RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Enron Gas Pipeline Group Request No.: R98023

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

Per Recommendation:
   - Initiation  
   - Modification  
   - Interpretation  
   - Withdrawal

3. RECOMMENDATION

SUMMARY:  
* Add six code values for the Reduction Reason data element in the Scheduled Quantity.  
* Add four code values for the Reduction Reason data element in the Scheduled Quantity for Operator.

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

Document Name and No.: Scheduled Quantity. 1.4.5

<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>M</td>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>Pipeline Capacity Constraint at Receipt Location</td>
<td>A constraint on the transportation service provider’s system at the receipt location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCD</td>
<td>Pipeline Capacity Constraint at Delivery Location</td>
<td>A constraint on the transportation service provider’s system at the delivery location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Technical Change Log
(all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

| Document Name and No.: | Scheduled Quantity, 1.4.5  
Scheduled Quantity for Operator, 1.4.6 |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------|

### Description of Change:
- **G865SQTS - Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5)**

### Transaction Set Tables
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table: For data element Reduction Reason: add the following code values and code value descriptions for columns “Elem 234” and “Description”: “CCR”, “Pipeline Capacity Constraint at Receipt Location”; “CCD”, “Pipeline Capacity Constraint at Delivery Location”; “PMR”, “Pipeline Maintenance at Receipt Location”; “PMD”, “Pipeline Maintenance at Delivery Location”; “PBR”, “Pipeline Balancing at Receipt Location”; “PBD”, “Pipeline Balancing at Delivery Location”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name and No.:</th>
<th>G865SQOP - Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

Add the following Reduction Reason code value descriptions to the Scheduled Quantity and Scheduled Quantity for Operator: Pipeline Capacity Constraint at Receipt Location, Pipeline Capacity Constraint at Delivery Location, Pipeline Maintenance at Receipt Location, Pipeline Maintenance at Delivery Location, Pipeline Balancing at Receipt Location, Pipeline Balancing at Delivery Location, Elapsed-Prorated-Scheduled Quantity, Other (temporary code).

b. Description of Recommendation:

Executive Committee (July 16, 1998)

[Note: The following discussion and vote applied only to the requested code value ‘Elapsed-Prorated-Scheduled Quantity. The remainder of the request was sent to IR.]

“A motion was made to consider Request No. R98023 as a minor correction and clarification. The Information Requirements Subcommittee would provide the code to the GISB office and the GISB Standards Action Bulletin will carry a notice that the correction will be implemented for version 1.3 of the standards manuals. ... The motion was adopted unanimously.”

Information Requirements Subcommittee

MOTION:
Add the following Reduction Reason code values to the Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5) and 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>various</td>
<td>Pipeline Capacity Constraint at Receipt Location</td>
<td>A constraint on the transportation service provider’s system at the receipt location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipeline Capacity Constraint at Delivery Location</td>
<td>A constraint on the transportation service provider’s system at the delivery location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipeline Maintenance at Receipt Location</td>
<td>[No definition necessary]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipeline Maintenance at Delivery Location</td>
<td>[No definition necessary]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The requested code values “Pipeline Balancing at Receipt Location” and “Pipeline Balancing at Delivery Location” were deferred until tomorrow when more information would be available. The group decided that the use of “Other” is not necessary due to the EII proposed standard s21.

Discussion:
It was stated that regardless of where the gas was actually nominated (at the receipt location or the delivery location) the appropriate receipt or delivery capacity constraint code would be used to indicate the general area where the constraint existed.

Sense of the Room: January 18, 1999  11 In Favor  0 Opposed
Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor: End-Users LDCs Pipelines Producers Services
Opposed: End-Users LDCs Pipelines Producers Services

MOTION:
Add the following code values to the Scheduled Quantity 1.4.5:

<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>M</td>
<td>Pipeline Balancing at Receipt Location</td>
<td>Reduction due to balancing of mismatched nominated quantities across contracts at an on-system receipt location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction Reason</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipeline Balancing at Delivery Location</td>
<td>Reduction due to balancing of mismatched nominated quantities across contracts at an on-system delivery location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sense of the Room: February 22, 1999  14 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: March 3, 1999  7 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 first four additional Reduction Reasons will further define the existing ‘Pipeline Capacity Constraint’ and ‘Pipeline Maintenance’ code values by identifying the location where the reduction occurred. Also, the requested code values are consistent with existing code values such as ‘Confirming Party Reduction’, Confirming Party Reduction at Receipt Location’ and ‘Confirming Party Reduction at Delivery Location’.
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The addition of ‘Pipeline Balancing at Receipt Location’ and ‘Pipeline Balancing at Delivery Location’ allows the differentiation between mismatched quantities within a contract (existing ‘Contract Balancing’) and mismatched quantities across contracts at a location.

The addition of ‘Elapsed-Prorated-Scheduled Quantity’ allows identification of adjustments per Standard 1.3.22(iii).

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

IR: Adopted without objection.