COMMON CODES WORKPAPER

DRNs

Submitted by: Michael R. Hansen
Dated: February 1, 1999

Note: This workpaper is intended to generate a general discussion on whether a change to the location common code is needed. If the committee feels a formal request for standard is needed after the initial review of this workpaper, I would be happy to make the request.

Proposal to Change the Common Code for Locations:

It is proposed that a common location database is necessary for the industry but common location codes are not. It is proposed that Service Providers (TSPs in particular) be required to submit information about new locations to the location common database provider by the time that gas is to flow through the location. The location common database provider would simply add the location to the common database. The database would be available to everyone in the industry.

Justification for the Change:

The DRN is an unintelligent number and by itself does not add any value to the industry. Having a common location database does provide value to the industry so non-TSP parties can have a complete list of valid nominatable locations to be used in EDI.

Many in the industry worked under the assumption (albeit false) that the common code would establish a single location number at interconnects. In reality, an interconnect will have at least 2 DRNs – one for each party at the location. Since a single common code is not being achieved through the current process, then the DRN is really no more useful than proprietary location numbers.

Using proprietary numbers is user-friendly. Most customers already are very familiar with the TSPs proprietary codes and using DRNs will for the most part cause confusion and require additional key entry, demand more space on EBB screens and complicate TSP programming efforts to continually cross reference between the DRN and the proprietary numbers.

Proprietary numbers are already part of the location common database. Part of the information required when submitting a request for a location common code is to identify the proprietary number.

Making this change at this point in time does not harm the industry.

For companies that did away with their proprietary numbers to adopt the DRN, they will be able to continue to use the DRN as their proprietary number as well.

The location common database provider will have the same requirements as they

do today. No change to the contract between GISB and IHS would be needed.

- The combination of the TSP's DUNS # (which is also part of the current requirements to get a DRN) and the proprietary number will assure that there is a unique identifier for every location in North America.

Making the change at this point adds value.

- Besides being user friendly, using proprietary codes will minimize errors and delays associated with using an unintelligent common code. There is at least a 3-day lag in getting new DRNs assigned.
- DRNs doubled the location information that has to be tracked by parties. TSPs most likely are storing their own proprietary and DRN numbers for an interconnect plus the corresponding proprietary and DRN numbers for the interconnecting party. By using proprietary numbers in place of the DRN, the number of cross-references are cut in half.