

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: ANR Pipeline**

**Request No.: R96121 A-10**

**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.:** Nomination, 1.4.1  
Scheduled Quantity, 1.4.5

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Model Type	M	N	Non-Pathed Model	<i>[No definition necessary]</i>
		P	Pathed Model	<i>[No definition necessary]</i>
		T	Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Threaded Segment)	<i>[No definition necessary]</i>
		U	Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Un-threaded Segment)	<i>[No definition necessary]</i>

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: ANR Pipeline**

**Request No.: R96121 A-10**

**TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG** (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

**Document Name and No.:** Nomination (1.4.1)  
Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5)

<b>Description of Change:</b>
<b>G850NMST - Nomination (1.4.1)</b>
<b>Data Element Xref to X12</b>
Change key at top of page to add "Model" to each of the Model Types. i.e. "P - Pathed Model, N - Non-Pathed Model, T - Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Threaded Segment), U - Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Un-threaded Segment)"
<b>Transaction Set Tables</b>
"SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)" table: Change key at top of page to add "Model" to each of the Model Types. i.e. "P - Pathed Model, N - Non-Pathed Model, T - Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Threaded Segment), U - Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Un-threaded Segment), nu - not used"
<b>G865SQTS - Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5)</b>
<b>Data Element Xref to X12</b>
Change key at top of page to add "Model" to each of the Model Types. i.e. "P - Pathed Model, N - Non-Pathed Model, T - Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Threaded Segment), U - Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Un-threaded Segment)"
<b>Transaction Set Tables</b>
"SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)" table: Change key at top of page to add "Model" to each of the Model Types. i.e. "P - Pathed Model, N - Non-Pathed Model, T - Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Threaded Segment), U - Pathed Non-Threaded Model (Un-threaded Segment), nu - not used"

**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.

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: ANR Pipeline**

**Request No.: R96121 A-10**

**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.

**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:    Model Type  
Documents:      Nomination, 1.4.1  
                      Scheduled Quantity, 1.4.5

**MOTION:**

No definition necessary for the code values.

**Sense of the Room:** October 15, 1997      11 In Favor      0 Opposed

**Segment Check** (if applicable):

In Favor:         End-Users         LDCs         Pipelines         Producers         Services

Opposed:         End-Users         LDCs         Pipelines         Producers         Services

**RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Requester: ANR Pipeline**

**Request No.: R96121 A-10**

**Technical Subcommittee**

**Sense of the Room:** April 8, 1998                        7   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 felt there was a sufficient, more comprehensive explanation in the Technical Implementation of Business Process for the Nomination. It is not necessary to reiterate as a definition in the code values listing. Also, the Nomination Related Standards book contains a diagram, and paper and EDI examples.