



Meeting Minutes

<i>Project</i>	GISB Future Technology Task Force				
<i>Meeting Purpose</i>	Identification of FTTF recommendations vs. current standards and the EDM manual, GISB Procedures, Plan for 4Q1999, 1Q2000				
<i>Meeting Mission</i>	Identification of FTTF recommendations vs. current standards and the EDM manual, GISB Procedures, Plan for 4Q1999, 1Q2000				
<i>Meeting Scribe</i>	Terry Lehn				
<i>Facilitator</i>	Mike Shahan				
<i>Date</i>	10-22-99	<i>Time</i>	9AM PST	<i>Location</i>	Proxicom, San Francisco

<i>Distribution and Attendee List</i>					
T	Chris Solakian - ANR (C.Solakian@coastalcorp.com)	X	Mike Shahan - CNG (mshahan@cngt.cng.com)	X	Bill Fortney - El Paso (fortneyb@epenergy.com)
T	Ron Szuba - ANR (ron.szuba@coastalcorp.com)	X	George Heal - Proxicom (gheal@proxicom.com)	X	Rae McQuade - GISB (gisb@aol.com)
X	Terry Lehn - Enron (tlehn@enron.com)	X	John Smith - CNG (jsmith@cngt.cng.com)	X	Richard Hamilton - Williams (rhamilton@wis.twc.com)
X	Joe Kelly - FPL (jkelly@fpl.com)	X	Andy Sicignano - ECT (andy.sicignano@enron.com)	T	Myles Marshall - NrG (myles.marshal@nrinfo.com)

X— present T—teleconference

Next Meeting Date MM/DD/YYYY

Teleconference in next two weeks. Date and time to be determined by Rae McQuade. We are shooting for October 29, 1999 Another meeting will be scheduled in December, as necessary.

<i>Agenda</i>			
<i>Nbr.</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Time Frame</i>	<i>Responsible</i>
1.	Welcome		Mike
2.	GISB Antitrust		Mike
3.	Adoption of Agenda		Mike
4.	Review of Unapproved Minutes		Mike
5.	Open Issues		All
6.	GISB Procedures		Rae
7.	FTTF Plan		All
8.	Miscellaneous		All
9.	Adjournment		All

Annotated Agenda and Minutes

Topic 1. Welcome

Mike

- Mike welcomed attendees. All participants introduced themselves.

Topic 2. Antitrust

Mike

- The antitrust statement was stated.

Topic 3. Adoption of Agenda

Mike

- The proposed agenda was approved.

Topic 4. Review of Unapproved Minutes

Mike

- The adoption of minutes from several meetings was accomplished. Mike will call Veronica requesting that she change draft to final for these minutes.

Topic 5. Open Issues

All

- Postponed this item until GISB procedures (agenda item 6) were discussed.
- Note that the following items are listed in order of a handout provided by Mike Shahan.
- Looking for things that didn't make it as a standard. The timing of the recommendations that we feel require follow-up should be the January meeting of the Executive Committee (EC).

- ❑ Recent FTTF-suggested minimum technical characteristics are not in EDM manual.
- ❑ FERC action tends to lag by about a year because of the regulatory process.
- ❑ Recommendation for a footnote to what is meant by "minimum" is probably not be in the EDM manual as originally stated.
- ❑ Rae could email the current draft PDF document of the EDM manual. It contains notes highlighting what was changed.
- ❑ Recommendation regarding minimum technical characteristics standard 4.3.59
- ❑ Recommendation regarding allowing third party connections is standard 4.3.64.
- ❑ Recommend example configurations did make it in the EDM manual.
- ❑ Recommendation regarding security (access and encryption) made it as a standard 4.3.60.
- ❑ Recommendation regarding 40 bit and 128 bit encryption is standard 4.3.61
- ❑ Recommendation regarding signed code is standard 4.3.62.
- ❑ The statement regarding non-repudiation should be an annual review item.
- ❑ The statement regarding client certificates should be an annual review item.
- ❑ Recommendation regarding redundant connections to the Internet became standard 4.1.36.
- ❑ Recommendations related to redundancy and multiple URLs for disaster recovery are not considered an open issue. It is known that some of these are in the EDM manual. Individuals may want to review the final wording.
- ❑ Outbound ports are in the EDM manual. Again, members may wish to review the final wording. October 9 and 31 minutes incorrectly listed the port 8674 and it should be 6874. This should corrected in those minutes
- ❑ Recommendation regarding minimizing ports is principle 4.1.37.
- ❑ Recommendation regarding limited list of available TCP ports for EDM is standard 4.3.70. The footnote related to the range of ports 8001-8020 may not be in the manual. The list of ports should be another annual item for review.
- ❑ Definitions for Batch Flat File and Interactive Flat File are standards 4.2.18, 4.2.19
- ❑ Wording corrections made.
- ❑ Interactive Flat File links to determine status of received transmission did not make it as a standard. This is not a open item.
- ❑ Recommendation related to use of encryption for Interactive Flat File is standard 4.3.83. However, this item limits encryption to use of SSL which was not intended by FTTF. We should recommend that this be addressed as a minor correction. We should also explain that this change is fairly inconsequential (would probably not affect any party adversely).
- ❑ Recommendation related to Basic Authentication for Interactive Flat File is standard 4.3.84.

- ❑ There is no need to list applicable standards for Batch Flat File as it was determined that listing these did not add any real value to the EDM manual.
- ❑ The recommendation related to "compatible and usable" is not considered in need of action.
- ❑ Recommendation suggesting insertion of wording "and partially supported" is not considered in need of action.
- ❑ Minimum versions for EDM: most of this is not there (the exception is the footnote related to memory). These need to be sent to EC for adoption. The timing of this should be the January meeting of the EC. We need to keep in mind that we need to communicate that this should not mean a financial burden to any company. We should communicate that we chose our recommendations based on what was prevailing and relatively inexpensive technology and necessary to support a reasonable capability to secure Web-page-based commerce. It was voted to recommend version 4.7 of Netscape's browser (Navigator) and version 5.0 of Microsoft's browser (IE). This was passed unanimously. This is an annual review item.
- ❑ Need to recommend the elimination of service pack reference in the example for NT 4.0. It was felt that this reference implied a standard that doesn't exist. This was voted and passed with a vote of 8-1. This is an annual review item.
- ❑ Regarding the footnote recommendations to go with the Minimum Technical Requirements, the display resolution will be recommended 1024 X 768. Memory footnote exists.
- ❑ Regarding the fact that the EII document still references SSL, we have already addressed this in this meeting - see discussion above.
- ❑ Miles Marshall joined at this point.
- ❑ To our knowledge, no company is reliant on the JDK 1.1.6 plug-in and we can recommend the JDK 1.1.7b plug-in for now. We considered recommending its use for consideration by the EC in November, 1999. If this is approved, it would be effective in November, 1999 (for implementation in June, 2000). It would be characterized as a minor correction. We also discussed the timing of when to recommend use of the JDK 1.2 (Java 2) plug-in. We are interested in making the standard effective immediately. This would be presented to the EC in January, 2000. We felt that a survey of what the pipelines are using would be desirable to determine whether we can get there that fast. We also talked about having a specific meeting on this topic. We also know that NrG is using the JDK 1.2 plug-in for Iroquois. There exists a switch utility which allows a customer to move between these two plug-ins (only one can be installed at a time). We agreed to a teleconference call to allow FTTF members to determine whether moving to Java 2 (JDK 1.2) would be burdensome to proposed as a standard at the November EC meeting. Rae will arrange the teleconference. We voted to defer a vote on what version to recommend when until after the teleconference. The vote was unanimous in favor of this.

*Topic 6. GISB Procedures**Rae*

- ❑ FTTF reports to EDS committee which has been dormant for some time. EDM serves under the GISB executive committee.
- ❑ To do work, a request must exist or another committee must request it.
- ❑ This, so a record exists.
- ❑ Recommends a request to get things going - they go to Rae, then Triage which assigns it, then to Executive Committee for approval, then to membership for approval, EC eventually votes on findings and it then would become a standard.
- ❑ This is a process that is now being adhered to more tightly than in the past - benefits the EC and the membership.
- ❑ This process also allows a reference to the request identifier.
- ❑ FTTF is not subject to balanced voting as are other committees.
- ❑ Voting is one vote per company.
- ❑ Agenda items should be very clearly stated to make sure they are easily identified.
- ❑ For example, standing items such as annual review of minimum technical requirements need to be clearly identified on agenda but do not require a new request.
- ❑ There is a procedure for minor corrections and clarifications which don't require membership vote.

*Topic 7. FTTF Plan**All*

- ❑ The following is a brainstorming session. Any agreed ideas need to be advanced as a formal request as described in the previous agenda item. Send requests using the appropriate form (on the GISB home page) to Rae at the above email address.
- ❑ We discussed addressing XML again. If this is approved, the initial outcome of it being studied might be a progress report with any going forward recommendations. It was suggested that Enron file a request to do so. Terry will followup on this.
- ❑ A suggestion for more effective data exchange request was sent to Mike from Jim Keisler. He listed several sub-topics. It is recommended that Transco/Williams file a specific request.
- ❑ Joe and Terry recommend that we review security mechanisms to determine whether any revised approaches should be used. They will collaborate to make a request on this. Note that Jim Keisler mentioned this in his memo so he should be consulted as well.
- ❑ Bill suggested that we review our list of allowable ports. For example, the IIOP and IIOPS protocols (for CORBA) now have "well known" port numbers (this is not an OMG standard yet but will be looked at next year). There may be others that need consideration. Bill will followup with a request from El Paso.

Topic 8. Miscellaneous

All

- ❑ Joe requested more notice for meetings. Recent meetings have not had much notice but this has not been the norm over the last few years. We should strive for a lead time according to GISB practices (believed to be one or two weeks).

Topic 9. Adjournment

All

- ❑ The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM PST.