RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.   **Request No.: R97057(B)**

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)
_X_ Data Element (x.4.z)   ___Data Element (x.4.z)
_X_ Code Value (x.4.z)   ___ Code Value (x.4.z)
_X_ X12 Implementation Guide   ___ X12 Implementation Guide
___Business Process Documentation   _X_ Business Process Documentation

3. RECOMMENDATION

BUSINESS PROCESS DOCUMENTATION (for addition, modification or deletion of business process documentation language)

Standards Book:
Confirmation Response, 1.4.4

Language: Insert the following paragraphs at the end of the Technical Implementation of Business Process description for the Confirmation Response.

"When an error occurs at the line item level, the **quantity** returned in the Confirmation Response should be zero."

"When a business conditional data element is not processed, the **reduction reason** of "… not processed" should be returned in the Confirmation Response. In this case the information returned, including the quantity, should be the same as if the data element which was not processed had not been sent in the Request for Confirmation."

TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

Document Name and No.:

Description of Change:
No Technical Changes Needed

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

(Original Request) Add a data element, Validation code, to the Confirmation Response. It will also be necessary to develop a list of Validation Codes.

b. Description of Recommendation:

Business Practices Subcommittee

[BPS Minutes of October 9, 1997 Meeting:] Questions from IR (excerpted from August 1, 1997 correspondence from IR to BPS):

Why did BPS add the Reduction Reason data element to the Request For Confirmation?
It is the opinion of several IR participants that the best implementation to incorporate a validation process into the Confirmation Response is to add a new data element – Validation Code. Are the BPS minutes correct? Is the Reduction Reason data element to be added to the Request For Confirmation? Or are additional code values to be added to the existing Reduction Reason data element in the Confirmation Response? Or both? IR believes code values are to be added for the Reduction Reason data element in the Confirmation Response and that adding the Reduction Reason data element to the Request For Confirmation is an error in the BPS minutes.

If one of the Reduction Reason codes stated in the BPS recommendation is sent in the Confirmation Response, what is provided in the Quantity field? The total quantity that was nominated? Or zero? Some of the proposed Reduction Reason code values are a 'not processed' response to a 'BC' data element in the Request for Confirmation. In such a case, the quantity would not be 'reduced', as would be suggested by the use of a 'Reduction Reason'.

IR identified two data elements which exist at the header level in the Request for Confirmation (i.e., Invalid Confirming Party and Invalid Confirmation Requester). There are issues as to whether Reduction Reason codes should be implemented as a response to the header level.

Discussion:
The BPS instructions to add reduction reason code instead of validation code was the determination of the BPS on June 26. The reduction reason code addition to the request to confirm should not have been

included in the instructions, rather it should have been added to the unsolicited confirmation response transaction.

Action:

The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously that the following instructions sent to IR replace the instructions previously sent regarding request R97057:

Add additional codes for the reduction reason code and add reduction reason code to the Confirmation Response and Unsolicited Confirmation Response. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to accept the addition of codes for the reduction reason code, and add reduction reason code to the Confirmation Response and Unsolicited Confirmation Response transactions:

>Date range in the past
>Invalid location
>invalid contractual flow indicator (note: use of 'x' when it should be 'r' or 'd')
>wrong contractual flow indicator (note: use of "r" or "d" when it should be 'd" or "r" , respectively)
>business conditional field not processed no match on service requester
>no match on up/down party
>no match on up/downstream contract identifier
>no match on service requester contract
>Invalid confirming party
>Invalid Confirmation Requester

Sense of the Room: October 9, 1997   14 In Favor   0 Opposed
Segment Check (if applicable):

	End-Users	LDCs	Pipelines	Producers	Services
In Favor :	1	0	10	1	2
Opposed:					

Action:

The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to forward the following instructions to the IR regarding request R97057:

When a data element is not processed and the reduction reason is "not processed", the information including the quantity sent would be the same as it would have been had the "not processed" value not been submitted. When there are header level errors, only the header level information including the reduction reason is returned, and when there are detail level errors, the quantity returned for the line item with errors is zero. With these two actions, all questions asked by the IR regarding request R97057 have responses.

Sense of the Room: October 9, 1997   13 In Favor   0 Opposed
Segment Check (if applicable):

	End-Users	LDCs	Pipelines	Producers	Services
In Favor :	1	0	9	1	2
Opposed:					

Information Requirements Subcommittee

Motion:

3

BPS Issue #1: (see BPS answer. Implement reduction reason, not add validation code.) No IR action required.

BPS Issue #2: (see BPS Minutes of 10/9/97, p. 4 in Discussion section. Reduction Reason should not be added to RFC, rather it should be added to the unsolicited Confirmation Response.)   IR handled per R97057A. No further IR action required.

BPS Issue #3: (see BPS Minutes of 10/9/97, p. 5 in Action section.) "When a data element is not processed and the reduction reason is "not processed", the information including the quantity sent would be the same as it would have been had the "not processed" value not been submitted."

Add the following language at the end of the Technical Implementation of Business Process for the Confirmation Response:

"When an error occurs at the header level, only the header level information, including a **reduction reason** (if used), is returned in the Confirmation Response." [IR decided not to add above sentence, see BPS Issue #4 outcome below, but does recommend the following two paragraphs be added.]

"When an error occurs at the line item level, the **quantity** returned in the Confirmation Response should be zero."

"When a business conditional data element is not processed, the **reduction reason** of "… not processed" should be returned in the Confirmation Response. In this case the information returned, including the **quantity**, should be the same as if the data element which was not processed had not been sent in the Request for Confirmation."

BPS Issue #4: (see BPS Minutes of 10/9/97, p. 5 in Action section.)
Map existing reduction reason data element to header level of Confirmation Response. This is in addition to mapping at line item level. Usage remains 'SO'. Also add two code values which will be for header level use only.

NEW CODE VALUES:
Name: Invalid Confirming Party
Definition: [No definition necessary.]

Name: Invalid Confirmation Requester
Definition: [No definition necessary.]

IR decided <u>not</u> to add header level errors [new code values above] because:
-- misuse of the CR document. Trying to make into validation quick response and confirmation document at once. To make one document fulfill two purposes.
-- substantial revisions to Usage and Condition of existing data elements

       Sense of the Room: December 9, 1997   10 In Favor   1 Opposed
       Segment Check (if applicable):

In Favor :	___End-Users	___LDCs	___Pipelines	___Producers	___Services
Opposed:	___End-Users	___LDCs	___Pipelines	___Producers	___Services

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.   **Request No.: R97057(B)**

Technical Subcommittee

All technical changes have been implemented in R97057(A).

> **Sense of the Room:** December 19, 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:

(Original Request) To validate the Request for Confirmation. It is possible for the Request for Confirmation to have invalid data. Currently, one cannot validate the incoming data because there are no validation codes. The Validation Codes (both errors and warnings) would be used to indicate that the Request for Confirmation contained errors and/or warnings. It is more correct to return a Validation Code for data errors than to return a Reduction Reason

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

IR: BPS Issue Nos. 1 and 2 resolved in previous recommendation on R97057(A) - no IR action required.
BPS Issue No. 3, as modified by IR, resolved by addition of text to Technical Impelementation of Business Process for the Confirmation Response Document.
BPS Issue No. 4, adding Reduction Reason and associated codes at the header level to the Confirmation Response, IR recommends *against* adding Reduction Reason codes at the header level for the reasons described above.