

**NAESB WGQ Business Practices Subcommittee
Action Items Resolution**

| Discussion Category & Priority | Order 587N Paragraph (P) and/or Footnote (F) Number | Proposed Issues | Discussion Date | Discussion and/or Resolution |
|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| Recall 1 | None | Explore whether we should standardize terms such as partial day recall or flowing day recall? | 04/10/02 | Do not create definitions for the terms at this time. Reflect the concept of the terms (such as “timely recall”, “evening recall”, etc.) in the recall timeline that will be developed |
| Recall 2 | P 40; P 41 | Review the order to determine if the timeline proposed for use in the interim can be used as the basis for the timeline for the period beyond the interim so that pipelines do not have to modify their systems a second time. | 04/10/02 | See attached Proposed Recall Timeline Options document. Also, see Proposed Recall Timeline and Strawman Options Cross Reference document. These options will be discussed further. |
| Recall 2 | P 32 | Review capacity release timeline in standard 5.3.2 and recall timeline in standard 5.3.6 for proposed modification. It was discussed that the replacement shipper receiving the recall notice should have the ability to obtain and reschedule capacity. | 04/10/02 | See attached Proposed Recall Timeline Options document. Also, see Proposed Recall Timeline and Strawman Options Cross Reference document. These options will be discussed further. |
| Recall 2 | P 37 | Review nomination timeline in standard 1.3.2 for proposed modification. It was discussed that the replacement shipper receiving the recall notice should have the same notification rights as an interruptible shipper. | 4/10/02 | This action item cannot be resolved until the recall timeline and capacity release timeline action items are resolved. If modifications are need, this item will be discussed further. |
| Recall 3 | P 71 | Should standards be considered for recalls at non-standard nomination times? It was discussed that whatever is decided in NAESB shouldn't preclude pipelines from allowing recalls at non-standard times. | 4/10/02 | No standards should be proposed at this time. |

| Discussion Category & Priority | Order 587N Paragraph (P) and/or Footnote (F) Number | Proposed Issues | Discussion Date | Discussion and/or Resolution |
|--------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| Recall 4 | P 41; P 37 | Determine who supplies recall notification to the replacement shipper. Determine how the notification is accomplished. | 4/11/02 | <p>In order to meet the timeline, the transportation service provider (TSP) should be the official sender of the recall notification to all parties in the release/ re-release chain. The recall shipper should notify the replacement shipper at the same time the notification is given to the TSP.</p> <p>It was desirable to TSPs for notification to be done through the TSP's Customer Activities web site and that TSPs would then email out notification of the recall to the replacement shipper(s). The following Notices standards should be reviewed for modification to accomplish the email notification: 4.3.29, 5.2.2, 5.3.34, 5.3.35, 5.3.36, 5.3.37, 5.3.38, 5.3.39, 5.3.40.</p> <p>The method of how the notification should be done will be discussed further.</p> |
| Recall 5 | P 14, including F 22 | It was discussed that the total volumes delivered do not exceed original contract MDQ. | 4/11/02 | Total quantities delivered should not exceed original contract quantity. |
| Recall 6 | P 33; P 66 | Review standards to determine if any are affected by the penalty discussions in the order. | 4/11/02 | Review 1.3.51 to determine if modifications should be made or if new standards are needed. Any standards created will be related to the communication of penalty information (such as intra-day bumps). Penalty provisions will not be standardized as it is out of scope of the NAESB WGQ. |

| Discussion Category & Priority | Order 587N Paragraph (P) and/or Footnote (F) Number | Proposed Issues | Discussion Date | Discussion and/or Resolution |
|--------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|---|
| Recall 6 | P. 66 | What is the penalty exposure? | 4/11/02 | Review 1.3.51 to determine if modifications should be made or if new standards are needed. Any standards created will be related to the communication of penalty information (such as intra-day bumps). Penalty provisions will not be standardized as it is out of scope of the NAESB WGQ. |
| Recall 7 | P 17, including F 25; P 41 | Review standards 5.3.6 and 5.3.7 for proposed modification. | 4/11/02 | Delete Standard 5.3.6 and either put the recall timeline into a new standard or modify the capacity release timeline in 5.3.2 to reflect the recall timeline. This will be discussed further. Delete the first sentence of Standard 5.3.7 per Order 587 or we could delete 5.3.7 and add new standards relating to reputs. Reputs will be addressed during the reput discussion. |
| Recall 8 | P 29; P 39 | Review existing data sets and web site standards to determine if a release is recallable or not and to determine if the existing standards are sufficient to let the replacement shipper know the terms of the release upfront. It was discussed that we may need to pull some of the pieces of information related to recalls out of the special terms and conditions to be data elements or code values so that the replacement shipper can know the terms of the release upfront. | 4/11/02 | Transportation service providers shouldn't administer the specific terms of the release. Cycles should be indicated by the use of code values. |

| Discussion Category & Priority | Order 587N Paragraph (P) and/or Footnote (F) Number | Proposed Issues | Discussion Date | Discussion and/or Resolution |
|--------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| <u>Recall 9</u> | ?? | <u>Should the recall notifications be sent to the affected point operator(s) along with the affected replacement shipper(s)?</u> | <u>4/24/02</u> | <u>This issue has been only identified.</u> |
| Reput 1 | P 64 | Determine whether a schedule or timeline for reput notification is necessary. | 4/11/02 | Recall notification and reput notification should be separate actions and should require two separate processes. Current code values support reput options. These code values should be reviewed. The recall timeline that will be developed may not impact the current reput process. Automatic reput is not a good idea. This will be discussed further. |
| Last | | Review of existing standards for consistency. | 4/11/02 | This will be discussed after all other standards have been created and/or modified. |