RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Market Settlement Task Force   **Request No.: R97025**

---

1. Recommended Action: **Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:**

   ___Accept as requested   ___Change to Existing Practice
   ___Accept as modified below   _X_Status Quo
   _X_Decline

2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

Per Request: **Per Recommendation:**

   ___Initiation   ___Initiation
   _X_Modification   ___Modification
   ___Interpretation   ___Interpretation
   ___Withdrawal   ___Withdrawal

   ___Principle (x.1.z)   ___Principle (x.1.z)
   ___Definition (x.2.z)   ___Definition (x.2.z)
   _X_Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)   ___Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)
   ___Document (x.4.z)   ___Document (x.4.z)
   ___Data Element (x.4.z)   ___Data Element (x.4.z)
   ___Code Value (x.4.z)   ___Code Value (x.4.z)
   ___X12 Implementation Guide   ___X12 Implementation Guide
   ___Business Process Documentation   ___Business Process Documentation

3. RECOMMENDATION

STANDARD LANGUAGE (for adddition, modification or deletion of a principle, definition or business practice standard)

Standard No. and Language: (no change)

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

If the Executive Committee approves of the direction the task force is taking in not using charge type to distinguish service code, then Standard 3.3.5 "Differentiate between sales, transportation, and storage transactions through charge codes" should be reworded to "Differentiate between sales, transportation, and storage transactions through service codes".

1

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Market Settlement Task Force   **Request No.: R97025**

b. Description of Recommendation:

Information Requirements Subcommittee

IR recommends declining this request as per the following:

Option A: Make some change (change TBD) to the standard
Option B: Do not make any change to the standard

Sense of the Room: July 29, 1997   __0__   Option A   __6__   Option B

Do we file a request for interpretation on this?

Sense of the Room: July 29, 1997   _2_ In Favor   __4__ 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: <date>   _____ In Favor   _____ Opposed
Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor :   ___End-Users   ___LDCs   ___Pipelines   ___Producers   ___Services
Opposed: ___End-Users   ___LDCs   ___Pipelines   ___Producers   ___Services

c. Business Purpose:

Per the request, this change is needed to make the standard consistent with the Invoice data elements. Charge code is not a data element on the invoice. Charge Type is a data element, but it is not a mandatory data element. Service Code is the only mandatory data element on the Invoice that provides sufficient support for the standard.

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

IR: There was reluctance to revise the standard to specifically name the data element because if the data element name changes, then the standard will again need to be revised. Also, revising the standard (even by this one word) would require TSP's to re-file their tariffs to incorporate the new standard.