

# EBB TRANSITION TO INTERNET TECHNOLOGY

## COMPROMISE MODEL APPROACH

By Bob Betonte of Southern California Gas Co.

### 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)

*Buccigross - Agrees to the following extent: HTTP "Get" for Informational Postings; HTTP "Post" for Transactional Activity using GISB EDI as the format for transfers of transactional data via HTTP "Post".*

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

*Buccigross - Agrees for Information Postings under GISB Standard 4.3.6. This would not be applicable to transactional information. Currently the GISB EDI/EDM uses "Batch browser approach" to call a batch posting process, there can be on-line browser approach to post as well, but there is no need for defining additional GISB standards with respect to on-line form-entry via browsers for transactional functions.*

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

*Buccigross - Disagrees.*

*Given the order, TSP's EBB's will go away effective June 1, 1999. We understand that the present proposed "Common Look and Feel" standards provide that informational posting under GISB Standard No. 4.3.6 should be available via the public Internet via standard browser software.*

### 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.**

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

*Buccigross - Agrees, for informational posting under GISB Standard No. 4.3.6.*

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)

*Buccigross - Agrees.*

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

*Buccigross - Agrees, for informational posting under GISB Standard No. 4.3.6.*

## **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)

*Buccigross - Disagrees. The existing 32 standardized X12 datasets are communicated via HTTP in the Server to Server model per existing GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanisms.*

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)

*Buccigross - Agrees regarding informational postings under GISB Standard No. 4.3.6 which should be displayed and navigated utilizing the proposed "Common Look and Feel" standards.*

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

*Buccigross - Disagrees. Transactions should be communicated utilizing the existing 32 standardized X12 EDI datasets, plus the Upload of Offers and Bids, communicated via HTTP in the Server to Server model per existing GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanisms.*

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

*Buccigross - Disagrees. Given the order, TSP's EBB's will go away effective June 1, 1999. Even if GISB does adopt Internet Transactional Standards for "Common Look and Feel" there is no requirement that TSP's have to transition. Given that TSP's would have to also create and support EDI for all Transactions on an EBB, there is even a question as to whether they would be willing to run the risk of having to support dual systems because they offered something on an EBB. In addition, if the only benefit of migrating to GISB standards for transactional web pages is that they get cost-of-service treatment, they have to ask themselves "do we want to be at the beck and call of every GISB change to the transactional web pages in return for getting COS Treatment?" Lastly, if there is an alternative comparable means of accomplishing a business result, (i.e., fax etc.) why go through the hassle of transitioning everything when all I have to do is the GISB mandatory, and then only via EDI. I can always contract with a third-party to provide my customers an interface if they really need or want one.*

### **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)

*Buccigross - Disagrees. Transactions should be communicated utilizing the existing 32 standardized X12 EDI datasets, plus the Upload of Offers and Bids, communicated via HTTP in the Server to Server model per existing GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanisms. Informational Postings (except for Index of Customers data) should be downloadable via HTML or RTF per GISB Standard No. 4.3.16 (as modified by the "Common Look and Feel" proposed standards.)*

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)

*Buccigross - Disagrees with entire concept of transactional web pages. However, in the event a TSP does choose to migrate to a transactional web page, this requirement is paramount. So too is the requirement that the web-page provide the identical response capability as the EDI. This means that the Web page server communicates to the business system using the GISB EDI/EDM. Only in this way will the industry be assured that the same results and responsiveness exist for both (read dual) systems. If the Web-page server for transactional forms uses the EDI format via GISB EDM, then all will be assured that the EDI will really achieve the same results when used via a third-party. There is no other way to be comparable.*

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

*Buccigross - Agrees. This would be exceeding the standards, but there is no GISB requirement regarding flat file uploads or downloads.*

## **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)

*Buccigross - Disagrees. If the topic is Informational Postings, this can certainly occur by June 1, 1999. If topic is transactional standards for web sites, disagrees with entire concept of GISB formulating standards for transactional web-pages. IF TSP's want to transition an EBB to the Internet they can do so. It is a competitive service. If they wish to acquire a standards-based solution, or to build a standards based solution (GISB EDI/EDM, then they can put whatever front-end on that system that they wish so long as the data that gets to the business system is GISB EDI/EDM. There is no need for GISB to standardize the look and feel of the forms. A TSP should be able to format the forms in any way that meets their business needs. Once the form is submitted, the data would travel to the business system in GISB EDI/EDM. This method of compliance is perfectly acceptable.*

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

*Buccigross - Disagrees. If the topic is Informational Postings, this can certainly occur by June 1, 1999. If topic is transactional standards for web sites, disagrees with entire concept. There is no need for "Common Look and Feel" for transactional information, it is done via X12 EDI utilizing the HTTP "Server to Server" model per existing GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards.*

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)

*Buccigross - Disagrees with entire concept of standardizing transactional web pages.*

## **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)

*Buccigross - Agrees in part. The recent order said that all transactions must be standardized via X12 EDI utilizing the GISB HTTP "Server to Server" model per existing GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism standards. A survey of what functions TSPs will require be done only via electronic means should be conducted. Then a prioritization of this effort can occur. Permitting faxes in the interim (and for the long term is certainly acceptable for the non-mandatory GISB 32 datasets.*