

# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002  
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

**TO:** Common Codes Subcommittee Chairs, Interested Industry Participants  
**FROM:** Rae McQuade, Executive Director  
**RE:** Final Minutes from the Common Codes Subcommittee Meeting  
**DATE:** March 26, 1999

---

## **I. Administrative**

The meeting opened with Ms. Scott welcoming the participants to the meeting. Ms. Unruh gave the antitrust advice. The participants introduced themselves. The agenda was adopted with modifications. Mr. Beaston will make a presentation to the group. Mr. Lander withdrew his work paper from the agenda. Other modifications to the agenda were made. The minutes of February 24, 1999 were adopted with changes.

## **II. Transfer of R97058B to Common Codes from BPS**

Ms. Unruh related to the group that the request was transferred to Common Codes on March 25, 1999 from BPS. There was discussion about what data sets Common Codes should review to satisfy the request. It was determined that Common Codes would address all data sets except the Capacity Release data sets.

Mr. Lander also noted that R98020 has also been transferred to this group. It deals with agency lists and agency use of D-U-N-S® Numbers.

These requests will be dealt with in the next meeting of the Subcommittee.

## **III. Dun & Bradstreet Negotiation Update**

For discussion purposes only, Ms. Scott distributed copies of the most recent draft version of the D&B Statement of Work. She noted that this is not the final document. She and Ms. Unruh then relayed a summary of Ms. McQuade's report to the Board of Directors in March. There was discussion about how the D&B repository/cross reference table would be populated. There was also discussion about how to access the repository. A question was raised about whether this repository would meet the FERC requirements for regulated entities. There were numerous detailed questions raised that remain unanswered. The chairs urged participants with questions or concerns to contact either the GISB office or D&B directly, as this subcommittee cannot answer the questions raised.

## **IV. UGI Presentation**

Mr. Beaston distributed materials to help explain the business situation in which UGI finds itself, as it relates to D-U-N-S® Numbers. Currently, UGI cannot obtain DUNS Numbers for its "buyers groups" (pipeline approved shippers), for whom UGI acts as agent. The reasons given by D&B are: (1) buyers groups are not legal entities and (2) they do not have mailing

## **Gas Industry Standards Board**

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002  
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

addresses. Consequently, UGI would be unable to use EDI, if it should choose to. Mr. Beaston requested that the group develop an alternative means to transact business without having to use D-U-N-S® Numbers. Mr. Beaston then entertained questions from the group. One participant suggested that UGI use its D-U-N-S® Number to represent the buyers' groups in its transactions. Mr. Beaston explained why this would not work in all instances.

It was determined that this issue will be discussed again this afternoon.

### **V. New Section in GISB Booklets**

There was discussion about the need for a new section in the GISB standards booklets. There are essentially two options: add a "0 (zero).X.Y" section or a "8.X.Y" section. It was suggested that, for the implementation guides, this new section should be included in all of them. The question was raised whether the section would include something more than common codes standards. Several thought it would be appropriate to have any kind of general standards in this proposed section. It was also asked whether this group should review all existing standards to determine which standards should be moved into the section. Several participants noted that this could be a rather large and time-consuming undertaking. No one thought that this should be attempted now.

Mr. Young moved the following, and Ms. Barnett seconded:

#### **Motion:**

A new category, "General Standards," should be added to the front of the GISB Standards booklet and to each of the GISB Implementation Guides. This category includes common codes standards and any other global standards.

There was no opposition to this motion. A memo will be sent to the GISB office from the subcommittee.

### **VI. 1997 D&B Report Status**

Ms. Scott stated that the GISB office has informed the chairs that the 1997 D&B Report that is currently posted on the GISB Home Page will be superceded by the new Statement of Work. Once the Statement of Work is complete, the "Related Standards" sections of the Implementation Guides will need to be updated to reflect the work of this committee. Ms. Scott asked that participants think about volunteering for this task.

### **VII. Review /Resolve Parked Issues**

Discussion began about the posted "Current Parked Issues" work paper. Ms. Hess suggested that the section regarding the central repository be eliminated since it is being addressed by the Statement of Work and/or by the Board and EC members involved with that effort. Others agreed. After further discussion, it was agreed that section three of the work paper could be eliminated or otherwise considered resolved.

## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002  
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

Discussion ensued about the use of propriety codes when D-U-N-S® Numbers are not available. Some noted that GISB requires the use of D&B Numbers, and those numbers should be the only numbers used in TSP processes. Others disagreed. There was lengthy discussion on this point. There was a suggestion that, to be consistent, it may be necessary for the group to re-examine R97058A at the same time it examines R97058B. It was noted that some TSPs do not want to be required to allow for the use of proprietary codes, but if others need or want to, they are agreeable to crafting standards that allow for this practice. Several participants stated that the group should focus on the business practices surrounding this issue, rather than getting into more technical issues like conditionality and usage of data elements.

Mr. Scheel moved the following, Mr. Young seconded:

### **Motion:**

#### **S4**

Parties should mutually agree to use the Transportation Service Provider's proprietary entity code when the D-U-N-S® Number is not available.

### **Discussion:**

There was concern expressed about whether this proposed standard would force those TSPs that do not currently support proprietary numbers to do so. There were several changes made to the motion to make it clear that this would not be the result. There were concerns expressed about how proprietary numbers are processed in TSP systems - that is, information (the audit trail) may be lost in TSP systems when a party that was using a proprietary number gets a D-U-N-S® Number subsequent to beginning to do business with the pipeline.

**Vote:** passed unanimously

Ms. Unruh asked if any of the participants believed there were still unresolved issues on the "Current Parked Issues" document. Some believed that there were no remaining issues. There was some discussion about the issue regarding rejecting a nomination because the common code submitted was unrecognizable. There may be two possible interpretations of the issue. One is when there is no D-U-N-S® Number available. In those cases, the proposed S4 will solve the problem - the parties should use the TSP's proprietary code. The other possible interpretation of the issue is where the TSP's database does not reflect the Service Requester's newly assigned D-U-N-S® Number because of the timing of the TSP's database "refresh." Mr. Young asked whether this issue is significant enough to continue to address in this subcommittee. Ms. Scott is not sure whether this is an issue that the subcommittee can resolve. Mr. Scheel agreed. It was agreed that this issue will be removed from the "Current Parked Issues" document.

It was agreed that all of the "Current Parked Issues" have been either resolved by proposed S4 or are not within the scope of this subcommittee. The exception is R97058B, which will be discussed at the next meeting. Although the participants felt that proposed S4 likely resolves the request, the request was not noticed for this meeting, so it will be added to the agenda for next time. A revised and renamed "Current Parked Issues" will be posted for the next meeting.

# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002  
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

## VIII. Standards (if any) to be issued by Common Codes

### S1

~~The entity common code should not be limited, in Dun & Bradstreet Corporation terms, to the Headquarters Location and/or Single Location levels.~~

Mr. Keisler moved the following; Ms. Hess seconded.

#### **Motion:**

Eliminate S1 from the list of proposed Common Code Subcommittee standards.

#### Discussion:

Mr. Keisler noted that he believes that S2 addresses the same issue that S1 addresses, but better describes the situations in which a "Branch" may be used. There was discussion about the motion. Concerns were raised about whether "Division" is encompassed by this standard. Mr. Keisler stated that, in D&B terms, "Division" would be covered by the standard, as "Division" is part of "Branch." He referred the group to page 25 of the 1997 D&B report that was posted on the GISB Home Page. No one disagreed with Mr. Keisler's conclusion.

**Vote:** passed unanimously

There was discussion about whether S3 should remain part of the subcommittee's recommendation. Some suggested that the standard should be deleted; others disagreed.

It was determined that that P1, S2, S3, and S4 would be submitted to the industry for comment, to be sent to the EC for approval in May, along with the following recommendation.

Ms. Barnett moved, Mr. Young seconded the following:

#### **Motion:**

The Common Codes Subcommittee recommends that the proposed standards not go out for ratification until they are fully staffed.

There was no opposition to the motion.

## IV. Discussion of Next Steps, Next Meeting, and Agenda

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next meeting will be **April 21, 1999 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at Koch's offices**. The following D-U-N-S® Number-related requests will be addressed:

R97058B

R98020

Review of "Related Standards" sections of Implementation Guides

The subcommittee will then address Columbia's work paper regarding DRNs.

An official agenda will be posted separately prior to the April 21 meeting.