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  
   ___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  

   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  

DATA DICTIONARY (for new documents and addition, modification or deletion of data elements)  

Document Name and No.:  Note/Special Instructions, 5.4.17  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Type</td>
<td>Code indicating to which transaction set the Note/Special Instruction refers</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Document Name and No.:  Note/Special Instructions, 5.4.17  

<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>Associated Transaction Set</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Capacity Release - Operationally Available and Unsubscribed Capacity</td>
<td>[No definition necessary]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| IN       | Capacity Release - Firm Transportation and Storage - Bid Review | [No definition necessary] |
| RB       | Capacity Release - Replacement Capacity                        | [No definition necessary] |
| RC       | Capacity Release - Firm Transportation and Storage - Offer     | [No definition necessary] |
| U3       | Capacity Release - Upload to Pipeline of Prearranged Deal (UPPD) | [No definition necessary] |
| U4       | Capacity Release - UPPD Notification                           | [No definition necessary] |
| VI       | Capacity Release - Firm Transportation and Storage - Award Notice | [No definition necessary] |

TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

Document Name and No.: Note/Special Instructions, 5.4.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Change:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G864CRNS - Note/Special Instructions (5.4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Element Xref to X12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMG segment: Change &quot;Transaction Type&quot; to &quot;Associated Transaction Set&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X12 Mapping
BMG segment: Change "Transaction Type" to "Associated Transaction Set" in BMG03

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>
</table>

Segment Check (if applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End-Users: 2</td>
<td>End-Users:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCs: 4</td>
<td>LDCs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines: 5</td>
<td>Pipelines:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producers: 3</td>
<td>Producers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services: 3</td>
<td>Services:</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of the Room:</th>
<th>August 18, 1997</th>
<th>12 In Favor</th>
<th>0 Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Segment Check (if applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End-Users:</td>
<td>End-Users:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCs:</td>
<td>LDCs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines:</td>
<td>Pipelines:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producers:</td>
<td>Producers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Services:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity Release Transaction Type data element:

There are two data elements named Transaction Type, one in nominations, flowing gas and invoicing related data sets, and one in capacity release related data sets. These two data elements currently have two different definitions. IR will attempt to rectify this issue.

As a start, IR will address the Transaction Type in the nominations, then go into the capacity release datasets and investigate a "fix" for the duplicate Transaction Type data element.

Current Name: Transaction Type
Definition: Code indicating to which transaction set the note/special Instruction refers
Usage: Mandatory
New Name: Associated Transaction Set
Definition: Code indicating to which transaction set the note/special Instruction refers
Usage: Mandatory

Discussion that the codes were so self-explanatory that no definitions were necessary and they would add
no clarification or value to the use of the codes. Further proposed that bracketed text would be added to
the definition column as follows: [No definition necessary]

Change one code value as follows:
Capacity Release - UPPD - Notify and Request to Confirm Notification
[Note: This change had already been made in the Version 1.2 Standards Books, no action necessary.]

Motion: Change data element name Transaction Type in the Capacity Release - Notes/Special
Instructions data set (5.4.17) from "Transaction Type" to "Associated Transaction Set" with no change in
usage or definition.

Move all existing codes from "Transaction Type" (capacity release transaction type) to "Associated
Transaction Set." Modify transaction type code "Capacity Release - UPPD - Notify and Request to
Confirm" to "Capacity Release - UPPD - Notification." No definitions are necessary for these codes.

Sense of the Room: September 10, 1997
10 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: October 29, 1997
6 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: No code value definitions necessary, data element "fix" approved without opposition.