To: WGQ Executive Committee

From: Dale Davis, Williams Gas Pipeline and Rachel Hogge, Dominion Transmission

Date: January 28, 2013

Subject: R12007 – Comments

In reviewing the above referenced recommendation, which the WGQ Executive Committee is supposed to vote on February 21, 2013, the following corrections need to be made:

**Edit #1: Page 2 Standards Language**

The words ‘with the’ need to be deleted below the bullets. The clean version of the standard is correct.

**Proposed Modified NAESB WGQ Standard No. 4.3.28**

On the Informational Postings Web site, under For the subcategories of Notices, a list of notices should be provided wherein the first column headings in the Content Area should be:

* Notice Type (pursuant to NAESB WGQ Standard No. 4.3.29),
* Posted Date/Time,
* Notice Effective Date/Time (and Notice End Date/Time, when applicable),
* Notice Identifier (optional\*),
* Subject, and
* Response Date/Time, when applicable.,

~~with the~~ The list of notices should be sorted in reverse chronological order by Posted Date/Time.

For the information contained within the column titled Notice Type, a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) may provide more than one Notice Type, as more fully explained in NAESB WGQ Standard No. 5.3.70. The NAESB-defined Notice Types can be found in the Code Values Dictionary for System-wide Notices (NAESB WGQ Standard No. 5.4.16). Additionally, including a TSP may send a TSP-defined notice type(s), as more fully explained in NAESB WGQ Standard No. 5.3.71. If more than one Notice Type is provided, they should all be contained in the column labeled “Notice Type.” A TSP-defined type of notice may NOT be the first Notice Type.

\* When used as a reference, the Notice Identifier should be displayed.

**Edit #2:**

With the deletion of NAESB WGQ Standard No. 4.3.29 (page 3 of the recommendation), the data dictionary is unclear as to whether the Notice Type that is supposed to be sent is only the code value and/or the code value description. In most situations like this, it is either one or the other. It is believed that this was oversight by the Information Requirements Subcommittee. Therefore, in order to maintain the ability to send one or the other, the proposed edit is needed to make this clear in the data dictionary and the recommendation summary:

**Page 1: Summary:**

Add the following bullet:

* Modify the existing mandatory data element ‘Notice Type’ to continue to accommodate the sending of at least one of the Notice Type or the Notice Type Description. The data element is still effectively mandatory.

**Data Dictionary:**

**Standards Book:** Capacity Release Related Standards Manual

**Document Name and No.:** System-Wide Notices NAESB WGQ Standard No. 5.4.16

| **Business Name (Abbreviation)**  | **Definition** | **EBB Usage** | **EDI/FF Usage** | **Condition** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Notice Type Data~~(Notice Type)~~ | An indicator to specify the type of notice. | ~~M~~ |  |  |
| Notice Type (Notice Type) |  | C | M | For EBB, at least one of Notice Type or Notice Type Description is required. |
| Notice Type Description(Notice Type Desc) |  | C | nu | For EBB, at least one of Notice Type or Notice Type Description is required. |