RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline  Request No.: R96121 A-15

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:  
   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)  
   X Code Value (x.4.z)  
   X X12 Implementation Guide  
   ___Business Process Documentation

3. RECOMMENDATION

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

   Document Name and No.:  
   Pre-determined Allocation, 2.4.1  
   Allocation, 2.4.3

   Business Name | Usage | Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition
   --------------|-------|------------|------------------------|-------------------------------
   Direction of Flow | M | R | Receipt | [No definition necessary.]  
   | | D | Delivery | [No definition necessary.]  

   TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

   Document Name and No.:  

   Description of Change:  
   No Technical Changes Needed
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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.
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Sense of the Room: August 18, 1997
In Favor: 0
Opposed: 0

Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor: End-Users LDCs Pipelines Producers Services
Opposed: End-Users LDCs Pipelines Producers Services

Data Element: Direction of Flow
Documents: Pre-determined Allocation, 2.4.1
Allocation Statement, 2.4.3

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
In Favor: 8
Opposed: 0

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
In Favor: 5
Opposed: 0

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.