1. **Recommended Action:**

- **Accept as requested**
- **Accept as modified below**
- **Decline**

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

- **Change to Existing Practice**
- **Status Quo**

2. **TYPE OF MAINTENANCE**

**Per Request:**

- **Initiation**
- **Modification**
- **Interpretation**
- **Withdrawal**

**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**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard No. and Language:</th>
<th>1.3.27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The key should be composed of: service requester contract (Service Agreement), transaction type, upstream party, upstream contract (when applicable), receipt location (as applicable), downstream party (as applicable), downstream contract (when applicable), delivery location (as applicable), package ID, capacity type indicator (where mutually agreed) service provider activity code (where mutually agreed). Upon receipt by a service provider from a service requester of a transaction whose key data elements match those previously received by the service provider from the service requester, the service provider should then process the begin date/time and end date/time consistent with the intentions of the standard 1.3.7 and then process the rest of the transaction's data elements consistent with the applicable standards to determine the business results. When data is not supplied (e.g. is not applicable, is not supported or is not mutually agreed upon) the pertinent portion of the key would be determined to be null.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Co.  Request No.: R97051

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

Transco proposes that GISB Standard 1.3.27 be modified to remove the data element Service Provider’s Activity Code (Activity Code) from the transaction key. The Activity Code data element is used in Transco’s current business practice, but we use it as a substitute for the transaction key, not a part of the transaction key. Therefore, it should in our view be removed from the list of key elements in the Standard.

b. Description of Recommendation:

Strike the words "service provider activity code (where mutually agreed)" from GISB Standard No. 1.3.27. No further implementation or technical changes are necessary to implement this request.

Information Requirements Subcommittee

Sense of the Room: July 29, 1997  
10 In Favor  
0 Opposed

Segment Check (if applicable):

In Favor:  
End-Users  
LDCs  
Pipelines  
Producers  
Services

Opposed:  
End-Users  
LDCs  
Pipelines  
Producers  
Services

c. Business Purpose:

[Transco's] ability to use the Activity code in this manner in EDI exchanges is necessary to maintain [their] current level of service. When this proposed modification is incorporated into the Standard, Transco and other pipelines will be able to identify gas transactions in conformance with current business practices.

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

No objection to request. Activity code is used by a limited number of transportation service providers. This recommendation was supported by two TSP's who utilize the activity code and also had no opposition.