| **NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD 2013 Annual Plan for the Wholesale Gas Quadrant**  **Adopted by the Board of Directors on December 12, 2013** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Description** | | | | **Completion[[1]](#endnote-1)** | **Assignment[[2]](#endnote-2)** |
| **1. Organize Standards Manuals for Ease of Use[[3]](#endnote-3)** | | | | | |
|  | a. | | Update the reference tool developed for Version 2.0 to reflect modifications applicable to Version 2.1  Status: Completed | 2nd Q, 2013 | IR/Technical |
|  | b. | | Based on the results of 1a, address any issues identified during the update of the reference tool  Status: Complete | 4th Q, 2013 | IR/Technical |
| **2. Sample Paper Review3** | | | | | |
|  | a. | | Execute Plan to Review and Update Sample Papers and ASC X12 Samples for all data sets with the exception of the Offer – Standard No. 5.4.24, Bid - Standard No. 5.4.25, Award Download - Standard No. 5.4.26 and the Operational Capacity - Standard No. 0.4.2 and Unsubscribed Capacity - Standard No. 0.4.3 data sets in Capacity Release to ensure consistency with the related data dictionaries.[[4]](#endnote-4)  Status: Underway | 2nd Q, 2014 | IR/Technical |
| **3. Development of EBB Code Values3** | | | | | |
|  | a. | | Execute the plan for the review code values and code value descriptions in all data sets to make them easier to understand on the TSPs’ EBB web sites.[[5]](#endnote-5)  Status: Underway | 2nd Q, 2014 | IR/Technical |
| **4. Electronic Delivery Mechanisms** | | | | | |
|  | a. | | Review minimum technical characteristics in Appendices B, C, and D of the WGQ QEDM Manual, and make changes as appropriate. (Reference NAESB Standard No. 4.3.59)  Status: Completed – dependent on publication schedule for Version 2.2 | 3rd Q, 2013 | EDM |
| **5. Review and Analyze the Interpretations of Standards** | | | | | |
|  | a. | | Analyze the Interpretations to determine if they should be implemented as standards  Status: Completed | 1st Q, 2013 | WGQ EC, WGQ BPS, IR/Technical, Contracts, EDM & Interpretations |
|  | b. | | Based on the results of 5a, incorporate interpretations / interpretations language, as appropriate, into the WGQ business practice standards  Status: Complete | 3rd Q, 2013 | WGQ EC, WGQ BPS, IR/Technical, Contracts, EDM & Interpretations |
|  | c. | | Determine if other courses of action are needed upon completion of 5b.  Status: Completed | 3rd Q, 2013 | WGQ EC, WGQ BPS, IR/Technical, Contracts, EDM & Interpretations |
| **6.**  **Final Rules published by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and implications to NAESB contracts** | | | | | |
|  | a. | | Review Final Rules published by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) to determine if new rules on various definitions will impact any of NAESB contracts, specifically their General Terms and Conditions  Status: Underway | 2nd Q, 2014 | Contracts Subcommittee |
| **7. Session Encryption** | | | | | |
|  | a. | | Investigate and determine if changes to standards are needed to support adequate session encryption (SSL/TLS issues [**US-Cert Vulnerability Note VU#864643**](http://www.kb.cert.org/vuls/id/864643)**)**  Status: Completed | 3rd Q, 2013 | EDM |
|  | b. | | Modify or develop standards as needed to apply the analysis of the above item (7a)  Status: Completed | 3rd Q, 2013 | EDM |
| **Program of Standards Maintenance & Fully Staffed Standards Work** | | | | | |
|  | Business Practice Requests | | | Ongoing | Assigned by the EC[[6]](#endnote-6) |
|  | Continue review against plan for migration to ANSI ASC X12 new versions as needed and coordinate such activities with DISA. | | | Ongoing | ANSI X12 Subcommittee |
|  | Information Requirements and Technical Mapping of Business Practices | | | Ongoing | Assigned by the EC3 |
|  | Interpretations for Clarifying Language Ambiguities | | | Ongoing | Assigned by the EC3 |
|  | Maintenance of Code Values and Other Technical Matters | | | Ongoing | Assigned by the EC3 |
|  | Maintenance of eTariff Standards | | | As Requested | Assigned by the EC3 |
| **Provisional Activities** | | | | | |
| 1. | Review and develop standards as needed related to [Docket No. RM11-1-000](http://www.naesb.org/pdf4/ferc102110.doc), Capacity Transfers on Intrastate Natural Gas Pipelines (Notice of Inquiry issued on October 21, 2010). | | | | |
| 2.. | Gas-Electric Coordination | | | | |
|  | a. | As provided for the GEH Report approved by the Board of Directors on September 20, 2012, (<http://www.naesb.org/pdf4/bd092012a1.pdf>), which was initiated by the NPC Report,[[7]](#footnote-1) review and develop standards or modify existing standards as needed for market timelines and coordination of scheduling. | | | |
|  | b. | As provided for the GEH Report approved by the Board of Directors on September 20, 2012, (<http://www.naesb.org/pdf4/bd092012a1.pdf>), which was initiated by the NPC Report,[[8]](#footnote-2) review and develop standards or modify existing standards as needed for flexibility in scheduling. | | | |
|  | c. | As provided for the GEH Report approved by the Board of Directors on September 20, 2012, (<http://www.naesb.org/pdf4/bd092012a1.pdf>), which was initiated by the NPC Report,[[9]](#footnote-3) review and develop standards or modify existing standards as needed for provision of information. | | | |
| 3. | Develop standards as needed in support of Variable Energy Resources (VERs) final order (RM10-11-000). ([NAESB Comments 3-2-11](http://www.naesb.org/pdf4/naesb_comments_ver_integration_nopr_030211.pdf), [FERC NOPR RM10-11-000](http://www.naesb.org/pdf4/ferc_111810_vers_nopr.doc), FERC Final Order RM10-11-000[[10]](#footnote-4)) In review of the NAESB standards, the Gas/Electric Operational Communications Standards may require changes, and other standards may be required or modified to support gas-electric coordination. | | | | |

**Wholesale Gas Quadrant Executive committee and Subcommittee Structure**

**Wholesale Gas Quadrant**

**Executive Committee (WGQ EC)**

**Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS)**

**Contracts Subcommittee**

**Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR)**

**Technical Subcommittee**

**Electronic Delivery Mechanism Subcommittee (EDM)**

**Technical**

**Implementation**

**Task Forces & Working Groups**

**Practices**

**Development**

The translation of business practices to usable uniform business transactions is accomplished through the definition of information requirements for the data, and mapping of that data into specific electronic transactions. This translation is performed by IR and Technical subcommittees and completes the standards development process, often referred to as “full staffing.” Both IR and Technical work in tandem to complete this crucial technical implementation activity. Until these steps have been completed, the process is incomplete, and in many cases, the business practices cannot be used.

**Interpretations Subcommittee**

**NAESB 2013 WGQ EC and Subcommittee Leadership:**

Executive Committee: Jim Buccigross, Chair and Dale Davis, Vice-Chair

Business Practices Subcommittee: Kim Van Pelt, Lori Lynn Pennock, Sylvia Munson and Richard Smith

Information Requirements Subcommittee: Dale Davis, Rachel Hogge

Technical Subcommittee: Kim Van Pelt

Contracts Subcommittee: Keith Sappenfield

Electronic Delivery Mechanism Subcommittee: Leigh Spangler

Interpretations Subcommittee: Mark Gracey

1. **End Notes, WGQ 2013 Annual Plan:**

   Dates in the completion column are by end of the quarter for completion by the assigned committee. The dates do not necessarily mean that the standards are fully staffed to be implementable by the industry, and/or ratified by membership. If one item is completed earlier than planned, another item can begin earlier and possibly complete earlier than planned. There are no begin dates on the plan. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. The assignments are abbreviated. The abbreviations and committee structure can be found at the end of the annual plan document. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. As business issues are presented to the Information Requirements Subcommittee and Technical Subcommittee, those business issues will be given precedence over WGQ 2012 Annual Plan Item Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Comments Provided by Spectra Energy in the 2010 Annual Plan process: <http://www.naesb.org/pdf4/wgq_aplan102010w3.doc>. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. Comments Provided by Spectra Energy in the 2010 Annual Plan process: <http://www.naesb.org/pdf4/wgq_aplan102010w4.doc> [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. The EC assigns maintenance of existing standards on a request-by-request basis. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Review and develop standards as needed and requested based on the National Petroleum Council (NPC) findings as communicated to the NAESB Board of Directors, government agencies or reliability organizations, as applicable. (9-15-11 NPC Report: [http://www.npc.org/NARD-ExecSummVol.pdf](http://www.npc.org/NARD-ExecsummVol.pdf)) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
8. Id. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
9. Id. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
10. For FERC Final Order, Docket No. RM10-11-000, specifically paragraph nos. 146 and 182 should be reviewed:

    146. The Commission concludes that an independent review of NERC standards and NAESB business practices is not necessary prior to the implementation of intra-hour scheduling. As noted by NERC, several entities currently offer intra-hour scheduling without any apparent conflict with Reliability Standards. NERC comments that it does not believe there are any existing standards that prohibit industry from implementing intra-hour scheduling, and no commenters have pointed to specific NAESB business practices that prevent industry from implementing intra-hour scheduling. The Commission therefore concludes that it is not necessary to delay adoption of the intra-hour scheduling requirements of this Final Rule pending further review of NERC Reliability Standards and NAESB business practices. To the extent industry believes it is beneficial to refine one or more existing NERC Reliability Standards or NAESB business practices to reflect intra-hour scheduling, stakeholders can use existing processes to pursue such refinements.

    182. Some commenters request that the Commission standardize protocols for reporting meteorological or forced outage data required by this Final Rule. The Proposed Rule did not contain standard protocols for data reporting and, as a result, the merits of such a requirement have not been fully addressed in the record.  Whether standardization of data communications would facilitate or hinder development of power production forecasting may implicate a variety of data and communications issues that would benefit from broad industry input through standards development processes such as those used by NAESB and other organizations. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)