

**Gas Industry Standards Board
Future Technology Task Force
October 19-20, 1998
Duke Energy, Houston, Texas
Draft Minutes**

October 19

Susan Croley, FTTF chair, called the meeting to order.

Terry Lehn volunteered to server as secretary for minute-taking.

Added to the agenda:

- pilot test to try out the client-side configuration determined in August

1. Introductions of meeting participants

2. Minutes review for October 9th meeting minutes:

- attendees list is missing
- changed word comminations to commucations

3. New implementation issues:

- none

4. Define Electronic Delivery Mechanism Requirements for Flat File/EDM:

- Security
- Internet Protocol(s)

Discussed format for a while though not in our scope:

- Pete Hollyer not here to discuss formats that don't seem to interchange
- Agreed that this is not to be solved by FTTF but rather the Technical task force on Oct 29
- Generally, want to do a "File Save As" without having to write a macro
- Currently, Technical is addressing the Nom group which should address all types beyond Noms

Discussed that which URL is used should not be restrictive

Discussion on Security and Protocol:

- Terry suggested an approach for both the batch and interactive uses of flat files; generally, it is to use the existing architecture for EDI for the batch process and use the same protocol for Interactive (HTTP, multi-part form) and possibly just SSL for the security (giving up non-repudiation)
- Most seemed to agree that use of the existing batch architecture makes sense
- Some concern was expressed about giving up the digital signature of PGP for an interactive
- Should we let EII choose between "ease of use" (no PGP) or security (use PGP to deliver digital signature and, therefore, nonrepudiation)

- The question of what happens when a user disconnects – part of the answer to that is that the same question exists for forms-based forms – thus it could be answered in that broader context)
- Suggestions were made to suggest dropping the use of batch flat files
- We believe the user we are addressing is the one that needs “ease of use”
- Steve suggested that we need to address both batch on interactive flat files
- Discussion on what exactly is required by EII and/or Order 587I took place. It may be the case that at least one file mechanism (EDI or FF) that is fully automatable must be implemented
- We discussed the following:
- Definitions:
 - Batch Flat File – is the term used to describe the upload of files via the GISB EDI/EDM architecture
 - Interactive Flat File – is the term used to describe the upload or download via an interactive browser (e.g., Navigator, Internet Explorer) Protocol
 - Batch: HTTP, multipart form (standard EDI/EDM architecture with “Flat File” type) – continuously listening Web server capability.
 - Interactive: HTTP, multipart form without requiring special “enveloping” data elements – one HTTP round trip or “make available” hyperlink, and an HTTP response containing the official timestamp acknowledging receipt of the uploaded file, or sent to designated site (assumes response to continuously listening Web server).
- Security
 - Batch: EDI mechanisms: PGP for data privacy, data integrity, non-repudiation; basic authentication for access
 - Interactive: EBB mechanisms: 40-bit encryption (e.g., SSL) for data privacy, data integrity; 40-bit encrypted basic authentication for access
 - Decided to take a straw poll as to whether to include non-repudiation – 3 in favor and 9 opposed
 - Many opposed due to previous positions taken by the EII
 - A “Note” will be sent to EII explaining that non-repudiation is a desirable security feature.
- Redefining Flat File/ Electronic Delivery Mechanisms (FF/EDM) was considered. What was troubling was the use of the words “Computer to Computer”. It was moved to take those words out. **Voted:** For: 10 Against: 1.
- Moved to add “for GISB FF/EDM” at the end; For 11 , Against , 0, Abstention: 1.
- Definitions for Batch FF and Interactive Flat File:
 - For GISB FF/EDM, “Batch Flat File” is the term used to describe the automated computer to computer transfer of flat files. For GISB FF/EDM, “Interactive Flat File” is the term used to describe the transfer of flat files using an interactive browser. Moved, For 12, Against 0.
- Susan noted that standard 4.3.8 applies to all forms of EDM. Correct to insert the word “be”.
- Correct standard 4.3.2 to replace the word “designed” with “designated”.
- Discussed the following protocol and security standards as being applicable for Batch Flat File:
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.2
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.3
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.7
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.8
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.9
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.10
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.11
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.12
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.13
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.14

- Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.15

October 20, 1998

4. Define Electronic Delivery Mechanism Requirements for Flat File/EDM (continued):

- EII standards s1, s2, s35 are directly applicable to Interactive Flat File protocol and security
- It was suggested that standard 4.3.9 be modified to say "For EDI/EDM and FF/EDM, ...". **Voted:** For: Unanimous (10 present, 2 on phone). It is noted that this standard adequately addresses necessary protocol aspects of the response and the time attribute for Flat Files.
- For Interactive Flat Files uploads, one or more hyperlinks should be provided that allow the sender to determine the status of received transmissions and transactions. **Voted:** For: Unanimous (10 present, 1 on phone).
- We decided to capture certain Implementation Guide issues. Based on our discussion, the following should be reviewed, time synchronization and logging, what is in HTTP response, enveloping elements, spectrum or specific models of implementation (e.g., Quick Response in one HTTP round trip, "make available" hyperlink, sent to designated site assuming response to continuously listening Web server), transmission identifier for response, issues for EBB's.
- For Interactive Flat File EDM, 40-bit Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) encryption should be used. Where possible, 128-bit SSL encryption is strongly recommended. **Voted:** For: Unanimous (10 present, 2 on phone).
- For Interactive Flat File EDM, access should be protected by HTTP Basic Authentication. **Voted:** For: Unanimous (10 present, 2 on phone).
- Standard s34 should be changed to remove the words "using 40-bit encryption". **Voted:** For: Unanimous (10 present, 2 on phone).
- Protocol and security standards for Batch Flat File EDM include the following:
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.2
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.3
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.7
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.8
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.9
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.10
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.11
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.12
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.13
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.14
 - Batch flat file EDM will follow 4.3.15
- Note to EII on the above. ". **Voted:** For: Unanimous (10 present, 2 on phone).
- Done with Protocol and Security

4a. Discuss Pilot of Client Configuration (added agenda item)

Agreed to create a list of what is needed:

- Client – Andy Sicignano – ECT – NT; Steve Hinton – TCAP – 95
- Sites w/ various implementations used to test out effect on client will include a mix (in the interest of time) non-industry sites as well as gas industry, when available.
- Specific Test Sites
 - Enron – ICA and Cookies; Javascript, Tables/Nested Tables, Frames/ Nested Frames (SSL) – John, Terry

- El Paso will check on Winframe -
- Duke Energy will check on Java (signed code?) - Susan
- Columbia will check on ActiveX – Altra -
- The following are Non-industry sites that may be used
- Style Sheets? -
- Gamelan – Java - Susan
- Investor – ActiveX – Bill, Terry
- MSNBC – ActiveX – Bill, Terry
- Volunteers should create a “cheat sheet” describing how to navigate the site and what features will be tested by such navigation by Oct 26 on 2PM (Susan plans teleconference).
- Test by November 13 FTT (compile results of Pilot test). Implementation guidelines in November 23, 24. Will look at moving to Nov 18, 19 in Salt Lake City instead.
- RMI? No one has indicated they are using this to implement
- Ports against Proxy servers and firewalls – Steve

Attendees:

Terry Lehn	Services	EDS
Jim Keisler	Pipeline	Transco
Andy Sicignano	Services	Enron Capital and Trade Resources
Chris Phillips	Pipeline	Columbia Gas Transmission
Kim VanPelt*	Pipeline	Panhandle Eastern
Susan Croley	Pipeline	Trunkline Gas Company
John Smith	Pipeline	CNG
Ron Szuba	Pipeline	ANR
Bill Fortney	Pipeline	El Paso Energy
Joe Kardas	Pipeline	National Fuel Gas Supply
Richard Hamilton**	Pipeline	Williams Natural Gas
Steve Hinton**	Services	Transcapacity
John Tsucalas***	Services	A.T. Kearny

*first day only

**by phone

***second day only