

To: GISB Business Practices Subcommittee Chairs  
From: Theresa Hess, Chair – GISB Information Requirements Subcommittee  
Subject: Issue Regarding R98035  
Date: November 2, 1999

---

During the processing of R98035, the Information Requirements Subcommittee raised several issues. Below is an excerpt from the October 12 – 13, 1999 IR meeting minutes.

- **R98035 – ANR Pipeline**

**Request:** Modify confirmation data sets to accommodate pre-limit quantities.

**EITF Action:**

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a pre-limit quantity code value to the transaction identifier data element in the Request for Confirmation (G850RQCF) and the Confirmation Response (G855RRFC) datasets.

Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate the pre-limit quantities in the to be developed Confirmation By Exception dataset.

**IR Implementation:**

IR split the request into ‘A’ (add pre-limit quantity code value to the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response) and ‘B’ (add pre-limit quantity to the to be developed Confirmation by Exception data set per R98031). IR will address ‘A’ now and put ‘B’ on hold until we do R98031.

In the confirmation process, the requester receives the Request For Confirmation (RFC) and sends the Confirmation Response (CR) back. The pre-limit quantity is sent to the requester in the RFC and they use it in the confirmation process. The pre-limit quantity can be set for as long as a year. The requester uses the pre-limit quantity where they do passive confirmations (i.e., confirmation by exception).

Per the requester, when the RFC is used to transmit pre-limit quantities, all of the required fields in the RFC are populated. The quantity field is used for the pre-limit quantity. The requester wants an indicator in the header to show that the entire document is not being used for confirmation purposes; it is being used for setting pre-limit quantities.

IR is also questioning whether this is appropriate for EDI because the information may only be transmitted once a year. The requester currently provides the ability to submit on-line.

**MOTION:**

Send the following issues to BPS:

1. How does the pre-limit quantity differ from a confirmation quantity that is sent for a date range, where the date range is longer than a confirmation cycle? (See Interpretation 7.3.26)
2. In light of its infrequent use, should the pre-limit quantity be included in an EDI transaction set?
3. If the pre-limit quantity is included in an EDI transaction set, should we add a GISB data element in the Request For Confirmation for the ANSI data element 'purchase order type code' (BEG02)? If so, the code value descriptions could be 'Request for Confirmation' and 'Pre-limit Quantity'.
4. If the pre-limit quantity is included in an EDI transaction set, should we add a GISB data element in the Confirmation Response for the ANSI data element 'transaction set purpose code' (BAK01)? If so, the code value descriptions could be 'Confirmation Response' and 'Pre-limit Quantity Response'.