2

010	HL	Hierarchical Level - Line Detail		
020	LX	Line Number		
030	SI	Service Code Location Indicator Charge Indicator (R/D) Adjustment Type Package ID Replacement Release Code Associated Contract		
180	ITA	Amount Due		
210	IT1	Quantity Unit Price		
310	ITA	Charge Type Rate	(ITA06)	(New Segment)
		Price Tier	(ITA12)	(business conditional)
		Charge Type	(ITA13)	
340	N1	Delivery Location		
340	N1	Receipt Location		
340	N1	Delivery Zone		
340	N1	Receipt Zone		
340	N1	Replacement Party Identifier		