1. **Recommended Action:**
   - ___Accept as requested
   - X Accept as modified below
   - ___Decline

   **Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:**
   - ___Accept as requested
   - X Change to Existing Practice
   - ___Decline

2. **TYPE OF MAINTENANCE**

   **Per Request:**
   - ___Initiation
   - X Modification
   - ___Interpretation
   - ___Withdrawal

   **Per Recommendation:**
   - ___Initiation
   - X 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.:**
   - Confirmation Response, 1.4.4
   - Scheduled Quantity, 1.4.5
   - Scheduled Quantity for Operator, 1.4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Code Value</th>
<th>Code Value Description</th>
<th>Code Value Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction Reason</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>No Corresponding Nomination</td>
<td>A nomination does not exist which matches up at the applicable level. This does not refer to nominations which contain mismatched quantities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Change:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G855RRFC - Confirmation Response</td>
<td>X12 Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G865SQTS - Scheduled Quantity</td>
<td>X12 Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G865SQOP - Scheduled Quantity for Operator</td>
<td>X12 Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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  6  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 consistency in implementation as with other additional reduction reason codes recommendations.