

Draft 2 - Implementing Standards Proposed by TransCapacity
(Redlined to initial 3/16/98 version)

Specific proposed standards, principles and definitions to implement TransCapacity's Conceptual Outline:

4.2.A

“GISB EDI/EDM is defined as ANSI X12 Documents (EDI) exchanged via Internet designated site(s) utilizing Electronic Delivery Mechanism (EDM) standards.”

4.3.A

“Transactional functions required to be provided by TSPs via EBBs (i.e., information required to initiate, execute and settle required transactions) should be transitioned to GISB EDI/EDM.”

4.3.B

“The non-transactional data (Information Postings) listed as items 1 and 3 under Standard No. 4.3.6 should be made available via the existing GISB EDI/EDM standards.”

4.3.C

“The non-transactional data (Informational Postings) listed as items 1 through 5 under Standard No. 4.3.6 should be communicated over the Internet via a "common look and feel" (i.e., information required to be available would be accessible via Internet web page(s) using common navigation and common naming conventions).

4.3.D

“Required transactional functions which should be provided by TSPs via GISB EDI/EDM standards are those transactions identified within the:

- a) 1.4.X,
- b) 2.4.X (excluding 2.4.6 which is used only where the parties have mutually agreed to do so),
- c) 3.4.X; and,
- d) 5.4.X (excluding 5.4.4, 5.4.10, and 5.4.11, which are used only where applicable to TSP business practices),

sections of GISB's standards.

4.3.E

By June 1, 1999, GISB business practice and GISB EDI/EDM standards with respect to: 1) the ability to upload an offer, have it considered valid, and have it processed by the TSP; as well as, 2) the ability to upload a bid, have it considered valid, and be processed for bid evaluation and awarding purposes will be available and will be added to the list of required transactional functions under Standard 4.3.D.

Draft 2 - Implementing Standards Proposed by TransCapacity (Redlined to initial 3/16/98 version)

8.1.A [8 denotes a new “general” section]

GISB makes no finding as to the specific timing of implementation of any Standard(s) that it establishes.

4.3.F

No TSP should be compelled to provide required transactional functions via an EBB (without regard to mode of communications with that EBB, including Internet EBB, web page EBB, dial-up EBB etc.) following a reasonable period of time after which the required transactional functions have become available via GISB EDI/EDM.

4.3.G

Following a reasonable period of time after which all required transactional functions have become available via GISB EDI/EDM, a TSP which determines to provide transactional functions via an EBB (without regard to mode of communications with that EBB, including Internet EBB, Web-page EBB, dial-up EBB etc.), may do so provided the mode of communications between the EBB and the TSP’s business system are conducted via GISB EDI/EDM.

4.3.H

A TSP which determines to provide transactional functions via an Internet EBB, Web-page EBB, or Internet accessible EBB and which requires its trading partners to employ such EBB to achieve an intended transaction result or acquire transaction information, should request GISB EDI/EDM standards for such transactional functions; and, within a reasonable amount of time after such standards are approved and ratified, should support the conduct of such transactions using such standards with those trading partner(s) wishing to employ same.

4.3.I

Where a transactional functionality, is in addition to the required transactional functions, is provided by a Transportation Service Provider (TSP), and, the TSP’s trading partners can achieve the same transaction result or acquire the same transaction information by a means other than use of the TSP’s EBB (if any) then the requirements of [4.3.H -- insert applicable GISB Standard following adoption and ratification by GISB membership] do not apply. Only when a transaction can only be achieved via the TSP’s EBB (without regard to type) would the use or support of otherwise mutually agreed business practices or datasets become a requirement under [4.3.H -- insert applicable GISB Standard following adoption and ratification by GISB membership]. Thus, except where there exists a non-GISB X.4.X electronic data viewing/data collection mechanism which (without support for a GISB X.4.X functionality) would be the only mechanism available (i.e., where there is no provision for communication of a document via fax, e-mail, letter, phone-call, etc.), support for GISB X.4.X standards, other than those set forth in [4.3.D -- insert applicable GISB Standard following adoption and ratification by GISB membership], is on a mutually agreeable basis.

Draft 2 - Implementing Standards Proposed by TransCapacity (Redlined to initial 3/16/98 version)

4.1.A

Users of EBB services for required transactional functions (which EBB services are transitioned to Internet protocols and procedures (Internet-EBB)) should bear the cost of that service. A TSP, at its option, may seek a determination, in an applicable regulatory proceeding, that on-going payment to the TSP by a trading partner for the TSP's transportation services (which services include the trading partner's no-fee use of Internet-EBB services for required transactional functions) meets the intent of this "users pay" principle with respect to such trading partner's receipt of Internet-EBB services for required transactional functions from the subject TSP. There is no requirement that a TSP seek such determination.

Explanatory Discussion:

4.3.A, 4.3.B, 4.3.C, 4.3.H, and 4.3.I clarify, and are within the meaning and intent of, Standard 4.3.6 which states in part:

“Transportation Service Providers should make all pertinent EBB functions and information available via the Internet or via technology recommended by GISB within a reasonable amount of time after each function or information has become standardized as appropriate by GISB.

Here the accent is on “*pertinent*”. The *pertinent* functions and information are 1) the required *information* (the list of 1 through 5 in standard 4.3.6); and, 2) the required *transactional functions* which are clearly the already standardized 10 HPDR's, plus the remaining required, but yet to be standardized, uploads of Offers and uploads of Bids. As uploads of Offers and uploads of Bids have yet to be standardized, they are not yet in the GISB EDI/EDM group of standards. Once these were to be standardized, the “*pertinent*” functions and information referred to in the first paragraph after the listing of the five non-transactional items would have been so standardized. Proposed standards 4.3.H and 4.3.I also clarify that should a TSP require parties to employ an EBB only, then they need for a commensurate GISB EDI/EDM standard arises. However, if a comparable non-EBB solution exists (again aside from a GISB EDI/EDM standard) then there would be no need to formulate or support a GISB EDI/EDM standard for that transaction. Of course those TSPs which wish to accomplish all activity via only electronic means can request a GISB EDI/EDM standard and then require parties to use it to accomplish that business result via a non-EBB methodology.

The other portion of 4.3.6 states:

“Within a reasonable amount of time, all EBB information, functions and transactions should be achieved via one mode of communications. Information and functions should remain available through existing systems until one mode of communication is available”.

Draft 2 - Implementing Standards Proposed by TransCapacity (Redlined to initial 3/16/98 version)

As to “all EBB *information*”; this term refers to the present list of required 4.3.6 non-transactional data. This data is now available on web pages. There exists no unmet requirement for additional information to be “available”. Therefore, there is no additional “non-transactional information” to be made available via web pages and no new non-transactional standards need be formulated.

As to “all... ..functions and transactions [being] achieved via one mode of communications”. The one mode of communications is clearly via the Internet. And, in this context, “one mode of communications” refers to the GISB EDI/EDM standards to achieve the functions and transactions listed in the X.4.X standards. With respect to the “all” portion of the sentence, if we interpret this to mean all *required* transactional functions, then, the only *requirements* (as set by GISB or FERC) that are not yet met for transactions and functions (i.e., those which are not yet achievable via the X.4.X standards) are: 1) the ability to upload an offer, have it processed by the TSP; as well as, 2) the ability to upload a bid, have it considered valid, and be processed for bid evaluation and awarding purposes.

Proposed 4.3.D makes it clear that while there may be other transactions and functions on TSP EBBs, they are not among the “required” transactional functions which are the only ones that need to be migrated to the Internet.

Proposed 4.3.E, makes it clear that the only new ones to be added are the upload of Offers and Uploads of Bids, and that once they are standardized they will be part of the list in 4.3.D.

Proposed 8.1.A, makes it clear that when GISB publishes standards it makes no finding as to the timing of implementation of that standard.

Proposed 4.3.F, gets to the heart of maintaining dual systems. No one should be compelled to maintain dual systems for required transactional functions after the availability of GISB EDI/EDM for such functions.

Proposed Standard 4.3.G further clarifies the EDM model diagrammed in Standard 4.1.1

Proposed Standard 4.3.H, as mentioned at the top of this explanatory discussion further clarifies the intent of the last paragraph at the end of the current 4.3.6.

Proposed Standard 4.3.I, as mentioned at the top of this explanatory discussion further clarifies the intent of the last paragraph at the end of the current 4.3.6.

Proposed Standard 4.1.A straightens out the competitive comparability issue and makes clear that users pay, that users may be deemed to have paid when they pay for transportation service (assuming the TSP wishes to provide EBB service for free and seeks regulatory determination of this). This applies only to EBBs transitioned to Internet web pages. It would not apply to existing “un-transitioned systems. This marks a softening of TransCapacity’s position to the minimum acceptable to TransCapacity from a competitive stand-point.