RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline

Request No.: R96121 A-14

1. Recommended Action:  
   ___Accept as requested  
   _X__Accept as modified below  
   ___Decline  

Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:  
   _X__Change to Existing Practice  
   ___Status Quo

2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

Per Request:  Per Recommendation:
   ___Initiation   _X__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)
   _X__Code Value (x.4.z)   _X__Code Value (x.4.z)
   _X_X12 Implementation Guide   _X_X12 Implementation Guide
   ___Business Process Documentation   ___Business Process Documentation

3. RECOMMENDATION

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

Document Name and No.: Request for Confirmation, 1.4.3
Confirmation Response, 1.4.4
Scheduled Quantity for Operators, 1.4.6

<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>Contractual Flow 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.:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Change:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Technical Changes Needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of the Room:</th>
<th>March 5, 1997</th>
<th>17 In Favor</th>
<th>0 Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment Check (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Favor:</td>
<td>2 End-Users</td>
<td>4 LDCs</td>
<td>5 Pipelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-14

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:  Contractual Flow Indicator
Documents:  Request for Confirmation, 1.4.3
            Confirmation Response, 1.4.4
            Scheduled Quantity for Operators, 1.4.6

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.