RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline  Request No.: R96121 A-16

1. Recommended Action:  Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:
   ___Accept as requested  ___Accept as requested
   ___Accept as modified below  ___Change to Existing Practice
   ___Decline  ___Status Quo

2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

   Per Request:  Per Recommendation:
   ___Initiation  ___Initiation
   ___Modification  ___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)
   ___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.:  Nomination, 1.4.1

   Business Name | Usage | Code Value | Code Value Description | Code Value Definition
   Quantity Type Indicator | M | R | Receipt | [No definition necessary.]
   | D | Delivery | [No definition necessary.]
   | B | Both | [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      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: Quantity Type Indicator
Document(s): Nomination, 1.4.1

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, believed data element definition adequately explained purpose. No objections.