1. PROPOSED PROJECT TEAM/STUDY NAME

Enhancing PIDX Field Ticket Response Schema (v1.61)

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PIDX would like to explorer enhancing the field ticket response schema to adapt to the newer application programming interfaces (often referred to as "API") architecture that provides developers with programmatic access to a proprietary software application or web service.

3. DESCRIPTION

PURPOSE	The purpose of this project is to update the PIDX field ticket response schema to accommodate current technology enhancements in workflow messages.
SCOPE	- The scope is limited to field ticket workflow submission messages so that we can understand the technical challenges, risks, and potential solutions to the wider PIDX standards. - Identify technical and business gaps that exist in the current PIDX field ticket messaging schema. - The scope will also include reviewing existing PIDX users who have implemented similar workflow field ticket message solutions. - Map process for routing evaluation (what level of approvals, approvers, checks needed) - Map process for routing evaluation (what level of approvals, approvers, checks needed) - Identify process/flows for costing information entry, price/rate validations, SAP Service Entry Sheet creation - Identify process/flows for sending back messages to submitter
GOALS	Update field ticket submission workflow messages for these categories: a. Field Ticket Service Requests-add status codes, i.e. receive, supplier acceptance, confirmation of services, etc. b. Field Ticket Rejection- add status codes, i.e. operator coding error, unit of measurement, invalid field personnel id, incorrect pricing, etc. c. Field Ticket Acceptance or Acknowledgment, i.e. Status code - Date Accepted d. Field Ticket Approval, i.e. Status Code - Date Approved

PROJECT TEAM PROPOSAL
Approved December 24, 2018

DELIVERABLES	• Additional Workflow messages to field ticket response schema • Lessons learned from enhancing message responses architecture • Findings from other members or partners that have executed similar workflow messages, successfully or unsuccessfully.

Identify how the proposed deliverables / specification relates to existing or under development deliverables/specifications. Identify how these will relate to each other.

Existing Standards	New Standards/Deliverables
FieldTicketResponse.xsd	Existing standard (FieldTicketResponse.xsd) will be updated with additional response messages.
FieldTicket.xsd	Existing standard

Identify the integral sets of specifications that will be created or modified by the proposed work effort. (See 8.0 Initial Contributions)

Identify the expected useful life of the proposed deliverables / specification, e.g. estimated retirement dates or circumstances.

- The useful life of field ticket messages will be determine based on risks and gaps identified in this project.

BACKGROUND

Identify how this work is specific to the energy industry and to the primary area of focus for PIDX. Identify other sources for aspects of the required solution that are not industry specific.

- *The enhancements to the workflow message field ticket schema pairs well with the movement towards more mobile friendly technology devices, i.e. tablets, smart phones, and integrating with Blockchain technology.*

Identify the solutions that currently exist in the proposal. Identify competing technologies/solutions.

- *Current solutions in this area include legacy solutions, and marketplace cloud proprietary platforms. The goal of PIDX is to drive field ticket message workflow approval standards for the industry. We don't believe the proprietary platforms are long-term viable solutions.*

Identify other organizations that are doing similar work. Identify what they are doing and why additional work is needed. Identify how the proposed work effort will coordinate with related work efforts.

- We believe that there are PIDX members that have incorporated similar workflow messages. One of the goals of this project is to investigate them further, capture lessons learns, and any best practices that have been developed.

Identify the industry organizations/groups who want this deliverable/specification.

- We are currently working with Baker Hughes, a GE Company (BHGE), Cortex, Oildex, SAP, Spira, ConocoPhillips, Ondiflo, Amalto, Microsoft, LiquidFrameworks, Frontline Group and ConsenSys on this specification.

Identify all the stakeholders of which you are aware.

- Baker Hughes, a GE Company (BHGE), Cortex, Oildex, SAP, Spira, ConocoPhillips, Ondiflo, Amalto, MicroSoft, LiquidFrameworks, and ConsenSys on this specification.

Identify the stakeholders who are willing to join the work effort. (See Sponsor & Participants)

- BHGE, Cortex, SAP, Spira, ConocoPhillips, Ondiflo, Amalto, LiquidFrameworks, and Consensys have confirmed that they are willing to join the work effort within PIDX.

PROPOSAL

The proposal includes mapping enhancements to the PIDX Field Ticket Response schema.

The goal of the project is to understand how current PIDX architecture would map, both technical and business process, and identify gaps or challenges that are encountered.

The project team is also expected to canvas the PIDX community for similar workflow messages and capture lessons learned and best practices.

4. BENEFITS

Key Benefits include:

Updates to field ticket message schema will accommodate technology messages trends standards and applications, i.e. mobile devices, supplier marketplace portals, IoT sensors, open API's, etc.

5. SPONSORS AND PARTICIPANTS

PIDX member/company sponsoring development of these specifications/this project:

Member	Company
James Thompson	ConocoPhillips
Marc Battistello	BHGE
Chris Lambert	Cortex

The following PIDX members/companies are participants in the development of these specifications:

Member	Company
James Thompson	ConocoPhillips
Chris Lambert	Cortex

Mail distribution list required?	No
Please provide the name of the mail distribution list:	NA

6. DELIVERABLE SCHEDULE

To be determine base on resources.

7. ANTICIPATED COMPLETION DATE

February 28, 2019

8. INITIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Document Name	Type of Document	Document Source
FieldTicketResponse.xsd	Field Ticket Schema v1.61	PIDX

9. PIDX RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

Minute taking	0
Facilitation	0
List other activities	0

TBD – This depends on the technical contact to lead this effort.

Assume the 'typical' amount of time commitment for a 3 month-long effort with weekly meetings.

Planned activity	Number per month	Number of months	Duration (hrs)	PIDX Time (hrs)
Conference calls	4	3	1	1
Face to face meetings	0	0	0	0

Total PIDX staff time required for this project.	

10. SPONSORING MEMBER/WORK GROUP/SUBCOMMITTEE

This specification has been submitted by James Thompson, ConocoPhillips on behalf of the Business Processes Work Group/Sub-Committee.

The chair of this Work Group/ Sub-Committee has reviewed this submission for completeness and understands this particular Work Group/ Sub-Committee is the Sponsoring Work Group/SIG, responsible for the communication process. This does not mean the Chair or Work Group/SIG is approving the actual work or its inclusion in any specification.

Chair Approval: Marc Battistello, Baker Hughes
Date: December 7, 2018

11. PIDX EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Upon review by the PIDX Executive Committee, this Project Team Proposal (PTP) is:

✓ Approved

____ Denied

____Requires additional information

If "Denied" or "Requires additional information, please provide details:

_____
_____

December 24, 2018
Date