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:**
   - X Initiation
   - X Modification
   - Interpretation
   - Withdrawal

   **Per Recommendation:**
   - X Initiation
   - X 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**

   **CODE VALUES LOG** (for addition, modification or deletion of code values)

   **Document Name and No.:** Transportation/Sales Invoice, 3.4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Code Value</th>
<th>Code Value Description</th>
<th>Code Value Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charge Indicator</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
<td>[No definition necessary.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>[No definition necessary.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG** (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

   **Document Name and No.:**

   **Description of Change:**
   
   No Technical Changes Needed
4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

[The request was specific to charge type descriptions which were processed as R96121B. Please reference the Executive Committee discussion and procedural instructions below for an accurate description of the "request" surrounding R96121A.]

b. Description of Recommendation:

Executive Committee

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:
There are currently over 90 different charge types, some of which may overlap, and are not easily distinguishable. Information Requirements Subcommittee should review the terms for defining descriptions in a glossary, eliminating any redundancy and overlaps. Service codes should be reviewed at the same time with the same actions. Possibly this should be a joint Information Requirements Subcommittee and Business Practices Subcommittee effort. This item is also in our annual plan.

PROCEDURAL VOTE:
The revised recommendation is for the Information Requirements Subcommittee and Business Practices Subcommittee to review all codes for a higher degree of standardization.

| Sense of the Room: March 5, 1997 | 17 In Favor | 0 Opposed |
| Segment Check (if applicable): | | |
| In Favor: | 2 End-Users | 4 LDCs | 5 Pipelines | 3 Producers | 3 Services |
| Opposed: | End-Users | LDCs | Pipelines | Producers | Services |

Business Practices Subcommittee

September 4, 1997 Business Practices Subcommittee Conference Call:

With respect to the Code value clean-up effort, Information Requirements is to undertake the effort and as with the current custom, should in the process of this effort, the Information Requirements Subcommittee identify business practice issues (i.e., controversies) they should refer those to the BPS for resolution.

(Note: No specific sense of the room was taken as the motion was procedural and instructional. There was no opposition stated by any of the 20 attendees on the conference call.)

Information Requirements Subcommittee

This request is split into two parts: **R96121A** is be assigned to the code value clean-up effort. **R96121B** is assigned to the definitions on the request.
RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline  Request No.: R96121 A-13

Sense of the Room: August 18, 1997   12 In Favor    0 Opposed
Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor:  __End-Users __LDCs __Pipelines __Producers __Services
Opposed: __End-Users __LDCs __Pipelines __Producers __Services

Data Element: Charge Indicator
Documents: Transportation/Sale Invoice

MOTION:
Adopt above code value definitions . . . for the above referenced documents:
[See table in Section 3 of this Recommendation Form.]

Sense of the Room: March 18, 1998   8 In Favor    0 Opposed
Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor:  __End-Users __LDCs __Pipelines __Producers __Services
Opposed: __End-Users __LDCs __Pipelines __Producers __Services

Technical Subcommittee

Sense of the Room: April 8, 1998   5 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:

Review all codes for a higher degree of standardization.

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

IR: Believed no definitions necessary as noted. No objections.