



RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline

Request No.: R96121 A-14

1. Recommended Action:

- Accept as requested
- 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:

- Initiation
- 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:

- Initiation
- 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.: Request for Confirmation, 1.4.3
 Confirmation Response, 1.4.4
 Scheduled Quantity for Operators, 1.4.6

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Contractual Flow Indicator	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

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline

Request No.: R96121 A-14

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 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.