

## **EBB TRANSITION TO INTERNET TECHNOLOGY**

### **COMPROMISE MODEL APPROACH**

**Summary of model comments as of 4/23/98**

#### **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.

**Please Note:**

**Carl Caldwell has merged his model with Mike Novak.**

**I have not received comments from Jim Buccigross or Norm Walker.**

**ACCESS**

**Access covers the issues surrounding how we get to the Web pages**

The public Internet and internet communication protocols will be one mode of communication for accessing all pipeline business functions. (Norm Walker)

*Novak - Agrees*

*Hahn - Agrees*

Web browser interface should use Internet compatible browser software. (Carl Caldwell)

*Novak - Agrees*

*Hahn -Agrees*

A TSP's EBB should be accessible via the public internet via standard browser software. (Mike Novak)

*Munson - Agrees*

*Novak - Agrees although he thinks 587-G makes this moot or at best, the same as the statement immediately above.*

*Hahn - Agrees*

***Added by Munson:***

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).

## **NAVAGATION**

**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.**

GISB should develop a standardized Web site navigational structure (Common Internet Format) to provide access to business functions. (Mike Novak)

*Novak - Agrees*

*Hahn - Agrees*

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)

*Novak - Agrees*

*Hahn - Agrees*

Standard navigation screens should be developed as templates. (Mike Novak)

*Novak - Agrees*

*Hahn - Agrees*

Navigation through the “menus” of the Common Internet Format should be consistent so far as location and technique. (Mike Novak)

*Novak - Agrees*

*Hahn - Agrees*

***Added by Munson:***

All non-transactional postings should be communicated via the standard look & feel navigational page (Buccigross, modified)

A TPS’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)

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**

**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.**

The necessity and order of the existing 32 standard X12 data sets should be examined. (Norm Walker)

***Novak - Agrees although he thinks 587-G somewhat expands the 32 because of comparability.  
Hahn - Agrees in concept but all 32 do not need to be evaluated.***

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)

***Novak - Agrees but thinks that standard screen layouts need to be discussed and developed even if they end up being “mutually agreeable”. Standard “look and feel” would govern certain elements of features of the screens.***

***Hahn - Disagrees***

A list of standard transactions should be provided with the Common Internet Format. (Mike Novak)

***Novak - Agrees***

***Hahn - Agrees***

Consequently, the alternative solution is to simplify and consolidate, through standardization, the EBB screens. (Jerry Hahn)

***Novak - Disagrees in absolute terms but agrees that a fair degree of simplification and consolidation is necessary.***

***Hahn - Agrees***

***Added by Munson:***

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)

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)

The approach should address all current EBB transactional functions (Walker, modified)

All business transactions that are available in an electronic format should be defined in X12 datasets (Caldwell, modified, Buccigross, modified)

Any transactional web page should perform the same functions as standardized EDI data (Buccigross, modified)

Any business transaction offered by a TSP in an electronic media should be comparably available via X12

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.

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.

## **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)**

Valid codes available for data validation or selection on transactional web page should also be available in a downloadable format for use by customers and their third party service providers. (Carl Caldwell)

*Novak - Agrees but there is room for discussion on limits.*

*Hahn - Agrees*

Flat file uploads and downloads from the transactional web page should be allowed on a mutually agreeable basis. (Carl Caldwell)

*Novak - Agrees*

*Hahn - Agrees*

*Added by Munson:*

All non-transactional postings should be communicated via the standard look & feel navigational page (Buccigross, modified)

## **TIMING**

**Timing deals with the issue of what we are going to transition to the Internet and when.**

The process of creating standards for transactional web sites should begin by 6/1/98. (Norm Walker)

*Hahn - Agrees*

*Novak - No Comment*

The initial phase of common look and feel for internet transaction should be implemented by 6/1/2000. (Norm Walker)

*Novak - 587-G seems to insist that the final phase be completed by 6/1/2000.*

*Hahn - Disagrees*

The producer community would support delay of Web site implementation for transactional content past 6-1-99 in order to achieve greater standardization of TSP Web sites. (Jerry Hahn)

*Novak - Agrees*  
*Hahn - Agrees*

## **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.**

This approach should begin with an industry 'survey' or 'study' of existing EBBs to determine the range of transactions that remain to be standardized. (Sylvia Munson)

*Novak - Disagrees because 587-G spells out what should be provided. With more time, this would have been a good approach.*

*Hann - Disagrees*

### ***Added by Munson:***

This approach should be designed as an extension to standard 4.3.6 and is not intended to displace future EDI development (Novak, modified)

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)

This approach should begin with an industry 'survey' or 'study' of existing EBBs to determine the range of transactions that remain to be standardized

The approach should address all current EBB transactional functions (Walker, modified)

All business transactions that are available in an electronic format should be defined in X12 datasets (Caldwell, modified, Buccigross, modified)

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.

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.