

Notes on changes and work-to-be-done on EDM book:

990823, sfm

This is not done as a fancy formal document. It's just something for us to talk from on the conference call.

Entire document – all additions must be underlined, all deletions should have strike through. This is the responsibility of the team submitting the document recommendation.

1 Table of Contents, need to add new sections for EBB and IFF/EDM

Changes needed are:

Tab 6 – and “and Batch FF/EDM” to title bar

Tab 8 – add as EBB/EDM

Tab 9 – add as Interactive FF/EDM

*Not an EC recommendation issue*

2 Version Notes

Need to write text of version notes

*Not an EC recommendation issue*

3 Introduction

Need to add description of Tab 8 and Tab 9 to introduction, modify description of Tab 6 to include Batch FF/EDM

*Not an EC recommendation issue*

4 Executive Summary

Addition of Y2K statement: need to confirm Rae's approval. I understand that the group has asked for this – just need to follow through.

5 Business Process and Practices

Page 1 – why remove the text references to VAN services. This text should remain in place for 2 reasons. First, the EDM model in the standards still refers to VANs – it has not been updated. Second, this is a hot issue at some of the state discussions right now who are looking at using GISB EDM stds for Internet. It would be good to keep it.

Page 4 – TCP Communications section

Delete the two standards – all standards should be just like they were in 1.3, within this section, grouped by Prin, Def and Std. We will be adding Jim

Keisler's table denoting which EDM issue the std relates to after the Stds in the Tab 4 section.

Reword the introduction statement so that it reads like text – it's like an outline right now.

Capitalize TCP throughout the discussion (or don't, just be consistent about it).

What in the new standards justifies the addition of all of these allowable TCP ports. The standard is HTTP – it looks like we're opening up ports for plugins and don't we have a standard that says we shouldn't do plugins? And don't we have a principle to limit the number of ports?

From the HTTP Port list, this one says "8674". There are two other references to this, some say 8674 and some say 6874. Which is right?

Principles, Definitions and Standards – we'll add these back in, there is some new formatting though. Also, there is a new section for General Standards to cover the 3 new standards for common codes – these will appear in all books.

Keisler's Xref -- will appear in two views. The first is in order of standard number and the second is in order by section.

## 6 Related Standards

This section has been updated from Common Codes recommendations and to be brought up to date, also the new stuff about HTTP voted in by the EC in July. This section will be the same in all books.

## 6 TIBP for Internet EDI/EDM

Since this section also serves as the instructions for Batch FF/EDM, the text opening should include something saying such and the title should say it.

Dictionary, "transaction-set", Format –

The list of code values for this item were added to the Related Standards section under the HTTP discussion by the request from Technical. This should be changed to refer to that list in that section.

Are all of these changes a reflection of EII or of requests that were submitted, or is there a 'update' that needed to be made to keep up to date?

The ones I am particularly interested in are the "from" and "to" elements. The GISB common code for entities does not include the usage of the duns+4 number. GISB common codes only support the 9 digit duns number. So why are we saying use the Common code identifier but saying that it should be 13 (9+4) instead of 9?

Table of contents – page 1 for EDI subtab –

These page numbers are risky because when the document gets PDF'd, the page numbers can change. I'd recommend we call these items Sections or something and label each of the 'sections' sequentially rather than using page numbers.

Page 3 – General Flow . . . – make this title more informative as a lead in.

Page 8 – MA elements refers to the standard list of codes, make the description refer to the table in Related Stds.

Page 13 – General Flow – same change as above

Page 17, Sever Specifications – change last sentence reference to GISB page to refer to Appendix A, Time Synchronization for the references

Page 18 – reference to HTTP ports – see note above – which is right

Page 33 – new error codes – did these come through a request or are they in response to EII stds? We need to be able to justify the additions.

Appx A Ref guide

HTTP, 'syntax information . . . ', deletion of the url makes sense, but reference to RFC should be preceded by something like the 'W3C published protocols' or something so that ignorants (like myself) will know what this means.

PGP Software – fix font so that it matches

### **Tab 9 – Interactive FF/EDM**

Paraagraph 4 – after first sentence insert: "While GISB has set no standards on how this should be accomplished,, an example . . . "

Change "Also,"" to "As another example,"

Related Stds section – change this section – in all tabs (it wasn't in tab 6), to list the standard numbers that pertain to this section. Otherwise keeping the two locations for the stds in sync will be a nightmare.

Flow Diagram – text should be softened a little to emphasize that this is not a standard, but a 'for instance'?

Make the flow diagram bigger – more in keeping with other books

Specification, the parts of a page thru Matrix area

This section is interpreting the standard. Pull this section and be more generic up front

Page Format - delete the first sentence. It interprets the stds – or remove this section and page functions, also.

File Creation – replace references to s27, etc with real stanard numbers

Ditto on “assigning data element values”

#### Pre-validations

This text implies GISB std messages that do not exist.

Delete the sentence that begins “It could also be . . . “ and at the end of the next sentence add “or unrecognizable format” inside the parens.

#### Examples

Work on making the ‘pasted’ pictures readable.

#### Security

Put in GISB std numbers

### **Tab 7 – Informational Postings**

Related Stds – use list of applicable stds

The technical characteristics need to be kept in the Appendix. Two reasons – One, they are used in two sections of this book and as a maintenance issue, should not be repeated.. Two, the standard that makes these items important refers to them as in an appendix, not in a body of text.

If these characteristics are being updated from last years (or not), the recommendation should be clear to the EC, because there are folks who are concerned about changing this list.

“Information Postings Web Site Developer . . .

second paragraph – “Any other Web technologies . . . - Where does this statement come from? What you are saying is that its okay to use the non-http plug ins that are in this list (in the ports listing), but if anyone has another solution it’s not okay – sounds like we’re picking winners – and GISB doesn’t like to do that.

#### Flow Diagram

From Keisler

#### Page Format

Text sounds like it is interpretive. – sounds like frames and tables are the chosen solutions – lets stick to muddier text and not pick solutions.

Appendices – I understand that we’re deleting all of these – but we need to keep the one on the characteristics.

Tab 8 – EBB/EDMM

What's covered

Include Invoicing and cap rel, we've set a few stds there, too.

:☺)

Specification - oops, everywhere – make font same as in other tabs

Navigation - in EBB, the navigation doesn't have to be on the left and visible, it can be at the top of the page. This looks like its leading to imply otherwise via the extensive text and examples.

Examples need to be readable

Nominations Categories

Fix typo of 'ling' to 'link'

Capacity Release Categories - is this the official list? Just asking!

Parts of the page – COOL PICTURES, but some of them were walked on by the example – need to straighten this out.

The Form

Bullet 3 & 4. Don't refer to brands

On first one replace 'Java Objects' with 'pages/links'

On second one replace 'JavaScript' with something else that doesn't pick a solution, just describes the problem

Under Security – make sure we're consistent on the Firewall language across all sections

Server specs – sync up the lists

Place Min config here – NO, keep it in the appendix

Java – the 'standards' allow for . . .

ICA language – what 'standard' allows for ICA plug ins?

Both of these should probably be moved into the configuration appendix and the language should not refer to these as 'standards'.