TO: GISB Members, Interested Industry Participants, Posting on the GISB Home Page

FROM: Rae McQuade, Gas Industry Standards Board Executive Director

RE: Requests for Industry Comment on Proposed Standards and Interpretations

The industry comment period for 1 recommended standard begins today and ends on September 10. The recommended standard is referenced by request number R98021:

R98021 Modify the implementation of the CTT segment within the Shipper Imbalance and the Transportation/Sales Invoice. In these transactions, the CTT should be the accumulation of the number of ITI segments.

All comments received by the GISB office by end of business September 10 will be posted on the home page and forwarded to the Executive Committee members for their consideration. The Executive Committee members will consider all comments before voting on the recommended standards, planned for September 17 in Chicago.

The request and recommended standard can be downloaded from the home page, www.gisb.org, in the “Request for Standards” area. The minutes of the meetings in which the recommended standards and interpretations were defined can be accessed from the home page in the subcommittee areas. If you have difficulty retrieving these documents, please call the GISB office at (713) 757-4175.
RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: Columbia Gas Transmission    Request No.: R98021

1. Recommended Action:

   ___Accept as requested
   _X_ 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:  Per Recommendation:

   ___Initiation  ___Initiation
   _X_ Modification       _X_ 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) ___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)
   _X_ X12 Implementation Guide       _X_ X12 Implementation Guide
   ___Business Process Documentation ___Business Process Documentation

3. RECOMMENDATION

TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

Document Name and No.: Transportation/Sales Invoice, 3.4.1
Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice, 3.4.4
Shipper Imbalance, 2.4.4

Description of Change:

Data Element Cross Reference to ASC X12:

G811TSIN - Transportation/Sales Invoice

Summary - Delete “CTT, M, Transaction Totals”

Sample ASC X12 Transaction:

Delete “CTT*1”
Decrease the SE01 count by 1

EDISIM:

Mark CTT segment as Not Used.

G811SRCA - Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice

Data Element Cross Reference to ASC X12:

Summary - Delete “CTT, M, Transaction Totals”
Sample ASC X12 Transaction:
Delete “CTT*1”
Decrease the SE01 count by 1

EDISIM:
Mark CTT segment as Not Used.

G811IMBL - Shipper Imbalance

Data Element Cross Reference to ASC X12:
Summary - Delete “CTT, SO, Number of Line Items”

EDISIM:
Mark CTT segment as Not Used.

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:
Modify the implementation of the CTT segment within the Shipper Imbalance and the
Transportation/Sales Invoice. In these transactions, the CTT segment should be the accumulation of the
number of IT1 segments.

b. Description of Recommendation:

Technical Subcommittee
The X12 purpose of the CTT segment is to provide hash totals. This is not how the Transportion/Sales
Invoice, Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice and Shipper Imbalance have been using this
segment. The CTT segment is not included in most X12 transaction sets (it is only used in 33 out of
almost 300 transaction sets). The SE (ending) segment is the segment that is used for data transmission
checking by indicating the total number of segments included in a transaction set. Therefore, GISB has
no need for the CTT segment.

Sense of the Room: June 16, 1998
Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor: __End-Users __LDCs __Pipelines __Producers __Services
Opposed: __End-Users __LDCs __Pipelines __Producers __Services

5 In Favor
0 Opposed

C. Business Purpose:
n/a

d. Commentary/Rationale of Subcommittee(s)/Task Force(s):
see Description of Recommendation above