Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page www.gisb.org

November 6, 1998

TO: Common Codes Subcommittee chairs, Posting on the GISB home page for interested industry participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: **Final Minutes from the Common Codes Subcommittee Meeting -- November 6, 1998**

I. Administrative

The meeting was called to order at 1:15 pm by Mr. Hahn. The antitrust statement was read, roll call of attendees was taken and the agenda adopted. Attached is the sign-in sheet. Mr. Hahn explained the issue for the meeting. The agenda was adopted for the one issue only; therefore any other issues that would come up in the meeting would be captured for discussion and handling at a later meeting. The list is included in the bulleted items :

- The issue was defined in the form of a question: "How can GISB give those companies that need to communicate at the Dun & Bradstreet branch level for business reasons (such as business unit accounting) the capability to do so?".
- As identified in the meeting minutes from the 9-3-97 CCSC, Ford Motor Company and NorAm were cited as practical examples of companies that are not totally served by GISB's current Common Code definition.
- Lengthy discussions resulted in the identification of 8 different solutions which are considered possible. They are :
    1. Alter the current standard for defining the Common Code for legal entities so that the Branch location level could be used as a Common Code. Data set changes would not be required as contemplated but, financial information such as credit and receivables controls would be negatively impacted.
    2. Alter the current applicable transaction sets to add the capability to designate a Branch location DUNS number to the required Common Code as currently defined in GISB.
    3. Create a central repository for proprietary numbers which are not DUNS numbers.
    4. Create a central repository for GISB Common Code or proprietary codes.
    5. Alter the current applicable process so that the Common Code and the receipt and delivery point data are used to identify such lower level accounting needs.
    6. Create a central repository of GISB-owned codes that may or may not be at the Dun & Bradstreet branch level, but is tied to the D&B headquarter (HQ) number.
    7. Alter the current applicable transaction sets to add some other number or data element.
    8. Consider use of a modification to the data set to accommodate the DUNS +4 process.

- Three questions were agreed to be applied to our discussions:
    1. Should the GISB Common Code be the same as that used for credit reporting?

2. Should the GISB Common Code enable users to get credit information?
3. Should the GISB Common Code support gas industry transactional coordination?

Sense of the room of how each of the 8 listed solutions in bullet # 5 support the questions posed in bullet # 6:

Solution #	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Data Set Change
1	no	yes	yes	no
2	yes	yes	yes	yes
3	no	no	yes	yes
4	y w/ cr n w/o cr*	it depends	y w/ cr n w/o cr*	yes
5	yes	yes	don't know	no
6	it depends	yes	yes	no
7	don't know	don't know	don't know	yes
8	yes	yes	yes	yes

* y w/ cr n w/o cr - yes with central repository, no without central respository

- The parked issues are as follows:
  1. Not everyone has DUNS numbers.
  2. Should parties use proprietary numbers when DUNS numbers aren't available?
  3. What can we do when a company won't support the D&B set-up after we have identified that company as one that needs a DUNS number in order to be GISB compliant.
  4. Should GISB own or control the entity Common Codes which are used to coordinate gas industry transactions?
  5. Appalachian producers are asking D&B for set-up so they will have a DUNS number, but are being told by D&B that they don't need one.
  6. Do we need a central repository or is the FERC's directive enough for pipelines to post them?
  7. Does it matter that if we go to branch, that during the up/down coordination process, the entities coordinating don't use the same branch, or should we limit the use of branches? (Issue is related to the pipes validating - i.e. the party is not in the pipes data base.)
  8. 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.
  9. Can a pre-approval process be successfully conducted with D&B or any other service provider?

- Meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm.