**To: WGQ Annual Plan Committee**

**From: Sylvia Munson, The Vessel Group**

The Vessel Group submits the following two requests for consideration in the 2026 WGQ

Annual Plan.

Thank you,

Sylvia Munson

[Sylvia.Munson@TheVesselGrp.com](mailto:Sylvia.Munson@TheVesselGrp.com)

**Annual Plan Request 1:**

Review the 30-Year-Old Nominations Related Standards for applicability:

1. Remove data elements that can be replaced by business practices, technology and/or are no longer needed.
2. Make corresponding changes to all datasets in the corresponding Related Standards to complement changes to the Nomination Related Standards.

**Annual Plan Request 2:**

Review and update Standard 4.3.52. Consider its interaction with other standards. The standard as used today creates an opportunity to be “compliant” with NAESB standards while using data elements and code values that are not identified and supported in the NAESB Standards, thereby enabling non-Standard, compliant implementations that are difficult to interact with.

**Background:**

In 1995, NAESB published Version 1.0 of the NAESB standards. It was a monumental accomplishment to bring the Nomination dataset from over 100 data elements (from Exxon’s research at that time) down to 27 concise data elements, using common terms, that met the purposes of all pipeline participants. In the next 4 years, as pipelines implemented the datasets and found ‘gaps’ and ‘wants’ the dataset grew to 42 (Version 1.4). In an industry discussion with NESA in 2000, my notes were that “If we can keep the datasets from drowning in too many details, then the information can be evaluated quickly and accurately in a real time environment.” Twenty-five years later, we are drowning with 80 data elements in the Nomination dataset.

As an industry, we talk about “new” and “next” technologies, such as digital ledgers, and the benefits they can bring to the industry, but we need to clean up some of these basic transactions so that we don’t drag a lot of extra, no longer needed, baggage with us.

For example:

**Capacity Type Indicator** has values of Primary-to-Primary, Primary-to-Secondary, etc. These values are determined, today, by the Contract and Locations specified in the nomination and are determined by the Pipeline’s validations. The Pipeline does not need the shipper to provide this information.

**Nomination User Data 1 and 2**, was added for a single pipeline in order to continue a service on their previous nominations. That pipeline is now owned by another company and uses the company’s common software.

**Upstream Service Provider’s Activity Code**. Added for a single pipeline.

In the intervening years, we have taken on a practice of adding data elements to the Nomination dataset that can be solved by other means. Every time we add a data element, it costs everyone in the industry.

* Commercial applications for Service Requesters must add the data element to support any of their clients who use the application because they may nominate on the pipeline requiring the data element. This applies to all pipelines, if the pipeline builds their own system or uses a commercial application, the applications for Service Requesters must be changed.
* Commercial applications for Transportation Service Providers (TSPs) must add, at least, the validation to reject the data element if it is sent in an EDI or Flat File dataset.
* Customers using Commercial Applications must take an update from their application provider to accommodate the change.

Expanding lists of data elements costs everyone and often does not add value.

This issue, for commercial applications, is exacerbated by the WGQ QEDM standards that permit a Transportation Service Provider to request an additional data element or code value and, if the request is rejected, the TSP may implement the change anyway and still be considered compliant (NAESB 4.3.52). By supporting this standard, NAESB has inadvertently created a situation that permits implementations to be “compliant” using data elements and code values that are not identified or supported by the NAESB standards. For Service Requesters, this becomes a situation of chasing an elusive ghost when they cannot use a NAESB standard dataset for EDI or Flat File and have a successful exchange of data without matching these non-standard TSPs.

These two areas of change, updating the Nominations Related Standards and fixing the corresponding EDM standards are a step to prepare the WGQ standards for the future technologies we are facing.