

**Minor Corrections
Revealed through Compilation of Version 1.7 user manuals**

1. R97058B Missing footnote reference

Dictionary changes for 2.4.1 - Pre-determined Allocation

Recommendation says:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Service Requester Data	Identifies the party requesting the service.	TSDG			
Service Requester ID * (Svc Req)		TSDG	C	C	Based upon the usage as defined by the PDA transaction type. See PDA Transaction Type Matrix below.

Recommendation should read:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Service Requester Data	Identifies the party requesting the service.	TSDG			
Service Requester ID * ⁴ (Svc Req)		TSDG	C	C	Based upon the usage as defined by the PDA transaction type. See PDA Transaction Type Matrix below.

2. R97058B Superfluous footnote reference

Dictionary changes for 2.4.8 – Response to Request for Information

Recommendation says:

| **RELEVANT FOOTNOTES:**

* Indicates Common Code

** When a Transportation Service Provider's proprietary location code is employed pursuant to this standard, the parties agree that nominations, confirmations, scheduled quantities, and capacity release documents employing such code should be for one gas day at a time, and used only until there is a verified common code for the point associated with the proprietary location code. This would include daily nominations over a weekend. Within two months following the availability of the location the parties should employ the common code and no longer employ the proprietary code for identifying such location in the datasets related to the identified standards.

| [⁴ Refer to NAESB Standard No. \[S4 – from R97058B\]](#)

Recommendation should read:

| **RELEVANT FOOTNOTES:**

* Indicates Common Code

| [⁴ Refer to NAESB Standard No. \[S4 – from R97058B\]](#)

3. R97058B Typo in recommendation

PDA Transaction type Matrix for 2.4.1 - Pre-determined Allocation – usage C11:

Recommendation says:

C11 Mandatory when Upstream Identified Code is not present.

Recommendation should read:

| C11 Mandatory when Upstream ~~Identified~~ Identifier Code is not present.

4. R97058B Data Elements referenced should not be included in dataset

Dictionary Changes for 2.4.11

Recommendation says:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Contract Holder Data	The entity with the contractual relationship with the transportation service provider.	CTDG			
Contract Holder * ⁴ (K Holder)		CDG	M	M	
Contract Holder Name (K Holder Name)		CDG	M	nu	
Contract Holder Proprietary Code (K Holder Prop)		CDG	C	C	Mandatory when Contract Holder is not present.
Service Requester Data	Identifies the party requesting the service, or their agent.	CDG			
Service Requester * ⁴ (Svc Req)		CDG	M	M	
Service Requester Name (Svc Req Name)		CDG	M	nu	
Service Requester Proprietary Code (Svc Req Prop)		CDG	C	C	Mandatory when Service Requester is not present.

Recommendation should read:

These two data elements do not exist for this dataset.

5. R97058B Superfluous footnote reference

Dictionary Changes for 3.4.3 – Statement of Account

Recommendation says:

RELEVANT FOOTNOTES:

* Indicates Common Code

** When a Transportation Service Provider's proprietary location code is employed pursuant to this standard, the parties agree that nomination, confirmations, scheduled quantities, and capacity release documents employing such code should be for one gas day at a time, and used only until there is a verified common code for the point associated with the proprietary location code. This would include daily nominations over a weekend. Within two months following the availability of the location the parties should employ the common code and no longer employ the proprietary code for identifying such location in the data sets related to the identified standards.

[⁴ Refer to NAESB Standard No. \[S4 – from R97058B\]](#)

Recommendation should read:

RELEVANT FOOTNOTES:

* Indicates Common Code

[⁴ Refer to NAESB Standard No. \[S4 – from R97058B\]](#)

6. R97058B Data Elements referenced for change is different than reference

Dictionary Changes for 3.4.4 – Service Requester/Charge Allowance Invoice

Recommendation says:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Service Requester Data	Identifies the party requesting the service, or their agent.	BEDG	MA	
Service Requester * 4 (Svc Req)		BEDG	MA	
Service Requester Proprietary Code (Svc Req Prop)		BEDG	MA	

Recommendation should read:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Service Requester Data	Identifies the party requesting the service, or their agent.	BEDG	M	
Service Requester * 4 (Svc Req)		BEDG	MA	
Service Requester Proprietary Code (Svc Req Prop)		BEDG	MA	

7. R97058B Superfluous footnote reference

Dictionary Changes for 3.4.4 – Service Requester/Charge Allowance Invoice

Recommendation says:

| **RELEVANT FOOTNOTES:**

* Indicates Common Code

** When a Transportation Service Provider's proprietary location code is employed pursuant to this standard, the parties agree that nomination, confirmations, scheduled quantities, and capacity release documents employing such code should be for one gas day at a time, and used only until there is a verified common code for the point associated with the proprietary location code. This would include daily nominations over a weekend. Within two months following the availability of the location the parties should employ the common code and no longer employ the proprietary code for identifying such location in the data sets related to the identified standards.

| [⁴ Refer to NAESB Standard No. \[S4 – from R97058B\]](#)

Recommendation should read:

| **RELEVANT FOOTNOTES:**

* Indicates Common Code

| [⁴ Refer to NAESB Standard No. \[S4 – from R97058B\]](#)

8. R97058B Data Element Usage column should be left blank

Dictionary Changes for 5.4.20 – Transactional Reporting – Capacity Release

Recommendation says:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Contract Holder Proprietary Code (K Holder Prop)		BEDG	C	C	Mandatory when Contract Holder is not present and one of the following conditions is met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Status is 'New', or Contract Status is 'Amended' and Amendment Reporting is 'All Data'.
Releaser Company Proprietary Code (Releaser Prop)		BEDG	C	C	Mandatory when Releaser Company Code is not present and one of the following conditions is met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Status is 'New', or Contract Status is 'Amended' and Amendment Reporting is 'All Data'.
Transportation Service Provider Proprietary Code (TSP Prop)		TSPDG	C	C	Mandatory when Transportation Service Provider is not present.

Recommendation should read:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Contract Holder Proprietary Code (K Holder Prop)		BEDG	C		Mandatory when Contract Holder is not present and one of the following conditions is met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Status is 'New', or Contract Status is 'Amended' and Amendment Reporting is 'All Data'.
Releaser Company Proprietary Code (Releaser Prop)		BEDG	C		Mandatory when Releaser Company Code is not present and one of the following conditions is met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Status is 'New', or Contract Status is 'Amended' and Amendment Reporting is 'All Data'.
Transportation Service Provider Proprietary Code (TSP Prop)		TSPDG	C		Mandatory when Transportation Service Provider is not present.

9. R97058B Data Element Usage column should be left blank

Dictionary Changes for 5.3.21 – Transactional Reporting – Firm Transportation

Recommendation says:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Contract Holder Proprietary Code (K Holder Prop)		BEDG	C	C	Mandatory when Contract Holder is not present and one of the following conditions is met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Status is 'New', or Contract Status is 'Amended' and Amendment Reporting is 'All Data'.
Transportation Service Provider Proprietary Code (TSP Prop)		TSPDG	C	C	Mandatory when Transportation Service Provider is not present.

Recommendation should read:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Contract Holder Proprietary Code (K Holder Prop)		BEDG	C		Mandatory when Contract Holder is not present and one of the following conditions is met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Status is 'New', or Contract Status is 'Amended' and Amendment Reporting is 'All Data'.
Transportation Service Provider Proprietary Code (TSP Prop)		TSPDG	C		Mandatory when Transportation Service Provider is not present.

10. R97058B Data Element Usage column should be left blank

Dictionary Changes for 5.3.22 – Transactional Reporting – Interruptible Transportation

Recommendation says:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Contract Holder Proprietary Code (K Holder Prop)		BEDG	C	C	Mandatory when Contract Holder is not present and one of the following conditions is met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Status is 'New', or Contract Status is 'Amended' and Amendment Reporting is 'All Data'.
Transportation Service Provider Proprietary Code (TSP Prop)		TSPDG	C	C	Mandatory when Transportation Service Provider is not present.

Recommendation should read:

Business Name	Definition	Data Group	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
Contract Holder Proprietary Code (K Holder Prop)		BEDG	C		Mandatory when Contract Holder is not present and one of the following conditions is met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Status is 'New', or Contract Status is 'Amended' and Amendment Reporting is 'All Data'.
Transportation Service Provider Proprietary Code (TSP Prop)		TSPDG	C		Mandatory when Transportation Service Provider is not present.

11. R97058B Typo in recommendation

Dictionary Changes for 3.4.2 – Payment Remittance

Recommendation says:

Payment Remittance (3.4.2)
X12 Mapping
Heading N1 segment (position 0700): N104: Replace data element list in the element note with “Remitting Party/Remitting Party Proprietary Code, Payee/Payee Proprietary Code, Remit to Party/Remit to Party Proprietary”.

Recommendation should read:

Payment Remittance (3.4.2)
X12 Mapping
Heading N1 segment (position 0700): N104: Replace data element list in the element note with “Remitting Party/Remitting Party Proprietary Code, Payee/Payee Proprietary Code, Remit to Party/Remit to Party Proprietary Code ”.

12. R97058B Typo in recommendation

Dictionary Changes for 3.4.2 – Payment Remittance

Recommendation says:

Payment Remittance (3.4.2)
X12 Mapping
Detail ENT segment (position 0100): ENT03: code value 1: Add code value note “For NAESB WGQ, this code value may only be used when sending the “Billable Party (Payer).”

Recommendation should read:

Payment Remittance (3.4.2)
X12 Mapping
Detail ENT segment (position 0100): ENT03: code value 1: Add code value note “For NAESB WGQ, this code value may only be used when sending the “ Billable Party (Payer).”

(remove opening quotation mark in mid sentence)

13. R97058B Typo in recommendation

Dictionary Changes for 3.4.3 – Statement of Account

Recommendation says:

Statement of Account (3.4.3)
X12 Mapping
Detail ENT segment (position 0100): ENT03: code value 1: Add code value note “For NAESB WGQ, this code value may only be used when sending the “Billable Party (Payer).”

Recommendation should read:

Statement of Account (3.4.3)
X12 Mapping
Detail ENT segment (position 0100): ENT03: code value 1: Add code value note “For NAESB WGQ, this code value may only be used when sending the “Billable Party (Payer).”

(remove opening quotation mark in mid sentence)

14. R98011/R98012 Incorrect Reference to GISB, not NAESB (this recommendation was written in 1999)

New & Modified Standards for Flowing Gas

Recommendation says:

2.1.A (new standard 2.1.6)

The Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should provide allocations to a Service Requester (SR) at the nomination detail level either in the Allocation (GISB Standard 2.4.3) or the Shipper Imbalance (GISB Standard 2.4.4). The sending of the Allocation or the Shipper Imbalance to the SR would be dependent upon the TSP's business practices. In either case, the level of detail would only be to the package ID level where mutually agreed between the TSP and the SR.

2.3.A.1 (new standard 2.3.54)

At a location, the total quantity measured or estimated for the period should be used to provide allocations to parties' scheduled transactions (or otherwise identified transactions consistent with GISB Standard No. 2.3.F).

Modify Standard 2.3.21

The timing for reporting daily operational allocations after the gas has flowed is within one business day after the end of gas day. If the best available data for reporting daily operational allocations is the scheduled quantity, that quantity should be used for the daily operational allocation.

This standard applies to the daily provision of operational allocated quantities whether they are provided pursuant to GISB standard 2.4.3 or GISB standard 2.4.4.

Upon request to its Transportation Service Provider (TSP), a Service Requester (SR) should be provided operational allocated quantities pursuant to Standard 2.4.3 or 2.4.4 for the transaction(s) which have been scheduled by such TSP for the SR.

A TSP can agree to send the operational allocated quantities on a daily basis to a SR rather than accept the Upload of Request for Download for operational allocated quantities.

A TSP is not required to support requests for operational allocated quantities other than on an "all locations for a SR basis." Where a TSP has determined to support this standard in a manner other than:

- a) providing specific operational allocated quantities in response to a request for same, or
- b) providing operational allocated quantities on an "all locations for an SR basis," then the SR can rely on the absence of a line item(s) provided by a TSP as indicative that the particular line item(s)' scheduled quantities are operational allocated quantities.

Recommendation should read:

2.1.A (new standard number 2.1.6)

The Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should provide allocations to a Service Requester (SR) at the nomination detail level either in the Allocation (~~GISB~~ NAESB WGQ Standard 2.4.3) or the Shipper Imbalance (~~GISB-NAESB WGQ~~ Standard 2.4.4). The sending of the Allocation or the Shipper Imbalance to the SR

would be dependent upon the TSP's business practices. In either case, the level of detail would only be to the package ID level where mutually agreed between the TSP and the SR.

2.3.A.1

At a location, the total quantity measured or estimated for the period should be used to provide allocations to parties' scheduled transactions (or otherwise identified transactions consistent with [GISB-NAESB WGQ](#) Standard No. 2.3.F).

Modify Standard 2.3.21

The timing for reporting daily operational allocations after the gas has flowed is - within one business day after the end of gas day. If the best available data for reporting daily operational allocations is the scheduled quantity, that quantity should be used for the daily operational allocation.

This standard applies to the daily provision of operational allocated quantities whether they are provided pursuant to [GISB-NAESB WGQ](#) standard 2.4.3 or [GISB NAESB WGQ](#) standard 2.4.4.

Upon request to its Transportation Service Provider (TSP), a Service Requester (SR) should be provided operational allocated quantities pursuant to [NAESB WGQ](#) Standard 2.4.3 or 2.4.4 for the transaction(s) which have been scheduled by such TSP for the SR.

A TSP can agree to send the operational allocated quantities on a daily basis to a SR rather than accept the [Upload of Request for Download Request for Information](#) for operational allocated quantities.

A TSP is not required to support requests for operational allocated quantities other than on an "all locations for a SR basis." Where a TSP has determined to support this standard in a manner other than:

- a) providing specific operational allocated quantities in response to a request for same, or
- b) providing operational allocated quantities on an "all locations for an SR basis," then the SR can rely on the absence of a line item(s) provided by a TSP as indicative that the particular line item(s)' scheduled quantities are operational allocated quantities.

Note: When the recommendation was written, the expectation was that the Capacity Release – Upload of Request for Download dataset would be used to meet the requirements of 2.3.21. Once processed through IR and Technical, it was determined that the Capacity Release dataset did not meet the needs and a new dataset – Standard 2.4.7 - Request for Information – was created.

15. R98011/R98012 Typo in text

New Standards for Flowing Gas

Recommendation says:

2.3.B.1.e

At a location which is not covered by an OBA, an Allocating Party should receive Pre-determined Allocations and calculate the allocations for the location and provide these allocations to the appropriate parties for their use.

Recommendation should read:

2.3.B.1.e

| At a location which is not covered by an OBA, an Allocating Party should receive Pre-~~deterined~~determined Allocations and calculate the allocations for the location and provide these allocations to the appropriate parties for their use.

16. R99020/R99032/R01001/R02005 Typo in recommendation

Dictionary Changes for 5.4.8 – Offer Upload Quick Response

Recommendation says:

Validation Code (Sub-detail)

Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
E538	<u>Invalid Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator</u>	[no definition necessary]
E539	<u>Missing Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator</u>	[no definition necessary]
E540	<u>Missing Right to Amend Primary Points Terms</u>	[no definition necessary]
W823	<u>Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator not used</u>	[no definition necessary]
W824	<u>Right to Amend Primary Points Terms not used</u>	[no definition necessary]

Recommendation should read:

Validation Code (~~Sub-detail~~)(Heading)

Code Value	Code Value Description	Code Value Definition
E538	<u>Invalid Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator</u>	[no definition necessary]
E539	<u>Missing Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator</u>	[no definition necessary]
E540	<u>Missing Right to Amend Primary Points Terms</u>	[no definition necessary]
W823	<u>Right to Amend Primary Points Indicator not used</u>	[no definition necessary]
W824	<u>Right to Amend Primary Points Terms not used</u>	[no definition necessary]

17. R99024 Typo in recommendation

Dictionary Changes for 5.4.11 – Offer Upload Bidder Confirmation Quick Response

Recommendation says:

Standard 5.4.11

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Bidder Company -Data	The unique company code number for the legal entity which is the bidder.		
Bidder Company Code * ⁴		M	
Bidder Company Proprietary Code		C	Mandatory when Bidder Company Code is not present.

Recommendation should read:

Standard 5.4.11

Business Name	Definition	Usage	Condition
Bidder Company -Data	The unique company code number for the legal entity which is the bidder.		
Bidder Company Code * ⁴		M	
Bidder Company Proprietary Code		C	Mandatory when Bidder Company Code is not present.

18. R99024 Typo in recommendation

Data Dictionary for the following:

- o 5.4.3 Award Download
- o 5.4.4 Replacement Capacity
- o 5.4.7 Offer Upload
- o 5.4.9 Offer Upload Notification
- o 5.4.13 Operationally Available & Unsubscribed Capacity

Recommendation says:

Business Name	Definition	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<u>Location Proprietary Code Code (Loc Prop)</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Mandatory when Location is not present. When this field uniquely identifies the segment, a proprietary segment identifier may be used.</u>

Recommendation should read:

Business Name	Definition	EBB Usage	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<u>Location Proprietary Code Code (Loc Prop)</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Mandatory when Location is not present. When this field uniquely identifies the segment, a proprietary segment identifier may be used.</u>

19. R99024 Typo in recommendation

Data Dictionary for the 5.4.8 Offer Upload Quick Response

Recommendation says:

Business Name	Definition	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<u>Location Proprietary Code Code</u> (Loc Prop)		<u>C</u>	Mandatory when Location is not present. When this field uniquely identifies the segment, a proprietary segment identifier may be used.

Recommendation should read:

Business Name	Definition	EDI/FF Usage	Condition
<u>Location Proprietary Code</u> Code (Loc Prop)		<u>C</u>	Mandatory when Location is not present. When this field uniquely identifies the segment, a proprietary segment identifier may be used.

20. R99024 Typo in recommendation

Change Log for 5.4.1 – Offer Download

Recommendation says:

Offer Download (5.4.1)
Transaction Set Tables
N1 Segments (Heading) table: For the “Releaser Company Code/Releaser Company Proprietary Code” row, modify the Element Name column to “Releaser/Releaser Proprietary Code”
N1 Segments (Heading) table: For the “Bidder Company Code/Bidder Company Proprietary Code” row, modify the Element Name column to “Bidder/Bidder Proprietary Code”

Recommendation should read:

Offer Download (5.4.1)
Transaction Set Tables
N1 Segments (Heading) table: For the “Releaser Company Code/Releaser Company Proprietary Code” row, modify the Element Name column to “Releaser/Releaser Proprietary Code”
<u>N1 Segments (Heading) table: For the “Releaser Company Code/Releaser Company Proprietary Code” row, modify the Element Name (N102) column to “Releaser Name”</u>
N1 Segments (Heading) table: For the “Bidder Company Code/Bidder Company Proprietary Code” row, modify the Element Name column to “Bidder/Bidder Proprietary Code”
<u>N1 Segments (Heading) table: For the “Bidder Company Code/Bidder Company Proprietary Code” row, modify the Element Name (N102) column to “Bidder Name”</u>

21. R99024 Typo in recommendation

Change Log for 5.4.2 – Award Download

Recommendation says:

Award Download (5.4.2)
Transaction Set Tables
N1 Segments (Heading) table: For the “Releaser Company Code/Releaser Company Proprietary Code” row, modify the Element Name column to “Releaser/Releaser Proprietary Code”

Recommendation should read:

Award Download (5.4.2)
Transaction Set Tables
N1 Segments (Heading) table: For the “Releaser Company Code/Releaser Company Proprietary Code” row, modify the Element Name column to “Releaser/Releaser Proprietary Code”
<u>N1 Segments (Heading) table: For the “Releaser Company Code/Releaser Company Proprietary Code” row, modify the Element Name (N102) column to “Releaser Name”</u>

22. R00016 Typo in recommendation

Change Log for 1.4.3 – Confirmation Response, 1.4.5 – Scheduled Quantity

Recommendation says:

Document Name and No.: Confirmation Response, NAESB WGQ Standard 1.4.3
Scheduled Quantity, NAESB WGQ Standard 1.4.5

Description of Change:
Confirmation Response
Transaction Set Tables
LQ Segments (Detail) table: For the Reduction Reason data element, add the reduction reason codes and their descriptions (in alphabetical order) in the LQ02 and LQ02 Description columns, respectively, as follows: LPI Loop In LPO Loop Out
Scheduled Quantity
Transaction Set Tables
LQ Segments (Sub-detail) table: For the Reduction Reason data element, add the reduction reason codes and their descriptions (in alphabetical order) in the LQ02 and LQ02 Description columns, respectively, as follows: LPI Loop In LPO Loop Out

Recommendation should read:

Document Name and No.: Confirmation Response, NAESB WGQ Standard 1.4.3
Scheduled Quantity, NAESB WGQ Standard 1.4.5

Description of Change:
Confirmation Response
Transaction Set Tables
LQ Segments (Detail) table: For the Reduction Reason data element, add the reduction reason codes and their descriptions (in alphabetical order) in the LQ02 and LQ02 Description columns, respectively, as follows: LPI Loop In LPO Loop Out

LQ Segments (Sub-detail) table: For the Reduction Reason data element, add the reduction reason codes and their descriptions (in alphabetical order) in the LQ02 and LQ02 Description columns, respectively, as follows:

LPI Loop In
LPO Loop Out

Scheduled Quantity

Transaction Set Tables

LQ Segments (Sub-detail) table: For the Reduction Reason data element = RED, add the reduction reason codes and their descriptions (in alphabetical order) in the LQ02 and LQ02 Description columns, respectively, as follows:

LPI Loop In
LPO Loop Out

LQ Segments (Sub-detail) table: For the Reduction Reason data element = REE, add the reduction reason codes and their descriptions (in alphabetical order) in the LQ02 and LQ02 Description columns, respectively, as follows:

LPI Loop In
LPO Loop Out

23. C03004 Incorrect Document Reference

Recommendation says:

C03004 Request from Caminus Regarding the Data Dictionary for:

In the data dictionaries for the Request for Confirmation – NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.3 (document G85RQCF) and the Confirmation Response – NAESB WGQ Standard G850RQCF) and the Confirmation Response – NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.4 (document G855RRFC) it is required that an upstream/downstream identifier code be sent depending on the contractual flow indicator. At a pipeline interconnect the usual confirmation process is by upstream/downstream contract identifier. Shouldn't the upstream/downstream identifier code between the two pipelines 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 upstream and downstream identifiers (entities) in the confirmation process, specifically as used in the Request for Confirmation – NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.3 (document G850RQCF) and the Confirmation Response – NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.4 (document G855RRFC), dates back to GISB version 1.0. In requesting that NAESB “justify” it’s position in requiring these data elements,(the rest remains as in the recommendation)

Recommendation should read:

C03004 Request from Caminus Regarding the Data Dictionary for ~~G855RRFC~~ ~~G873RRFC~~ and ~~G850RQCF~~ ~~G873RQCF~~:

In the data dictionaries for the Request for Confirmation – NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.3 (document ~~G850RQCF~~ ~~G873RQCF~~) and the Confirmation Response – NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.4 (document ~~G855RRFC~~ ~~G873RRFC~~),) it is required that an upstream/downstream identifier code be sent depending on the contractual flow indicator. At a pipeline interconnect the usual confirmation process is by upstream/downstream contract identifier. Shouldn't the upstream/downstream identifier code between the two pipelines 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 upstream and downstream identifiers (entities) in the confirmation process, specifically as used in the Request for Confirmation – NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.3 (document [G850RQCFG873RQCF](#)) and the Confirmation Response – NEASB WGQ Standard 1.4.4 (document [G855RRFCG873RRFC](#)), dates back to GISB version 1.0. In requesting that NAESB “justify” it’s position in requiring these data elements,(the rest remains as in the recommendation).....