RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Request #: 96057

Type of Request (check all that apply) (E-5):

A-3 ____ New Document (Data Dictionary attached)
A-1 ____ New Data Element (Data Dictionary attached)
A-6 __ X _ Revision to Data Element (Data Dictionary attached)
A-2 ____ New Code Value (Table attached)
A-2 ____ Revision to Code Value (Table attached)
A-4 ____ New Business Practice Standard
A-5 ____ Revision to Business Practice Standard

Abstract / Discussion (E-1, E-3, E-4): 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.

Applicable Documents: Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity.

Associated Revisions: Error messages, changes to X12 if re-mapping is necessary.

Is Revision Required to Support an Existing GISB Standard? If So, State Standard Number and Language: No.

Applicable to Upstream/Downstream Process? Yes
If So, State Task Force Referred To: Market Settlement Task Force

Sense of the Room Results: - Package ID 10 In Favor; 4 Opposed
Sense of the Room Results: - Contract Fields 11 In Favor; 1 Opposed
Per November 21, 1996 METF meeting. Proposal modified as described.

**Executive Committee Sponsor:** Norm Walker.

**GISB Subcommittee/Task Force:** Market Execution Task Force.

**Requester:** El Paso Natural Gas.

**Due Date (E-6):** 3/97

### DATA DICTIONARY

#### REQUEST # 96057

#### PROPOSED REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage (E-2)</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Package ID</td>
<td>Service requester assigned identification number used to differentiate between discrete business transactions. A maximum 12 character alpha-numeric code.</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream Contract Identifier</td>
<td>This field identifies the contract of the party who is receiving the quantities from the service requester. A maximum 12 character alpha-numeric code.</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Requester Contract</td>
<td>This is the contract under which service is being requested. A maximum 12 character alpha-numeric code.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream Contract Identifier</td>
<td>This field identifies the contract of the party who is supplying the quantities from the service requester. A maximum 12 character alpha-numeric code.</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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.