

## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester: Columbia Gas Transmission**

**Request No.: R97127**

### 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

- Add error code value descriptions for the Validation Code data element in the Nomination Quick Response.

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

**Document Name and No.:** Nomination Quick Response, 1.4.2

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Validation Code	M (C)	ENMQR578	Inactive Delivery Location	[No definition necessary]
(Errors)		ENMQR579	Inactive Receipt Location	[No definition necessary]
		ENMQR580	Inactive Downstream Identifier Code	[No definition necessary]
		ENMQR581	Inactive Upstream Identifier Code	[No definition necessary]
		ENMQR115	Inactive Service Requester	[No definition necessary]
		ENMQR116	Inactive Transportation Service Provider	[No definition necessary]



## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester: Columbia Gas Transmission**

**Request No.: R97127**

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

**Document Name and No.:** Nomination Quick Response (1.4.2)

<b>Description of Change:</b>
<b>G855NMQR - Nomination Quick Response (1.4.2)</b>
<b>Transaction Set Tables</b>
"Errors and Warnings (Heading)" table: Add the following errors in numerical order in the table: ENMQR115 - Inactive Service Requester; ENMQR116 - Inactive Transportation Service Provider
"Errors and Warnings (Sub-detail)" table: Add the following errors in numerical order in the table: ENMQR578 - Inactive Delivery Location; ENMQR579 - Inactive Receipt Location; ENMQR580 - Inactive Downstream Identifier Code; ENMQR581 - Inactive Upstream Identifier Code

## 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

### a. Description of Request:

For locations and entities, add an error message that indicates “Inactive” (for example, Inactive Upstream ID).

### b. Description of Recommendation:

#### Information Requirements Subcommittee

Do we need to add more error code values? Or does the existing "Invalid" cover? This may create a proliferation of error messages. Would it suffice to send "Invalid ..." error code and also send a Validation Message to give additional information? “Inactive ...” error codes are more descriptive and the additional Validation Message would not need to be sent.


After extensive discussion, it was determined that we would only add the error codes to the Nomination Quick Response, which, per the requester, was the intent of the request. The request should not be expanded to apply to all quick response data sets.

Some parties noted that it is appropriate for entities due to the proliferation of mergers in the industry today.

#### MOTION:

Add the following error code value descriptions for the Validation Code data element in the Nomination Quick Response. The definition for each is "No definition necessary".

- Inactive Delivery Location
- Inactive Downstream Identifier Code
- Inactive Receipt Location



**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: Columbia Gas Transmission**

**Request No.: R97127**

- Inactive Service Requester
- Inactive Transportation Service Provider
- Inactive Upstream Identifier Code

**Sense of the Room:** December 15, 1998                        5   In Favor                        2   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:**            January 11, 1999                        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 “Inactive” error codes would be used when a valid location or entity is no longer used by the TSP.

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

“Inactive ...” error codes are more descriptive than the current “Invalid ...” error codes. Also, the additional Validation Message would not need to be sent.