RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: NorAm   **Request No.: R97038**

1. Recommended Action: **Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:**
   ___Accept as requested   _X_ Change to Existing Practice
   _X_ Accept as modified below   ___Status Quo
   ___Decline

2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

Per Request: **Per Recommendation:**

___Initiation   ___Initiation
_X_ Modification   _X_ Modification
___Interpretation   ___Interpretation
___Withdrawal   ___Withdrawal

___Principle (x.1.z)   ___Principle (x.1.z)
___Definition (x.2.z)   ___Definition (x.2.z)
___Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)   ___Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)
___Document (x.4.z)   ___Document (x.4.z)
___Data Element (x.4.z)   ___Data Element (x.4.z)
_X_ Code Value (x.4.z)   _X_ Code Value (x.4.z)
_X_ X12 Implementation Guide   _X_ X12 Implementation Guide
___Business Process Documentation   ___Business Process Documentation

3. RECOMMENDATION

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

Document Name and No.:   Confirmation Response, 1.4.4
                                    Scheduled Quantity, 1.4.5
                                    Scheduled Quantity for Operator, 1.4.6

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Reduction Reason	SO	*012*	*No Corresponding Nomination*	*A nomination does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.*

		013	*No Corresponding Nomination at Receipt Location*	*A nomination at the receipt location does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.*
		014	*No Corresponding Nomination at Delivery Location*	*A nomination at the delivery location does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.*

TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

Document Name and No.: Confirmation Response 1.4.4, Scheduled Quantity 1.4.5, Scheduled Quantity for Operator 1.4.6

Description of Change:
G855RRFC - Confirmation Response
X12 Mapping
"Reduction Reason Codes (Detail/Sub-detail)" table - add code values "No Corresponding Nomination", "No Corresponding Nomination at Receipt Location", "No Corresponding Nomination at Delivery Location" to data element Reduction Reason. See Code Values Log.
G865SQTS - Scheduled Quantity
X12 Mapping
"SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)" table - add code values "No Corresponding Nomination", "No Corresponding Nomination at Receipt Location", "No Corresponding Nomination at Delivery Location" to data element Reduction Reason. See Code Values Log
G865SQOP - Scheduled Quantity for Operator
X12 Mapping
"SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)" table - add code values "No Corresponding Nomination", "No Corresponding Nomination at Receipt Location", "No Corresponding Nomination at Delivery Location" to data element Reduction Reason. See Code Values Log

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

Add additional Reduction Reason Codes:

No Delivery Nomination - to indicate that a scheduled quantity is reduced as a result of no transportation delivery nomination being supplied that corresponds with the downstream pipeline quantity nominated. Suggested Code: NDN..

b. Description of Recommendation:

Business Practices Subcommittee

BPS recommends the following statement will be used by Information Requirements Subcommittee as instructions in adding the code: A "No corresponding nomination" code could be sent by the confirming party to respond to a request to confirm or by a Transportation Service Provider in a scheduled quantity document where the confirming party had no corresponding nomination.

Sense of the Room: June 5, 1997 __14__ In Favor   __0__ Opposed
Segment Check (if applicable):

In Favor :	_2_ End-Users	___LDCs	_6_ Pipelines	_1_ Producers	_5_ Services
Opposed:	___End-Users	___LDCs	___Pipelines	___Producers	___Services

Information Requirements Subcommittee

Add three reduction reason codes to the Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity and Scheduled Quantity for Operators document:

1. No Corresponding Nomination: A nomination does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.

2. No Corresponding Nomination at Receipt Location: A nomination at the receipt location does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.

3. No Corresponding Nomination at Delivery Location: A nomination at the delivery location does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.

Note: Based on discussion surrounding the recommendation, a sense of the room was taken on the following mutually exclusive options:

Option A: Add reduction reason codes 1, 2 and 3 to the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, and Scheduled Quantity for Operators documents.

Option B: Add only reduction reason codes 2 and 3 to the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, and Scheduled Quantity for Operators documents.

Option C: Add only reduction reason code 1 to the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, and Scheduled Quantity for Operators documents.

Option A was adopted as the recommendation of the Information Requirements Subcommittee.

Sense of the Room: July 29, 1997

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: NorAm   Request No.: R97038

Option A: __6__ In Favor
Option B: __2__ In Favor
Option C: __0__ In Favor

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   __5__ 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:

The proposed standards above will be used to allow a pipeline to give more specific error messages to customers on electronic data received by MRT/NGT.

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

Implemented per BPS recommendation with the addition of two additional codes specifying receipt and delivery locations. This was done for consitency in implementation as with other additional reduction reason codes recommendations.