



2016 NAESB GEH Survey

2016 NAESB GEH Survey

Instructions and general information concerning the survey are included in the email that accompanied this survey link.



2016 NAESB GEH Survey

* Please provide your contact information.

**Company or
Organization:**

Representative:

Email Address:

Phone Number:

* Do you participate in the WHOLESALE NATURAL GAS MARKET (**WGQ**), WHOLESALE ELECTRIC MARKET (**WEQ**) or RETAIL MARKETS (**RMQ**) as a:

(check one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> WGQ - Producer | <input type="radio"/> WEQ - Merchant or Marketer |
| <input type="radio"/> WGQ - Pipeline | <input type="radio"/> WEQ - Independent Grid Operators and Planners |
| <input type="radio"/> WGQ - Distributor | <input type="radio"/> WEQ - Marketers/Brokers |
| <input type="radio"/> WGQ - Services or Technology Company | <input type="radio"/> WEQ - Technology and Services Companies |
| <input type="radio"/> WGQ - Marketer | <input type="radio"/> RMQ - Retail Electric End Users/Public Agencies |
| <input type="radio"/> WGQ - End User | <input type="radio"/> RMQ - Retail Gas Market Interests |
| <input type="radio"/> WEQ - Transmission Company | <input type="radio"/> RMQ - Retail Electric Utilities |
| <input type="radio"/> WEQ - Generator | <input type="radio"/> RMQ - Retail Electric Service Providers/Suppliers |
| <input type="radio"/> WEQ - Distributor/Load Serving Entity | |
| <input type="radio"/> If you do not fit any of the market functions described or your market function has not been provided, please describe your market function. | |



2016 NAESB GEH Survey

Questions:

1a) Is this issue within the scope of the Commission's request and directly responsive to the Board's directive to the GEH Forum?

1b) Is this issue within the scope of NAESB's purview, without necessarily suggesting any action be taken by NAESB?

2a) Would pursuing this issue lead to more uniformity or streamlining that would meet the Commission's request and be directly responsive to the Board's directive to the GEH Forum?

2b) Can this issue be economically pursued?

2c) Is there a benefit to waiting until more experience has been gained after the April 1st 2016 implementation of the changes to the nomination timeline before pursuing this issue?

3) Do you concur that this issue would not benefit from a national standard due to one or more of the following reasons (non-FERC policy issue, operational issue, service issue, etc.)?

4) Do you concur that additional uniformity with respect to this issue may not be needed because this issue falls into a potential area where, for example, tools could be used to address the Commission's request?

5) Does this issue have policy implications that would require Commission direction before NAESB (or others) were to proceed further, or where there are other issues that stand in the way of moving

forward at present?

6) Is this issue a statement of fact/observation?

Please respond by selecting “yes” or “no” to each of the questions included above as they relate to each item. Questions that are left blank will be treated the same as a “no opinion” response. Additional instructions and general information concerning the survey are included in the survey request email.

1. (Item 1) No-notice needs for capacity to support anticipated usage of services purchased, which may or may not be scheduled (e.g., if no notice is not scheduled, such capacity can be made available to other shippers). This issue is one way to address the potential for greater flexibility. Pipelines forecast the amount of no-notice service they expect to provide on a next-day basis and then utilize any projected unused capacity on a interruptible basis to serve other shippers including gas fired electric generators with non-ratable demand. This is a foundational concept for Order 636.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

2. (Item 2) Non-ratable flexibility, both required to support services purchased and on a best efforts basis. Pipelines that offer no-notice service forecast the amount of no-notice service they expect to provide on a next-day basis and then utilize any projected unused capacity on an interruptible basis to serve other shippers including gas fired electric generators with non-ratable demand. This is a foundational concept for Order 636.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

3. (Item 11) Physical assistance agreed upon between interconnecting parties. OBAs and similar type of arrangement (the implementing devices), seem to be working well.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

4. (Item 17) Levels of confirmation

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

5. (Item 18) Nomination errors requiring manual intervention for mismatches during the confirmation process

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation
- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

6. (Item 19) Manual confirmation processes

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

7. (Item 20) Availability of capacity at interconnection points. There is currently uncertainty as to impact of tighter timeframes on the scheduling of capacity for the later cycles. (At present, the schedules tend to come out early.)

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

8. (Item 21) Computerized scheduling and confirmations for nomination of subscribed services during non-traditional business hours.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment
- Actionable by NAESB after sufficient experience has been gained and analyzed after April 2016
- No actionable items

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

9. (Item 22) It would be desirable to have a set of terminology agreed upon by participants to characteristics shapes, profiles, ratable, non-ratable, and so forth to facilitate discussion.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

10. (Item 23) For certain service types, the ability to provide a more granular (e.g., 24 hour) take pattern could alleviate/reduce reliance on intraday to achieve that take pattern.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings
- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment for those pipelines offering such services

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

11. (Item 25) Communication protocols with LDCs, gas generator operators and natural gas marketing companies

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment
- Actionable by NAESB after sufficient experience has been gained and analyzed after April 2016

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

12. (Item 26) Improve efficiency of critical information sharing (related to items 22 and 25)

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment
- Actionable by NAESB after sufficient experience has been gained and analyzed after April 2016

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

13. (Item 28) Tight execution windows for gas markets

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

14. (Item 29) Generators rely on flexibility for a number of operational issues on the electric side. (Electric systems may require very-short periods of gas use to address perturbations on the systems, and electric systems also need to address forecasting error for flexible power-plant operations.) Interruptible services are needed because firm service doesn't always provide for all of the flexibility attributes needed for reliability of power system operations. There are no-notice services, but they are limited. It is challenging to generators that flexibility elements of services are themselves interruptible.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

15. (Item 30) Decreasing operational flexibility provided by IT service when providing the possibility of more frequent opportunities for FT and IT through additional nominations/scheduling cycles. The status quo has certain rights and benefits that have been baked into expectations about the amount of flexibility that is available under different services. Changes ahead in either the gas or electric industries may disrupt the flexibility that has worked in the past and may not in the future.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

16. (Item 31) Coordination/timing challenges

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

17. (Item 32) Forcing pipelines to process quicker may decrease operational flexibility because there may be less time to determine if interruptible transportation is available. Shorter timeframes may inadvertently introduce too much rigidity.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

18. (Item 33) Use of multiple confirmation methods in addition to traditional confirmations for intraday nominations. There is currently a good definition of Confirmation by Exception (CBE) in NAESB standards. CBE however, may not be available everywhere but there may also be additional confirmation methods that could benefit from standardization.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

19. (Item 34a) There are non-bumping best-efforts nomination opportunities with streamlined confirmations as an intra-cycle nomination subject to operating conditions of the pipeline.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

20. (Item 34b) True-up processes at the end of the gas day are examples of best efforts. This may be necessary but not sufficient to effectuate a transaction that can be scheduled.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

21. (Item 35) Lining up the processes and timeframes that occur within the confirmations/scheduling window to gain efficiency of data exchange.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment.
- Actionable by NAESB after sufficient experience has been gained and analyzed after April 2016

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

22. (Item 36) 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 in the first presentation.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment.

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

23. (Item 37) Investigate the need to define the number of iterations to support confirmation, including on a best-effort basis. Defined iterations needed to support confirmations, including best efforts. Taking a look at these issues does not necessarily presume there is a magic number of iterations, in part to changing market conditions and because of respecting the goal of maximizing flow.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items
- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment. Here iterations is meant to refer to the frequency and timing of data exchanges between confirming parties.

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

24. (Item 38) Further standardize methods and processes (for example, standardizing time frames for the different elements of the processes) employed to support confirmations. Standardization could clarify the steps and expectations among parties surrounding default actions that may arise from different time periods in the process.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment
- Actionable by NAESB after sufficient experience has been gained and analyzed after April 2016

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

25. (Item 39) Addressing the communication of characteristics of the information in the confirmation process could require a fundamental redesign, with potential changes to make confirmations more efficient. (Reasonable) commercial confidentiality issues must be respected. Note that some pipeline practices already may include this kind of information in the confirmation process.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

26. (Item 41) Would the ability to reserve current contracted primary FT capacity for use tomorrow, address issues related to inability to use FT contracts to serve intermittent electric generation?

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- A better industry understanding is needed to determine if there are issues that could be identified for later policy review
- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

27. (Item 42) A field test for best-efforts scheduling may be able to give us information as to demand and utility of services supporting non-ratable service.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

28. (Item 43) Observation: the current set of firm offerings is not meeting the demands of generators in some parts of the country. The suggestion is that it is not necessary to change the existing services, but rather to add new services (for example, one could add a block of capacity, e.g. a seasonal block in which a shipper could take x quantity and y quantity for day). This is similar to the type of offering that some pipelines now offer (e.g. revenue banking). Of course physical capabilities of pipeline systems must be taken into account.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

29. (Item 44) Volumetric service to support electric generation akin to SGS (Small Generation Service) on a best-efforts basis may meet expressed needs.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings
- A better industry understanding is needed to determine if there are issues that could be identified for later policy review

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

30. (Item 45) Intra-cycle capacity releases may improve best efforts scheduling. Conversely best-efforts scheduling may improve the effectiveness of existing intraday capacity releases.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

31. (Item 46) Best-efforts scheduling could also be applied to day-ahead shaped flows.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings
- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment for those pipelines offering such services

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

32. (Item 47) Episodic analysis of daily flows suggests that more opportunities to schedule may provide additional flexibility to generators and electric consumers' benefits.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

33. (Item 48) There could be benefits that flow from better matching the efficiency of gas scheduling to the provision of electric-market ancillary services (e.g., addressing short term imbalances, frequency regulation, flexible capacity) by gas generators. Because scheduling of gas is a process and electric ancillary services are products, it would be helpful to analyze what components of the scheduling process could be helpful in accommodating the provision of ancillary service.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment
- No actionable items, but if there are actions, they should occur through FERC and /or pipeline service offerings
- A better industry understanding is needed to determine if there are issues that could be identified for later policy review
- Actionable by NAESB after sufficient experience has been gained and analyzed after April 2016

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

34. (Item 49) As the electric system continues to evolve into a peakier and a more renewable grid, the need for enhanced scheduling and flexibility from the gas transportation system will grow.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- Actionable by NAESB in the current environment
- Actionable by NAESB to the extent FERC orders and/or pipelines offer the provision of enhanced scheduling services

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

35. (Item 50) How to support through efficient scheduling, a better coordination of gas supplies, transport services, ISOs and RTOs needs and needs of power generators? Using simulation to recreate “The Art of Scheduling” tools of software models could support more efficient and effective decision making.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

36. (Item 51) Through efficient nominations and scheduling, addressing service interruptions in the supply chain. Using simulation to recreate “The Art of Scheduling” tools of software models could support more efficient and effective decision making.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

37. (Item 52) How to address less time to validate nomination data that would not lead to errors or legal risks? Using simulation to recreate “The Art of Scheduling” tools of software models could support more efficient and effective decision making.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

38. (Item 53) How to address tighter deadlines that hamper gas controllers ability to account for shifts in volume. Using simulation to recreate “The Art of Scheduling” tools of software models could support more efficient and effective decision making.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

39. (Item 54) By adding more schedules, are tools available or currently in use that support both the gas controllers and the gas fired generators? Using simulation to recreate “The Art of Scheduling” tools of software models could support more efficient and effective decision making.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

40. (Item 55) Need for role playing. Using simulation to recreate “The Art of Scheduling” tools of software models could support more efficient and effective decision making.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items because this is an observation

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

41. (Item 56) Compress confirmations by expediting verification of nominations. Using simulation to recreate “The Art of Scheduling” tools of software models could support more efficient and effective decision making.

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- No actionable items

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

42. (Item 57) Could eTag be applied to the gas industry to mimic the significant number of transactions processed on the power grid that use eTag in short processing windows, and if so, can it result in a streamlined scheduling process for natural gas?

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- A better industry understanding is needed to determine if there are applicable/relevant lessons for improving the gas scheduling process

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

43. (Item 58) Are there “lessons learned” in the electric industry that could benefit the gas industry as it considers the feasibility of modifying the scheduling process to make it more efficient?

Proposed Solution(s) identified and discussed by Forum participants:

- A better industry understanding is needed to determine if there are applicable/relevant lessons for improving the gas scheduling process

	1a)	1b)	2a)	2b)	2c)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: