



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

May 4, 1998

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

CC: Carl Caldwell, Sylvia Munson, Jean Ford

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: EBB-Internet Transition Plan Meeting Notes, Assignments

MEETING NOTES

The team met via conference call on May 4 to discuss the various models submitted regarding the EBB-Internet transition plan, collapsing the models, and assignments. The models are:

- (1) EDI and "common look and feel" standardized web sites for postings (the Buccigross model)
- (2) The common front end, navigation and presentation would be the same but the content areas would not be standard (the Novak model - combining the Caldwell model),
- (3) EDI, "common look and feel" standardized web site for postings with a browser compatibility for EBBs including transactions (the Walker model),
- (4) EDI, "common look and feel" standardized web site for both postings and transactions (the Jerry Hahn model -- to be combined with the Novak model).
- (5) EDI, a combination of features of the above models (the Munson model -- to be combined with the Buccigross model)

Each of the model drafters were asked to evaluate their models based on key components organized into six categories defined by Mr. Betonte. This information was provided to the task force and posted on the Home Page prior to the meeting. The responses were reviewed and the Betonte chart was modified to include the responses, (see attached). Some clarifications to the definitions and key components of the chart were made, and others may be needed. Mr. Buccigross and Ms. Munson will collapse their models in to one, and Mr. Hahn and Mr. Novak will collapse their models into one.

Mr. Lander noted that from his perspective, before answering the "what" questions (what attributes are needed for standard transactional web sites) addressed in the Betonte chart, it appears that an affirmative response to an unasked a threshold question is assumed: "Should GISB develop standards for a standardized transactional web site?" It was his observation that that question has not been asked, and there is not a consensus in the task force that the response would be affirmative. If affirmative, another threshold question should be asked before proceeding: "Are the GISB standardized transactional web sites' use mandatory or mutually agreeable?" Other task force members differed with him that those were "threshold" questions, and further, that the task force was not charged with responding to those questions. It was determined to place those questions in a background section of the report.

Ms. Ford reviewed work papers provided to the task force regarding the use of XML, eXtended Mark-up Language. It was her opinion that use of XML with EDI would further allow models to be collapsed. Mr. Lander and Mr. Novak noted that their models could accommodate the use of XML, although Mr. Lander noted that the first threshold question that was posed earlier should have an affirmative response before the Buccigross model would support its use. Mr. Walker was unsure if his model would support it. Because few of the attendees were knowledgeable of XML, Ms. Ford offered to continue her research and it will be referred to the Future Technology Task Force for their evaluation. One of the observers noted that other technologies may provide similar benefits, and the models should



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

not address the use of XML. Mr. Lander added that in review of XML one task must be completed first -- the identification of business transactions that require the development of EDI data sets. A threshold question on the use of XML is outstanding should its use be determined to be beneficial: "Should GISB develop templates for XML which would standardize the on-line screens?"

The format of the June 1 report to the Board of Directors was discussed. Below is an outline of the report and the assignments for completion of each part:

Part	Description	Prepared By
Executive Summary	Background Discussion	GISB Office edited by task force members
	Summary not to exceed two paragraphs and a picture for each model	Drafters of the models
Comparison of Models	Betonte Chart	GISB Office edited by drafters
Model Descriptions	Full descriptions of Models and any associated standards	Drafters of the models

Supplementary information will be provided with the report including the notes from the meetings and the original six model descriptions.

For assignments and a time table of events regarding the report:

May 8	J. Hahn/M. Novak	Review models for collapsing and provide any changes to the Betonte chart to the GISB office
May 8	J. Buccigross/S. Munson	Review models for collapsing and provide any changes to the Betonte chart to the GISB office
May 18	R. McQuade	Background Discussion edited by task force members
	Drafters	Summary not to exceed two paragraphs and a picture for model to the GISB Office
	Drafters	Full description of Model to the GISB Office
May 20/21	Drafters	Presentation to EC on the three models
May 25	Drafters	Changes to model descriptions, summary and Betonte chart as a result of the EC presentations to the GISB Office
	Task Force	Changes to the Background Discussion as a result of the EC presentations to the GISB office
May 27	GISB Office	Incorporate changes and forward draft of complete report to task force for review
May 29	GISB Office	Incorporate any last minute changes to the report from the task force
May 29	GISB Office	Post report and forward it to the Board of Directors
June 18		Presentation to the Board

While there are no meetings envisioned for the task force, during the above work it may become apparent that a meeting is required. If so, the GISB office will call a teleconference, post it and inform the task force members with as much advance time as possible.



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

ATTENDEES

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Present</u>
Task Force:	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	✓
	Dona Gussow	Florida Power and Light	×
	Laurie Valasek	Midland Cogeneration Venture	✓
	Mike Bray	Duke Energy	✓
	Jerry Hahn	Texaco Natural Gas	✓
	Rae McQuade	GISB	✓
Observers:	Jean Ford	Andersen Consulting	✓
	Dale Smith	ANR Pipeline	✓
	John Smith	CNG Transmission	✓
	Betty Barnum	Duke Energy - Panhandle Eastern	✓
	Donna Scott	Enron Administrative Corp.	✓
	Andy Sicignano	Enron Administrative Corp.	✓
	Mary Dramer	Enron - Northern Border	✓
	Diane Eckels	Enron - Northern Natural	✓
	Theresa Hess	Enron - Transwestern	✓
	Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway	✓
	Sandra Barnett	Koch Midstream	✓
	Anjie Hoppe	KN Energy	✓
	Leigh Spangler	Latitude Technologies	✓
	Steve Elmer	PG&E Transmission	✓
	Rick Ishikawa	SoCal Gas	✓
	Greg Lander	TransCapacity	✓
	Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipelines	✓



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

BETONTE CHART

Excerpts from FERC Docket No. RM96 - 1 - 007; Order No. 587-G

The Commission is adopting the requirement that all transactions and information be conducted using the Internet.

GISB and the pipeline's should consider measures to ensure communication reliability, such as mirror (duplicate) servers and the use of a back-up ISP.

First , pipelines conducting business transactions electronically must conduct all such transactions using EDI format.

Thus, the pipelines and GISB need to create EDI datasets for all transactions not yet standardized.

Second, pipelines may, but will not be required to, provide interactive web sites. Pipelines will be permitted cost-of-service recovery in subsequent section 4 rate cases for the costs of the interactive web site only if the pipelines together with GISB create standards governing the access to, presentation, and format ("look and feel") of the sites.

As NGC notes, many electric utilities collaborated on developing a common Internet site that not only provided shippers with a standardized format, but significantly reduced the utilities' development costs as well. The pipelines and GISB should give serious consideration to pursuing a similar course.

All transactions available on the interactive web site also must be available through EDI communications.

Forth, by the June 1, 1999 conversion to Internet communications, communications using EBBs should cease.

The Commission will require pipelines to provide third-party connections as long as the third-party pays a reasonable fee, to be included in the pipelines' tariff, reflecting the costs of the pipeline of providing the connection.

All transactions provided on EBBs are covered by the regulation.

The pipelines should be prepared to move to the Internet by the June 1,1999 deadline regardless of whether standards are developed.

In addition, as discussed earlier, pipelines can save significant monetary and personnel resources as well as provide a more standardized product if, instead of each pipeline developing a proprietary solution, they collaborated on development of a standardized Internet communication system, as was done in the electric industry.

While pipelines should accommodate reasonably current versions of web browsers, they should not be required to accommodate browsers that have been out-of-date for several years. GISB should consider standards reflecting the level of HTML coding that should be supported.



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

DESCRIPTIONS OF CATEGORIES

- ACCESS** Access covers the issues surrounding how we get to the Web pages
- NAVIGATION** Navigation deals with the issues of once we are in the Web page how we move around the page, where things are located, what they look like, their names, etc.
- CONTENT/FORMAT** Content deals with the services that are offered. For example, when we go to the Web page we navigate to nominations by selecting the "Nomination Button" and then we enter the Nomination content area. Format deals with the arrangement of the nomination content area.
- UPLOAD/DOWNLOAD** Upload/Download deals with the ability to access and input data to the Web page instead of going directly into the Web page. (i.e. X12)
- TIMING** Timing deals with the issue of what we are going to transition to the Internet and when.
- SCOPE OF TRANSACTION STANDARDIZATION** This issue deals with the need to discuss, identify and explore what services need to be standardized with regard to transactional data as we transition to the Internet.



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

COMPARISON CHART

CATEGORY/KEY COMPONENTS	MODEL :				
	Novak	Hahn	Walker	Buccigross	Munson
ACCESS					
1. The public Internet and internet communication protocols will be one mode of communication for accessing all pipeline business functions. (Norm Walker)	✓	✓	✓	✓ in part ¹	✓ ²
2. Web browser interface should use Internet compatible browser software. (Carl Caldwell)	✓	✓	✓	✓ in part	
3. A TSP's EBB should be accessible via the public internet via standard browser software. (Mike Novak)	✓	✓	✓	✗	
Added by Munson:					
4. Any non-mandatory functions provided on web pages should be treated as a competitive offering and, consistent with GISB Standard 1.1.11, users of such services should bear the cost (Buccigross, modified).					✓
NAVIGATION					
5. GISB should develop a standardized Web site navigational structure (Common Internet Format) to provide access to business functions. (Mike Novak)	✓	✓	✓	✓ in part	
6. Non-transactional data (informational Postings) under Standard No. 4.3.6 would be communicated over the Internet via a "common look and feel" standardized web page. (Jim Buccigross)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
7. Standard navigation screens should be developed as templates. (Mike Novak)	✓	✓	✓	✓ in part	
8. Navigation through the "menus" of the Common Internet Format should be consistent so far as location and technique. (Mike Novak)	✓	✓	✓	✓ in part	
Added by Munson:					
9. All non-transactional postings should be communicated via the standard look & feel navigational page (Buccigross, modified)					✓
10. A TSP's proprietary screen format, navigation techniques, content format and functionality (other than required business standards) should continue to be available at the TSP discretion (Novak, modified)					✓



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

		MODEL :				
		S				
CATEGORY/KEY COMPONENTS		Novak	Hahn	Walker	Buccigross	Munson
11.	Any non-mandatory functions provided on web pages should be treated as a competitive offering and, consistent with GISB Standard 1.1.11, users of such services should bear the cost (Buccigross, modified).					✓
CONTENT/FORMAT						
12.	The necessity and order of the existing 32 standard X12 data sets should be examined. (Norm Walker)	✓ in part	✓ in part	✓	✗	
13.	Standard field name descriptors or abbreviations should be used on all transactional web pages. [No standards for screen layouts, exact placement, font size, colors, etc.] (Carl Caldwell)	✓ in part	✗	? ³	✓ in part	
14.	A list of standard transactions should be provided with the Common Internet Format. (Mike Novak)	✓	✓	?	✗	
15.	Consequently, the alternative solution is to simplify and consolidate, through standardization, the EBB screens. (Jerry Hahn)	✗	✓	✗	✗	
Added by Munson:						
16.	A TSP's proprietary screen formats, navigation techniques, content format and functionality (other than required business standards) should continue to be available at the TSP discretion (Novak, modified)					✓
17.	The approach should begin with the existing 32 standard X12 data sets. The necessity, order and time frame of implementation should be determined for each. (Walker, modified)					✓
18.	The approach should address all current EBB transactional functions (Walker, modified)					✓
19.	All business transactions that are available in an electronic format should be defined in X12 datasets (Caldwell, modified, Buccigross, modified)					✓
20.	Any transactional web page should perform the same functions as standardized EDI data (Buccigross, modified)					✓
21.	Any business transaction offered by a TSP in an electronic media should be comparably available via X12					✓
22.	There should be a set of core data sets that are identified as mandatory for any party who offers electronic transactions. There should be non-core datasets identified that can be offered by parties who choose to offer those transactions electronically.					✓



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

		MODEL :				
		S				
CATEGORY/KEY COMPONENTS		Novak	Hahn	Walker	Buccigross	Munson
33.	This approach should begin with an industry 'survey' or 'study' of existing EBBs to determine the range of transactions that remain to be standardized					✓
34.	The approach should address all current EBB transactional functions (Walker, modified)					✓
35.	All business transactions that are available in an electronic format should be defined in X12 datasets (Caldwell, modified, Buccigross, modified)					✓
36.	There should be a set of core data sets that are identified as mandatory for any party who offers electronic transactions. To choose to offer those transactions electronically.					✓
37.	The set of core data sets should include the ability for a customer or third party service provider to download, in an X12 format, a TSP's subset of standard GISB codes, and a TSP's list of Business Conditional and Mutually Agreeable elements supported for each data set.					✓

FOOTNOTES:

- ¹ Please refer to the actual comments provided by the model drafter. The model did not fully encompass the key component described
- ² Blank indicates that no response was received from the drafter regarding whether his model supported the key component.
- ³ More explanation is required before the drafter can determine if his model encompasses the key component.
- ⁴ No comment.