

**Gas Industry Standards Board
Future Technology Task Force
El Paso Energy, Houston TX
January 19, 1998**

Meeting Minutes

Call to Order

Susan Croley called the meeting to order by reading the Anti-Trust statement.

Secretary

Mike Shahan, from CNG, was asked to take minutes.

Introductions

Participants introduced themselves.

Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

Minutes Of Previous Meeting

Transcapacity wanted their objection in the December meeting to the FTTF discussion of 'future' standards noted into the minutes. 'Transcapacity feels it is inappropriate for FTTF to address transaction related web issues since FTTF has not been authorized to do so, and the FERC NOPR indicates there is potential to harm of dual-systems.' The group noted that the FTTF does not agree with Transcapacity's objection and did agree that we should be looking forward. It was stated that the FTTF consensus at the December meeting was that we needed to offer the user community the requirements for both non-transactional and transactional at the same time. The trading partner, based on the technical characteristics we give them, will potentially enter into lease agreements for 2-3 years - they want to have as much information now on which to base their investment decision. Susan will get the wording from Transcapacity on their objection and reflect their objection in the minutes for the next meeting. Minutes of the December 12, 1997 meeting will need to be approved at the next meeting.

Implementation Issues

PGP/Security

Richard Hamilton stated that the Implementation Guide is not clear on the version of PGP that is required. A new version of PGP does not support RSA, as the currently implemented version does. Richard's concerns are with the current EDM implementation. The issue is with key generation of the new version.

It was suggested that perhaps the FTTF should submit a request to change the standard to require PGP versions compatible with version 2.6 (or supports RSA).

It was suggested that we should research the issue further first.

Some participants think that PGP is working fine and we should look at staying with it

and look at working with ViaCrypt and the electric industry on our requirements. It was also suggested that now might be the time to look at products other than PGP since new options now exist (SMIME from browser vendors). This suggestion drew some comments that SMIME would be more appropriate for on-line transactions while PGP is more appropriate for our current EDM model.

It was decided that a group from within FTTF to research the issues with the new version of PGP. This group will be Terry Lehn, Pete Whately, John Tsucalás, Lyle Schenher.

It was suggested that EDM EDI security should be addressed separately from on-line transaction security.

Y2K Compliance

Richard Hamilton asked about Y2K compliance of the 4.x standards and recommendations of GISB. Should we issue a statement of compliance? Some attendees think that most companies are handling this as a business issue and this group should not issue a compliance statement.

It was suggested that any such statement should be approved by GISB legal. Susan will bring this issue to GISB management.

Richard Hamilton will review FTTF documents to identify any issues we may need to look at, including recommended product versions.

EDM Transaction Sets

Richard Hamilton noted that his company is using less than half of the EDM transaction sets and less than 5% of customers are using EDI. He asked if any one had a sense of where EDI was going in the future. Some participants responded that it is required even if customers don't use it and some see more people being interested.

Review of December Internet Look & Feel Meeting

Susan briefly reviewed the results of the December meeting.

Requests from IL&F

Minimal & Optimal Technical Characteristics for Users & Developers of Web Sites

A draft from the December meeting was presented for discussion.

- John Tsucalás stated his concern about trying to set technical standards 18 months out in the future - that it was hard to predict the technology. Again, it was pointed out that transactional vs. non-transactional issues should be separate and distinct.
- It was suggested that Java Script should be a technology considered.
- Should we name version numbers of specific OS vendors with naming all? It was suggested that we identify the characteristics instead of the name and version.

A sense of the room was taken and it was decided to separate the technical characteristics between transactional and non-transactional but ensure they are addressed and presented together.

User characteristics for both non-transactional and projected transactional were redeveloped (see charts and copies from meeting).

Minimal Vs Optimal - Options under minimal characteristics are required to access and use the functionality of the site. Options under optimal can make the use of the site more functional or easier, but are not required to access or use the site.

A sense of the room was taken and it was decided to move 'cookies' from the optimal list to the minimal list for user characteristics for non-transactional. 11 yes, 4 no, 4 abstain.

A sense of the room was taken and it was decided to move Java Script from the optimal list to the minimal list for user characteristics for non-transactional. 14 yes, 2 no, 4 abstain.

A sense of the room was taken on the following question: "Are we going to allow the developer to use Java Applets for Minimal on non-transactional" 1 yes, 13 no, 5 abstain.

User Characteristics (tested environment)

Non-transactional

	<u>Minimal</u>	<u>Optimal</u>
Modem Speed	28.8 KB	Direct Connect
OS	Multi-threaded & Pre-emptive	
RAM	32 MB	>32 MB
Browser Capabilities	Cookies & Java Script Frames & Nested Frames Tables & Nested Tables HTML 3.2	
Display Resolution	800x600 256 colors	16k colors

User Characteristics

Projected Transactional (in addition to Non-transactional)

	<u>Minimal</u>	<u>Optimal</u>
Modem Speed	56 KB	Direct Connect
OS		
RAM	64 MB	
Browser Capabilities	JDK 1.1	

Definitions

Minimal - The environment and components designed and tested for

- Client environment comprised only of characteristics listed
- Should provide for all mandated functions in accessing informational postings

Examples of exclusions:

Java Applets, Active X Components, plug-ins, style sheets, dynamic HTML (positional), SSL, authentication, client side VB

Optimal - Environment or components not required to perform all mandated functions in accessing information postings, but could provide an enhanced user experience

Examples (non-transactional)

	<u>Minimal</u>	<u>Optimal</u>
Hardware	P(entium) 90 MHz	P 200 MHz or greater
RAM	32 MG	> 32 MB
Connectivity	28.8	Direct Connect ISDN Satellite 56 KB modem
Monitor	12" Laptop 15" Desktop	> 12" Laptop > 15" Desktop
Display Capabilities	800 x 600 256 colors	> 800 x 600 > 256 colors
Operating System	Win 95 System 7 Solaris 2.5	Win 95 NT 4.0 or greater Solaris 2.6 System 8
Browsers	Microsoft IE 3.02 Netscape 3.0	IE 4.0 Communicator or Navigator 4.0

A sense of the room was taken on the above: For 19, Against 1, Abstain 0. A segment check was called for:
P/L For 10, Against 1
Services For 9, Against 0

Examples (Projected Transactional)

Minimal

Optimal

_____ On motion, since this item's timing is not as critical as the non-transactional list it is tabled until the next meeting. For 20, Against 1, Abstain 0.

Guidelines for Positioning TSP Name in the Upper 1/3 of display.

The draft proposal was reviewed.

- remove 'the' from 'for the two major browsers'
- clarify that the name should appear on 'each' page when printed
- note that this standard can apply to a broader base than just TSP pages

- need to specify when the name may not appear when printed using Frames
- remove the last item under the 'Frames' list or reword (same for item 3 under 'top of web page')

It was suggested that we recommend the name be included in the Title Bar and recommend the other 2 options to enhance the users experience.

It was also suggested that we include pictures of the options. Susan will work with Terry Lehn and John Tsucalas to get this document ready for the IL&F meeting.

The draft document with suggested changes was approved. Yes 19, No 0, Abstain 0.

Meeting Adjourned

On motion, leftover items were tabled until our next meeting.

Due to the time of day, the meeting was adjourned.