

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline

Request No.: R96121 A-12

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.: Allocation, 2.4.3
Shipper Imbalance, 2.4.4

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Statement Basis	M	A	Actual	<i>Quantity based upon the best available data.</i>
		E	Estimate	<i>Quantity based upon the best available data, which is recognized as preliminary.</i>
		R	Revision	<i>Change to a quantity based upon a prior period adjustment.</i>

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline

Request No.: R96121 A-12

Document Name and No.: Measurement Information Statement, 2.4.5

Business Name	Usage	Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
Statement Basis	M	AC	Actual	<i>Quantity based upon the best available data.</i>
		ES	Estimate	<i>Quantity based upon the best available data, which is recognized as preliminary.</i>
		RV	Revision	<i>Change to a quantity based upon a prior period adjustment.</i>

TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

Document Name and No.:

Description of Change:
No Technical Changes Needed

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.

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline

Request No.: R96121 A-12

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: Statement Basis
Documents: Allocation, 2.4.3
 Imbalance, 2.4.4
 Measurement Information Statement, 2.4.5

Is change from 'Estimate' to 'Actual' a 'Revision'? Can be. Some parties stated that an Estimate can be revised. Others will send a second Estimate and only use Revision when changing an Actual.

For some, the Estimate becomes an Actual when the accounting cycle closes.

IR is defining the code value descriptions and not the business practices surrounding their use. We will not define how or when or if any of the code value descriptions are used.

MOTION:

Each code value description has same meaning in all three documents. Combine into one set of three code value descriptions -- Actual, Estimate, Revision.

Code value descriptions and definitions:
[See table in Section 3 of this Recommendation Form.]

RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: ANR Pipeline

Request No.: R96121 A-12

Sense of the Room: October 15, 1997 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: See discussion in relevant motion section above.