

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Transcapacity

Request No.: R97104

1. Recommended Action:

- Accept as requested
- Accept as modified below
- Decline

Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:

- Change to Existing Practice
- Status Quo

2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

Per Request:

- Initiation
- Modification
- Interpretation
- Withdrawal

- Principle (x.1.z)
- Definition (x.2.z)
- Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)
- Document (x.4.z)
- Data Element (x.4.z)
- Code Value (x.4.z)
- X12 Implementation Guide
- Business Process Documentation

Per Recommendation:

- Initiation
- Modification
- Interpretation
- Withdrawal

- Principle (x.1.z)
- Definition (x.2.z)
- Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)
- Document (x.4.z)
- Data Element (x.4.z)
- Code Value (x.4.z)
- X12 Implementation Guide
- Business Process Documentation

3. RECOMMENDATION

STANDARDS LANGUAGE:

Proposed Standard 4.2.x

Testing data sets between trading partners includes testing of:

- a) intended business results,
- b) proposed electronic delivery mechanisms, and
- c) related EDI/EDM and, where supported, FF/EDM implementation issues.

Testing should include enveloping, security, data validity, and standards compliance (e.g. ANSI X12 and GISB EDM Related Standards).

Proposed Standard 4.3.x

When the receiver of:

- 1) a Nomination,
- 2) a Pre-determined Allocation, or,
- 3) a Request for Confirmation,

has determined to change the business rule(s) it will apply to the processing of (and/or response to) one or more of these documents; or, when the sender of:

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Transcapacity

Request No.: R97104

- 1) a Confirmation Response (solicited and unsolicited),
- 2) a Scheduled Quantity,
- 3) a Scheduled Quantity for Operator,
- 4) an Allocation,
- 5) a Shipper Imbalance, or,
- 6) an Invoice

has determined to change the business rule(s) it will apply to the generating of (and/or content within) one or more of these documents, then it should notify its trading partners of same at least two weeks in advance of the change(s). The notification should include identification of the data element(s) that are changing (or whose content is changing), the intended business result of such change(s) in the business rule(s), and the effective date of such change(s).

For the purposes of this standard, a business rule change is any change in:

- a) the presence and/or the acceptable content of a data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice;
- b) a new business response to an accepted data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice;
- c) a new business response to the acceptable content of a data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice; or,
- d) a new intended business result to be communicated to a receiver by the trading partner sending notice;

Absent mutual agreement between the affected trading partners to the contrary, trading partners notifying their sending or receiving trading partners of a change(s) under this standard should provide the means to test such change(s) during at least a two week time period prior to the effective date of the change(s).

Trading partners receiving notice of such change(s) from their trading partner should be prepared not to implement such change(s) even after testing has been completed, as the notifying trading partner is permitted to cancel or postpone such change(s). Notifying trading partners canceling or postponing the effective date of change(s) should provide affected trading partners with notice of cancellation or postponement at least one business day prior to the applicable effective date.

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

The request is to add a new standard to the current GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards. This proposed standard deals with testing, and as such can and should be read in conjunction with existing GISB Standard No. 4.3.14 which reads in part: "The industry should use standard policies and guidelines for testing new data sets."

b. Description of Recommendation:

Business Practices Subcommittee (July 1, 1999)

Proposed Standard:

"Testing of new data sets includes testing of the current and/or future electronic delivery mechanisms including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). Standard policies and guidelines should be developed to test these aspects."

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Transcapacity

Request No.: R97104

While standard 4.1.14 indicates that the industry use standard testing methodology for testing of the GISB standardized datasets, this is only a piece of the overall testing which must take place. TransCapacity believes that this standardized testing methodology should be applied to the underlying communication methodology (Electronic Delivery Mechanisms), security features, and EDI enveloping, as well as to the datasets themselves.

This new standard would apply to testing of the electronic delivery mechanisms and communication procedures. Mere testing of datasets, without the surrounding methods of communication, accomplishes neither the purpose nor spirit of the existing standards. Standardized testing methodologies are clearly beneficial to the goal of a seamless electronic marketplace for natural gas. Participants in the GISB standards initiation and adoption process recognized this in enacting the existing GISB standard No. 4.1.14. However, this standard - as written - is arguably applicable only to the datasets themselves. (Though this is not TransCapacity's view, it can rationalize a reading of the standard in this manner.)

The proposed additional standard language will clarify the issue that standardized testing also applies to the electronic delivery mechanism including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). This will ease implementation for all parties involved and will identify any potential obstacles earlier in the process. Certainly testing has a cost associated with it. However, this testing must be undertaken, and currently is. The only difference is the standardization aspect that this language would add. Therefore, the true incremental cost is marginal, and we believe it will be recovered through a less labor intensive (and smoother) implementation down the line.

Proposed Standard 4.2.x

Testing data sets between trading partners includes testing of intended business results, proposed electronic delivery mechanisms, and, related EDI/EDM and, where supported, FF/EDM implementation issues (i.e., enveloping, security, data validity, and standards compliance (e.g. ANSI X12, and GISB EDM Related Standards)).

Proposed Standard 4.3.x

When the receiver of a Nomination, Predetermined Allocation, or a Request for Confirmation has determined to change the business rules it will apply to the processing of (and/or response to) one or more of these documents, the receiver should notify their sending trading partners of same at least two weeks in advance of the change. The notification should include identification of the data elements that are changing (or whose content is changing), the results (content(s) of response documents) that will change as a result of the change in the business rules and the date of such change.

When the sender of a Confirmation Response (including unsolicited), Scheduled Quantity, Allocation Statement, Operator Scheduled Quantity, Imbalance Statement, or Invoice document has determined to change the business rules, it will apply to the generating of (and/or content within) one or more of these documents, the sender should notify its receiving trading partners of same at least two weeks in advance of the change. The notification should include identification of the data elements that are changing (or whose content is changing), the intended business result of such change in the business rules, and the date of such change.

For the purposes of this standard, a business rule change is any change in:

- a) the conditionality of a data element sent or received (by the trading partner sending notice under this standard);
- b) the acceptable content of a data element (received by receiver sending notice);
- c) a new business response to a previously accepted data element (received by receiver sending notice);

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Transcapacity

Request No.: R97104

- d) a new business response to previously accepted data element content (received by a receiver sending notice); or,
- e) a new intended business result to be communicated to a receiver (by a sender sending notice).

Trading partners notifying their sending or receiving trading partners of a change under this standard should provide the means to test such changes during at least a two week time period prior to the effective date of the change.

Discussion: Mr. Lander described the work paper. Mr. McAnally took over the responsibilities of facilitator for the meeting. In discussion, the proposed standards underwent changes that are reflected as redlines to the work paper. Mr. Young asked for simplifying changes to the proposed standards and to identify transportation service providers. Mr. Aschbrenner noted that the business rules might not always only apply to pipelines, but with GISB definitions, transportation service providers include LDCs. Clarifying changes were made regarding the time period of the availability of the testing environment to the trading partners and the reference to "environment" was removed. Mr. Lander will provide marked up language to the first two paragraphs of 4.3.x.

Action: A new work paper will be provided by Mr. Lander prior to the next meeting, at which time the request will be further discussed and possibly voted.

Business Practices Subcommittee (July 8, 1999)

Mr. Lander explained the provided work paper, which was revised during the meeting:

Proposed Standard 4.2.x

Testing data sets between trading partners includes testing of:

- a) intended business results,
- b) proposed electronic delivery mechanisms, and
- c) related EDI/EDM and, where supported, FF/EDM implementation issues.

Testing should include enveloping, security, data validity, and standards compliance (e.g. ANSI X12 and GISB EDM Related Standards).

Proposed Standard 4.3.x

When the receiver of:

- 1) a Nomination,
- 2) a Predetermined Allocation, or,
- 3) a Request for Confirmation,

has determined to change the business rules it will apply to the processing of (and/or response to) one or more of these documents; or, when the sender of:

- 1) a Confirmation Response (including unsolicited),
- 2) a Scheduled Quantity,
- 3) an Allocation Statement,
- 4) an Operator Scheduled Quantity,
- 5) an Imbalance Statement, or,
- 6) an Invoice document

has determined to change the business rules it will apply to the generating of (and/or content within) one or more of these documents, then it should notify its trading partners of same at least two weeks in advance of the change. The notification should include identification of the data elements that are changing (or whose

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Transcapacity

Request No.: R97104

content is changing), the intended business result of such change in the business rules, and the effective date of such change.

For the purposes of this standard, a business rule change is any change in:

- a) the presence and/or the acceptable content of a data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice;
- b) a new business response to an accepted data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice;
- c) a new business response to the acceptable content of a data element which is received by the trading partner sending notice; or,
- d) a new intended business result to be communicated to a receiver by the trading partner sending notice;

Absent mutual agreement between the affected trading partners to the contrary, trading partners notifying their sending or receiving trading partners of a change under this standard should provide the means to test such changes during at least a two week time period prior to the effective date of the change.

Trading partners receiving notice of such changes from their trading partner should be prepared (even after testing has been completed) to not implement such changes, as the notifying trading partner is permitted to cancel or postpone such change. Notifying trading partners canceling or postponing the effective date of a change should provide affected trading partners with notice of cancellation or postponement at least one business day prior to the applicable effective date.

Discussion:

There were several minor changes made for clarity. There was discussion on whether one business day was sufficient for notice. After discussion, it was not changed. Mr. Lander gave examples of business rule changes that would affect whether a TSP supported certain data elements and data content. He further described the roles of the sender and receiver. This is not intended to apply to the migration from one version of GISB standards to another version, such as from version 1.3 to version 1.4. After further discussion, other changes were made to the list of changes that constitute business rules changes. Mr. Lander explained the intended business result and gave several examples. Again, he reiterated that it would not be applicable to version changes.

Some concern was raised that a two week test period could be construed as lack of response to customer requests or to the need for an immediate implementation. An example was given that a pipeline might want to change its response to no longer send an error message but instead provide a warning message which would be delayed two weeks for implementation based on a requirement of a two week test period. This delay may be avoided through mutual agreement and reasonable communication of expectations between parties. There was discussion on the timing of change implementation and whether the timing of the testing period could imply that a change should be implemented in the middle of the month when it is more appropriate to implement the change at the beginning of the month. It was noted that this request addresses testing, not the effective date of implementation, and it is not the intent that the testing period prescribe the effective date of implementation of the change.

Action:

The discussion will continue with a limit of 15 minutes on the next call after which it will be voted.

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Transcapacity

Request No.: R97104

Business Practices Subcommittee (July 28, 1999)

Proposed Standard:

"Testing of new data sets includes testing of the current and/or future electronic delivery mechanisms including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). Standard policies and guidelines should be developed to test these aspects."

While standard 4.1.14 indicates that the industry use standard testing methodology for testing of the GISB standardized datasets, this is only a piece of the overall testing which must take place. TransCapacity believes that this standardized testing methodology should be applied to the underlying communication methodology (Electronic Delivery Mechanisms), security features, and EDI enveloping, as well as to the datasets themselves.

This new standard would apply to testing of the electronic delivery mechanisms and communication procedures. Mere testing of datasets, without the surrounding methods of communication, accomplishes neither the purpose nor spirit of the existing standards. Standardized testing methodologies are clearly beneficial to the goal of a seamless electronic marketplace for natural gas. Participants in the GISB standards initiation and adoption process recognized this in enacting the existing GISB standard No. 4.1.14. However, this standard - as written - is arguably applicable only to the datasets themselves. (Though this is not TransCapacity's view, it can rationalize a reading of the standard in this manner.)

The proposed additional standard language will clarify the issue that standardized testing also applies to the electronic delivery mechanism including related EDI implementation issues (i.e., enveloping and security). This will ease implementation for all parties involved and will identify any potential obstacles earlier in the process. Certainly testing has a cost associated with it. However, this testing must be undertaken, and currently is. The only difference is the standardization aspect that this language would add. Therefore, the true incremental cost is marginal, and we believe it will be recovered through a less labor intensive (and smoother) implementation down the line.

Work Paper¹: The group reviewed and proposed changes to the proposed standards below (carryover from July 8 meeting minutes):

Proposed Standard 4.2.x

Testing data sets between trading partners includes testing of:

- a) intended business results,
- b) proposed electronic delivery mechanisms, and
- c) related EDI/EDM and, where supported, FF/EDM implementation issues.

Testing should include enveloping, security, data validity, and standards compliance (e.g. ANSI X12 and GISB EDM Related Standards).

Proposed Standard 4.3.x

When the receiver of:

- 1) a Nomination,
- 2) a Pre-determined Allocation, or,
- 3) a Request for Confirmation,

¹ The work paper is revised with changes supported by the submitter during the discussion on the work paper.

