



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925

HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

March 24, 1998

TO: Ad Hoc Task Force of Executive Committee for EBB-Internet Transition Planning: Rae McQuade, Mike Bray, Jerry Hahn, Tom Ehinger, Tommie Hartmann, Jim Buccigross, Mark Scheel, Dona Gussow, Laurie Valasek, Shelley Corman, Norm Walker, Bob Betonte, Mike Novak

CC: Carl Caldwell, Sylvia Munson

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: EBB-Internet Transition Plan Meeting Notes, Call for Questions, Schedule for Next Meeting & Draft Agenda

MEETING NOTES

The team met on March 19 to discuss the various models submitted regarding the EBB-Internet transition plan, which addressed which functions should be transitioned and to what extent standardization is required. The submitters were requested to describe their models and provide a road-map for achieving consensus. The models were:

- (1) EDI and "common look and feel" standardized web sites for postings (the Jim Buccigross model)
- (2) EDI, "common look and feel" standardized web site for postings and a common front end on the web site for transactions (the Carl Caldwell model),
- (3) The common front end, navigation and presentation would be the same but the content areas would not be standard (the Mike Novak model), and
- (4) EDI, "common look and feel" standardized web site for postings with a browser compatibility for EBBs including transactions (the Norm Walker model),
- (5) EDI, "common look and feel" standardized web site for both postings and transactions (the Jerry Hahn model).

Models were submitted, as requested, by Mr. Buccigross, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Novak, Mr. Walker and Mr. Hahn. Mr. Scheel did not submit a model as Mr. Caldwell's model addressed his concept. Handouts were distributed during the meeting and have been posted as work papers for the meeting. Each of the submitters reviewed his model and entertained a few questions.

Mr. Hahn's model represented the producer segment sentiments. His model advocates standardized web sites for transactional data, simplifying and consolidating EBB screens as they are transitioned to the Internet. His model noted that EDI is not in wide use with two reasons cited: (1) activity level does not merit developing EDI transactions, and (2) pipeline implementations of EDI are dissimilar. In response to questions, Mr. Hahn noted that phased implementation would not be opposed, but should be concluded by June 1, 1999. He also noted that pipelines should offer standardized nominations processing on Internet web sites even if they do not offer that function today through their proprietary EBBs. He added that all GISB defined EDI transactions should be the minimum or base case level of standardized functions provided on the web sites.

Mr. Walker's model described a road-map of the activities with due dates that should be performed in order to achieve industry consensus. His model advocates one mode of communication for shippers to access all pipeline business functions using browser software. Transactions with EDI formats defined would be reviewed for applicability for standardization on the web pages, and if determined that standards are needed, prioritized based on necessity and minimization of impact to the business. The model advocates phased implementation, with the initial phase concluding June, 2000. Mr. Walker noted that his model assumes a mandatory transition for necessary functions, and an optional transition for other functions. GISB would determine necessary functions.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925

HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

Mr. Novak's model advocated the use of standard browser software to access a TSP's EBB on the Internet. The TSP may choose to use, or provide additionally, a standard screen format for transactions in lieu of its proprietary screens. A common Internet format should be developed, through which TSPs will provide access to functions currently provided within the proprietary EBB, and access to functions determined to be standard that are not currently provided. There should be standard navigation through the menus. In response to questions, he noted that there should be a lock out time on the transactions when control is returned to the pipeline, such as the same way in which the airport gate takes control of airline seating ten minutes before departure of the airplane and travel agents and others are locked out. Mr. Novak observed that his model is between Mr. Walker's and Mr. Caldwell's in level of standardization required.

Mr. Caldwell's model described the Transportation Service Provider's web site and customer interface. For transactions, his model advocates standard field names and abbreviations, but screen layouts, placement of information, and formatting items should not be standardized. Transactions from the web site to the back room systems should have EDI formats defined, and should use the same data elements, codes and usages on the web sites. Validation codes should be available for downloading. Other functions may be provided on a mutually agreeable basis, such as flat file uploads. For comparability, his model advocates validation that is not performed on-line.

Mr. Buccigross's model advocated the use of standardized EDI data sets for transactional data over the Internet. For non-transactional data, the postings described in GISB Standard No. 4.3.6 would be communicated using a standardized web page. There is no requirement or prohibition for TSPs to establish transactional web pages, but there must be comparable access. If TSP's choose to develop a transactional web site, it should be treated as a competitive offering, and follow the GISB Standard No. 1.1.1. If developed, communications from the transactional web page to the TSP's back end systems should be accomplished via standardized EDI for comparability reasons. His model emphasizes that those companies that use the on-line web site services for transactions should pay for it, otherwise he noted that there will be significant barriers to competition.

Ms. Munson's model, which was not discussed due to time constraints, was distributed and advocated a combination of the features shown in the above five models. Her model will be considered and she will be identified as one of the submitters.

CALL FOR QUESTIONS & NEXT MEETING

Due to restrictions of time, not all questions could be taken, so those having additional questions are requested to **forward the written questions to the GISB office by March 30.** The questions should be addressed to one or more of the submitters. On March 31, the GISB office will forward the questions to the submitters for their responses. **The responses will be requested to be returned to the GISB office by April 6.** The questions and the responses will be posted by April 7, and **a teleconference call will be scheduled for April 9, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. central.** The team members will be notified of the number to call and the pass code. The draft agenda is attached.

Submitters are asked to contact each other before the meeting to determine if their models can be collapsed, and report on those conversations on April 9. **Work papers resulting from these discussions should be provided to the GISB office by April 6.** Submitters are asked to review the parameters/requirements to be applied to the models, (submitted by Jim Buccigross) to determine if other parameters/requirements should be applied and come prepared to discuss the objectives and needs for such an exercise. If observers have questions or comments on the questions or the potential collapsing of models they should contact the submitters.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925

HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

Attendees:

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Present</u>
Members:	Bob Betonte	Southern California Gas	✓
	Mike Novak	National Fuel Gas Distribution	✓
	Shelley Corman	Enron Gas Pipeline Group	✓
	Norm Walker	El Paso Natural Gas	✓
	Jim Buccigross	National Registry	✓
	Mark Scheel	NGC Corp	✓
	Tommie Hartmann	Exxon	✓
	Tom Ehinger	Amoco	✓
	Dona Gussow	Florida Power and Light	✗
	Laurie Valasek	Midland Cogeneration Venture	✗
	Mike Bray	Duke Energy	✓
	Jerry Hahn	Texaco Natural Gas	✓
	Rae McQuade	GISB	✓
Observers:			<u>Members</u>
	Sylvia Munson	Altra Streamline	✓
	Jean Ford	Andersen Consulting	✓
	Carl Caldwell	Deloitte and Touche	✓
	Kim Van Pelt	Duke Energy - Panhandle Eastern	✓
	Sandra Barnett	Koch Gateway	✓
	Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway	✓
	Dale Davis	Transco	✓
	Leigh Spangler	Latitude Technologies	✓
	Jim Keisler	Transco	✓
	Bob Wallenhorst	Exxon	✓
	Greg Lander	TransCapacity	✓
	Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	✓
	Paul Love	KN Energy -- NGPL	✓
	Randall Young	Koch Midstream Services	✓
	Magan Yarbrough	Duke Energy - Panhandle Eastern	✓
	Coralie Sculley	Duke Energy - Panhandle Eastern	✓
	Theresa Hess	Enron - Northern Natural	✓
	Diane McVicker	Salt River Project	✓
	Carl Caldwell	Deloitte & Touche	✓
Dennis Holbrook	GISB General Counsel	✓	



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925

HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002

PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
EBB-INTERNET TRANSITION PLAN TASK FORCE**

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL DRAFT AGENDA

**APRIL 9, 1998
2:00 P.M. TO 4:00 P.M.**

1. Welcome, Antitrust Advice
 2. Discussion on Collapsing Models
 3. Identification of Parameters/Requirements to be Applied to the Models and Analysis of Models against those parameters
 4. Discussion on Further Collapsing of Models
 5. Assignments to define detailed provisions to accomplish models
 6. Assignments
 7. Adjourn
-