

Resolved Issues as of March 26, 1999
Common Codes Subcommittee

- I. Education
- Nominations are being rejected at the Nomination Quick Response stage because the entity Common Code is not in the database used to validate the nomination.
 - ⇒ There is a timing issue today with entity Common Code setups. The Subcommittee elected not to address this issue at this time.
- II. Not everyone has D-U-N-S® numbers.
- What can we do when a company will not cooperate with the Dun & Bradstreet set-up process after we have identified that company as one that needs a D-U-N-S® number in order to be GISB compliant?
 - ⇒ Proposed Standard 4 resolves this issue, however, if Dun & Bradstreet would set up a number for the company and the company refuses to obtain a number, the nomination could be rejected.
 - Appalachian producers are asking Dun & Bradstreet for set-up so they will have a D-U-N-S® number, but are being told by Dun & Bradstreet that they do not need one.
 - ⇒ Parties should agree to use proprietary numbers per Proposed Standard 4.
 - Should parties use proprietary numbers when D-U-N-S® numbers are not available?
 - ⇒ Resolved by Proposed Standard 4.
 - Resolve R97058B
 - ⇒ Placed on the agenda for the next meeting, however, Proposed Standard 4 would resolve R97058B and modified R97058A.
 - How long should the use of proprietary numbers be allowed? (New issue)
 - ⇒ As long as no D-U-N-S® number exists.
 - If D-U-N-S® Numbers are not available for parties to do a deal that is being executed immediately, what numbers are the parties supposed to use? (New issue)
 - ⇒ The proprietary number could be utilized per Proposed Standard 4.
- III. Central Repository
- Should GISB own or control the entity Common Codes which are used to coordinate gas industry transactions?
 - Do we need a central repository or is the FERC's directive enough for pipelines to post them?
 - ⇒ The Central Repository is being resolved by on-going Board negotiations.