**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 Standard 1.3.[z3].

**STANDARDS LANGUAGE**

**Proposed NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.3.z3**

A Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should support, if requested by a Point Operator at a receipt location, the ability for the Point Operator’s upstream party(ies) to nominate on the TSP or

1. the ability for the Point Operator to confirm each of its upstream parties and each of the upstream party’s aggregate quantity at the location, and

(b) the ability for each of the Point Operator’s upstream parties to confirm its Service Requester(s) on the TSP and the associated Service Requester quantity(ies) and any additional information at the confirmation level supported by the TSP.

For the purposes of parts (a) and (b) of this standard, the TSP can require, and the Point Operator at the receipt location should supply and maintain, the identities of the Point Operator’s upstream party(ies).

**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 NAESB WGQ Standard No. 1.3.z3**

A Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should support, if requested by a Point Operator at a receipt location, the ability for the Point Operator’s upstream party(ies) to nominate on the TSP or

1. the ability for the Point Operator to confirm each of its upstream parties and each of the upstream party’s aggregate quantity at the location, and

(b) the ability for each of the Point Operator’s upstream parties to confirm its Service Requester(s) on the TSP and the associated Service Requester quantity(ies) and any additional information at the confirmation level supported by the TSP.

For the purposes of parts (a) and (b) of this standard, the TSP can require, and the Point Operator at the receipt location should supply and maintain, the identities of the Point Operator’s upstream party(ies).

**Motion passed a balanced vote with 7.5 in favor and 2.5 opposed**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Segment** | **Votes Cast** |  | **Balanced Vote** |  |
|  | **YES** | **NO** | **TOTAL** | **YES** | **NO** | **TOTAL** |
| **End Users** | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| **LDCs** | 7 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| **Pipeline** | 0 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| **Producer** | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| **Services** | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1.5 | .5 | 2 |
| **Total** | **14** | **17** | **31** | **7.5** | **2.5** | **10** |

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)