



RECCOMENDATION TO THE NAESB WGQ EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
PROPOSED INTERPRETATION

Requester: Caminus

Request No.: C03004

Proposed Modifications

C03004 Request from Caminus Regarding the Data Dictionary for G855RRFC and G850RQCF:

In the data dictionary ~~ies~~ for [the Request for Confirmation - NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.3 \(document G850RQCF\)](#) and [the Confirmation Response - NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.4 \(document G855RRFC\), and G850RQCF](#) it is required that an ~~Upstream/Dn~~ upstream/downstream identifier code be sent depending on the contractual flow indicator. At a pipeline interconnect the usual confirmation proces is by upstream/downstream ~~Up/Dn~~ contract identifier. Shouldn't the upstream/downstream ~~Up/Dn~~ identifier code between the two pipelnes be a business conditional process? Here is one reason why. At an interconnect there could be several buy/sale transactions. The transport contract may be communicated through the chain but the entity may not due to confidentiality reasons. Please justify your position on this required element.

Proposed Draft Language:

The Mandatory usage of ~~U~~upstream and ~~D~~downstream ~~I~~identifiers (~~E~~entities) in the ~~C~~confirmation process, specifically as used in ~~documents the Request for Confirmation - NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.3 (document G850RQCF) and the Confirmation Response - NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.4 (document G855RRFC)~~G855RRFC and G850RQCF, dates back to GISB version 1.0. In requesting that NAESB "justify" it's position in requiring these data elements, C03004 states: "At a pipeline ~~I~~interconnect the usual confirmation process is by upstream/downstream ~~Up/Dn~~ contract identifier". The discussions for crafting version 1.0 and subsequent versions have repeatedly revealed that this assumption is incorrect. The industry as a whole has agreed that the ~~C~~confirmation process requires, at a minimum, the use of ~~U~~upstream and ~~D~~downstream ~~I~~identifiers. These discussions and the resulting votes have promulgated the ~~I~~industry's wishes to specify through NAESB a single method of confirmation for all facilities, whether a wellhead, interconnect, etc, as opposed to creating separate processes based on facility type. Subsequent standards have been adopted for other processes that rely on the mandatory usage of these identifiers.

With respect to interconnected parties coming to agreement not to use the ~~U~~upstream and ~~D~~downstream ~~I~~identifier elements in their joint ~~C~~confirmation process, NAESB recognizes the right for such parties to so agree to the extent that other standards, processes and agreements are not adversely affected, as is the case in any question of usage. Should one of the parties not agree to exclude the ~~U~~upstream and ~~D~~downstream ~~I~~identifier elements in the ~~C~~confirmation process, the standards will govern specifying mandatory usage of these elements.