1. Recommended Action: Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:
   ___Accept as requested  X  Change to Existing Practice  ___Decline
   X  Accept as modified below  ___Status Quo

2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

   Per Request:  Per Recommendation:

   ___Initiation  X  Initiation
   ___Modification  ___Modification
   ___Interpretation  ___Interpretation
   ___Withdrawal  ___Withdrawal

   ___Principle (x.1.z)  ___Principle (x.1.z)
   ___Definition (x.2.z)  ___Definition (x.2.z)
   ___Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)  X  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 addition, modification or deletion of a principle, definition or business practice standard)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard No. and Language: 3.3.x (new standard)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Where no specific contract otherwise applies, in case of shipper level interest charges due from prior invoices, shipper level imbalance charges, and shipper level GRI refunds, a data element(s) should exist to support these charges due from the service requester. The invoice data sets (GISB Standards 3.4.x) should support a method of communicating this information at the service requester level.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

   Add two new data elements to the invoice data dictionary. These new data elements will be in the Summary Section of the invoice data set to allow allocation of charges or allowances at the
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invoice/Service Requester level. The new elements would be “Invoice Level Charge/Allowance Descriptor” and “Invoice Level Charge/Allowance Amount”. These data elements would have the usage of ‘SO’.

b. Description of Recommendation:

Business Practices Subcommittee

The purpose of the request was to handle charges that are assessed at other than contract level. The requester, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, needs the ability to handle charges which are assessed at other than a contract level. An attendee asked if the account number data element could suffice for these business functions, -- the structure may not support the business functions. In discussions on request level, if another lower level should be specified, it should be forwarded on a different request. The BPS recommends the following motion:

3.3.x Where no specific contract otherwise applies, in case of shipper level interest charges due from prior invoices, shipper level imbalance charges, and shipper level GRI refunds, a data element(s) should exist to support these charges due from the service requester. The invoice data sets (GISB Standards 3.4.x) should support a method of communicating this information at the service requester level.

The Business Practices Subcommittee and Information Requirements Subcommittee recommendations should be separately considered for vote by the Executive Committee.

Sense of the Room: March 13, 1997 18 In Favor 0 Opposed
Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor: 1 End-Users 1 LDCs 1 Pipelines 2 Producers 3 Services
Opposed: End-Users LDCs Pipelines Producers Services

C. Business Purpose:

Per the request: The current structure of the invoice data set only allows charges or allowances assigned to specific contracts; therefore, charges at the Service Requester Level which are not specifically assigned to individual contracts must be plugged to an arbitrary selected contract, or to a dummy contract number assigned for the purpose. This change would allow accurate representation of the level to which invoice charges and allowances are assigned.

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