

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Northern Border Pipeline      Request No.: R96130**

**1. Recommended Action:**

- Accept as requested
- Accept as modified below
- Decline

**Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:**

- Change to Existing Practice
- Status Quo

**2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE**

**Per Request:**

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

**Per Recommendation:**

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

**3. RECOMMENDATION**

**CODE VALUES LOG** (for addition, modification or deletion of code values)

**Document Name and No.:**

**Data Element Usage:**

Nomination, 1.4.1	'M'
Scheduled Quantity, 1.4.5	'C'
Shipper Imbalance, 2.4.4	'MA'
Transportation/Sales Invoice, 3.4.1	'M' (per R97029, comments due 9/2/97)

<b>Business Name</b>	<b>Usage</b>	<b>Code Value</b>	<b>Code Value Description</b>	<b>Code Value Definition</b>
Transaction Type	(see above)	52	<i>Receipt Deficiency</i>	<i>The service provider's inability to provide full level of contracted firm service.</i>
		53	<i>Tender Deficiency</i>	<i>The service requester's un-scheduled firm quantities.</i>

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Northern Border Pipeline      Request No.: R96130**

**TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG** (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

**Document Name and No.:** Nomination 1.4.1, Scheduled Quantity 1.4.5, Shipper Imbalance 2.4.4, Transportation/Sales Invoice 3.4.1

<b>Description of Change:</b>
<b>G850NMST - Nomination</b>
<b>X12 Mapping</b>
“SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - add code values “Receipt Deficiency”, “Tender Deficiency” for data element Transaction Type. See Code Values Log.
<b>G865SQTS - Scheduled Quantity</b>
<b>X12 Mapping</b>
“SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - add code values “Receipt Deficiency”, “Tender Deficiency” for data element Transaction Type. See Code Values Log.
<b>G811IMBL - Shipper Imbalance</b>
<b>X12 Mapping</b>
“SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-sub-detail)” table - add code values “Receipt Deficiency”, “Tender Deficiency” for data element Transaction Type. See Code Values Log.
<b>G811TSIN - Transportation/Sales Invoice</b>
<b>X12 Mapping</b>
“SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail - HL03 = ‘9’)” table - add code values “Receipt Deficiency”, “Tender Deficiency” for data element Transaction Type. See Code Values Log.

**4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**a. Description of Request:**

Add two new transaction type indicators to delineate receipt deficiency and tender deficiency nominations, and their associated error messages in the Nomination, Quick Response and Scheduled Quantities transactions.

**b. Description of Recommendation:**

**Business Practices Subcommittee**

The Business Practices Subcommittee recommends that: All data sets support the ability of service requesters and service providers to communicate receipt deficiencies, defined as the service provider’s inability to provide full level of contracted firm service, and tender deficiencies, defined as a service requester’s un-scheduled firm quantities.

**Sense of the Room:** March 20, 1997      18 In Favor      0 Opposed

**Segment Check** (if applicable):

In Favor:      1 End-Users      1 LDCs      11 Pipelines      2 Producers      3 Services

Opposed:           End-Users           LDCs           Pipelines           Producers           Services

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Northern Border Pipeline      Request No.: R96130**

**Information Requirements Subcommittee**

Add transaction types 'Receipt Deficiency' and 'Tender Deficiency' (as defined by BPS) to the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, Imbalance and Invoice documents.

**Sense of the Room:** July 29, 1997        9   In Favor        0   Opposed  
**Segment Check** (if applicable):  
In Favor:         End-Users         LDCs         Pipelines         Producers         Services  
Opposed:         End-Users         LDCs         Pipelines         Producers         Services

**Technical Subcommittee**

**Sense of the Room:** August 22, 1997        6   In Favor        0   Opposed  
**Segment Check** (if applicable):  
In Favor:         End-Users         LDCs         Pipelines         Producers         Services  
Opposed:         End-Users         LDCs         Pipelines         Producers         Services

**c. Business Purpose:**

This allows service requesters and service providers to delineate these different nominations.

**d. Commentary/Rationale of Subcommittee(s)/Task Force(s):**

IR: No opposition to implementation per BPS recommendation.