**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 DEVELOPMENT/MAINTENANCE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Per Request:** | **Per Recommendation:** |
| X | Initiation |  | Initiation |
|  | Modification |  | Modification |
|  | Interpretation |  | Interpretation |
|  | Withdrawal | X | Withdrawal |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Principle |  | Principle |
|  | Definition |  | Definition |
| X | Business Practice Standard |  | Business Practice Standard |
|  | Document |  | Document |
| X | Data Element |  | Data Element |
|  | Code Value |  | Code Value |
|  | X12 Implementation Guide |  | X12 Implementation Guide |
| X | Business Process Documentation |  | Business Process Documentation |

**3. RECOMMENDATION**

**SUMMARY:**

The Coordinate Interchange Scheduling Subcommittee (CISS) was provided an overview of standards request R19013 by David Nilsson who submitted the request.

The requester indicated the new functionality would enable parties to communicate aspects of the tag before it was submitted. However, the subcommittee has concerns regarding system impacts. When a tag is created for other entities to see, it must be sent to the e-Tag Authority Service. This approach would result in impacts to the tag systems due to tags that may or may not be needed no being sent to an Authority Service resulting in additional computational and communication overhead on the tagging system.

The CISS also considered an option to develop a protocol or data set for exchanging the information outside of the e-Tag systems. The subcommittee found this would eliminate the risks associated with performance impacts. After discussions at several meetings it was determined by straw poll there was insufficient support to move forward with developing such a data set.

While the CISS found the idea novel, we recommend no action be taken to develop the standards requested.

**Recommended Standards:**

None

**4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

1. **Description of Request:**

A standards development effort to support bilateral information exchange related to an e-Tag that could be used to collaboratively create a tag.

1. **Description of Recommendation:**

No action to be taken, as there is insufficient support among industry.

1. **Business Purpose:**

Not applicable

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

Minutes to be added