**1. RECOMMENDED ACTION: EFFECT OF EC VOTE TO ACCEPT RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Accept as requested | X | Change to Existing Practice |
| X | Accept as modified below |  | Status Quo |
|  | Decline |  | Correction |

**2. TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT/MAINTENANCE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Per Request:** | **Per Recommendation:** |
|  | Initiation |  | Initiation |
|  | Modification | X | Modification |
|  | Correction |  | Correction |
|  | 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) | X | 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 |  | X12 Implementation Guide |
|  | Business Process Documentation |  | Business Process Documentation |

**3. RECOMMENDATION**

**SUMMARY:**

Add NAESB WGQ Definition 1.2.[z1], NAESB WGQ Standard 1.3.[z1], and NAESB WGQ Standard 1.3.[z2].

**STANDARDS LANGUAGE**

**Proposed NAESB WGQ Definition No. 1.2.[z1]**

Ranking across transactions is the term used to describe the Service Requester’s (SR) ability to rank nomination transactions, at a location, across multiple contracts for that SR.

**Proposed NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.3.[z1]**

Absent mutual agreement to the contrary, confirmations between two interconnected Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should be conducted with consideration of the nomination model type of each of those parties. The model type determines the information available to be exchanged in the confirmation and the information needed in the confirmation.

(i) When a Service Requester (SR1) nominates on a Transportation Service Provider (TSP1) which utilizes the pathed non-threaded model or supports ranking across transactions at a location under the pathed or non-pathed models, the SR1 on TSP1 should provide its Service Requester Data on TSP1 to SR1’s upstream or downstream party, as applicable, for inclusion in that Service Requester’s (SR2) nomination on its corresponding Transportation Service Provider (TSP2). SR2 should provide the SR1’s Service Requester Data in its nomination to TSP2.

(ii) When a Service Requester (SR1) nominates on a Transportation Service Provider (TSP1) which utilizes the pathed or non-pathed nomination model and does not support ranking across transactions, the SR1 on TSP1 should provide its Service Requester Data and Service Requester Contract on TSP1 to SR1’s upstream or downstream party, as applicable, for inclusion in that Service Requester’s (SR2) nomination on its corresponding Transportation Service Provider (TSP2). SR2 should provide the SR1’s Service Requester Data and Service Requester Contract in its nomination to TSP2.

(iii) When a TSP utilizes the pathed non-threaded model and the Business Conditional data element Service Requester Contract in the upstream and downstream un-threaded segments in the Nomination (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.1), the TSP’s confirmation should comport with the requirements of the pathed model type.

Any TSP receiving Upstream/Downstream Identifier Data and, when applicable, Upstream/Downstream Contract Identifier from a Service Requester should send such information, as reflected in the Confirmation Level Matrix, in the Request for Confirmation (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.3) or use the information, as reflected in the Confirmation Level Matrix, in the Confirmation Response (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.4) to other TSPs.

**Proposed NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.3.[z2]**

Service Requester ranks, provided in the nomination, should be used only by the Transportation Service Provider to which they are provided.

**4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

1. **Description of Request:**

GEH Forum Issue 36[[1]](#footnote-1)

Level of confirmations: there is a wide range of data elements that are exchanged, from a minimum amount to a very large set of data. In the "Art of Scheduling," pipelines confirm at different levels, with potential for disparities. Greater standardization could produce confirming efficiencies. (For example, confirm at the shipper-to-shipper level. Or, if there are confirmations at a lower level of detail, it would be driven by model type.) See issue 17[[2]](#footnote-2) in the first presentation.”

1. **Description of Recommendation:**

**Business Practices Subcommittee**

See the agenda and corresponding meeting minutes for the Business Practices Subcommittee for GEH related annual plan items and their corresponding discussions for the following dates:

* 07/12/2016
* 07/28/2016
* 08/11/2016
* 08/25/2016
* 09/12-13/2016
* 09/29/2016
* 10/04/2016
* 10/18/2016
* 10/27-28/2016
* 11/02/2016
* 11/09-10/2016
* 11/16/2016
* 11/30-12/01/2016
* 12/08-09/2016
* 12/14/2016
* 12/19-20/2016
* 01/17/2017

**Motion (01/17/2017):**

**Proposed Revised NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.3.z1**

Absent mutual agreement to the contrary and regardless of whether a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) offers a Mutually Agreeable level of data in the confirmation process, confirmations between two interconnected Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should be conducted with consideration of the nomination model type of each of those parties. The model type determines the information available to be exchanged in the confirmation and the information needed in the confirmation.

(i) When a Service Requester (SR1) nominates on a Transportation Service Provider (TSP1) which utilizes the pathed non-threaded model or supports ranking across transactions at a location under the pathed or non-pathed models, the SR1 on TSP1 should provide its Service Requester Data on TSP1 to SR1’s upstream or downstream party, as applicable, for inclusion in that Service Requester’s (SR2) nomination on its corresponding Transportation Service Provider (TSP2). SR2 should provide the SR1’s Service Requester Data in its nomination to TSP2.

(ii) When a Service Requester (SR1) nominates on a Transportation Service Provider (TSP1) which utilizes the pathed or non-pathed nomination model and does not support ranking across transactions, the SR1 on TSP1 should provide its Service Requester Data and Service Requester Contract on TSP1 to SR1’s upstream or downstream party, as applicable, for inclusion in that Service Requester’s (SR2) nomination on its corresponding Transportation Service Provider (TSP2). SR2 should provide the SR1’s Service Requester Data and Service Requester Contract in its nomination to TSP2.

(iii) When a TSP utilizes the pathed non-threaded model and the Business Conditional data element Service Requester Contract in the upstream and downstream un-threaded segments in the Nomination (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.1), the TSP’s confirmation should comport with the requirements of the pathed model type.

Any TSP receiving Upstream/Downstream Identifier Data and, when applicable, Upstream/Downstream Contract Identifier from a Service Requester should send such information, as reflected in the Confirmation Level Matrix, in the Request for Confirmation (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.3) or use the information, as reflected in the Confirmation Level Matrix, in the Confirmation Response (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.4) to other TSPs.

**Motion failed a balance vote with .4 in favor and 7.6 opposed**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Segment** | **Votes Cast** |  | **Balanced Vote** |  |
|  | **YES** | **NO** | **TOTAL** | **YES** | **NO** | **TOTAL** |
| **End Users** | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| **LDCs** | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| **Pipeline** | 0 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| **Producer** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Services** | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 2 |
| **Total** | **1** | **35** | **36** | **0.4** | **7.6** | **8** |

**Motion (01/17/2017):**

**Proposed NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.3.z1**

Absent mutual agreement to the contrary, confirmations between two interconnected Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should be conducted with consideration of the nomination model type of each of those parties. The model type determines the information available to be exchanged in the confirmation and the information needed in the confirmation.

(i) When a Service Requester (SR1) nominates on a Transportation Service Provider (TSP1) which utilizes ~~either~~ the pathed non-threaded model or supports ranking across transactions at a location under the pathed or non-pathed models, the ~~Service Requester (~~SR1~~)~~ on TSP1 should provide its Service Requester Data on TSP1 to SR1’s upstream or downstream party, as applicable, for inclusion in that Service Requester’s (SR2) nomination on its corresponding Transportation Service Provider (TSP2). SR2 should provide the SR1’s Service Requester Data in its nomination to TSP2.

(ii) When a Service Requester (SR1) nominates on a Transportation Service Provider (TSP1) which utilizes the pathed or non-pathed nomination model and does not support ranking across transactions, the ~~Service Requester (~~SR1~~)~~ on TSP1 should provide its Service Requester Data and Service Requester Contract on TSP1 to SR1’s upstream or downstream party, as applicable, for inclusion in that Service Requester’s (SR2) nomination on its corresponding Transportation Service Provider (TSP2). SR2 should provide the SR1’s Service Requester Data and Service Requester Contract in its nomination to TSP2.

(iii) When a TSP utilizes the pathed non-threaded model and the Business Conditional data element Service Requester Contract in the upstream and downstream un-threaded segments in the Nomination (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.1), the TSP’s confirmation should comport with the requirements of the pathed model type.

Any TSP receiving Upstream/Downstream Identifier Data and, when applicable, Upstream/Downstream Contract Identifier from a Service Requester should send such information, as reflected in the Confirmation Level Matrix, in the Request for Confirmation (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.3) or use the information, as reflected in the Confirmation Level Matrix, in the Confirmation Response (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.4) to other TSPs.

**Motion passes unanimously**

**Motion (11/30-12/01/2016):**

**Definition 1.2.z1**

Ranking across transactions is the term used to describe the Service Requester’s (SR) ability to rank nomination transactions, at a location, across multiple contracts for that SR.

**Standard 1.3.z1**

Absent mutual agreement to the contrary, confirmations between two interconnected Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) should be conducted with consideration of the nomination model type of each of those parties. The model type determines the information available to be exchanged in the confirmation and the information needed in the confirmation.

When a Transportation Service Provider (TSP1) utilizes either the pathed non-threaded model or supports ranking across transactions at a location under the pathed or non-pathed models, the Service Requester (SR1) on TSP1 should provide its Service Requester Data on TSP1 to SR1’s upstream or downstream party, as applicable, for inclusion in that Service Requester’s (SR2) nomination on its corresponding Transportation Service Provider (TSP2). SR2 should provide the SR1’s Service Requester Data in its nomination to TSP2.

When a Transportation Service Provider (TSP1) utilizes the pathed or non-pathed nomination model and does not support ranking across transactions, the Service Requester (SR1) on TSP1 should provide its Service Requester Data and Service Requester Contract on TSP1 to SR1’s upstream or downstream party, as applicable, for inclusion in that Service Requester’s (SR2) nomination on its corresponding Transportation Service Provider (TSP2). SR2 should provide the SR1’s Service Requester Data and Service Requester Contract in its nomination to TSP2.

When a TSP utilizes the pathed non-threaded model and the Business Conditional data element Service Requester Contract in the upstream and downstream un-threaded segments, the TSP’s confirmation should comport with the requirements of the pathed model type.

Any TSP receiving Upstream/Downstream Identifier Data and, when applicable, Upstream/Downstream Contract Identifier from a Service Requester, should send such information in the Request for Confirmation or use the information in the Confirmation Response to other TSPs.

**Proposed Standard No. 1.3.z2**

Service Requester ranks, provided in the nomination, should be used only by the Transportation Service Provider to which they are provided.

**Proposed Instruction from WGQ BPS to the Information Requirements and Technical Subcommittees:**

The WGQ BPS instructs the Joint IR/Technical Subcommittees to modify the NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.4.3 Confirmation Request and any other corresponding data sets, as necessary, to accommodate the business practice of performing confirmations at various levels dependent upon the model types of the interconnecting parties and whether they support ranking across transactions as per the proposed standards for GEH Forum Issue #36.

**Motion passed a balance vote with 7.39 in favor and 1.61 opposed**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Segment** | **Votes Cast** |  | **Balanced Vote** |  |
|  | **YES** | **NO** | **TOTAL** | **YES** | **NO** | **TOTAL** |
| **End Users** | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| **LDCs** | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0.571429 | 1.428571 | 2 |
| **Pipeline** | 10 | 1 | 11 | 1.818182 | 0.181818 | 2 |
| **Producer** | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| **Services** | 8 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| **Total** | **25** | **6** | **31** | **7.38961** | **1.61039** | **9** |

1. The GEH Forum Issues may be found in the GEH Survey Addendum: <https://www.naesb.org/pdf4/geh_report_addendum_041816_clean051316.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)