

# 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:** April 21, 1999

---

## **I. Administrative**

The meeting opened with Ms. Unruh welcoming the participants to the meeting. Ms. Scott gave the antitrust advice. The participants introduced themselves. The agenda was adopted with a minor modification. The minutes of March 26, 1999 were adopted with changes.

## **II. Review of R97058B and R98020**

### **R97058B**

Mr. Lander reviewed the request. He believes there will be an on-going need for the use of proprietary numbers. Mr. Scheel asked if S4 addresses this request. Ms. Scott reminded the group that, among others, S4 is currently out for comment. Mr. Lander was not sure what "should mutually agree" means in S4. There was discussion about this point. Mr. Lander then suggested language to replace S4.

As support for the existing language of S4, Mr. Young gave an example where the up- or downstream parties have no relationship with the TSP, so therefore, the TSP cannot assign a proprietary code to those parties.

Mr. Keisler suggested that eliminating "mutually" in the proposed S4 might solve the issue. Mr. Young disagreed, and noted that the situation being described do not happen frequently and he does not want to make costly system changes to allow for the use of proprietary codes when there are other solutions. Ms. Scott described another similar situation where the Service Requester is using a D-U-N-S® Number that TSP does not recognize and the TSP does not have proprietary numbers in its system.

After more discussion, Mr. Scheel noted that the only way to change S4 at this point is for parties to make comments to the EC. He reiterated that the current language reflects a compromise and he opposes changing it now.

Mr. Young raised several other problems with the use of proprietary codes. His primary concern with changes to the proposed S4 is that parties that do not currently support proprietary codes would be forced to accommodate their use. Ms. Barnum has concerns with the use of proprietary codes being received in confirmation requests from other pipelines. One TSP will have no way to identify what party is associated with the other TSP's proprietary code.

Ms. Scott asked Mr. Lander if the current language of S4 would satisfy his request. Mr. Lander stated that, with further interpretation, it probably would, but he would rather modify the language of S4 and avoid having to have an interpretation.

## 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

---

Mr. Lander moved the following, Mr. Keisler seconded:

**MOTION:**

Modify S4 by deleting the word “mutually,” and if the Subcommittee unanimously agrees, it will submit comments to this effect to the EC.

Discussion:

Ms. Unruh stated that she did not believe a subcommittee could (or should) submit comments to the EC, but individual members could. Mr. Lander disagreed and stated that he believed there is nothing that prohibits this from happening.

Mr. Scheel and Ms. Scott expressed disagreement with the motion and noted that this could create a precedent to allow “re-trading” of issues. Mr. Lander thinks the latter portion of the motion addresses this. Ms. Hess suggested that changes to S4 should be submitted to the EC in comments by any party that is not happy with the existing language.

**VOTE:** motion fails (5 objections to the motion)

S4 satisfies this request. It was further noted that after the EC approves S4, it will be up to the EC to send this request to IR and Technical for further staffing.

### **R98020**

The submitter withdrew the request. TransCapacity believes the D&B Statement of Work will ultimately satisfy the request.

Ms. Barnum moved and Mr. Keisler seconded a motion to review Columbia’s work paper prior to the “Related Standards” sections of the Implementation Guides. There was no opposition to the motion.

### **III. Review of Columbia Work Paper**

Mr. Hansen introduced the work paper. He noted that he believes there is value in the common repository, but not in the use of DRNs, primarily because parties’ expectations have not been met, as explained in more detail in the work paper. Mr. Lander agreed with Mr. Hansen that he does see benefit to the central repository, but he is not convinced that there is a great deal of benefit in using the DRN numbers.

Mr. Young is concerned that GISB is creating standards and then essentially rescinding them. Ms. Barnum supports Columbia’s position. She believes that GISB made a mistake with this issue, and the group now has an opportunity to correct it. Ms. Scott stated that her company has spent a great deal of money creating a system to support DRNs, yet they remain the source of lots of problems. If the group determines that DRNs will be eliminated, she would at least like to see a field length limit so that her current system will still be able to support the numbers. Mr. Young agreed. There was extensive discussion about this issue.

## 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

---

Mr. James suggested that perhaps the GRID™ Code concept should be re-examined so that there would be some commonality at a point; that is, there would be one number at a point, but there would be some way to identify each side of the meter, such as additional digits on the end of the GRID™ number. Mr. Scheel remarked that this possibility has been examined in the past and it was not a viable solution at that time; the group, however, could always re-examine the issue, if necessary. Mr. Keisler supported Mr. Scheel that this issue has been examined in the past and it was determined that two numbers are necessary at a point. He added that the fact that DRNs are non-intelligent is for good reason - they are associated with the PI GRID™ numbers which are subject to change, so in his opinion, it is a plus that the numbers are non-intelligent.

Mr. Scheel asked Mr. Hansen if Mr. Hansen envisioned that there would be a central repository, and if so, what party would maintain it. Mr. Hansen believes that there would still be a central repository, and that the industry may still be able to support the existing repository structure; that is, IHS could still maintain the repository. He added that parties that currently use only DRNs could populate any proprietary number fields with DRNs.

Mr. Hansen did not support the idea of re-examining the GRID™ codes due to the size of the field. He added that some TSPs, including his company, have never supported the use of DRNs. He thinks there is merit in re-examining this issue now. This has not historically been a problem because so few parties have been using EDI, but with Internet Web sites looming on the horizon, he is being required to build his Internet system to support DRNs, which are not used by his customers.

Ms. Scott did not see the value of a repository if the industry determines that only proprietary numbers will be used in the future. TSP Web sites will likely be more current and accurate.

After a break from lunch, Mr. Hansen informed the group that he had gathered a sufficient amount of information about this issue.

#### **IV. Review of “Related Standards” sections of Implementation Guides**

The group began reviewing the existing “Related Standards” language. Ms. Barnum noted that the GISB phone number needs to be corrected. Ms. Scott asked whether it should be noted that IHS is now the provider of the codes. Mr. Scheel suggested inserting the text of S2 between the last and next-to-last paragraphs.

There was discussion about what the practical implication will be if a new section for common codes is added to the GISB standards booklets. Some thought there would be Implementation Guides to go along with the new section; others believed that the general standards would be included in the “Related Standards” section of the existing Implementation Guides.

Ms. Hess moved, Mr. Keisler seconded the following:

#### **MOTION:**

Replace the second paragraph and fourth paragraph of the “Related Standards” section of the Implementation Guides as follows:

# 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

---

[second paragraph]

However, after extensive consideration by GISB's Common Code Subcommittee, GISB adopted, on September 30, 1996, a new Common Code for Gas Transaction Points, the GISB/PI Data Reference Number (generally referred to as "DRN"). The DRN is a one-to-nine digit, non-intelligent number also assigned by [IHS \(successor to PI\)](#), which has a one-to-one relationship with the PI GRID™ Code. For more information, ~~call GISB at (713) 757-4175 or~~ access the GISB Web Page at [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org).

[fourth paragraph]

~~However, after extensive consideration by GISB's Common Code Subcommittee, GISB, on December 10, 1996, did not confirm the use of the D-U-N-S Number, but with a major refinement:~~ For GISB Common Code purposes, ~~an legal~~ entity will use one and only one D-U-N-S® ~~N~~umber. Entity common codes should be legal entities, that is, Ultimate Location, Headquarters Location, and/or Single Location (in Dun & Bradstreet Corporation ("D&B") terms). However, in the following situations, a Branch Location (in D&B terms) can also be an entity common code: 1. when the contracting party provides a D-U-N-S® Number at the Branch Location level; or 2. to accommodate accounting for an entity that is identified at the Branch Location level. Since D&B offers customers the option of carrying more than one D-U-N-S® ~~N~~umber per ~~legal~~ entity, please refer to GISB's Web Page at [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org) for directions on determining the one and only one D-U-N-S® ~~N~~umber constituting the GISB ~~Legal~~ Entity Common Code.

[There will be a footnote added for the Registered Trademark for D&B.]

In addition to having a separate section in the GISB standards booklets, the general standards will be included in every Business Process and Practices section of the Implementation Guides, along with the other applicable standards and interpretations.

Discussion:

Mr. Stewart asked if this proposal will create extra work in the long run if S2 is ever modified. Ms. Hess did not think so. There were various modifications made to the motion

**VOTE:** There was no opposition to the motion.

## IV. Revised D&B Statement of Work

Ms. McQuade joined the meeting and informed the group that the D&B Statement of Work is now on its seventh revision. She is awaiting Mr. Holbrook's final approval before the revision is posted. The cross reference file will contain three fields: D-U-N-S® Number, business party name associated with the Number, and a verification flag (either a "yes/no" or a date). The file will be sorted by D-U-N-S® Number. Initially, all entries will not be verified and the file will contain a disclaimer. Per D&B, the file is not to be displayed anywhere else on the TSP's system. She suggested TSPs establish a link to the GISB Home Page if this is a service TSPs wish to offer. Ms. McQuade noted that information sent to the GISB office in electronic form will be posted within one business day of receipt by the GISB office. Specifics on file formats can be found within the Statement of Work. Disclaimer language in the Statement of Work is also being fine-tuned, but should not be substantively different than what has been discussed previously.

## 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

---

Ms. Hess asked when the seventh revision will be posted. Ms. McQuade noted it will be posted shortly after letters are sent to GISB members, which is expected to be within a few days. Ms. Barnum asked if TSPs are expected to populate the file. Ms. McQuade responded that everything about the cross reference file is voluntary.

Mr. Hansen asked what "cleaning the data" means. Ms. McQuade explained that an example of "cleaning" might be a situation where the name submitted by the data provider is not what D&B has in its database. D&B will then ask the data submitter to change the name of the entity in the TSP's system. Mr. Hansen asked about situations where a company with multiple entities may want to only have one D-U-N-S® Number for use in the natural gas industry. For instance, a Service Requester with ten different D-U-N-S® Numbers wants to only have one used in all TSPs' processes - can that SR have nine removed from the cross reference file? Ms. McQuade noted that this could be difficult to manage, but the mechanism is in place to ultimately allow for situations like Mr. Hansen described. Mr. Hansen noted that he believes there is a need for this kind of streamlining. Others agreed.

Mr. Keisler asked if there will be a date referenced on the cross reference file to indicate if the file is being updated or otherwise changed. Ms. McQuade responded that this is possible, but is not in place now. The only things GISB is prohibited from posting is address information, data providers, and the like.

Mr. Stewart asked how situations just described will work with the proposed S3. He sees a conflict. Ms. McQuade noted that the initial response from FERC was that if FERC staff is looking at a capacity release data sets, s/he could find in the cross reference file the corresponding party. Mr. Stewart asked about the reverse situation; that is, if a Service Requester knows the name of a party but not the number, if the SR goes to the cross reference file, it will be very difficult to determine what number should be used.

Mr. Hansen added that, because the standards are voluntary, it will be incumbent on all parties that will be listed in the cross reference file to ensure that the numbers associated with their entities are accurate, and if there are too many, that party should authorize deletions. Others agreed.

Ms. Hess asked if non-verified information will remain in the cross reference file forever. Ms. McQuade responded that a process will need to be established to deal with this situation, but it has not been addressed yet.

Mr. Keisler suggested that changes be made to the Statement of Work before it is posted and replaces the "old" version that has been posted on the Common Codes Home Page for some time. Ms. McQuade noted that if the suggested changes are non-substantive, D&B will likely be able to make the changes relatively quickly, but substantive changes may take time. Mr. Keisler reviewed his suggested changes to the Statement of Work.

Ms. McQuade noted that files can either be sent concurrently to GISB and D&B or, alternatively, sent to D&B and then subsequently to GISB. She added that specifics on cleaning of data needs to be worked out between the data provider and D&B.

Mr. Scheel asked how quickly the cross reference file will be populated and available for use. Ms. McQuade responded that once she receives the information, she can post it within one

# 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

---

business day. The file will contain a date that indicates when the file was last updated by GISB. D&B will send cleaned data to the data provider and GISB at the same time; GISB will then either change the indicator to "verified" if the data submitted to D&B remains unchanged after review by D&B, or, if there is a discrepancy between what was submitted by the data provider and what D&B sends to the GISB office, there will be two line items - one unverified line item and one verified.

In response to questions, Ms. McQuade clarified that the cross reference file will, at this point, be downloadable only, not viewable. The D&B central repository, on the other hand, is viewable and will contain significantly more information than the cross reference filing.

Mr. Stewart shared a concern he has with a two different shippers submitting two different D-U-N-S® Numbers for the same entity. Some TSP systems cannot recognize both. Ms. McQuade asked why this is not a problem today. Mr. Stewart responded that he does not do EDI now.

Ms. McQuade added that the GISB contract with IHS has not been finalized yet for a number of reasons beyond the GISB office's control, which is causing the delay. She noted that the cross reference file and lookup function is behind schedule, but she hopes that the matter can be resolved by the end of April.

Ms. McQuade thanked the participants for the opportunity to discuss the Statement of Work. She reminded participants that this effort has not been part of the Common Codes Subcommittee's charge, but she appreciated using the Common Codes forum for discussion.

## **V. Discussion of next steps, next meeting, and agenda**

It was determined that the motion passed above will be sent to the EC for consideration in May along with the proposed standards.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

It was further determined that there will be no need to hold a conference call on May 7. Conference calls are scheduled for Friday, May 28 and Friday, June 18. The chairs will determine after the May EC meeting whether it will be necessary to have the calls.