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

   **Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:**
   - ___Change to Existing Practice
   - **X** Status Quo

2. **TYPE OF MAINTENANCE**

   **Per Request:**
   - **X** Initiation
   - ___Modification
   - ___Interpretation
   - ___Withdrawal
   - ___Principle (x.1.z)
   - ___Definition (x.2.z)
   - ___Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)
   - **X** 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**

   **SUMMARY:**
   * EII Task Force (11/20/98) –IR13
   * No change required—this request was declined by the BPS.

4. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

   a. **Description of Request:**

   Modify the confirmation data sets to accommodate sending of pre-limit quantities.
b. Description of Recommendation:

**EBB-Internet Implementation Task Force** (November 20, 1998)

**Motion:** "Instruct Information Requirements Subcommittee to add a pre-limit quantity code value to the transaction identifier data element in the Request for Confirmation (G850RQCF) and the Confirmation Response (G855RRFC) datasets. (IR13)

**Action:** Passed unanimously

**Information Requirements Subcommittee**

**Discussion:** IR split the request into ‘A’ (add pre-limit quantity code value to the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response) and ‘B’ (add pre-limit quantity to the yet to be developed Confirmation by Exception data set per R98031). IR will address ‘A’ now and put ‘B’ on hold until we do R98031.

In the confirmation process, the requester receives the Request For Confirmation (RFC) and sends the Confirmation Response (CR) back. The pre-limit quantity is sent to the requester in the RFC and they use it in the confirmation process. The pre-limit quantity can be set for as long as a year. The requester uses the pre-limit quantity where they do passive confirmations (i.e., confirmation by exception).

Per the requester, when the RFC is used to transmit pre-limit quantities, all of the required fields in the RFC are populated. The quantity field is used for the pre-limit quantity. The requester wants an indicator in the header to show that the entire document is not being used for confirmation purposes; it is being used for setting pre-limit quantities.

IR is also questioning whether this is appropriate for EDI because the information may only be transmitted once a year. The requester currently provides the ability to submit on-line.

**MOTION:**

Send the following issues to BPS:

1. How does the pre-limit quantity differ from a confirmation quantity that is sent for a date range, where the date range is longer than a confirmation cycle? (See Interpretation 7.3.26)
2. In light of its infrequent use, should the pre-limit quantity be included in an EDI transaction set?
3. If the pre-limit quantity is included in an EDI transaction set, should we add a GISB data element in the Request For Confirmation for the ANSI data element ‘purchase order type code’ (BEG02)? If so, the code value descriptions could be ‘Request for Confirmation’ and ‘Pre-limit Quantity’.
4. If the pre-limit quantity is included in an EDI transaction set, should we add a GISB data element in the Confirmation Response for the ANSI data element ‘transaction set purpose code’ (BAK01)? If so, the code value descriptions could be ‘Confirmation Response’ and ‘Pre-limit Quantity Response’.

**Sense of the Room:** October 12, 1999 6 In Favor; 0 Opposed
Business Practices Subcommittee

Motion: “Based upon information provided by the requester during the Information Requirements (IR) implementation discussion, and subsequent discussion in BPS, prompted by questions from IR, BPS has determined that this business practice does not require standardization. Therefore, BPS recommends that R98035A be declined.”

Action: The motion carried unanimously.

Sense of the Room: November 18, 1999  9 In Favor  0 Opposed

Segment Check (if applicable):

In Favor: ___ End-Users  ___ LDCs  7 Pipelines  ___ Producers  ___ Services

Opposed: ___ End-Users  ___ LDCs  ___ Pipelines  ___ Producers  ___ Services

c. Business Purpose:

To provide shippers with a means of communicating pre-limit quantities to the Transportation Service Provider.

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