

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Request #: R96029

Type of Request (check all that apply) (E-5):

- A-3 New Document (Data Dictionary attached)
- A-1 New Data Element (Data Dictionary attached)
- A-6 Revision to Data Element (Data Dictionary attached)
- A-2 New Code Value (Table attached)
- A-2 Revision to Code Value (Table attached)
- Revision to Business Process Documentation
- Revision to X12
- A-4 New Business Practice Standard
- A-5 Revision to Business Practice Standard

Abstract / Discussion (E-1, E-3, E-4) This request is for an additional data element, 'Service Requester's Agent'. The existing 'Service Requester' data element is used to identify the Service Requester or their agent. Does the dual usage of the 'Service Requester' data element introduce confusion in the process? It is assumed that the Service Requester name can be derived from the Service Requester Contract number. METF does not feel that the defined usage of the existing 'Service Requester' data element is confusing.

Applicable Documents: Nomination, Quick Response, Scheduled Quantity

Associated Revisions: N/A

Is Revision Required to Support an Existing GISB Standard? If So, State Standard Number and Language: No

Applicable to Upstream/Downstream Process? If So, State Task Force Referred: Tbl

Sense of the Room Results: 3 In Favor; 13 Opposed

Executive Committee Sponsor: Norm Walker

GISB Subcommittee/Task Force: Market Execution Task Force

Requester: Natural Gas Pipeline

Due Date (E-6): 3/97