

Questions From Tom Ehinger

Subj: Questions for Internet Models
Date: 98-03-26 10:01:33 EST
From: thomas_g_ehinger@amoco.com
To: gisb@aol.com, HAHNGE@Texaco.com, Robert.P.Wallenhorst@Exxon.sprint.com, Tommie.R.Hartmann@Exxon.sprint.com

March 26, 1998

Rae McQuade

Re: Questions for Internet Transition Models

Please have these questions put to the various Model sponsors as noted. Would you also get the extra material pages (presented at the March 19 meeting) posted for review since there were no copies available.

Jim Buccigross Model

1. Does "using only internet protocols and procedures" mean that TSPs will not design web pages for their current EBB screens at this time?
2. What purpose is served if many TSPs develop their own web pages but they have not followed a common look& feel(including content area) and users are now obliged to pay separately for this and a vendor product?

Carl Caldwell Model

1. By including "no standards for screen layouts" in your description, how do you address common look& feel when you essentially promote chaos at a party where no dress code applies but costumes are optional?
2. If every TSP has leverage to define a flat file layout then the user is back where he started with proprietary EBBs. Isn't a flat file just an abbreviated EDI data set?

Norm Walker Model

1. According to what technology and mandate will dial-up EBBs transfer to the internet while prohibiting extensive replacement web pages from being developed? A double cost is possible if standards then follow six months later.
2. Does "the process of creating standards for transactional websites" include access to the content area of the screen? What limits does this

protend?

3. How do you stop TSPs from an evolution of current EBBs to a web page design on their own by June 1999 without approved standards?

Mike Novak Model

1. Explain the technology and rules that would transfer current dial-up EBBs to the internet while precluding a wholesale change and extra costs being attributed to a web page design before standardization has occurred?

2. When you speak of standard screens "as being templates" and then you allow proprietary means for submission of nominations, you turn good words back into status quo. Where is industry progress on common business transaction communication?

3. You have expressed (rightfully so) that single TSP shippers are already standardized, but the premise is that multi-pipe shippers (likely larger entities that compose the bulk of nominations) want a change to a "single" standard. Will you support that "drill down"?

4. If LDCs do not want or accept industry standard screens being developed, then the multi-TSP/LDC users can expect a non-Ferc regulated environment to produce a plethora of screens albeit on the internet. Right?

Thanks for the opportunity to question.

Tom Ehinger

Amoco (281-366-4559; thomas_g_ehinger@amoco.com)

Questions From Bob Wallenhorst

Subj: Internet Transition Meeting - Followup Questions
Date: 98-03-24 12:07:41 EST
From: Robert.P.Wallenhorst@EXXON.sprint.com
To: gisb@aol.com (EXT-GISB)
CC: /DD.ID=./@EXXON.sprint.com (Hartmann, Tommie R.), hahnge@texaco.com (EXT-HAHNGE(A)TEXACO.COM,), thomas_g_ehinger@amoco.com (EXT-THOMAS(U)G(U)EHINGER(A)AMOC)

Following are some questions regarding the Internet Transition models discussed at the March 19 meeting. Please post/forward them for consideration at upcoming meetings. Thanks.

Buccigross Model

- (1) Does this model suggest that the only means of communication common to all TSPs is EDI via the public internet using X12 documents?
- (2) Would it be possible under this model for entities, either affiliates of a jurisdictional pipeline or otherwise, to be the sole provider of "EBB" services (aside from EDI) for a jurisdictional pipeline?
- (3) Who does this model envision as being "users" in the reference to Standard 1.1.11? Shippers? Pipelines? Marketers? Confirming Operators? Regulatory agencies?
- (4) On page 30 of the 11/12/97 NOPR, the Commission states "Regardless of whether standards are developed, however, pipelines should begin preparing to make the transition to the public internet". Since pipelines are already required to support EDI via the public internet using X12 documents, what is it that this model envisions the pipelines "should begin preparing" to do?

Caldwell Model

- (1) Does this model presume that standardizing only the data requirements for transactional web pages sufficiently addresses the Commission's concerns regarding customer training costs and delays?
- (2) Does this model suggest that all jurisdictional pipelines would provide a transactional web page? Would the provision of such be jurisdictional?
- (3) Does this model envision that certain "standard" transactions (e.g., 1.4.1 - 1.4.6) could be conducted via all transactional web pages, and that all transactions would have standard data sets, and that transactions beyond

those specified as "required" would be provided on a mutually agreeable basis?

(4) What would be included in "all gas industry transactions"?

Walker Model

(1) Would the common look and feel web site for Informational Postings provided by 6/1/99 comply with the proposal on page 33 of the 11/12/97 NOPR that the content of information provided be the same regardless of format (EBBs, web sites, or EDI)?

(2) During the phased transition to the internet, will customers be required to maintain both dial-up EBB access and internet access, or will all functionality remain on the dial-up EBB until all transactions have been transferred to the internet web site?

Novak Model

(1) What is the proposed timing for transitioning to the CIF?

(2) Does standardizing only navigation sufficiently address the Commission's concerns regarding customer training costs and delays?

Robert P. Wallenhorst

Exxon Company, U.S.A. - Natural Gas Department

E-mail: Robert.P.Wallenhorst@Exxon.Sprint.Com

Phone: 713-656-5230 Fax: 713-656-4144 or 1-800-473-3079 Pager:

1-888-358-2362

Questions From Jim Buccigross

Specific questions for Gerry Hahn/Producers:

In your first paragraph you state: “The industry cannot afford for this to happen [development of separate “fragmented” EBBs for each] non-jurisdictional compan[ies]y [as they] unbundle their traditional services.”

What is your definition of an EBB?

Is an EBB, a human-to-computer form of data entry and communication?

In the case of an EBB, do you agree that the human using an EBB must enter data at least three times? Namely, once into the EBB, once into their own tracking system, and once again into their own tracking system when the scheduled quantity comes back (a fourth time may also be necessary when actuals are received where there is no OBA).

If you do not agree that an EBB form of data entry and communication results in a three times (to four times) data entry activity, why not?

Is it your view that there is real efficiency still to be gained by having three to four fold data entry (via somewhat more standardized EBB screens) rather than a one-time system which you get with EDI?

If so, whose efficiency? In other words what party or parties benefit from the increased efficiency?

How does this three to four fold data entry hold “value” when you add in the likelihood of having 300+ of these “EBBs on the web” instead of an underlying universal support for an EDI-based “one-write” system?

Is it your view that 300+ EBB’s conforming to whatever level of standardization is preferable over a one-write system relying on EDI?

Are you proposing the elimination of EDI?

If not, are you proposing that TSP’s maintain dual systems for transactions, one Internet web-page and the other Internet EDI?

Your proposal states: “Producers do not support a solution that would force customers to use EDI or force customers to communicate with pipelines via third-party service providers”.

What is your definition of customer?

Is a customer an entity which pays for service?

Is a customer an entity which receives a service regardless of whether the provider is compensated?

Your proposal goes on to state that: “Pipelines should be responsible for providing the means by which efficient, reliable and effective communications are achieved.”

If GISB has already achieved this and pipelines are responsible for providing the means (with respect to the 10 HPDR’s, UPPDs, and the five 4.3.6 postings, via one standardized method for transactions (Internet EDI done via a browser) and one standardized method for Informational Postings (Internet web pages also done via a browser), why should there be any additional requirement?

Since your proposal clearly indicates that a transition to Internet Web pages of the transactional data entry forms is required to be done, does this mean that pipelines should provide this service for free?

Your proposal states: “Greater value to the Shipper community will be achieved only when one gas control person is able to effectively nominate gas on any pipeline operating in North America.”

Since these capabilities exist today in the third-party market, because of the GISB standards, hasn’t this goal of “greater value” already been achieved?

Your proposal states: “Merely replicating the existing diverse, non-standard EBBs on Internet Web sites does not create sufficient value.”

Sufficient value to who?

How do you measure value when you propose no charge?

Isn’t the value of a service always infinite when it is free?

Isn’t this an argument to not transition the EBBs at all, but rather to standardize the EDI, leave the EBBs alone and for those that want the “value” of standards to employ the tools the standards provide?

Questions From Jim Buccigross

Specific questions for Norm Walker:

Please provide specifics for what you mean by “provide access to all current EBB transactional functions over the public Internet using Internet protocols and procedures.”

Does this mean that the existence of what anyone’s EBB provides will be provided by every EBB?

If not, how do we determine whether any given EBB has in fact transitioned functionality?

What is your technology model for doing this?

Is it browser?

Is it Remote Access Server?

Is it Network Dial-up?

Are the connections between parties via permanent IP addresses?, or dynamic IP addresses?

Does the TSP have a permanent IP address and the shipper able to have either?

Please define what you mean by “Internet protocols and procedures?”

Does this mean EDI/EDM?

If so, for everything, or only some things?

Does it mean EDI/EDM **plus** browser?

Again, for everything or only for some things?

Does it mean either EDI/EDM **or** browser?

If so, who chooses? the TSP, the Service requester, GISB?

Does it mean EDI/EDM where GISB has made EDI/EDM standards?

Does it mean EDI/EDM (where GISB has made EDI/EDM standards) and browser or some other means where GISB has not done EDI/EDM standards?

If yes to “some other means”, what is this “other means”?

Does it mean EDI/EDM (where GISB has made EDI/EDM standards) and browser (or some other means for these same transactions) and browser only or some other means only in cases where GISB has not done EDI/EDM standards?

If yes to “some other means”, what is this “other means”?

You propose to “begin the process of creating standards for transactional web sites. Of the existing 32 standard X12 datasets, determine the necessity, order and time frame for implementation.”

Do you include the Uploads of Offers and Uploads of Bids as these are remaining to be done in X12?

If those are done in X12 would those be added to your 32?

When you say “begin” please define “begin”.

When you say “determine” what do you mean?

By what process would we “determine the necessity”?

Would it be 17-2? ratified by members and sent to the FERC?

Would this “determination” be a package? or subject to individual voting?

Would this “determination of necessity” be a BPS one vote one company vote or a segment-balanced at the EC vote?

What are the benefits of delaying the determination to a later date?

What is the benefit to TSP’s of doing any of this?

Do you intend to recommend a **requirement** that TSPs transition their transactions to Web pages?

Why would a TSP want to be **required** to transition EBBs to web pages?

Do you intend to have GISB do standardized look and feel for transactional web pages?

Questions From Jim Buccigross

Specific questions for Carl Caldwell:

In your point 6, you state that “TSP and Service Requester may mutually agree to support additional data elements”.

Does this mean that TSPs would, on a by-Service-Requester-basis, have different browser web pages depending on what they mutually agreed to with each Service Requester?

If not, then how would you propose this be implemented?

In your point 9, you state “Valid codes available for data validation or selection should be available in downloadable format for use by customer and third-party service providers.”

Does this mean that DUNS Numbers would be provided by TSPs?

Does this mean that if the Web page provides contract MDQ level validation that this information would be available for download?

Does this mean that if the Web-page provides point MDQ level validation that this information would be available for download?

Does this mean that if the Web-page provides data validation for different transaction types this information would be available for download?

Does this mean that the format for the downloads would be standardized?

If so, by GISB?

In your point 10 you state “EDI transactions for all gas industry transactions should be defined by trading partners and GISB according to the GISB process. Service providers may mutually agree to support these transactions on their transactional web pages according to the web page transactional technology model.”

What is the timing.

Does this mean that we do the EDI first, for all these transactions so that the business rules, data dictionaries and implementation guides are done, and then TSPs would provide these defined transactions on a mutually agreed basis?

Does this mean that TSPs would not deploy any of the yet to be standardized transactions on the web until the EDI needed to communicate them to the TSP’s business system is ready?

You indicate that “Data elements and codes used to communicate transactions from the TSP web site to the TSP backroom system should use GISB standard data elements and codes. (EDI)”

Is the parenthetical EDI to be construed as a requirement that this communication be via EDI?

If no, doesn’t this raise a comparability issue as between customers using EDI and those who may use the proposed web site?

As used in this table, “required” means required by FERC or other generally applicable government regulations, does not include requirements in specific tariffs which requirements are not generally applicable regulations)

Questions listed below are applicable to all proposals.

	Issue	Model 1 - Jim Buccigross	Model No.
	Overview Question:		
1	What has FERC required be done on EBBs that GISB has yet to standardize via either Internet EDI or Internet web page?	Upload of Capacity Release Offers and Bids via EDI as proposed in Order No. 587-F NOPR.	
	Example: what in addition to the present GISB X.4.X and five Informational Postings has FERC required be done electronically?		
	Issue Area: Non-Transactional		
2	Should non-transactional information which is not required to be present but currently <i>only</i> available via an EBB be transitioned to Internet Web page(s)?	Either transition to Web page over 18 months beginning June 1999, or, make such information available via other means such as fax, E-Mail, diskette etc. If transitioned to Internet Web page(s), then no need for standardization of content or presentation and no need for common navigation or naming conventions.	
	Examples of this type of information would be: system expansion open seasons, notices of pending rate, service or fuel changes.		

3	Should non-transactional information which is <i>not required</i> by tariff to be available via an EBB, yet is available on an EBB, but at the same time is also available on a comparable basis via other methods (fax, EDI, diskette, flat-file download, E-Mail, letter, etc.) be transitioned to Internet Web page(s)?	No need to transition to Internet Web page(s) provided such non-transactional information continues to be available to people through other means.	
	Example: Maps, phone lists, general information, promotional items, advertising, etc.		
	Issue Area: Transactional		
4	Should transactional functions required to be present on an EBB today (i.e., capacity release) be transitioned to Internet Web Page(s)?	No. No transition of current HPDR's because they are already available in GISB EDI/EDM. Add ability to upload Offers and upload Bids via EDI.	
	Examples: Offers, Awards, Bidding, withdrawals etc.		
5	Should transactional functions which are required in EDI/EDM yet not required to be supported on EBBs , be required to be present on Internet Web EBBs?	No. No transition of current HPDR's because they are already available in GISB EDI/EDM. Add ability to upload Offers and upload Bids via EDI.	
	Examples: nominations, quick responses, requests for confirmations, confirmations, scheduled quantities, operator scheduled quantities, PDAs, PDA quick responses, measurement information statements, allocation statements, imbalance statements, invoices, payment remittances, and statements of account.		
6	Should transactional functions present on any EBB be standardized, transitioned to the web, and apply to every EBB ?	No.	

	<p>Example: Some EBBs provide functionality to request contracts, discounts, amend contracts, previous day's scheduled quantities, customer account balance, imbalance figures, etc. while others do not.</p>		
7	<p>Should each EBB's transactional functions (other than the GISB standardized functions) be transitioned to the web? If so, should these be standardized?</p>	No.	
	<p>Example: TSP 1 does contract requests on the EBB, TSP 2 does not. Should TSP 1 be required to transition contract requests to the web, and if so, should this be standardized?</p>		
8	<p>What about transactional functions which <i>become required</i> to be available electronically in the future?</p>	<p>No change recommended. If FERC or GISB standardizes and requires additional transactional functions, then these future transactional functions would be at least supported via GISB EDI/EDM.</p>	
	<p>Example: Suppose Title Transfer Tracking is required to be supported (but not provided) by TSPs, does this transactional, support, function then have to transitioned to Web pages?</p>		

9	<p>What about transactional functions which, while <i>not required</i> to be present on EBBs, <i>are (or become)</i> available <i>only</i> on an EBB? Should these be transitioned to GISB EDI/EDM and web pages because they are only available on an EBB?</p>	<p>Either transition the function to GISB EDI/EDM or provide other comparable means to conduct the transaction and achieve intended business results. Transaction available via GISB EDI/EDM a reasonable amount of time following the adoption and ratification of a request.</p>	
	<p>Example: Imbalance trading or netting is supported by a TSP, is not required by FERC to be done on an EBB, but for that TSP is only available if the shipper uses the EBB?</p>		
10	<p>What about transactional functions which are <i>not required by FERC</i> to be present on EBB, <i>are (or become)</i> available on EBB, <i>and yet are also</i> available on a comparable basis <i>via other</i> methods (E-Mail, fax, diskette, flat-file download, EDI, etc.)? Should these also be transitioned even though there are other comparable means to achieve the same business result?</p>	<p>No. No requirement for GISB EDI/EDM. No requirement for standardization of EBB presentation, content, navigation, or naming conventions. (There is no need for dual systems, as is made clear in the 587-F NOPR.)</p>	
	<p>Example: contract requests can be done on-line or via fax with no substantial difference in business result to service requester.</p>		
11	<p>Should TSPs be compelled to transition functions not covered by GISB (i.e., the 10 HPDR's, the five 4.3.6 items, and the upload of Offers and Bids to Web EBBs)? If so, what functions?</p>	<p>No.</p>	
	<p>Example: Should TSP's do more than what GISB has standardized in X.4.X datasets (plus uploads of offers and bids) and the Informational Postings?</p>		

12	Should we define “Look and Feel” to include content and appearance (presentation)?	No.	
	Should GISB standardize what is inside of a page?		
13	Should we define “Look and Feel” to be only navigation (getting to the page), naming conventions (naming the subject matter within a page), and downloads formats (RTF, tab delimited, text etc.)?	Yes.	
	Should GISB stop at the means of finding and getting to pages and electronic format of the downloads?		
14	Should we apply “Look and Feel” (however defined) to only the five 4.3.6 items?	Yes. If FERC or GISB adds standardized informational posting requirements to the 4.3.6 items, these would be added at that time.	
	Should we stop at the Informational Postings or get into requiring that transactions be on the Web in a common look and feel?		
15	Should Web EBBs (if implemented for transactional functions) communicate with the TSP’s business systems using GISB EDI/EDM?	Yes.	
	Example: Every user, whether they use the EBB, their own EDI, or a third-party would get the same level of functionality regardless of method because all forms would use GISB EDI/EDM to get to the business system.		
16	Should GISB re-examine the issue of requiring Web EBBs for transactional functions in 2001 to determine whether the market has responded by providing common “Look and Feel” solutions for transactional functions?	Yes.	

	Example: standardize the Uploads of bids and offers, stop there (with respect to new, required functions) and then see if in a couple of years the market has responded with “one interface solutions”.		
17	Should GISB make a finding that the question of transitioning EBB transactional functions to web EBBs is best left to individual TSPs and their service requesters?	Yes.	
	GISB would be able to create standards but the choice as to whether to transition any EBBs functions to web EBBs would be left to individual companies.		
18	Should GISB adopt a general principle that it makes no finding with respect to the timing of implementation of the standards it establishes?	Yes. GISB standards are voluntary. When and if the FERC adopts them, then they set implementation deadlines, not GISB.	
	Example: GISB would pass a standard that says that we make no finding as to the implementation timing of our standards.		

Questions From Jerry Hahn

To:Rae McQuade

3-26-98

From: Jerry Hahn

RE: Questions on Internet Transition Models

J.Buccigross – Could you please explain your logic or philosophy behind your support for CL&F for informational postings but not CL&F for transactional. It appears inconsistent to do so and also seems to disregard the messages clearly communicated in 9-95 FERC Hearing. I recall the IPAA in particular going so far as to advocate the concept of a national EBB approach!

N.Walker- In your model you advocate beginning the process of creating standards for transactional Web sites by 6-98! Does your model support creating more similarity than dissimilarity between TSP Web sites for transactional functions in that effort or does it merely call for discussions to begin as to the need for such similarity? In other words, does your model suggest that the effort would have a real commitment to creating CL&F for transactional?

QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED INTERNET TRANSITION MODELS

Questions From Mike Bray

HAHN MODEL

1. Is this model proposing a singular transactional Web Site or functionally similar EBBs?
2. What level of standardization in the content area is being proposed: Standard nomenclature? Standard functionality? Please clarify.
3. Given that it has taken 8 months to prepare the proposal to the GISB EC for common look and feel standards for the 9 documents for non-transactional postings, what schedule is being proposed for GISB to define common look and feel standards for transactional functions? When would TSPs be expected to implement these standards? What are the TSPs expected to implement for 6/1/1999?

WALKER MODEL

No questions.

CALDWELL MODEL

1. How long does the TSP hold the outbound response for the requestor to retrieve?
2. Is any data validation required beyond datatype validations and the common codes defined by GISB?
3. Item 9 states that all gas industry transactions should be defined via GISB. Is that all transactions available on any TSPs EBB or a subset? Please clarify.
4. Would the expected transaction response time required for this model be the same as the GISB EDI/EDM standards in 4.3.2 and 4.3.3?
5. Given that it has taken 8 months to prepare the proposal to the GISB EC for common look and feel standards for the 9 documents for non-transactional postings, what schedule is being proposed for GISB to define common look and feel standards for transactional functions? When would TSPs be expected to implement these standards? What are the TSPs expected to implement for 6/1/1999?

BUCCIGROSS MODEL

1. Please confirm that this model is proposing: (1) Upload of Offer and Uploads of Bid be standardized through GISB for EDI processing and implemented by the TSPs according to these standards by 6/1/1999. (2) No changes are required to the TSP's EBB for 6/1/1999.
2. Clarify how a transactional function, transaction result and/or transaction information would be identified as required. (4.3.A, 4.3.H)
3. Does 4.3.G preclude a TSP from having an EBB that may provide a faster response to the customer than the EDI/EDM server implementation?

QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED INTERNET TRANSITION MODELS

NOVAK MODEL

1. Clarify what standards should be developed for the standard screens (4d).
2. Is the TSP required to offer the standard screens?
3. What are the TSPs expected to implement for 6/1/1999?
4. Given that it has taken 8 months to prepare the proposal to the GISB EC for common look and feel standards for the 9 documents for non-transactional postings, what schedule is being proposed for GISB to define common look and feel standards for transactional functions? When would TSPs be expected to implement these standards?

MUNSON

1. Item 3 seems to state that a subset of EBB transactions should be identified for standardization yet Item 4 seems to state that all EBB transactional functions should be standardized. Please clarify.
2. Does Item 9 apply to only transactions that are standardized per Items 3 and 4? Does Item 9 mean the transactional web page should perform the same business functions as the standard EDI data sets with the TSP choosing how to communicate to the backend?
3. Is Item 12 proposing the non-core data sets would be used on a mutually agreeable basis?
4. Given that it has taken 8 months to prepare the proposal to the GISB EC for common look and feel standards for the 9 documents for non-transactional postings, what schedule is being proposed for GISB to define common look and feel standards for transactional functions? When would TSPs be expected to implement these standards? What are the TSPs expected to implement for 6/1/1999?

Questions From Norm Walker

Norm Walker

Member of the Sponsors of Model #3

Questions for the Models

Model # 1 - Jim

1. Does this model expressly preclude transportation service providers from offering an EBB for their customers that is covered by cost of service?
2. Does this model expressly preclude a transportation service provider, who is responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the pipeline system, from exceeding what ever standards are established to improve the response time in collecting and processing information to better serve their customers and manage the physical facilities?
3. Does this model require that parties who are not responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the pipeline system be given exactly the same access to the computer systems used to manage the pipeline as are transportation service providers who bear that responsibility?
4. Does your model require that all services provided by transportation service providers be standardized? And, if so, is this a requirement for all segments in the natural gas industry, such as marketers' buy/sell, wellhead operators' Joint Operating Agreements, etc?
5. What are the time frames associated with your model?

Model # 2 - Carl

1. Does this model expressly preclude transportation service providers from offering an EBB for their customers that is covered by cost of service?
2. Does this model expressly preclude a transportation service provider, who is responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the pipeline system, from exceeding what ever standards are established to improve the response time in collecting and processing information to better serve their customers and manage the physical facilities?
3. Does this model require that parties who are not responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the pipeline system be given exactly the same access to the computer systems used to manage the pipeline as are transportation service providers who bear that responsibility?
4. Does your model require that all services provided by transportation service providers be standardized? And, if so, is this a requirement for all segments in the natural gas industry, such as marketers' buy/sell, wellhead operators' Joint Operating Agreements, etc?
5. What are the time frames associated with your model?

Model # 3 - Norm

Model # 4 - Jerry

1. Would the sponsors of this model be willing to invest the resources and complete the task of implementation by the same time they are requesting others to invest resources and complete

implementation? In other words, since GISB standards are “voluntary”, are the sponsors willing to, in good faith, put their resources where their ideas are and show, by example, how Internet home pages can be constructed by their companies and how these Internet web pages can all work in the manner consistent with the GISB standards and their customers’ business needs?

2. Do any of the sponsors of this model have a working example that could be made available for view by the industry?
3. Does your model intend to minimize the contribution of the emerging 3rd party software service provider?
4. How does your model encourage the 3rd party software service provider?
5. If the absolute commonality of screens is as valuable to your sponsors as your proposal indicates, would you consider funding the development of a series of screens that meets your sponsors’ objectives and to work through GISB to standardize any resulting modifications to the structure of the resulting EDI files if the pipelines would agree to accept the resulting EDI files?
6. Are you and your sponsors awaiting the outcome of GISB standards with regard to moving your functions to the Internet or are you currently investing resources in developing Internet-compatible business functions for use by your trading partners? If you are moving now, is it a coordinated effort among all of the sponsors of this model? If you are waiting do you intend to make use of the standards developed by GISB as your model?

Model # 5 - Mike Novak

1. Does your model preclude pipelines from offering EBB functions as part of their cost of service?
2. Does this model expressly preclude a transportation service provider, who is responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the pipeline system, from exceeding what ever standards are established to improve the response time in collecting and processing information to better serve their customers and manage the physical facilities?
3. What are the time frames associated with your model?

Model # 6 - Sylvia

1. Does your model preclude pipelines from offering EBB functions as part of their cost of service?
2. Does this model expressly preclude a transportation service provider, who is responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the pipeline system, from exceeding what ever standards are established to improve the response time in collecting and processing information to better serve their customers and manage the physical facilities?
3. What are the time frames associated with your model?

Questions From Shelley Corman

Transition to the Internet Task Force Follow-Up Questions

Questions on Jerry Hahn Model

1. Does your vision of a standardized transactional website require that TSPs do away with current proprietary EBBs? Could a TSP choose to offer both standardized and nonstandardized transactional capabilities (i.e. could a TSP offer both a standardized nomination screen and their current nomination screens?)
2. Would this standardized transactional website be implemented on a single date by all TSPs for all transactions? Can you envision any interim steps to standardization?
3. Would you compel TSPs that don't currently have electronic nomination systems to create them?

Questions for Carl Caldwell Model

1. Your model contemplates that all website input screens would convert to EDI/X-12 prior to entering the TSP's internal system. Is that correct?
2. You said that the TSP can still provide "interactive" validation tools if the TSP agrees to download the data necessary for third-parties to provide the same validations. At what interval would the TSP have to provide updated data?
3. Do you believe that a TSP will be able to provide "interactive" contract level (as compared with point level) validations under your model? Does the answer to this question change if the EDI transmissions are sent at a line-item level?

Questions for Jim Buccigross Model

1. Does your statement that "if a TSP chooses to offer an EBB it must do so as a competitive offering" mean that all EBB costs (past and present) must be removed from TSP rates? How does this statement comport with GISB's standard about not taking a position on comparability? Are you also proposing that TSP EDI development and support costs will be separately collected?
2. Under your proposal, what should a TSP do with a shipper that refuses to use EDI? Could the TSP reject nominations without liability?
3. You say that no TSP should be compelled to provide an EBB, what about the FERC regulations which require EBBs? Are you suggested that GISB will petition the FERC to remove these requirements?
4. Under your proposal, must there be an EDI format for every document or transaction included on an EBB/website? Is this a precondition to putting a new function on an EBB? Can you envision any type or posting or transaction which does not lend itself to EDI?