Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925
HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

January 2, 1997

TO: Executive Committee (EC) and Alternates, Posting on the GISB home page for interested industry participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: **COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES FOR VOTE BY THE EC ON JANUARY9, 1997**

Attached please find the commentary on the requests to be voted on on January 9. The commentary includes a one line description of the original request, a brief description of the recommendation from the appropriate task force or EC appointee to the EC, and a brief summary of the comments received. The full text of the request can be found on the home page and were included in the EC materials from previous meetings (November 5 and December 10, 1996), the recommendations have been posted on the home page for more than one month for your review and have been included in the EC materials from previous meetings (November 5 and December 10, 1996), and the full text of the comments are posted for your review where they were received electronically.

As a result of the extensions of the comment periods, comments were received from four companies regarding the requests and recommendations that were out for comment due on December 18 and December 27:

Koch Gateway, abbreviated KOCH
Noram, abbreviated NES
TransCapacity, abbreviated TCAP
Williams Interstate Natural Gas Systems, abbreviated WINGS

These comments are included in their entirety, where possible, in the commentary. Comments that were received prior to the November 5 and December 10 meetings regarding the requests that will be voted on on January 9 were made available in paper form to each EC member and alternate voting prior to those meetings, and were also posted on the home page. As such they are not included in the commentary.

Koch Gateway offered comments in support of R96010, R96040, R96051, R96052, R96053, R96055, R96057 and R96063; and recommended changes in their comments to R96054. We were unable to electronically merge the files at the time this commentary was prepared, but the full text of the comments will be scanned and available for review from the home page -- and a summary was provided in the commentary. TransCapacity offered comments on one request that was not up for vote and a such is not included in this commentary -- R96028. Similarly, Noram offered comments on R96026 and R96059, also requests not included on the ballot for January 9 action. The comments will not included in the commentary, and are within the company comments that can be accessed from the home page. If these requests were mistakenly omitted from the ballot for January 9 action or from the requests for comments that were extended to December 18 and December 27, we could find no reference for them. The proposed standards that are to be voted on were defined in the Executive Committee meeting on December 10 in New York.

Please notify the GISB office if you need further information on the proposed standards, in your preparation to vote. I look forward to seeing you on January 9.

cc: Laurie Paulson, Media Relations Firm
Posting on the GISB Home Page

Gas Industry Standards Board

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MATERIALS FOR JANUARY 9, 1997

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED STANDARD CHANGES

R96005 Develop standards for Gas Metered Volume Statements

Recommendation : The transaction was approved by the Market Settlement Task Force as to Data Elements only. The usage codes were not approved by the Task Force due to time limitations and agreed to allow a subgroup to review the usage codes for applicability prior to submission.
The measured volume audit statement data dictionary is not included here, as comments requesting changes present a red-lined version.

Comments: KOCH:

Business Names

The data elements: *Meter Operator, Upstream Party and Downstream Party* are identified with an asterisk ("*") and footnoted as Common Codes. The *PI Data Ref. Number (DRN)* should also be noted as a Common Code.

Definitions

The *Business Period* data item is defined as a "current or prior period indicator." What are the expected values for this indicator?

The definition of the last data item listed, *Static Pressure Indicator*, specifies that "Gauge starts at zero and absolute starts at 14.4 psi." KGPC requests that this to be stated as "Gauge starts at zero and absolute starts at 14.7 psi."

Usage / Conditions

KGPC requests that the *Minimum Static Pressure Range* (M) usage be changed to Sender's Option (SO).

KGPC requests that the *Flow Period* (M) usage be changed to Conditional (C), based on meter type (i.e. to be provided only for orifice type meters).

The *Flow Rate* (C) data item specifies flow rate used only for EFM orifice meters. Does this mean that Flow Rate is "mandatory" for EFM orifice meters? KGPC requests that the *Flow Rate* (C) usage be changed to Sender's Option (SO).

KGPC requests that the *Pressure Factor* (BC) usage be changed to Conditional (C), based on meter type (i.e. to be provided only for positive type meters).

KGPC requests that *Date/Time On* (C) and *Date/Time Off* (C) usage be changed to Sender's Option (SO).

What are the specific requirements for reporting the *Component* data items (C1 through C6)?

KGPC requests that the data element format (field length and attributes) for the data items listed in this proposal be identified and made available.

NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

TCAP: In general, TransCapacity favors the new dataset. However, many edits are necessary for the definitions to be clearer, and unambiguous. In addition, we suggest changes to the usage codes for several of the data elements. Finally, as there is no standard in the "Book"

referring to this statement, and because this statement was offered in part as the solution to TransCapacity's request for the addition of one data element, “Reporting Pressure Base”, to the Measurement Statement (a mandatory dataset), we recommend that standards (proposed below) be adopted that will make the status of this dataset clear to all.

TransCapacity proposes two new companion standards for this dataset.

1. “All measuring parties should support the sending of the Measured Volume Audit Statement.

2. “Consistent with other standards where the obligation to send can be relieved by the receiving party, determination as to whether trading partners will use the Measured Volume Audit Statement dataset should be made by the receiving party.”

The following table is a reproduction of the recommendation. It contains proposed Amendments to the Definitions, Changes in Usage, Added Data Elements, Proposed Data Element Deletions. Amendments, Changes, and Adds are **bolded and underlined** while Deletes are ~~struck through~~.

Measured Volume Audit statement Data Dictionary

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
1	Statement Type	Specifies the statement as original, ~~change~~ replacement or advance notification.	M	
2	Statement Date/Time	Date and time statement was produced	M	
3	Beginning Flow Date/time	The data and time **at** ~~on~~ which ~~the~~ **this** measurement **was started.** ~~was taken~~	M	
4	Ending Flow Date/Time	Date and time at which ~~the~~ **this** measurement ended	M	
5	Meter Operator*	The party contractually responsible for the measurement of gas at **this** ~~a~~ meter	M	
6	Meter ID	The **meter** Operator's ID ~~number~~ for the measurement device being reported	M	Proprietary meter number
7	Device Station **ID** ~~Number~~	The station ~~number assigned~~ **ID of the station** to **which** this **meter** device **is associated.** ~~by the operator~~	M	
8	Upstream Party*	Identifies the party from whom gas is flowing	~~SO~~ **M**	
9	Downstream Party*	Identifies the party to whom gas is flowing	~~SO~~ **M**	
10	Contact Person	The name ~~and telephone number~~ of the contact for questions regarding the reported measurement information	M	

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
11	**Contact Phone**	**The telephone number associated with the Contact Person. For questions regarding the reported measurement information.**	**M**	
12	Physical Meter Effective Date	The effective date of physical meter information	M	
13	Measured Quantity	The quantity as measured in ~~MMBTU's~~ **Dth's.**	M	
14	Business Period	Current or prior period indicator	M	Default is Current
15	Tube Inside Diameter	The inside diameter measurement of the tube	C	Conditional on meter type
16	Maximum Static Pressure Range	Specifies the maximum value of the static pressure range	M	
17	Minimum Static Pressure Range	Specifies the minimum value of the static pressure range	M	
18	Maximum Differential Pressure	Specifies the maximum value of the differential pressure	C	Used only for orifice meters. Conditional on meter type
19	Orifice Diameter	Measurement of the diameter of the orifice plate.	C	Conditional on meter type
20	Chart Revolution Time	Specifies the chart revolution time for this metering device	C	Conditional on meter type **being equal to "orifice-chart", or, "time-driven positive displacement - chart"**
21	Reporting Pressure Base	Pressure base used in reporting volume in MCF's	M	Default is 14.73
22	Reporting Temperature	Temperature used to report volume if different from actual temperature.	C	Used only if different than actual temperature. Conditional on temperature ~~(31)~~
23	Temperature Range Maximum	The maximum temperature range for the recorder.	~~SO~~ **C**	**Conditional upon the existence of the data pertaining to this meter. If the meter has a maximum temperature, then this information is supplied in this data element.**

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
24	Temperature Range Minimum	The minimum temperature range for the recorder	~~SO~~ **C**	**Conditional upon the existence of the data pertaining to this meter. If the meter has a minimum temperature, then this information is supplied in this data element.**
25	Atmospheric Pressure	The site atmospheric pressure measurement	~~SO~~ **C**	**Conditional upon the existence of the data pertaining to this meter. If the meter has an atmospheric pressure measuring device, then this information is supplied in this data element.**
~~26~~	~~Flow Period~~	~~The length of time flow~~	~~M~~	
27	Tap Location	The location of the meter tap. Locations are upstream or downstream.	C	Used for orifice meters only. Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice- chart" or "orifice - EFM".**.
28	**Quality Indicator**	**Indicates that gas quality information is provided**	**BC**	**The receiver of the Metered Volume Measurement Statement may require that the measuring party provide gas quality information. This is especially the case where measurement is in Dth. Where so required by the receiver of the Metered Volume Audit Statement, this data element is present and the value is equal to "yes".**
29	Component Percentage	The percentage of a component of gas	~~SO~~ **C**	**Conditional upon Quality Indicator = yes**

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
30	Heating Factor	Quality information for measurement in **Dth.** ~~MMBTU~~ **The Btu per cubic foot of gas at the specific gravity, temperature and static pressure specified herein.**	~~BC~~ **C**	**Conditional upon Quality Indicator equal to "yes".** Mandatory for measurement in Dekatherms. **As the receiver of this Measured Volume Audit Statement can require that the Measuring Party send to them quantity information in Dth units, the presence of this data element is conditioned on the business practices of the receiver of this statement.**
31	Specific Gravity	The ratio of the weight of a given volume of a substance at **the** ~~a~~ given temperature to the weight of an equal volume of a standard substance at the same temperature.	M	
32	Temperature	The temperature of the gas flow **during the flow period.**	SO	
33	Static Pressure	The static pressure (PSIA) for the meter during the flow period	C	Conditional on meter type **equal to "time-driven positive displacement - chart", "time-driven positive displacement - EFM", or "flow-driven positive displacement"**
34	Differential Pressure	The differential pressure for the meter during the flow period	C	Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice - chart" or "orifice - EFM"**
35	Tap Type	Identifies the tap as flange or pipe	C	Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice - chart" or "orifice - EFM"**. Tap types are flange and pipe
36	Meter Status	Identifies the meter as active, removed, or on standby	M	Default is active.

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
37	Number Dials	Specifies the number of dials for a positive **displacement** meter	C	Used for positive **displacement** meters only. Conditional on meter type.
38	Volume Cycle	Identifies the volume cycle for a positive **displacement** meter	C	Used for positive **displacement** meters only. Conditional on meter type.
39	Chromatograph	Specifies the source of gas quality information. (Sample device is Chromatograph)	C	Used only when quality information is provided. **Quality Indicator equal to = yes.** Conditional on sample device.
40	Volume	The quantity of gas expressed in MCF.	M	
41	Flow Rate	The flow rate **for an** EFM orifice meter.	C	Used only for EFM orifice meters. Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice-EFM"**.
42	Coefficient	Provides coefficient factor	C	Not used for **orifice -** EFM ~~orifice~~ or positive **displacement - EFM** meters. Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice -chart", "time-driven positive displacement - chart", or "flow-driven positive displacement"**.
43	Integrated Differential	Provides the integrated differential	C	Not used for **orifice -** EFM ~~orifice~~ or positive **displacement - EFM** meters. Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice -chart", "time-driven positive displacement - chart", or "flow-driven positive displacement"**.

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
44	Index Differential	Provides the indexed differential	C	Not used for **orifice -** EFM ~~orifice~~ or positive **displacement - EFM** meters. Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice -chart", "time-driven positive displacement - chart", or "flow-driven positive displacement"**.
45	Pressure Factor	Specifies the pressure factor for positive **displacement** meter measurement.	~~BC~~ **C**	Used for positive **displacement** meters only.
46	Sample Type	Specifies the sample as spot or accumulated	C	**Conditional based upon Quality Indicator equal to yes.** Used only when quality information is provided. **Further c**~~C~~onditional on sample device **equal to "bottle" or "inline"**.
47	Gas Analysis Effective Date	Specifies the date the gas quality information was determined	~~BC~~ **C**	Mandatory when quality information is **required to be** provided. **Conditional upon Quality Indicator equal to "yes".**
48	Date/Time On	Specifies the date and time for which measurement began	C	Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice - chart" or "time-driven** - chart**"**
49	Date/Time Off	Specifies the date and time for which measurement ended	C	Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice - chart" or "time-driven** - chart**"**
50	Component	Identifies the gas component being reported	~~BC~~ **C**	Mandatory when quality information is **required to be** provided. **Conditional upon Quality Indicator equal to "yes".**
51	Meter Type	Identifies the type of meter being used.	M	

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
52	PI Data Ref. Number	Nominatable point as defined in the PI Data Reference Number Database	~~SO~~ **M**	**The PI equivalent of the measuring party's proprietary code for the nominatable point (location) (logical or physical) to which this meter location is associated.**
53	Machine Constant	Conversion factor for scanners or analyzers	C	Conditional on meter type **equal to "orifice - chart" or "time-driven** - chart**"**
54	Sample Device	Type of equipment used for sampling	M	
55	Static Pressure Indicator	Indicates the starting point for measuring Static pressure. Gauge starts at zero and absolute starts at 14.4 PSI	M	Default is PSIA.

Row 1: Removal of the word "change" makes the status consistent with the treatment of nominations which are all originals and must be replaced to be changed.

Row 2: Editorial and clarifying. A beginning time is not a time when something was taken, it is a time when something was started.

Row 5: Editorial and clarifying. Referring to this measurement makes the reference unambiguous.

Row 6: Editorial and clarifying. Specifies which operator (meter operator), and, clarifies that the Operator may have an ID that is other than numeric.

Row 7: Editorial and clarifying. Same as with Row 6, the ID may be alpha or alpha-numeric. In addition makes clear that the station contains the meter.

Row 8: The change in usage status is necessary so that the parties can unambiguously process the incoming information without reference to external data files which would add unnecessary ambiguity. Senders option in this case adds only ambiguity and no "options" are truly created.

Row 9: Same explanation as with Row 8.

Row 10: One data element should not refer to two entirely different things.

Row 11: Added data element supports the removal of "phone" from the contact person data element.

Row 13: Editorial and clarifying. Intended to make this reference consistent with the rest of the standards which are in Dth.

Row 20: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 22: Editorial and clarifying. Removes the "(31)" as this is a number with no meaning in the conditionality portion of the data dictionary.

Row 23: The change in usage status is necessary so that the parties can unambiguously process the incoming information without reference to external data files which would add unnecessary ambiguity. Senders option in this case adds only ambiguity and no "options" are truly created.

Row 24: The change in usage status is necessary so that the parties can unambiguously process the incoming information without reference to external data files which would add unnecessary ambiguity. Senders option in this case adds only ambiguity and no "options" are truly created.

Row 25: The change in usage status is necessary so that the parties can unambiguously process the incoming information without reference to external data files which would add unnecessary ambiguity. Senders option in this case adds only ambiguity and no "options" are truly created.

Row 26: Eliminated because the length of time can be derived from the "Beginning and Ending Date-times". Definition is ambiguous and conflicts with the two cited data elements.

Row 27: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 28: Added Data element necessary to clarify the conditionality of the various quality and heating factor types of data. Presently there is no data element which makes clear the "BC" nature of Heating Factor, Pressure Factor, Gas Analysis Effective Date, Component, and Component Percentage. This data Element, which is "BC" then makes clear what other data elements are provided.

Row 29: Conforming change to clarify the conditionality of this data element upon the presence of the "Quality Indicator" equal to "yes".

Row 30: The change to the definition is editorial and clarifying in nature. The change to the usage code is to conform to the addition of the "Quality Indicator" data element and this data element's dependency upon that data element's value. The change to the conditionality is explanatory in nature.

Row 31: Editorial and clarifying in nature. Specifies that the "temperature is the temperature not just any unspecified temperature.

Row 32: Editorial and clarifying in nature. Specifies that the temperature was that during the flow period, not just any temperature.

Row 33: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 34: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 35: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 37: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 38: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 39: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 41: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 42: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 43: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 44: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 45: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 46: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguities as to when supplied, (i.e., conditional upon Quality Indicator equal to “yes”) and further conditional upon the existence of a bottle type or in-line sample.

Row 47: Conforming change to the addition of the “Quality Indicator” data element

Row 48: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 49: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

Row 50: Conforming change to the addition of the “Quality Indicator” data element

Row 52: Usage status changed to make this dataset consistent with the other standards which are intended to use the PI DRN. If the meter itself does not have a DRN because the meter itself is not nominatable, it is nonetheless recording flow which is part of aggregating a quantity which is associated with quantities which are associated with a nominatable location.

Row 53: Editorial and clarifying. Removes ambiguity as to which type of meter it is conditional upon.

R96006 Modify nominations standards to incorporate granting firm shippers the ability to nominate outside the primary contract path

Recommendation : When a shipper submits a nomination using an alternate receipt and/or delivery point, the nomination must also identify the primary receipt/delivery point for which the nominated point is an alternate. The Maximum Daily Receipt Quantity/Maximum Daily Delivery Quantity assigned to the primary point is associated with the alternate point. Revisions need to the existing data sets are: appropriate error/warning messages will be added to the Quick Response.

Nominations - DATA DICTIONARY REQUEST # R96006 PROPOSED REVISIONS

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Associated Capacity Delivery Location *	The contractual location used to validate the capacity rights nominated at the Delivery Location.	BC	**Used by Transportation Service Providers who require Service Requesters to specify the primary location where capacity rights exist when nominating a delivery at a secondary location.**
Associated Capacity Receipt Location *	The contractual location used to validate the capacity rights nominated at the Receipt Location.	BC	Used by Transportation Service Providers who require Service Requesters to specify the primary location where capacity rights exist when nominating a receipt at a secondary location.

CODE VALUES REQUEST # R96006 PROPOSED REVISIONS Quick Response --

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Validation Code	M (C)	Invalid Associated Capacity Receipt Location	
Validation Code	M (C)	Invalid Associated Capacity Receipt Location	
Validation Code	M (C)	Invalid Associated Capacity Delivery Location	
Validation Code	M (C)	Missing Associated Capacity Delivery Location	
Validation Code	M (C)	Associated Capacity Receipt Location Not Processed	
Validation Code	M (C)	Associated Capacity Delivery Location Not Processed	

Comments: NES: NES does NOT support recommendation. This modification is unnecessary since the information requested would duplicate information already in a pipeline's internal contract system. The contact system information can be cross-referenced by the nomination system when a nomination contains the related service's contract number added under proposed modification R96057.

TCAP:

TCAP Recommendation: 1) Change the business practice giving rise to the request as worded.

Associated Capacity Receipt Location and Associated Capacity Delivery Location data elements are not needed by enough people in the industry and complicate the dataset. The business requirement should be eliminated as inconsistent with segmentation of capacity rights. Implicit in this request for standard is the requirement by the pipeline (which requirement creates a restriction upon the shipper) the effect of which is to frustrate or eliminate segmentation of a shipper's capacity rights.

The FERC has said that there should be nothing to prevent a shipper from segmenting their rights. The request states that the shipper must give up MDQ at the primary point when shifting to the secondary point and that the shipper. Implicit in this is that the shipper can only use their MDTQ equal to MDQ. This is contrary to the whole principle of segmentation. In addition, by requiring the shipper to identify the point where their primary rights are being given up, the pipeline is defeating the purpose of secondary rights.

If on the other hand, the pipeline is allowing shippers to designate primary capacity “on the fly” and retain other secondary capacity within their path rights, then, the pipeline can accomplish this business purpose in a much better way and without GISB agreeing to a standard that infringes on segmentability. The “better” way is to use the qualifier proposed in request number R96013.

First Alternative: the “Condition” should be changed to read:

“Used to allow shippers the ability to designate new primary capacity at an alternate location during the nomination process. Does not increase total Primary rights, nor impact secondary and/or path rights. The “Associated Capacity” at the receipt or delivery location is reduced by the nominated quantity upon scheduling of the nominated quantity. The duration of the reduction does not exceed the duration of the nomination.”

Second Alternative: Reject request.

Third Alternative: Vote for the 3rd Transaction Type proposed in R96013.

For those wishing to provide an alternative, we propose voting in favor of the third transaction type code requested in R96013 (”extended delivery service”). Extended delivery service was proposed by Tennessee initially.

R96010 Modify Scheduled Quantity Transaction to support sending the transaction to operators, producers and end users

Recommendation : The current Scheduled Quantity document handles data at the Service Requester level. Standard 1.3.2 states "... receipt of scheduled quantities by shipper and point operator ...". METF determined that developing a separate document for the operator would be better than trying to revise the shipper document.

Scheduled Quantity for Operator -- Proposed Data Dictionary Changes

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Beginning Date	This is the date that a transaction is to be initiated. It includes the century.	M	
Beginning Time	This is the time that a transaction is to be initiated. If the Beginning Time is not sent, the time defaults to the beginning of the gas day.	M	
Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number	This is created by the originator of the process. It is line item specific and is used by the originator of the process to tie request for confirmation to confirmation response. It is not validated by the receiver of the process nor is it a key in the receiver of the process' database. The receiver of the process will not track this number but merely echo it back in the response document. This number is used for EDI only and will not be added to EBBs.	C	Mandatory when present in the confirmation process.
Confirmation Service Contract	Data element used to define a confirming party's right to make the confirmation.	C (BC)	Mandatory when present in the confirmation process.
Confirmation Service Identifier Code *	This field identifies the owner of the confirmation service contract.	C	Required if Confirmation Service Contract field is populated.
Contractual Flow Indicator	Indicates the logical direction of flow at a point from the originator's perspective. May be different than physical flow.	M	
Downstream Contract Identifier	This field identifies the contract of the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester.	C (BC)	Mandatory when present in the confirmation process. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.
Downstream Identifier Code *	This field identifies the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester.	C	Required if 'Delivery' is specified in Contractual Flow Indicator. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.
Ending Date	This is the last date that the transaction is to finish. It includes the century.	M	
Ending Time	This is the time at which the transaction is to finish. If the Ending Time is not sent, the time defaults to the end of the gas day.	M	
Location *	The location where the quantity will be scheduled by the transportation service provider.	M	

Package ID	Service Requester assigned identification number used to differentiate between discrete business transactions.	C	Mandatory when present in the confirmation process. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.
Preparer ID *	The name and address of the business party preparing the report.	M	
Quantity	The amount expressed is a quantity per gas day in standard units.	M	
Reduction Reason	A code identifying the reason that the nominated quantity has been rejected or reduced.	SO	
Service Requester *	Identifies the party requesting the service or their agent.	C	Mandatory when present in the confirmation process.
Service Requester Contract	This is the contract under which service is being requested.	C	Mandatory when present in the confirmation process.
Statement Recipient ID *	Required if 'Receipt' is specified in Contractual Flow Indicator. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.	M	
Upstream Contract Identifier	This field identifies the contract of the party who is supplying the quantities to the service requester.	C (BC)	Mandatory when present in the confirmation process. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.
Upstream Identifier Code *	This field identifies the party who is supplying the quantities to the service requester.	C	Required if 'Receipt' is specified in Contractual Flow Indicator. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.

*** Indicates Common Code**

Comments:

KOCH: Supports and also has the need for the modifications requested.

NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

TCAP: In general TransCapacity favors the new dataset. However, many edits are necessary for the definitions to be clearer, and unambiguous. In addition, we suggest changes to the usage codes for several of the data elements. Finally, as there is no standard in the "Book" referring to this statement, and because this dataset was offered as one way of resolving the "open-ended" nature of the confirmation process, and replaced other suggestions for "Final Confirmation Document, Confirmation Quick Response, and Request for Final Confirmation, we recommend that standards (proposed below) be adopted that will make the status of this dataset clear to all.

TransCapacity proposes two new companion standards for this dataset.

1. "All parties initiating the confirmation process with the sending of the Request to Confirm dataset should support the receipt and processing of the Confirmation Response dataset and should

support the generation and sending of the Operator Scheduled Quantities dataset.

2. "Receiver of nomination (initiator of confirmation process) completes confirmation process with the sending of the Operator Scheduled Quantity document by the scheduling deadline with the caveat that the receiver of the Operator Scheduled Quantity document may relieve the obligation of the sender to send."

The following table is a reproduction of the recommendation. It contains proposed Amendments to the Definitions, Changes in Usage, Added Data Elements, Proposed Data Element Deletions. Amendments, Changes, and Adds are **bolded and underlined** while Deletes are ~~struck through~~.

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
1	Beginning Date	This is the date that a transaction is to be initiated. It includes the century.	M	
2	Beginning Time	This is the time that a transaction is to be initiated. If the Beginning Time is not sent, the time defaults to the beginning of the gas day.	M	
3	Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number	This is created by the originator of the process **(the "Confirmation Service Requester" or "Confirmation Request Originator")** It is line item specific and is used by the **Confirmation Service Requester** ~~originator of the process~~ to tie request**(s)** for confirmation to confirmation response**(s)**. It is not validated by the receiver of the ~~process~~ **Request to Confirm(the "Confirmation Service Provider")** nor is it a key in the **Confirmation Service Provider's** ~~receiver of the process'~~ database. The **Confirmation Service Provider's** ~~receiver of the process~~ will not track this number but merely echo it back in the **Confirmation R**esponse document. This number is used for EDI only and will not be added to EBBs.	C	Mandatory when present in the **Request to Confirm document** ~~confirmation process~~.

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
4	Confirmation Service Contract **Identifier**	~~Data element used to define a confirming party's right to make the confirmation~~. **The contract identifier used by the contract sponsor/owner for the contractual agreement between the Confirmation Service Requester and the Confirmation Service Provider pertaining to the confirmation process.**	C (BC)	Mandatory when present in the **Request to Confirm sent by the Confirmation Service Requester. As Confirmation Service Provider can require Confirmation Service Requester to provide correct value in this field, the conditionality of this data element is dependent upon the business practices of the Confirmation Service Provider.** ~~confirmation process~~.
5	Confirmation Service Identifier Code *	This field identifies the **party (owner/sponsor) whose contract number is used in the Confirmation Service Contract Identifier field**~~owner of the confirmation service contract~~.	C	Required if Confirmation Service Contract field is populated.
6	Contractual Flow Indicator	Indicates the logical direction of flow at a point from the **Confirmation Service Requester's (confirmation request** originator's**)** perspective. May be different than physical flow.	M	
7	Downstream Contract Identifier	**Based upon the value in the Contractual Flow Indicator Field, this is either the contract of the Transportation Service Requester on the Confirmation Service Requester's system, (Contractual Flow Indicator equals "R" for receipt), or, the contract of the Transportation Service Requester on the Confirmation Service Provider's system (Contractual Flow Indicator equals "D" for delivery)**~~This field identifies the contract of the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester.~~	C ~~(BC)~~	Mandatory when present in the **Request to Confirm sent by the Confirmation Service Requester. As Confirmation Service Provider can require Confirmation Service Requester to provide correct value in this field, the conditionality of this data element is dependent upon the business practices of the Confirmation Service Provider.** ~~confirmation process. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used~~.

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
8	Downstream Identifier Code *	**Based upon the value in the Contractual Flow Indicator Field, this is either the common code of the Transportation Service Requester on the Confirmation Service Requester's system, (Contractual Flow Indicator equals "R" for receipt), or, the common code of the Transportation Service Requester on the Confirmation Service Provider's system (Contractual Flow Indicator equals "D" for delivery).** ~~This field identifies the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester.~~	~~C~~ **M**	~~Required if 'Delivery' is specified in Contractual Flow Indicator. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.~~
9	Ending Date	This is the last date that the transaction is to finish. It includes the century.	M	
10	Ending Time	This is the time at which the transaction is to finish. If the Ending Time is not sent, the time defaults to the end of the gas day.	M	

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
11	Location *	**The location where gas will be scheduled by the transportation service provider; and, where the receiving party is also a transportation service provider, this will be the location code used by the receiving transportation service provider for the activity from the receiving transportation service provider's perspective.**~~The location where the quantity will be scheduled by the transportation service provider.~~	M	**The conventions with respect to populating the "Location" and "Confirmation Requester's Location Code" are as follows: Where a Confirmation Service Provider code exists, it must be provided. Where a Confirmation Service Requester code exists, it must be provided. Transportation Service Provider receiver's (Confirmation Service Providers) who wish to receive their code in an RTC from another Transportation Service Provider (Confirmation Service Requester) must supply their codes and the associated business activityperspective to those Transportation Service Providers sending them RTC's. Failure to do so will result in the receiver of an RTC, receiving the sender's code in the Confirmation Requester's Location Code field and a "DNE" (Does Not Exist) literal character string as the code in the Location Code field. Receivers of requests to confirm (Confirmation Service Providers) returning confirmation responses, must echo back the values contained in the Location Code and Confirmation Requester's Location Code data elements that they have received. Receiver'ssending unsolicited confirmation responses must send the values within the Location Code and Confirmation Requester's Location Code which would be returned from an RTC as though an RTC had been sent to them.**
12	Confirmation Requester's Location Code	**The location where gas will be scheduled by the sender of the request to confirm document. This is the location code used by the sending transportation service provider for the activity from the sending transportation service provider's perspective.**	**M**	~~Required if 'Receipt' is specified in Contractual Flow Indicator. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.~~

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
13	Package ID	**The identifier assigned by the** Service Requester **on the system of the Confirmation Service Requester** ~~assigned identification number used to differentiate between discrete business transactions~~.	C	**If sent to the Confirmation Service Requester by the Service Requester on Confirmation Service Requester's system, will be present in the Request to Confirm and the associated Confirmation Response. Plus, when present in the Request to Confirm, is mandatory in this dataset. If not present in the nomination, will not be present in the Request to Confirm, the Confirmation Response nor the Operator Scheduled Quantity.** ~~Mandatory when present in the confirmation process. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.~~
14	Preparer ID *	The **common code of the** ~~name and address of the~~ business party preparing **this Operator Scheduled Quantity** report.	M	
15	Quantity	The amount expressed is a quantity per gas day in standard units.	M	
16	Reduction Reason	A code identifying the reason that the nominated quantity has been rejected or reduced.	~~SO~~ **C**	**Mandatory when there is a reduction of the Quantity sent from the Confirmation Service Provider in the Confirmation Response document by the Confirmation Service Requester (sender of this Operator Scheduled Quantity)**
17	Service Requester *	Identifies the party **(or their agent)** requesting ~~the~~ service **on the system of the Confirmation Service Requester.** ~~or their agent.~~	~~C~~ **M**	~~Mandatory when present in the confirmation process.~~
18	Service Requester Contract	This is the contract under which **the Service Requester is requesting service from the Confirmation Service Requester.** ~~service is being requested.~~	~~C~~ **M**	~~Mandatory when present in the confirmation process.~~
19	Statement Recipient ID *	The **Common Code for the Confirmation Service Provider (the recipient of this Operator Scheduled Quantity from the Confirmation Service Requester)** ~~intended user of the statement.~~	M	

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
20	Upstream Contract Identifier	**Based upon the value in the Contractual Flow Indicator Field, this is either the contract of the Transportation Service Requester on the Confirmation Service Provider's system, (Contractual Flow Indicator equals "R" for receipt), or, the contract of the Transportation Service Requester on the Confirmation Service Requester's system (Contractual Flow Indicator equals "D" for delivery).** ~~This field identifies the contract of the party who is supplying the quantities to the service requester.~~	C ~~(BC)~~	Mandatory when present in the **Request to Confirm sent by the Confirmation Service Requester. As Confirmation Service Provider can require Confirmation Service Requester to provide correct value in this field, the conditionality of this data element is dependent upon the business practices of the Confirmation Service Provider.** ~~confirmation process. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.~~
21	Upstream Identifier Code *	**Based upon the value in the Contractual Flow Indicator Field, this is either the common code of the Transportation Service Requester on the Confirmation Service Provider's system, (Contractual Flow Indicator equals "R" for receipt), or, the common code of the Transportation Service Requester on the Confirmation Service Requester's system (Contractual Flow Indicator equals "D" for delivery).** ~~This field identifies the party who is supplying quantities to the service requester.~~	~~C~~ M	~~Required if 'Receipt' is specified in Contractual Flow Indicator. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.~~

Description of changes and reasons for same.

Row 3: Editorial and clarifying in nature, these changes confirm to the clarifications requested by METF in R96040. This also serves to clarify that those who send Requests to Confirm are Confirmation Service Requesters, and those who receive same and return Confirmation Responses are Confirmation Service Providers.

Row 4: Editorial and clarifying in nature. Without the change it is ambiguous and misleading. No data element defines a confirming party's right to make a confirmation. It is the contents of the data element, if anything, which point to a contract which may define the rights of parties. The present wording also implies that it is the confirming party's right to confirm. It may be the

requesting party that has the right to request and the confirming party that has the obligation to respond.

Row 5: Editorial and clarifying in nature. (See above)

Row 6: Editorial and clarifying in nature, these changes confirm to the clarifications requested by METF in R96040.

Row 7: The present wording is ambiguous, which contract (transportation service or confirmation service), which service requester (transportation, confirmation, or title transfer), on whose system (confirmation service requester's or confirmation service provider's)?

The changes are intended to always be unambiguous and allow parties to make use of the values in 1) the Contractual Flow Indicator field, 2) Service Requester field and 3) the Service Requester Contract fields in conjunction with the values in the Downstream and Upstream Identifier Code fields and Upstream and Downstream Contract Identifier fields respectively. These changes if adopted here, would also be proposed for the existing documents. If approved, they should relieve a great deal of the confusion currently existing in the Scheduled Quantities document and the various Request to Confirm and Confirmation Response documents.

Finally, the deletion of the sentence in the Condition portion “that it is not needed if the Confirmation Service Requester Tracking Number is present” is wholly inappropriate and assumes that the receiver of the document can require the Confirmation Service Requester to use the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number in exactly the same manner as the shipper uses package ID. Furthermore, it is not appropriate for the receiver of the Request for Confirmation to decide that the sender (the Confirmation Requester) “doesn't need something”. Just because a value is present in the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number doesn't mean that the sender is prepared to do without other data that it has sent to the service provider and which it would otherwise have every reason to expect to be present in a return document.

Row 8: Conforms changes to those suggested above. Again, the current wording is extremely ambiguous.

Finally, the deletion of the sentence in the Condition portion “that it is not needed if the Confirmation Service Requester Tracking Number is present” is wholly inappropriate and assumes that the receiver of the document can require the Confirmation Service Requester to use the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number in exactly the same manner as the shipper uses package ID. Furthermore, it is not appropriate for the receiver of the Request for Confirmation to decide that the sender (the Confirmation Requester) “doesn't need something”. Just because a

value is present in the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number doesn't mean that the sender is prepared to do without other data that it has sent to the service provider and which it would otherwise have every reason to expect to be present in a return document.

Row 11: Current definition is ambiguous. Which Transportation service provider?, which location code? This is the compromise language presently in play from the interpretation subcommittee. It has not been approved but is the current state of the compromise. Works in conjunction with the new data element in Row 12. Self explanatory between the Definition and Condition portions of the Data Dictionary.

Row 12: Eliminates current ambiguity and makes clear what will be sent in the cases where the Confirmation Service Requester and The Confirmation Service Provider are both Transportation Service Providers. See Definition and Condition portions of proposed Data Dictionary.

Row 13: Again, eliminates ambiguity in current definition as to “whose Package ID is in this data element? Is it the sender's or receiver's shipper's Package ID?

Finally, the deletion of the sentence in the Condition portion “that it is not needed if the Confirmation Service Requester Tracking Number is present” is wholly inappropriate and assumes that the receiver of the document can require the Confirmation Service Requester to use the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number in exactly the same manner as the shipper uses package ID. Furthermore, it is not appropriate for the receiver of the Request for Confirmation to decide that the sender (the Confirmation Requester) “doesn't need something”. Just because a value is present in the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number doesn't mean that the sender is prepared to do without other data that it has sent to the service provider and which it would otherwise have every reason to expect to be present in a return document.

Row 14: Definition: Editorial and clean up. There is not common code for the address, and if there is to be an address for the Preparer, then the address should be its own data element and then the description of what kind of address, electronic, mail, E-Mail, VAN, IP?

With respect to the change in usage code and the change to Condition, the existing usage was incorrect and misconstrued the effect of a BC in the RTC document.

Likewise, the change to the condition description further clears this up.

Row 16: Should not be Sender's Option. The receiver needs to know what the reason for reduction is

especially if this is the method they are going to employ to learn of the reduction. The proposed Condition wording makes it clear that the conditionality is only when there has been a reduction since the Confirmation Response was sent by the Confirmation Service Provider. If the "reduction" was done via a "Request to Confirm"; then the Confirmation Response would have the RTC quantity (or a lesser one) and the Operator Scheduled Quantity (OSQ) quantity would be the same as the Confirmation Response quantity and no "reduction reason" would apply.

Row 17: Eliminates ambiguity as to which "service requester" is being referred to: Is it the service requester on the Confirmation Service Requester's system, the service requester on the Confirmation Service Provider's system, or the identity of the Confirmation Service Requester itself? Also changed usage to mandatory. It is too ambiguous to cite "mandatory when present in the confirmation process". The Request to Confirm document has the identity of the confirmation service requester, the upstream identifier (when contractual flow indicator is receipt); the downstream identifier (when the contractual flow indicator is delivery) and the upstream and downstream contract identifier based upon the business conditional requirements of the receiver of the request to confirm; it does not have the Confirmation Service Requester's service requester - period. Thus the reference to "mandatory when present in the confirmation process" is unacceptably vague. Does that mean it is "SO" if not present? Or that it is "BC" if not present? Or that maybe it is "MA" if not present? Or do they mean that it is only present in the OSQ if present in the confirmation process. It is not clear and the change makes it clear.

Row 18: Eliminates ambiguity as to which "service requester's contract" is being referred to. Is it the contract of service requester on the Confirmation Service Requester's system, the contract of the service requester on the Confirmation Service Provider's system, or the contract used by the Confirmation Service Requester itself? Also changed usage to mandatory. It is too ambiguous to cite "mandatory when present in the confirmation process". This is an essential piece of information needed by those who confirm and schedule at the contract level. And, for those who do not need it, it is purely an extraneous field of information. It will not harm those who do not need it to have it and may help receivers of the OSQ, in resolving discrepancies, in data, with parties on their systems, at a later time, were they to know what was scheduled on the up/downstream operator.

Row 19: We do not know who intends to use the statement. But we certainly know who we sent it to. And as per the suggested standard, pertaining to who

initiates and completes the confirmation process, the party receiving this document is the Confirmation Service Provider, and the code for them is the common code.
Row 20: Same reasons that applied to Row 7
Row 21: Same reasons that applied to Row 8.

WINGS:

R96011 Modify Scheduled Quantity Transaction to support additional values for reduction reason code

Recommendation : These additional Reduction Reasons are necessary to specify the reason that a nomination quantity has been rejected or reduced.

CODE VALUES REQUEST # R96011 PROPOSED REVISIONS --Scheduled Quantity --

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Reduction Reason	SO	Balanced Corrected Routes	**Change to scheduled quantity that results from a correction and is made in a manne that scheduled receipts and deliveries remai in balance.**
Reduction Reason	SO	Unbalanced Corrected Routes	Change to scheduled quantity that results from a correction and is made in a manner that scheduled receipts and deliveries are out of balance.

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: As worded these two reduction reasons should be rejected.
As worded, it is not acceptable that a pipeline can reserve to itself what appears to be a wide reaching discretion to “change” a scheduled quantity through an unspecified “correction”.
The introduction of the SO fields, as requested here, will create discretionary catchall which will provide the ability for TSP's to decide whether to a) “change a scheduled quantity that results from a correction” and to decide to do so in a manner such that it “[and] is made in a manner that scheduled receipts and deliveries **remain in balance**”; or b) “change a scheduled quantity that results from a correction” and to decide to do so in a manner such that it “[and] is made in a manner that scheduled receipts and deliveries **out of balance**”.
What is the “correction”? There is no clue in the condition; nor is there a standard proposed to give any clue. Is this action unilateral by the pipeline? It certainly would appear so given the SO usage qualifier. When do they decide to force balance and when do they decide to not force balance? What can cause a force balance? What can cause the correction which does or does not cause the force balance? And finally, what is the

recipient supposed to interpret from this vaguely worded reason?

Alternative: Add eight reduction reasons and create associated codes as follows:

Receipt cut by upstream operator, delivery cut to balance contract
Receipt cut by upstream operator, delivery not cut; contract unbalanced
Receipt cut by TSP, delivery cut to balance contract
Receipt cut by TSP, delivery not cut; contract unbalanced
Delivery cut by downstream operator, receipt cut to balance
Delivery cut by downstream operator, receipt not cut, contract unbalanced
Delivery cut by TSP, receipt cut to balance
Delivery cut by TSP, receipt not cut, contract unbalanced

At present, the Reduction Reasons for Scheduled quantities are:

Pipeline Capacity Constraint
Contract Balancing
Credit Issues
Force Majeure
Pipeline Maintenance
Confirmation Response not received
Confirming party reduction
Exceeded Contract MDTQ
Exceeded point MDQ
Pipeline curtailment
Gas Quality specifications not met

The eight that we propose as alternatives instead of the instant two are less ambiguous and also reduce the likelihood that we will need to add other reduction reasons in the future.

R96012 Modify Confirmation and Confirmation Response Transactions to support receipt rank and delivery rank data element

Recommendation : These data elements should be added to the confirmation process to add flexibility to the confirming parties' business process of confirming gas transactions. The Usage Code and Condition used in the confirmation documents are different from that of the Nomination.

Request for Confirmation - DATA DICTIONARY REQUEST # R96012 PROPOSED REVISIONS

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition

Receipt Rank (Priority)	This is the scheduling rank (priority) assigned to the quantities on the downstream side of the flange at the receipt location. Priority 1 means the highest priority. Priorities 2, 3, etc. are in descending order of priority. Quantities assigned the same rank will be scheduled on a pro rata basis.	MA	**Provided by the Confirmation Requester**
Delivery Rank (Priority)	This is the scheduling rank (priority) assigned to the quantities on the upstream side of the flange at the delivery location. Priority 1 means the highest priority. Priorities 2, 3, etc. are in descending order of priority. Quantities assigned the same rank will be scheduled on a pro rata basis.	MA	Provided by the Confirmation Requester

* Indicates Common Code

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: This should be rejected. Since when will a pipeline tell an up or downstream interconnected party what the ranks are on its system? In addition, how many shippers want pipelines sharing this with each other and potentially the shipper's counterparties on the interconnected system?
Reject. In addition because it is an "MA", it is not clear that anyone wants to use it or that any shippers want the transportation service providers to use it even if it was accepted.

R96013 Modify Nominations and Scheduled Quantity Transactions to support additional values for transaction types

Recommendation : These code values allow customers to designate: (1) nominated overruns on their injections into and withdrawals out of storage; (2) extended receipt/delivery service. Transaction Type is 'mandatory' in the Nomination and 'conditional' in the Scheduled Quantity document.

CODE VALUESREQUEST # R96013 PROPOSED REVISIONS Nomination --

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Transaction Type	M	Injection with Authorized Overrun	**Storage injections above contract capacity rights.**
Transaction Type	M	Withdrawal with Authorized Overrun	Storage withdrawals above contract capacity rights.
Transaction Type	M	Extended Service	Service that allows customers to nominate beyond the zone(s) of their contractual rights.

CODE VALUES REQUEST # R96013 PROPOSED REVISIONS Scheduled Quantity --

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Transaction Type	C	Injection with Authorized Overrun	**Storage injections above contract capacity rights.**
Transaction Type	C	Withdrawal with Authorized Overrun	Storage withdrawals above contract capacity rights.

Transaction Type	C	Extended Service	Service that allows customers to nominate beyond the zone(s) of their contractual rights.

Comments:

KERN: Kern does support the request to pass deal type as a nomination data element in the data dictionary. Kern concurs with the benefits that were listed in Koch's request and requests that GISB adopt the modification.

NES: NES does NOT support recommendation as stated. This modification to nominations is not necessary specifically for storage or extended services. Shipper's always may nominate overrun and/or extended service, and Transportation Service Providers ("TSP") may authorize such services or deny such overrun or extended services. When TSPs return confirmations and scheduled quantities they may authorize such service by returning an authorized overrun code or authorized extended service code. Default could be an unauthorized service code. Codes for specific services, such as storage, are unnecessary since the contract number furnished under proposed modification R96057 will designate to the TSP which service the nomination is for, e.g. transportation, storage, pooling, lending, etc.

TCAP: Accept the third transaction type (Extended Delivery Service) with the code value ("Extended Delivery Service") as worded, however, modify the wording of the code value description.

The Code Value Description for Extended Delivery Service should be modified to read:

"Service requester seeks to nominate beyond the zone(s) or outside the path(es) of their primary contractual rights".

With respect to the first two, change wording of the code values slightly. The code values for first two should be modified as follows:

From: Injection with Authorized Overrun
to: Authorized Injection Overrun
From: Withdrawal with Authorized Overrun
to: Authorized Withdrawal Overrun

The Code Value Descriptions are fine the way they are.

The reason for the proposed change is to make it clear that this is the nomination for the overrun. There already is a Transaction type for both injection and withdrawal. The word "with" creates unnecessary ambiguity and should be eliminated.

he existing transaction types are:

Current business - (default if no value)
Authorized Overrun
Imbalance Payback from pipeline
Imbalance payback to pipeline
Plant thermal reduction
injection
Withdrawal
Pooling

R96014 Modify Nominations Transaction to support offer type data element

Recommendation : When used on the nomination, this data element allows the shipper to choose from multiple transportation arrangements. Associated Revisions: Appropriate error/warning messages will be added to the Quick Response.

Nominations Data Dictionary Proposed Changes

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Deal Type	A Transportation Service Provider supplied identifier which allows the Service Requester to specify the specific transportation arrangement under a contract and receipt/delivery. The transportation arrangements may vary in terms of rates, volume commitments, fuel requirements or other terms offered by the Transportation Service Provider.	BC	**Used if the Transportation Service Provider offers the ability for different arrangements under a contract and receipt/delivery.**

* Indicates Common Code

Scheduled Quantity Data Dictionary Proposed Changes

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Deal Type	A Transportation Service Provider supplied identifier which allows the Service Requester to specify the specific transportation arrangement under a contract and receipt/delivery. The transportation arrangements may vary in terms of rates, volume commitments, fuel requirements or other terms offered by the Transportation Service Provider.	C	**Mandatory when submitted in the original Nomination. This element is not needed when the Nominator's Tracking Number is used.**

* Indicates Common Code

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION

TCAP: **This "Deal Type" field needs a better explanation.** It is not clear why "bid transportation rate" combined with "Package ID" and/or "Service Provider's Activity Code" combined with "Package ID" cannot accomplish the same business purpose as we see intended by "Deal Type".

The other problem is that the code is "BC". In the definition, the deal type is referred to as something the TSP "allows" as opposed to "requires". Given the "allows" nature of the "Deal Type", and the fact that therefore it should be "MA" and not "BC", we believe the underlying business purpose can be accomplished in the following alternative manners.

First Alternative:

If the TSP were to request (MA) that the shipper place the "Deal type" value into the "service provider's activity code" data element; and also send a separate Package ID for each arrangement that the shipper is requesting (and the TSP is reviewing) we believe that the business result identified by Koch can be accomplished without

adding another field to the dataset. This is due to the fact that Koch does not, today, use service providers activity code.

Second Alternative:

The other alternative would be to use "Bid Transportation Rate" combined with Package ID" to accomplish the same result. The present Bid Transportation Rate field is an Alpha -numeric field in the EDI. This second alternative would be available to those pipelines who do employ service providers activity code and would like to provide the service implied by Deal Type to their service offerings.

R96022 Modify several standards from disposition of principle to disposition of standard

Recommendation : The EC appointee assigned to this item does not have a recommendation submitted at this time. The request was not assigned to any task force due to the nature of the request.

Comments:

NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

TCAP: **We recommend adopting the Request as filed with one modification to the request with respect to Standard 4.1.8. (see below)**

The proposed enhancement to certain existing GISB principles is made in response to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Order No. 587 which stated, "The Commission will incorporate the principles, since they are a part of the GISB documentation and provide guidance as to the intended meaning of the standards. Pipelines, however, will not be expected to comply with the principles unless they are officially adopted as standards." The Commission has made a clear and fair determination in this regard which is intended to assist GISB in determining the appropriate classification for the resolutions it adopts.

Clearly, not every principle should be a standard. This said, there are several GISB principles, adopted in March 1996 which, in keeping with the Commission's guidance, ought to be officially adopted standards. The following GISB resolutions contain, without exception, positive statements of business process which should be recognized and treated as standards.

GISB Principle 1.1.1 - Adopt as is as Standard

The nomination, confirmation and scheduling timeline for gas to flow on the first day of the calendar month is governed by standard 1.3.2.

This standard recommends that the first of the month should be treated similarly to every other day, and that no special circumstances or additional requirements be made in order to move gas on those days. Clearly, GISB intended all pipelines to comply with this standard.

GISB Principle 1.1.4 - Adopt as is as Standard

Pre-nominations are not a required step in the nominations process.

The pre-nomination process was used by very few pipelines and added significantly to the administrative burden shippers using those pipes faced in their attempts to exercise transportation rights and coordinate gas flow across multiple pipes. GISB determined, as part of streamlining and standardizing the nomination process, that pre-nominations are no longer required. This statement is mis-characterized as a principle and should be adopted as a GISB standard.

GISB Principle 1.1.7 - Adopt as is as Standard

Activity codes should be included in the nominations data elements, and usage is at the shipper's option if offered by the transportation service provider.

This resolution was mistakenly presented as a principle as it clearly has implications for several pipelines and the many shippers on those pipelines who currently support the use of activity codes. Absent reclassification and adoption as a standard, it is quite possible that each individual pipeline will continue to set its own requirements concerning the submission and use of this data element, and shippers will have no standard business practice to rely on. Principle 1.1.7 was intended to be a standard.

GISB Principle 3.1.2 - Adopt as is as Standard

Elements should stay consistent from nomination through billing.

This resolution is more than a guiding principle. It should be adopted as a standard which is intended to govern and ensure consistency as the activities of the gas industry progress through various transactions. If this is not adopted as a standard, the efficient flow of data could be seriously impeded due to intra-company and intercompany miscommunication.

GISB Principle 4.1.5 - Adopt as is as Standard

Data should be made available to all requesters in an accepted standard format comparable both in time and delivery mechanism.

The intent of this resolution is to set a business standard which states that standard formats, communication timing and delivery mechanisms should be used. This is a general standard, on which other specific standards depend and should be incorporated by industry participants into their business practices to ensure consistent focus and intent.

GISB Principle 4.1.6 - Adopt as is as Standard

Data providers (transportation service providers) should interface with third party vendors according to GISB standards.

This resolution should be adopted as a GISB standard as it is intended to ensure that all industry participants continue to work together to provide efficient, effective

communication interfaces and that GISB, not individual participants, will set industry-wide standards for interaction between market participants.

GISB Principle 4.1.7 - Adopt as is as Standard

Electronic communications between parties to the transaction should be done on a nondiscriminatory basis, whether through an agent or directly with any party to the transaction.

This resolution is intended to set a business practice standard that a company's independent choice of practical and available electronic communication mechanism(s) will not create any bias with respect to how that company's communications are treated by their trading partners. This principle should be adopted as a standard.

GISB Principle 4.1.8 - Adopt with changes as part Principle/part Standard

The same business result should occur regardless of the electronic delivery mechanism. ~~This principle should guide the definition of the business process, data content of the transaction, and the timing of the transaction.~~

This resolution contains two different concepts. The first sentence should be adopted as a business practice standard as it sets forth a common and founding premise for electronic communication. The second sentence should be deleted from the standard yet retained in a newly constituted Principle as follows:

"The standard with respect to the ability of service requesters to achieve the same business results regardless of the electronic delivery mechanism employed, should guide the definition of the business process, data content of the transaction, and the timing of the transaction."

WINGS: In the posting dated December 16, 1996, file name COR1218B.PDF,request R96022 was listed for comments by 12/27/96 and E.C. vote on1/9/97. This request involves the conversion of 8 principles (1.1.1; 1.1.4;1.1.7; 3.1.2; 4.1.5; 4.1.6; 4.1.7 and 4.1.8) to standards. The E.C. has not discussed this request, accept for the November 1996 E.C. meeting at which it was assigned to Group 6 - Other and given a status code of "2" (not urgent). To my knowledge, this request has not been discussed by any subcommittee or task force. It appears that this request was inadvertently put on the list as being ready for industry comment and E.C. vote. Due to the lack of discussion and evaluation, such request is insupportable at this time. Further, WINGS strongly opposes the conversion of any principle to a standard until after the 143 standards currently slated for implemented in 1997 have been in effectively put in place.

R96023 Modify Nominations Related Standards to include storage contract number data element

Recommendation : METF decided on the generic term 'balancing agreement' in place of 'storage contract' to allow for usage by more parties.

Nomination - DATA DICTIONARY REQUEST # R96023 PROPOSED REVISIONS

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Balancing Contract	Contract that Service Provider will use to balance the difference between actual receipts and actual deliveries.	BC	**Used when Service Provider allows for automatic balancing of the transaction.**

* Indicates Common Code

Scheduled Quantity - DATA DICTIONARY REQUEST # R96023 PROPOSED REVISIONS

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Balancing Contract	Contract that Service Provider will use to balance the difference between actual receipts and actual deliveries.	C	**Mandatory when submitted in the original Nomination. This data element is not needed when the Nominator's Tracking Number is used.**

* Indicates Common Code

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION

TCAP: **We support R96023 on the condition that R96024 is also passed.** The problem is you do not need an associated contract (for balancing) in the same nomination line item if you do not have the two quantities, and, are allowed to nominate "out of balance" by sending two quantities. This feature is in production on Columbia now, TransCapacity is using it with customers who like it and do not understand why the industry is going to one quantity. We support this request by Columbia on the condition that the request for the sending of the second quantity is also adopted (R96024)

R96025 Modify Nominations Related Standards to provide title transfer code for transaction type data element

Recommendation : The request was to add 'Title Transfer' as a Transaction Type code value. METF decided to reinstate the previously used 'Buy/Sell' code value and leave title transfer issues to the pilot group.

Nominations Proposed Revisions

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Transaction Type	M	Buy/Sell	**Title of gas transfers at a point (gas doesn't move).**

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION

TCAP: **We recommend adopting the request as filed, not as recommended by the Market Committee.** The request was to add a transaction type called "Title Transfer". It did not request "Title Transfer Tacking" the controversy is with respect to the tracking of title. Buy/Sell has a bad connotation and in fact is illegal in interstate commerce.

First Alternative: Adopt the request as filed.

We recommend overcoming the resistance of some to the term "title transfer" and adopt the requested Transaction Type "Title Transfer" and be done with it.

R96027 Develop Confirmed Quantity Transaction as part of the Nominations Related Standards

Recommendation : This new document would be used to transmit preliminary scheduled quantities. Transportation Service Provider would send to Service Requester after nominations have been validated and before final scheduled quantities are available. Instead of a new document, METF recommends adding a code value to the current Scheduled Quantity document to indicate whether scheduled quantities are preliminary. Status of quantity can be specified at the document level. This will be a revision to the 'BCA' segment of the X12 transaction set.

Comments: NES: NES does NOT support recommendation. Added code value could be accomplished by adding a prefix ("P" for preliminary and "F" for final) to either the nominator's tracking number or the nominator's package ID or in the absence of such values furnished with the nomination the TSP could return the word "preliminary" or "final" in such data element fields.

TCAP: Preliminary Scheduled Quantities - METF recommended that a new code be added to the current scheduled quantities document, at the BCA level which is a level that applies to every thing in the Scheduled Quantity document.

We recommend this request be rejected. It is too vague, allows the TSP to send data upon which the shipper cannot rely. It would serve to create a huge loophole in the standards as any TSP could send this at the 4:30 or other deadline, Intra-day, end-of-day etc. and communicate nothing meaningful.

What does it mean to receive a preliminary scheduled quantity. What can you say to your suppliers, or your markets. **This request should be rejected unless we draft standards specifying when this data element can be sent. Just approving it will be a huge mistake.**

R96032 Modify the Nominations Related Standards to add additional codes to the reduction reason and transaction type data elements

Recommendation : This request deals with code values for two data elements -- 'Reduction Reason' and 'Transaction Type'. Therefore, METF addressed as two separate requests and took a Sense of the Room for each set of code values. Many of the requested code values are either covered by an existing code value or were withdrawn by CNG (listed below). The attached tables reflect the new code values. The official definitions will be developed by METF at a later date. The additional 'Reduction Reason' code values will be used to specify the reason that a nomination quantity has been rejected or reduced. The additional 'Transaction Type' code values will be used to nominate different types of transactions. Requested code values that are withdrawn or covered by existing code values:

Reduction Reasons:

Prior Period Adjustment	withdrawn
Poor Shipper Credit	existing 'Credit Issues'
Cross Ref. Nom Does Not Exist	existing 'Contract Balancing'
Capacity Recalled	existing 'Exceeded Contract MDQ'
Customer Request	withdrawn
Previous Imbalance Exists	existing 'Contract Balancing'
True Up Enforced	existing 'Contract Balancing'

Transaction Types:

OBA - Current Month Correction	existing 'Imbalance Payback from Pipeline' and 'Imbalance Payback to Pipeline'
Manual - Internal Only	withdrawn
Overrun for Storage Injection	existing 'Injection with Authorized Overrun'
Overrun for Storage Withdrawal	existing 'Withdrawal with Authorized Overrun'
Parking	existing 'Park'
OBA - Prior Month Correction	existing 'Imbalance Payback from Pipeline' and 'Imbalance Payback to Pipeline'
Swing for GSS with FTNN (Storage)	withdrawn
Swing for Pooling	withdrawn
Seasonal Overrun for Storage Injection	withdrawn
Swing for OBA	withdrawn
Storage Transfer - Injection Party	withdrawn
Storage Transfer - Withdrawal Party	withdrawn

Nomination (Usage "M") and Scheduled Quantity (Usage "C") Proposed Code Value Changed

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description

Transaction Type		Meter Bounce (Was requested as 'Storage Fly By'. METF suggests rename.)	**TBD -- Describes a "fly by" or "bounce" situation where gas changes contracts at an interconnect, but does not leave the TSP's system. However, the interconnecting TSP monitors the "bounce".**
Transaction Type		Storage Inventory Cycling (Was requested as 'Must Turn Provision'. METF suggests rename.)	TBD -- Applies to storage injection and withdrawal cycling requirements.

Scheduled Quantity Proposed Code Value Changes

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Reduction Reason	SO	Confirmation Response Not Received for Delivery Location (Was requested as 'Delivery Operator Did Not Confirm'. METF suggests rename.)	**TBD -- For a pathed nomination, the Service Requester needs to know whether the Confirmation Response that was not received is for the receipt or delivery location.**
Reduction Reason	SO	Confirmation Response Not Received for Receipt Location (Was requested as 'Receipt Operator Did Not Confirm'. METF suggests rename.)	**TBD -- For a pathed nomination, the Service Requester needs to know whether the Confirmation Response that was not received is for the receipt or delivery location.**
Reduction Reason	SO	Confirming Party Reduction at Delivery Location	TBD -- For a pathed nomination, the Service Requester needs to know whether the quantity that was reduced is for the receipt or delivery location.
Reduction Reason	SO	Confirming Party Reduction at Receipt Location	TBD -- For a pathed nomination, the Service Requester needs to know whether the quantity that was reduced is for the receipt or delivery location.
Reduction Reason	SO	Storage Ratchet Provision	TBD --

Comments: NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

TCAP: **Reject in part, accept in part and accept some with the changes reflected below**

Although the recommendation appears to be in "favor" (the vote being 20 to 0) what the committee was "in favor" of was rejecting the majority of the requested codes due to the existence of codes which addressed the business reasons underlying the original request.

The following table is a reproduction of the recommendation. It contains proposed Amendments to the Definitions and proposed Changes in Usage. Amendments, Changes, and Adds are **bolded and underlined** while Deletes are ~~struck through.~~

Row	Business Name	Nomination Usage	Scheduled Quantity Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description

Row	Business Name	Nomination Usage	Scheduled Quantity Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
1	Transaction Type	~~M~~ **SO**	C	Meter Bounce	Describes a "fly-by" or "bounce" situation where gas changes contracts at an interconnect, but does not leave the TSP's system. ~~However, the interconnecting TSP monitors the "bounce".~~
2	Transaction Type	~~M~~ **SO**	C	Storage Inventory Cycling	Applies to storage inventory injection and withdrawal cycling requirements.
3	Reduction Reason	N/A	~~SO~~ **C**	Confirmation Response not received for Delivery Location	For a pathed nomination, the Service Requester needs to know whether the Confirmation Response that was not received is for the receipt location or the delivery location. **Is conditional upon the the presence of information to the TSP regarding the absence of a Confirmation Response at the delivery location.**
4	Reduction Reason	N/A	~~SO~~ **C**	Confirmation Response not received for Receipt Location	For a pathed nomination, the Service Requester needs to know whether the Confirmation Response that was not received is for the receipt location or the delivery location. **Is conditional upon the the presence of information to the TSP regarding the absence of a Confirmation Response at the receipt location.**
5	Reduction Reason	N/A	~~SO~~ **C**	Confirming Party reduction at Delivery Location	For a pathed nomination, the Service Requester needs to know whether the quantity that was reduced is for the receipt location or the delivery location. **Is conditional upon the the presence of information to the TSP regarding the Confirmation Response containing a reduction at the delivery location.**
6	Reduction Reason	N/A	~~SO~~ **C**	Confirming Party reduction at Receipt Location	For a pathed nomination, the Service Requester needs to know whether the quantity that was reduced is for the receipt location or the delivery location. **Is conditional upon the the presence of information to the TSP regarding the Confirmation Response containing a reduction at the receipt location.**

Row	Business Name	Nomination Usage	Scheduled Quantity Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
7	Reduction Reason	N/A	~~SO~~ **C**	Storage Ratchet Provision	**For a storage nomination which was reduced due to the imposition of the TSP's provisions regarding ratcheting down of injection or withdrawal nominations in excess of amounts allowed based upon amounts in storage.**

Row 1: Usage Code change is necessary to be consistent with intent of adding the code. It is not mandatory that the code be sent, it is the Sender's Option to send the Code when the sender is intending to achieve the business result of Meter bouncing. Change in the Code Value Description is necessary to ensure that the business activities of a Service Requester on one TSP do not become revealed to another TSP without the knowledge, consent or action of the Service Requester. It is inappropriate for this language to be here.

Row 2: Usage Code change is necessary to be consistent with intent of adding the code. It is not mandatory that the code be sent, it is the Sender's Option to send the Code when the sender is intending to achieve the business result of Storage Inventory Cycling.

Row 3: Usage Code changed to make it clear that this is information that is in fact needed by the Service Requester and should therefore not be at the "option" of the Service Provider to tell the Service Requester or not.

Row 4: Usage Code changed to make it clear that this is information that is in fact needed by the Service Requester and should therefore not be at the "option" of the Service Provider to tell the Service Requester or not.

Row 5: Usage Code changed to make it clear that this is information that is in fact needed by the Service Requester and should therefore not be at the "option" of the Service Provider to tell the Service Requester or not.

Row 6: Usage Code changed to make it clear that this is information that is in fact needed by the Service Requester and should therefore not be at the "option" of the Service Provider to tell the Service Requester or not.

Row 7: Usage Code changed to make it clear that this is information that is in fact needed by the Service Requester and should therefore not be at the "option" of the Service Provider to tell the Service Requester or not. Code Value Description added as it was missing in the METF recommendation.

R96037 Modify Payment Remittance Transaction to add three new data elements -- disputed line item amount paid, unit price paid, and quantity paid

Recommendation : The Payment Remittance Statement currently has only one data element that identifies disputed amounts. This data element provides the total invoice amount in paid. The requested changes will structure the data set so that line item dispute information can be provided at a line item. With the changes, a customers will be able to provide information on amounts paid on an individual disputed invoice line. In addition, the new data elements will allow for additional detail as to the nature of the dispute (price or quantity). Line item information will provided only on invoice lines in dispute. Revision is needed to allow for the use of the payment remittances statement (GISB standard 3.4.2) in providing detailed payment remittance information.

Payment Remittance Data Set Proposed Changes

Change	**Data Element**	Usage	**Additional Condition**
Add	Unit Price Paid	SO	Mandatory if this element is in dispute
Add	Quantity Paid	SO	Mandatory if this element is in dispute
Add	Amount Paid on Disputed Line	C	Mandatory if line number exists
Modify	Line Number	**SO**	Mandatory if disputing an invoice line.
Delete	Price Tier	BC	

Comments:
NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: **We recommend adopting the recommendation of the MSTF.**

R96038 Modify the Pre-Determined Allocation Transaction to change the definition of allocation rank level, and to add values for the rank method data element

Recommendation : To ensure consistent implementation by Allocation Preparers, the definition of Allocation Rank Level should be revised to show that 1 is the highest priority and priority is order in descending order from 1 to 999 for Rank method. In the Percentage Method, percentages are recorded as 1 to 100 for percentages of 1% to 100%. Values to implement the ranking or percentage method. for the Rank method priority 1 means the highest priority. Priority 2, 3, etc. are in descending order of priority. Quantities assigned the same rank will be allocated on a pro rata basis. For the Percentage method enter the appropriate percentage.

Comments:
KOCH:
NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: **We recommend adoption of the request as recommended by MSTF.**
WINGS:

R96040 Modify the Request for Confirmation and confirmation Response Transactions for the definition of contractual flow indicator

Recommendation : Definition of "Contractual Flow Indicator" data element in the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response data dictionaries should be clarified. Current definition reads: Indicates the logical direction of flow at a point from the originator's perspective. May be different from physical flow. Proposed definition: Indicates the logical direction of flow at a point from the *confirmation request* originator's perspective. May be different from physical flow. This change is minor and clarifies the meaning as being the originator of the confirmation request and avoids any confusion on this data element in the Confirmation Response dataset. Otherwise, use of the data element is unchanged.

Proposed Changes to the Request for Confirmation Data Dictionary

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Contractual Flow Indicator	Indicates the logical direction of flow at a point from the *confirmation request* originator's perspective. May be different than physical flow.	M	

Proposed Changes to the Confirmation Response Data Dictionary

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Contractual Flow Indicator	Indicates the logical direction of flow at a point from the *confirmation request* originator's perspective. May be different than physical flow.	M	

* Indicates Common Code

Comments:

KOCH: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

NES: NES does **NOT** support recommendation. This modification is unnecessary since the flow direction information requested can be determined from other nomination data element information furnished that can be cross-referenced with information in a Transportation Service Provider's (TSP) internal contract system and operations system. The other nomination information necessary to determine flow direction is service's contract number [added under proposed modification R96057], the receipt point, the delivery point. Further, this requirement to give flow direction is currently not a requirement in EBB nomination procedures

TCAP: **We recommend adopting the recommendation of the METF.**

We believe that the request listed for comment as "R96041" is really the request in the December EC book as Number R96040. These comments apply to determination by the EC on request R96040.

We recommend adopting the recommendation of the METF to change the definition of Contractual Flow Indicator to:

"Indicates the logical direction of flow at a point from the confirmation request originator's perspective. May be different from physical flow."

R96041 Modify the Capacity Release Related Transactions to add new data elements, change usage codes, and modify text of the standard manual

Recommendation : Request R96041 was prepared by Market Initiation Task Force and has been out for comment since before the EC meeting in November. The team requested the changes to correct errors and streamline the Capacity Release Standards Manual.

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: See comments in R96041.

R96043 Modify the Nominations Transactions to add additional values to the transaction type data element

Recommendation : Add new code values to the Transaction Type Indicator in the nomination to delineate further types of business. In this manner, customers will be able to nominate and achieve the level of service that they are currently receiving. These include: Operator Balancing Agreement - Current Month; Operator Balancing Agreement - Prior Month; and Point Overrrun

Proposed Code Value Changes for the Nominations Data Set

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Transaction Type	M	01	Current Business (default)
		02	Authorized Overrun
		03	Imbalance Payback from Pipeline
		04	Imbalance Payback to Pipeline
		05	Plant Thermal Reduction
		06	Injection
		07	Withdrawal
		08	Pooling
		43A	*Operator Balancing Agreement - Current Month*
		43B	*Operator Balancing Agreement - Prior Month*
		43C	*Point Overrrun*

Comments: NES: NES does **NOT** support recommendation and suggests eliminating the Data Element altogether. This modification and data elements are unnecessary since the information requested would duplicate information that can be determine by cross-referencing other nomination data elements to information already in a TSP's internal contract system and by using the upstream and/or downstream contracts and/or the TSP's accounting codes. Further, TSP's current nomination system requires nominators to use either a TSP's accounting codes or other contract numbers as either a nominated receipt point or delivery point to determined these data elements, but the TSP does not require the

nominator to also designate under a separate data element the transaction type or description.

TCAP: **Follow the recommendation of the Market Committee and Reject**

Although the recommendation appears to be in "favor" (the vote being 15 to 2) what the committee was "in favor" of was rejecting the majority of the requested codes due to the existence of codes which addressed the business reasons underlying the original request, and modifying the definition of "Overrun" to be inclusive of the concept of MDTQ (entitlement) overrun and MDQ (point) overrun.

As there is not an offered definition to be voted upon, we recommend the following language.

Row	Business Name	Nomination Usage	Scheduled Quantity Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
1	Transaction Type	SO	C	Authorized Overrun	**Describes a nomination situation where the Service requester is nominating quantities in excess of either or both of their Maximum Daily Transportation Quantity (MDTQ) (i.e., entitlement) on a segment or path, or, their Maximum Daily Quantity (MDQ) at a point or location.**

We believe that the request listed for comment as "R96042" is really the request in the December EC book as Number R96043. These comments apply to determination by the EC on request R96043.

We agree with the recommendation of the METF to not accept the request for new standards and instead to respond to the requester that the existing standards handle two of their three cases and that the third case involves a clarification of "Point overrun" to be inclusive of instances involving either or both of a contract entitlement overrun or a point MDQ overrun.

R96046 Modify the Nominations Related Standards to add additional values to the transaction type data element to delineate linepack nominations and associated error messages

Recommendation : Add a new code value to the Transaction Type Indicator field to delineate linepack nominations. This would allow Transportation Service Providers to schedule linepack at the initiation and termination of contracts using the GISB nomination standards.

Proposed Code Value Changes For Nominations

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description

Transaction Type	M	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 *46*	Current Business (default) Authorized Overrun Imbalance Payback from Pipeline Imbalance Payback to Pipeline Plant Thermal Reduction Injection Withdrawal Pooling *Linepack*

Comments: NES: NES does **NOT** support recommendation. See comments to R96043 above.

TCAP: As there is not an offered definition to be voted upon, we recommend the following language.

Row	Business Name	Nomination Usage	Scheduled Quantity Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
1	Transaction Type	SO	C	Linepack	**Describes a nomination situation where the Service requester is nominating quantities of linepack to the Transportation Service Provider.**

R96051 Modify the Confirmation Response Transaction to provide for a usage code of "C" from "MA" for Service Requester Contract, and modify the text of the data dictionary

Recommendation : In the Request for Confirmation document, the usage of the Service Requester contract is mutually agreeable (MA). In the Confirmation Response, the response dataset to the request, it's usage is also MA. This is inconsistent with the way other Business Conditional (BC) and/or MA data elements are treated in their respective response documents. The response documents should reflect the same level of information as provided in the document it is in response to. In other words, if the Service Requester Contract information is provided in the confirmation request, it should be echoed back in the confirmation response. Thus, the usage in the confirmation response should be purely conditional with the condition being where the information was supplied in the original request for confirmation. This is consistent with the way these data elements are treated in the rest of the nomination process. See related request nos. 96052 and 96053.

Proposed Changes to Confirmation Response Data Dictionary

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Service Requester Contract	This is the contract under which service is being requested.	C	*Mandatory when provided in the request for confirmation. This element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.*

Comments: KOCH: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

TCAP: **We recommend adopting the recommendation of the METF.**

The recommendation is consistent with the intent of Business Conditional, MA and Conditional. Once trading partners have agreed that a predecessor document will contain (they have agreed to use and adopt) the MA data element, the succeeding documents should then contain that data element (and the associated value) as Conditional upon the presence of data in the MA data element.

R96052 Modify the Confirmation Response Transaction to provide for a usage code of "C" from "BC" for Upstream Contract Identifier, and modify the text of the data dictionary

Recommendation : In the Request for Confirmation document, the usage of the Upstream Contract Identifier is business conditional (BC). In the Confirmation Response, the response dataset to the request, it's usage is also BC. This is inconsistent with the way other BC data elements are treated in their respective response documents. The response documents should reflect the same level of information as provided in the document it is in response to. In other words, if the Upstream Contract Identifier information is provided in the confirmation request, it should be echoed back in the confirmation response. Thus, the usage in the confirmation response should be purely conditional with the condition being where the information was supplied in the original request for confirmation. This is consistent with the way these data elements are treated in the rest of the nomination process. See related request nos. 96501 and 96053.

Proposed Changes to the Confirmation Response Data Dictionary

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Upstream Contract Identifier	This field identifies the contract of the party who is supplying the quantities to the service requester	C	*Mandatory when provided in the request for confirmation.* This field is used by transportation service providers who confirm by contract at custody transfer locations (e.g. pipeline to pipeline interconnects, pooling points, logical points).

Comments:

KOCH: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

TCAP: **We recommend adopting the recommendation of the METF.**

The recommendation is consistent with the intent of Business Conditional, MA and Conditional. Once a receiving trading partner has determined that a predecessor document will contain (they have communicated to their sending trading partner their intention to adopt) the BC data element, the succeeding documents should then contain that data element (and the associated value) as Conditional upon the presence of data in the BC data element.

We recommend adopting the recommendation of the METF with the following modifications.

The following table is an interpretation of the recommendation. It contains proposed Amendments to the Business Name, Definition and Condition(s) and proposed deletions from the Definition and Condition(s). Amendments are **bolded and underlined** while deletes are ~~struck through.~~

Request to Confirm Dataset

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
1	Service Requester **Identifier ***	~~Identifies the party requesting the service, or their agent.~~ **This is the Confirmation Service Requester's (originator of the Request to Confirm) Service Requester (or their agent) which is requesting the service on the facilities of the ConfirmationService Requester and which party is also requesting to receive or deliver gas form/to the facilities of the Confirmation Service Provider**	~~MA~~ **BC**	**The recipient of the Request to Confirm (Confirmation Service Provider) can require that the Confirmation Service Requester provide to them the identity (common code) of the service requester on the facilities of the Confirmation Service Requester as a means of matching nominations to and from the respective systems.**

Row 1: Addition of the word “Identifier” and the asterisk (“*”) makes it clear that this is the common code for the entity.

The definition is proposed as there is no definition offered by the METF yet it appears that this is the intent of the Request.

The Usage Code is changed to make this data element consistent with the “Service Requester Contract Identifier” data element which is business conditional. It would be unfair in the extreme if a Confirmation Service Provider which matched on its shipper's contracts could require that a Confirmation Service Requester send to the Confirmation Service Provider the Confirmation Service Provider's Service Requesters’ (shippers’) contracts (i.e., BC), yet, those Confirmation Service Providers who match on Service Requester (Common Code), had to get the agreement of the Confirmation Service Requester in order to receive the common code of their (the Confirmation Service Requester's) Service Requester.

The following table is an interpretation of the recommendation. It contains proposed Amendments to the Business Name, Definition and Condition(s) and proposed deletions from the Definition and Condition(s). Amendments are **bolded and underlined** while deletes are ~~struck through.~~

Confirmation Response Dataset

Row	Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition

1	Service Requester **Identifier ***	~~Identifies the party requesting the service, or their agent.~~ **This is the Confirmation Service Requester's (originator of the Request to Confirm) Service Requester (or their agent) which is requesting the service on the facilities of the Confirmation Service Requester and which party is also requesting to receive or deliver gas form/to the facilities of the Confirmation Service Provider**	C	**If required by the Confirmation Service Provider in the Request to Confirm, this data element (and the associated value) will be present in the Confirmation Response returned to the Confirmation Service Requester by the Confirmation Service Provider.**

Row 1: Addition of the word “Identifier” and the asterisk (“*”) makes it clear that this is the common code for the entity.

The definition is proposed as there is no definition offered by the METF yet it appears that this is the intent of the Request.

The Usage Code is changed to make this data element consistent with the “Service Requester Contract Identifier” data element in the Request to Confirm which is business conditional. Once determined by the Confirmation Service Provider to be required, then the Confirmation Service Provider will echo it back to the Confirmation Service Requester.

R96053 Modify the Confirmation Response Transaction to provide for a usage code of "C" from "BC" for Downstream Contract Identifier, and modify the text of the data dictionary

Recommendation : In the Request for Confirmation document, the usage of the Downstream Contract Identifier is business conditional (BC). In the Confirmation Response, the response dataset to the request, it's usage is also BC. This is inconsistent with the way other BC data elements are treated in their respective response documents. The response documents should reflect the same level of information as provided in the document it is in response to. In other words, if the Downstream Contract Identifier information is provided in the confirmation request, it should be echoed back in the confirmation response. Thus, the usage in the confirmation response should be purely conditional with the condition being where the information was supplied in the original request for confirmation. This is consistent with the way these data elements are treated in the rest of the nomination process. See related request nos. 96051 and 96052.

Proposed Changes to the Confirmation Response Data Dictionary

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition

Downstream Contract Identifier	This field identifies the contract of the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester	C	*Mandatory when provided in the request for confirmation.* This field is used by transportation service providers who confirm by contract at custody transfer locations (e.g. pipeline to pipeline interconnects, pooling points, logical points).

Comments: KOCH: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
TCAP: **We recommend adopting the recommendation of the METF.**

The recommendation is consistent with the intent of Business Conditional, MA and Conditional. Once a receiving trading partner has determined that a predecessor document will contain (they have communicated to their sending trading partner their intention to adopt) the BC data element, the succeeding documents should then contain that data element (and the associated value) as Conditional upon the presence of data in the BC data element.

R96054 Modify the Request for Confirmation and the Confirmation Response Transactions to include a new data element - service requester

Recommendation : Add a data element “Service Requester” to the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response dataset. Usage would be Mutually Agreeable (MA) in the Request for Confirmation and Conditional (C) in the Confirmation Response dataset. Currently the Service Requester Contract field exists in the confirmation process. This request proposes to add the Confirmation Requester's identification to the confirmation process. While the contract is the information more familiar to the requester, the requester ID is more familiar to the confirming party. Request states this supplies meaningful information to the operator.

Proposed Changes to the Request for Confirmation Data Dictionary

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Service Requester *	Identifies the party requesting the service, or their agent.	MA	

Proposed Changes to the Confirmation Response Data Dictionary

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Service Requester *	Identifies the party requesting the service, or their agent.	MA	

* Indicates Common Code

Comments: KOCH: Service requester should be added to the request for confirmation possibly as a mandatory rather than mutually agreeable data element. Further discussion should be permitted at the Market Execution meeting in January before any final decisions regarding the

conditionality and/or the definition of service requester ID for the request for confirmation transaction be made.

NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

R96055 Modify the Invoice Related Standards to refer to the data element invoice code as invoice identifier

Recommendation : The change of the name of the data element Invoice Code (sometimes referred to as an Invoice number) to Invoice Identifier will eliminated confusion created by the name. The word code in a data element traditionally means that the data element is tied to a table in the implementation guide which contains code values. This data element is generated as a unique number by the service provider.

Invoice Data Set Proposed Data Dictionary Changes

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Invoice Identifier	Unique identification identifier assigned by the preparer.		

* Indicates Common Code

Comments:
KOCH: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
TCAP: **We recommend adopting the recommendation of the MSTF**

R96057 Modify the Nominations, Flowing Gas, and Invoicing Related Standards to change two data elements lengths - package id and contract number

Recommendation : The length of the Package ID and all contract numbers are not specified in the data dictionary, their maximum length is determined by the field that they are mapped to in the actual EDI documents. This request proposes that the maximum length for a Package ID be set at 3 characters, and the maximum length of all contract fields be 14 characters. Requester states that use of fewer characters makes it easier to design screens. **Note:** Subsequent to submittal of the request, but prior to any discussion, the subject of length of fields of the Package ID and contract fields were discussed by the Market Settlement Task Force (MSTF). That task force accepted the following field lengths:

Package ID: Maximum 12 character alpha-numeric fields

All contract fields: Maximum 12 character alpha-numeric fields

The request was thus modified to this proposal, and on this the sense of the room was taken. (In other words, this was what was “voted” on.) The attached data dictionary has been modified from the request to reflect this vote.

Proposed Data Dictionary Changes

Business Name	Definition	Usage (E-2)	Condition
Package ID	Service requester assigned identification number used to differentiate between discrete business transactions. *A maximum 12 character alpha-numeric code.*	SO	
Downstream Contract Identifier	This field identifies the contract of the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester. *A maximum 12 character alpha-numeric code.*	BC	For Nomination, Scheduled Quantities, Request for Confirmation, and Confirmation Response - This field is used by transportation service providers who confirm by contract at custody transfer locations (e.g. pipeline to pipeline interconnects, pooling points, logical points).
Service Requester Contract	This Is the contract under which service is being requested. *A maximum 12 character alpha-numeric code.*	M	
Upstream Contract Identifier	This field identifies the contract of the party who is supplying the quantities from the service requester. *A maximum 12 character alpha-numeric code.*	BC	For Nomination, Scheduled Quantities, Request for Confirmation, and Confirmation Response - This field is used by transportation service providers who confirm by contract at custody transfer locations (e.g. pipeline to pipeline interconnects, pooling points, logical points).

* Indicates Common Code

Note: Usage shown is for nomination transaction and is unchanged from the current standard. Usage codes in the related documents would also be unchanged from the current standard. Change involves maximum lengths of the fields only.

Comments:

KOCH: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION

NES: NES supports recommendation, but does **NOT** support the data element length. NES suggests that screen design limitations are not proper reason to reduce or set data element field lengths. NES agrees that data element field lengths should be uniform based on gas industry requirements and feels the 14 digit for contract numbers is acceptable. NES feels a limitation of 3 digits for the shipper activity code should be larger and suggests 5 or 6 digits.

TCAP: **Reject. The recommendation of the METF is out of line; inconsistent with ANSI; impinges on the valid values in the Sender's Option field, enables receivers to dictate what can appear in the sender's field; is inconsistent with the interpretation adopted by the EC in December with respect to Package ID, is a collateral attack on Package ID, and should be rejected.**

The Market Execution Task Force, acting on a request from El Paso, has recommended reducing the size of the "Package ID" from the present "up to 30 characters in length" to a maximum length of 12 characters. It was originally proposed by El Paso as a maximum 3

character limitation. Adopting this limitation will entail shipper's having to process their Package Id's prior to EDI translation. It will also require every Transportation Service Provider to process the Package ID field post-receipt and EDI translation to first determine its length before accepting the Package ID as valid.

The ANSI EDI field length for the field used to hold the Package ID is stated at 30 characters A/N (alpha-numeric). Reducing the length of the field to 12 characters will impose burdens on companies to preprocess outbound nominations to ensure that they are not in excess of 12 characters, and a burden on TSP's receiving nominations to process inbound post-translation Package ID fields to determine valid lengths. Then, if the field length is greater than the allowed 12, TSP's will have to then send error codes in the pipeline Quick Responses to identify that the ANSI allowed length was exceeded by the service requester. This error code and processing is necessary because it is unacceptably ambiguous to accept either the first 12 or the last 12 characters in the Package ID as this results in an ambiguous result.

There is no good reason to begin imposing artificial limits on field lengths (in particular the Package ID). The EDI lengths are in the ANSI documentation. The ANSI certification would also be jeopardized as GISB has represented to ANSI that it will take the x.12 as it is and not seek to change or otherwise modify the X.12.

In addition, this would be the first time that any non-ANSI limitation was placed on the length of data in a field established for the benefit of a sender of a document. It is important to note that no other limitations (other than ANSI field length limitations) on user-entered lengths are present anywhere else in all of the datasets. It appears that this is a collateral attack on the whole concept of Package ID as a service requester defined value.

One of the benefits of the 30 character field length is that it enables a unique character string or combination of characters and numbers for whatever identification a service requester may desire. We all remember the difficulties associated with DOS file naming and the difficulties it imposed upon us due to the 8 character plus “dot” plus 3 character extension (total of 12 characters) file name length limitation. Let's not repeat that now with the Package ID before it is even implemented; before we know how useful it may be; and before we have a chance to use the full ANSI EDI allowed length.

Please also note that Request for new Standard 96057 also proposed to limit Contract Identifiers to only 12 characters. While this is mostly an imposition on the TSP’s (one that they can deal with on their own by simply not making contracts with identifiers greater than

12, or for that matter 6 characters if they want), the portion of the standard request that we feel is most objectionable is the limitation on the length of the Sender's Option field, Package ID.

R96063 Add abbreviations developed by the Market Settlement Task Force for the invoicing functions.

Recommendation : Standard 3.3.2 requires the use of standard field name descriptors on paper invoices. Since paper invoices have a limited number of spaces for printing descriptions, abbreviations will be used to describe the data elements on the paper invoices. This request provides for standard abbreviations for each invoice data element.
Abbreviations have been available for review from the home page and distributed on December 10 prior to the EC meeting.

Comments: KOCH: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
TCAP: **We recommend adopting the recommendation of the MSTF**

R96064 Modify the Upload of Pre-Arranged Deals transactions to add one new data element -- retained quantity, and incorporate two existing data elements -- production area indicator, gas transaction point 1 zone, with the addition of conforming error messages and warning messages.

Recommendation : Addition of one new data element and incorporate two existing data elements into the UPPD data set. The data contained in the data elements is required in order to process El Paso's full requirements prearranged transactions. These items are provided on El Paso's EBB.

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: **We recommend adoption of the request as recommended by the MITF.** It enables El Paso to support UPPD for full requirements customers who have no specified MDTQ until they release a portion of their capacity. This data element, associated values and error codes facilitates the process of identifying capacity rights retained at full requirements locations.

R96065 Modify Standard 3.3.14 to define "rendered" as "postmarked for U.S. Postal Service delivery of communication, tim-stamped for facsimile communication and time-stamped and delivered to the designated site for electronic communication."

Recommendation : During the August 22, 1996 meeting of MSTF discussed standard 3.3.14 and determined the language should be revised to clarify the point at which the clock begins for each of the three forms of communication currently used by the gas industry.

Many MSTF members feel the current language requires invoices to be sent certified mailed. On October 17,1996 MSTF reviewed the proposed language to ensured it clearly states the postmark or time-stamp to be used for each form of communication. The task force unanimously agreed it does.

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: The material supplied for review is too unclear and does not contain the "agreed upon" language. We recommend deferral of this item until the pertinent material is supplied and ample time is given to comment. **Recommendation: Vote to defer.**

R96066 Modify the Transportation/Sales Invoice to add two data elements -- electronic funds transfer due data, and electronic funds transfer remittance address.

Recommendation : During the August 22, 1996 meeting of MSTF discussed standard 3.3.14 and determined the language should be revised to clarify the point at which the clock begins for each of the three forms of communication currently used by the gas industry. Many MSTF members feel the current language requires invoices to be sent certified mailed. On October 17,1996 MSTF reviewed the proposed language to ensured it clearly states the postmark or time-stamp to be used for each form of communication. The task force unanimously agreed it does.

Comments: NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
TCAP: **We recommend adopting the recommendation of the MSTF**

R96067 Modify nominations transaction to add an additional option for capacity type.

Recommendation : Add new code values to the Capacity Type Indicator in the nomination to delineate further capacity types. On some Transportation Service Providers a customer can nominate on their firm agreement out of balance as primary firm or interruptible. The current transaction set does not have a capacity type of primary firm, this addition will allow support of this service.

Proposed Code Values

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
Capacity Type Indicator	MA	PP	Primary to Primary
		PS	Primary to Secondary
		SS	Secondary to Secondary
		SP	Secondary to Primary
		IT	Interruptible
		F	*Primary Firm*
		MF	*Out of Balance Primary Firm*
		MI	*Out of Balance Interruptible*

Comments: NES: NES does **NOT** support recommendation. See comments to R96043 above.

TCAP: **Reject in part, accept in part and accept some with the changes reflected below**

The following table is a reasonable reproduction of the recommendation. It contains proposed amendments to the Definitions, proposed changes in Usage, proposed deletions of Transaction Type Code Values, and proposed deletions of words within both Code Values and Code Value Descriptions. Amendments, Changes, and Adds are **bolded and underlined** while deletes are ~~struck through.~~

Row	Business Name	Nomination Usage	Scheduled Quantity Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description
~~1~~	~~Transaction Type~~	~~M~~	~~C~~	~~Imbalance Payback from Pipeline - Firm~~	
2	Transaction Type	~~M~~ **SO**	C	Imbalance **Makeup** ~~Payback from Pipeline~~ - Interruptible	**Service Requester (Shipper) is requesting return of gas owed to it by the TSP on an interruptible basis.**
~~3~~	~~Transaction Type~~	~~M~~	~~C~~	~~Imbalance Payback to Pipeline - Firm~~	
4	Transaction Type	~~M~~ **SO**	C	Imbalance Payback ~~to Pipeline~~ - Interruptible	**Service Requester (Shipper) is requesting to return gas owed to TSP by Service Requester on an interruptible basis**

Row 1: Not needed. If a nomination is under a firm contract, and the shipper nominates with a "makeup" transaction type then the TSP knows that it is a Firm makeup request, thus this transaction type is superfluous for firm contract nominations. However, adding this Transaction Type means that TSP's will have to send error codes when the Shipper sends a "firm" transaction type instruction under an interruptible contract nomination.

Row 2: The change to the definition makes the wording consistent with the conventions adopted with respect to makeup and payback of gas. The language, "payback from pipeline" is non-standard and uses pipeline instead of the common term Transportation Service Provider. There is make-up to shippers and payback to pipelines/TSP, there is no payback from pipeline/TSP.

Usage Code change is necessary to be consistent with intent of adding the code. It is not mandatory that the code be sent, it is the Sender's Option to send the Code when the sender is intending to achieve the business result of requesting that the pipeline return gas to the shipper on an interruptible basis.

The change to the Code Value Description makes clear that this is a makeup to the shipper on an interruptible basis. If the contract is a firm one then this is clearly an instruction to treat this line item as an interruptible nomination for capacity allocation purposes. Should a shipper send this transaction type on a nomination under an interruptible contract, then it is not ambiguous (although redundant to a simple "make-up" transaction type under the same interruptible contract. Nonetheless, there is no ambiguity and the business results of both the shippers and the TSP's can be achieved with respect to Make-up nominations.

Row 3: Not needed. If a nomination is under a firm contract, and the shipper nominates with a "payback" transaction type then the TSP knows that it is a Firm payback request, thus this transaction type is superfluous for firm contract nominations. However, adding this Transaction Type means that TSP's will have to send error codes when the Shipper sends a "firm" transaction type instruction under an interruptible contract nomination.

Row 4: The change to the definition makes the wording consistent with the conventions adopted with respect to makeup and payback of gas. The language, "payback to pipeline" is redundant and uses "pipeline" instead of Transportation Service Provider. Payback is always to the pipeline/TSP. It is akin to saying "I just bought a car automobile."

Usage Code change is necessary to be consistent with intent of adding the code. It is not mandatory that the code be sent, it is the Sender's Option to send the Code when the sender is intending to achieve the business result of requesting that the pipeline accept gas from the shipper to payback an imbalance on an interruptible basis.

The change to the Code Value Description makes clear that this is a payback to the Transportation Service Provider on an interruptible basis. If the contract is a firm one then this is clearly an instruction to treat this line item as an interruptible nomination for capacity allocation purposes. Should a shipper send this transaction type on a nomination under an interruptible contract, then it is not ambiguous (although redundant to a simple "make-up" transaction type under the same interruptible contract). Nonetheless, there is no ambiguity and the business results desired by both the shippers and the TSP's can be achieved with respect to payback nominations.

R96077 Modify several transactions as a results of the existing 43 business practice standards that were approved on September 27 by the GISB membership. These modifications are explained in METF001 through METF005 in the recommendations provided by the task forces and Executive Committee appointees, described earlier in this document.

Recommendation : The modifications are required for the data sets to be in compliance with the GISB Business Practice Standards.

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION

TCAP: If these are the same as the METF 1-6 standards then the following comments apply:

Adopt METF #1 as recommended. Recommendation is for elimination of Future Quantity Status. This is consistent with the standardization of the treatment of the duration of nominations and what to do when a portion of a date-range is overwritten and the remainder is not.

Adopt METF #2 as recommended. Recommendation is to change the definition of Package ID in the data dictionary and EDI guides and Standards book to confirm to the new standard 1.2.5. "A Package ID is a way to differentiate between discrete business transactions".

Modify METF #3 and adopt as changed below: Change the proposed language as follows:

From: "Service Provider is not obligated to edit or validate the Package ID."

to: Service Provider is not obligated to validate the Package ID, may not edit or change the value received from Service Requester, and must return the Package ID as received as applicable in the dataset(s) transmitted to the Service Requester.

Adopt METF #4 as recommended. Recommendation is to change language in the Technical Implementation of Business Process section of the EDI Guide.

Modify METF #5. Adopt in part (Part 1 Request for Confirmation). Reject in part (Parts 2 and 3 -- Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity)

As proposed, Part 1, Request for Confirmation is fine and is consistent with the standards.

As proposed, Part 2 effectively eliminates Package ID from the documents Sent by the Confirmation Service Provider.

First Alternative Second Request: Oppose/Reject the change to Confirmation Response

Second Alternative Second Request: Modify the description of "Condition" in the "Confirmation Response" as follows:

From: Mandatory when submitted in the Request for Confirmation. This data element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.

to: Mandatory when submitted in the Request for Confirmation.

Reason: This introduces ambiguity. "Not needed", means what? This "not needed" is decided by who? As soon as the respondent is given the opportunity to determine that it is not needed. The

Confirmation Service Requester is in an ambiguous position and must be ready to accept either or both, the return of the Package ID that they sent or the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number. This is a collateral attack on Package ID. In addition, there is no reason to assume or require that the Confirmation Requester will have a one to one relationship between a Confirmation Request and a Package ID. This requires that the Confirmation Requester build a table on their side to map every outgoing Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number to a specific nomination or Package ID. This is unnecessary meddling in the internal designs of the data systems of parties and especially since the data element exists, is part of the Request for Confirmation and therefore available to the Confirmation Service Provider, should be sent back to the Confirmation Requester by the Confirmation Service Provider in the Confirmation Response. It is only courteous.

As proposed, Part 3 effectively eliminates Package ID from the documents Sent by the Transportation Service Provider to the Shipper in the Scheduled Quantities Document.

First Alternative Third Request: Oppose/Reject the change to Scheduled Quantity Document

Second Alternative Third Request: Modify the description of "Condition" in the "Scheduled Quantity" as follows:

From: Mandatory when submitted in the Request for Confirmation. This data element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester's Tracking Number is used.

to: Mandatory when submitted in the Request for Confirmation.

Reason: This introduces ambiguity. "Not needed", means what? This "not needed" is decided by who? As soon as the respondent is given the opportunity to determine that it is not needed. Then the Service Requester is in an ambiguous position and must be ready to accept either or both, the return of the Package ID that they sent or the Nominator's Tracking Number. This is a collateral attack on Package ID. In addition, there is no reason to assume or require that the Service Requester will have a one to one relationship between a Nominator's Tracking Number and a Package ID. There is nothing in the standard that says that Nominators Tracking Number is discrete for a transaction, a day a month or a year. This change, if adopted would require that the Service Requester build a table on their side to map every outgoing Nominator's Tracking Number to a specific nomination or Package ID. This is unnecessary meddling in the internal designs of the data systems of parties and especially since the data element exists, is part of the Nomination, the Quick Response, the Request for Confirmation and therefore is

not only available to the Confirmation Service Provider, and should be sent back to the Confirmation Requester by the Confirmation Service Provider in the Confirmation Response (see above) but should also be sent by the Transportation Service Provider to the Transportation Service Requester. It is time for the collateral attacks on Package ID to stop. The war is over.

THE FOLLOWING REQUESTS ARE RECOMMENDED TO BE DECLINED:

R96015 Modify Nominations Transaction to support fuel method indicator type data element

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION

R96017 Modify Offer, Bid Review, Award Notice, and Upload of Pre-Arranged Deals Transactions to support maximum Appalachian receipt quantity data element

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: **We recommend rejecting the request.**
This is consistent with the recommendation of the MITF. A new request, which enabled CNG to achieve their desired business result was recommended by MITF, filed by CNG and is awaiting action in the Box "C" group of requests.

R96020 Modify Nominations Quick Response Transaction to support additional error codes

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION

R96021 Modify Capacity Release Offer, Upload of Pre-Arranged Deals, Upload of Pre-Arranged Deals Notifications, Award Transactions to support second field for storage releases data element

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION

R96024 Modify Nominations Related Standards to provide receipt as well as delivered quantity data elements

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION

TCAP: **We support this request in conjunction with R96023.** The explanation of the METF for the rejection is inappropriate. On Columbia and others, the use of an associated balancing contract to and from which to attribute imbalanced nominations, is directly related to a pathing of gas. The explanation used by the METF would apply only to non-pathed nominations as a pathed nomination has both the receipt and delivery points on the same line. **The reasoning of the majority in rejecting the request is flawed.** The proposal should be adopted as requested.

R96029 Modify the Nominations, Quick Response, and Scheduled Quantity Transactions to add agent and shipper data elements

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
TCAP: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.

R96030 Modify the Invoicing related Standards to add three new data elements, Paid Amount - flow period, Beginning flow Date/Time, Ending Flow Date/Time to comply with GISB Standard 3.3.21

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: **Follow the recommendation of the MSTF and reject the Request as written.**
Follow the recommendation of the MSTF and adopt a new standard which would state:
"The purpose of the Statement of Account is to report outstanding balances by month."

R96031 Modify the Scheduled Quantity Transaction by adding a data element for the status of "not confirmed"

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
TCAP: **Follow the recommendation of the Market Committee and Reject**
The addition of a "not confirmed" data element and the associated ambiguity is unacceptable. It completely frustrates the purpose of getting closure to the process at the appointed hour.

R96033 Modify the Measurement Information Transaction to add two new data elements -- pressure base indicator and pressure base

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: As the company which requested the addition of the quantity qualifier for MCF and the measurement basis qualifier for pressure be added to the Measurement statement dataset we can agree that another whole dataset could be the best implementation. It was our hope that the addition of these two qualifiers would meet the business requirement that producers had expressed to us that they needed these two pieces of information to make severance tax payments without having to map an entire new dataset to get this information. **We will not oppose the implementation suggested by METF.**

R96042 Modify the Nominations and Shipper Imbalance Transactions to add additional values to the transaction type data element.

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP:

R96047 Modify the Nominations Related Standards to add additional values to the transaction type data element to delineate backhaul nominations and associated error messages

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
TCAP: **Follow the recommendation of the Market Committee and Reject**

Although the recommendation appears to be in "favor" (the vote being 14 to 0) what the committee was "in favor" of was rejecting the addition of the new data element called "Transaction Type Indicator" which presumably was to identify every transaction as a forward haul or backhaul. The committee wisely rejected the request and stated that the Transaction Type "Backhaul" was sufficient.

We can recommend that those transporters who wish to have both a distinction between the other types of transactions (ex. Authorized overrun Current Business Plant Thermal Reduction, etc.) and be able to determine forward versus backhaul, that they build a table which associated points with one another so that the incoming nomination can be processed and the determination of fuel made by the relative geographic locations of the receipt and delivery points.

R96050 Modify the Upload of a Pre-Arranged Deal, Offer Download, and Invoicing Transactions to include a new data element -- rate basis indicator

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION
TCAP: We recommend adoption of the request that an additional code i.e., "dekatherm 100 mile" be added to the list of valid codes in the "Quantity Qualifier" data element.
We recommend the rejection of the portion of the request pertaining to the addition of a new data element as the addition of the code to the Quantity Qualifier data element achieves the business result desired by Northern Border (the requesting party).

R96060 Modify the Nominations Transaction to add a new data element - cycle

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
TCAP:

Follow the recommendation of the Market Committee and Reject
While the FERC wrestles with batch versus continuous intra day nominations, those TSP's who adopt either approach can do so without the addition of this data element. There is no need to have the Service Requester tell the Transportation Service Provider which "cycle" they wish to be part of. If there is a cycle system, then the Service Requester can time their nomination transmittal to coincide with the one they are in interested in.

R96061 Modify the Nominations and Scheduled Quantity Transactions to add two new data elements - accounting data 1 and accounting data 2

Recommendation : DECLINE

Comments: NES: SUPPORTS RECOMMENDATION.
TCAP:

Follow the recommendation of the Market Committee and Reject
Interestingly, this request for two new (MA) data elements (specified to be of 5 characters each) was offered by the same requester that wanted to eliminate 18 characters from the Package ID (an SO) field. The business purpose sought presumably by the customers can be achieved by the Package ID field and if needed the Service Requesters can place all of their required data into this field. They can even use separators (a comma, an underscore, a slash ,etc.) to separate their

values within the Package ID field. If the thirty character limit is retained (the 12 character limit rejected) then presumably those customers who wanted only 12 character length Package ID but wanted two additional five character fields could achieve their business result by doing the following.

Package ID Acct 1 Acct 2

12345678910A_12345_12345 for a total of 24 characters

This concatenation achieves the specified business (length is still less than the 30 but greater than the 12) and without the need for two new “MA” fields.