



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

September 17, 1998

**TO:** GISB Members, Posting on the Web Page for Interested Industry Participants  
**FROM:** Rae McQuade, Executive Director  
**RE:** Final EBB Internet Implementation Task Force Meeting Minutes - September 17 & 18, 1998

## **SEPTEMBER 17, 1998**

### **I. Administrative**

The meeting opened at 8:30 p.m.. Mr. Caldwell opened the meeting, welcomed the attendees, and introduced and thanked the hosts, American Gas Association. Mr. Buccigross gave the antitrust advice. Each attendee introduced himself or herself. The agenda was adopted with additions to review revisions to recommended standard 4.3.A/L, categorization of survey items, clean-up items, and a change in order to address scheduled quantities before confirmations and to address proposed standard 34.4 after all nominations agenda items were addressed. The minutes of September 3 and 4 were adopted with changes. These minutes will reflect the decisions made. For a full accounting of the discussion, the transcripts can be ordered from Ms. Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting at (512) 882-9037. Items which are noted for future assignments are noted in bolded italicized text.

### **II. Revisions to 4.3.A/L**

Recommended standard no. 4.3A/L:

A Transportation Service Provider who determines to provide transactional functions via GISB EBB/EDM, for each transaction upon inception of support for such service, should:

- Provide the service via EDI/EDM, or FF/EDM or both, utilizing modifications defined by the TSP to the existing file structures, where GISB standards do not provide a solution, until such file structures are standardized by GISB; and,
- Submit a request for standardization to GISB including details of the EBB/EDM, EDI/EDM and/or FF/EDM implementation.

adopted on September 3 was requested to be modified and three work papers were submitted from Dynegy, Altra Energy and Duke Energy regarding rewording of the recommended standard. The following revised language was offered by Duke Energy as a motion to replace the existing recommended standard 4.3.A/L, which was further revised as a result of the discussion:

4.3.A/L A Transportation Service Provider which determines to provide new features utilizing existing transaction sets via GISB EBB/EDM, for each transaction upon inception of support for such service, should:

- If GISB EDI/EDM or FF/EDM standards exist for the transaction set, provide the service via EDI/EDM, or FF/EDM or both, utilizing modifications defined by the Transportation Service Provider to the existing file structures; and,
- Submit a request for modification or enhancement of the transaction set to GISB including details of the interim EBB/EDM, EDI/EDM and/or FF/EDM implementation.

Dynegy offered alternative language, which was not accepted by the motion makers:



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

A Transportation Service Provider who determines to provide transactional functions via electronic means (other than phone or fax), for each transaction upon inception of support for such service should:

- Provide the service via GISB EBB/EDM
- If GISB EDI/EDM or FF/EDM exist for the function, provide the service via EDI/EDM or FF/EDM or both, utilizing modifications defined by the Transportation Service Provider to the existing file structures
- Submit request for standardization to GISB including details of the EDI/EDM and/or FF/EDM implementation

Altra Energy's work paper regarding rewording of recommended standard 4.3.A/L was not put forward for consideration:

A Transportation Service Provider who determines to provide transactional functions via GISB EBB/EDM, for each transaction upon inception of support for such service, should:

- Provide the service via EDI/EDM, or FF/EDM or both, utilizing modifications defined by the TSP to the existing file structures, where GISB standards do not provide a solution, until such file structures are standardized by GISB; and,
- Submit the modified implementation to a chair of the Technical Subcommittee for a temporary approval of the assigned solution; and,
- Submit a request for standardization to GISB including details of the EBB/EDM, EDI/EDM and/or FF/EDM implementation.

**Mr. Buccigross and Ms. Tupper will off-line craft a proposal to address the associated recommendation for new transaction sets as the revised recommended standard addresses new features within existing transaction sets.**

VOTE: on the replacement 4.3A/L: The motion passed with the following votes cast:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	1	1	0	0
Services	8	1.6	2	0.4
Producers	1	1	1	1
Pipelines	21	2	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.4</b>

### III. Categorization of Survey Items for Submittal of Requests

Ms. Tupper formalized the categorization of the EDI survey results discussed at the last EII meeting. Survey respondents are requested to submit GISB Requests for Standards for those items that require EDI development after consideration of recommended standard nos. 27 and 52:

- 27 A Web page may display information (data elements and code values) from multiple functionally related EDI data sets (i.e. nominated volume and scheduled volume may appear on the same Web screen.)
- 52 Where display information on a Customer Activities Web site is derivable from data provided in a previous upload or download, the information should not be included in the EDI/EDM standard [or FF/EDM standard, for later consideration] that directly corresponds to the EBB/EDM page being displayed.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

The categories endorsed by the EII task force are:

Category	Disposition	Clarification
New data elements or code values	Submit request	These are new data elements for existing data sets and new code values not in existing standards but required for business. Example: bid-up.
"Name" elements	Already Routed 50A-F to IR	
Reports	Standard 52 covers	
"Borrowed elements"	Standard 27 covers	
Informational data elements	Standard 27 and 52 cover these	Example: Fuel Percent
New transactions	Submit Request	

#### IV. FTTF Responses to EII Requests Regarding CAMEL Model Items 7, 8, 9, 10 and 18

The motion was made to adopt the implementation guide recommendations as provided by the Future Technology Task Force:

##### **Implementation Guide Content under Customer Activities Sites:**

##### **Minimum Technical Characteristics of the Client Workstation**

Configuration\* Description:

##### **Hardware:**

CPU >= 166 MHz

Memory >= 64 MB Physical

Display Resolution >= 800 x 600

##### **Operating Systems:**

Multi-threaded and preemptive

##### **Connection:**

>=56KB (V90)

##### **Browser Characteristics (includes defined GISB current versions):**

Features as supported by both Netscape v4.06 and Internet Explorer v4.0 sp1 including:

- Frames and nested frames
- Tables and nested tables
- Style Sheets
- HTML
- Cookies
- JavaScript
- SSL (40 Bit RSA)



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

- 
- Java 1.1.6 Sun JDK (plug-in)
  - ActiveX (Plug-in for Netscape)
  - ICA v4 (Plug-in)

\*configuration shown indicates a minimum except where a specific level is established. "Minimum" implies a level where a reasonable experience for the user may be achieved. These levels also indicate the level that a user may expect that a client has been tested. Results may be less than satisfactory or may preclude use of a site if the user chooses to use anything less than those levels shown.

## Example Configurations of Client for Accessing Customer Activities Sites<sup>1</sup>

**EXAMPLES BELOW REPRESENT A NON-COMPREHENSIVE SET OF CONFIGURATIONS WHICH A CLIENT MAY USE. THIS EXAMPLE LIST IN NO WAY SHOULD BE CONSTRUED AS AN ENDORSEMENT BY GISB OF ANY SPECIFIC PRODUCTS. OTHER PRODUCTS MEETING THE MINIMUM TECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLIENT WORKSTATION MAY BE USED.**

### Hardware:

CPU: P166 MHz or higher  
Memory >= 64 MB Physical  
Display Resolution >= 800 x 600  
Pointing Device with left and right click capability

### Operating Systems:

Windows 95  
Windows 98  
Windows NT 4.0 service pack 3

### Connection:

56KB (V90) modem  
ISDN  
Direct Connect (T1, Fractional T1...)

### Browser:

Netscape Communicator/Navigator v4.06  
Microsoft Internet Explorer v4.0 service pack 1

### Plug-ins:

Java 1.1.6 Sun JDK (Activator)  
ActiveX (Plug-in for Netscape)

---

### <sup>1</sup> Note to EII Task Force from the Future Technology Task Force (9/11/98):

There is still a review of port numbers possibly needed to be opened on the client-side for certain protocols to be used. We want to arrive at a limited list on which users may rely to be able to access many TSP sites. Along with this, will be some other firewall administration notes addressing items such as applets. We intend to complete this draft in our October FTTF meeting.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

---

ICA v4 (Plug-in)

**[THE ABOVE TECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND EXAMPLES WILL BE REVIEWED FOR TRADEMARK, COPYRIGHT AND OTHER LEGAL CONSIDERATION PRIOR TO NOTICE FOR INDUSTRY COMMENT.] SPECIFIC PRODUCTS SHOULD BE REVIEWED PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION FOR YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE.**

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as the recommended implementation guide text.

The motion was made to adopt proposed standard 7A.

- 7A. Providers of Customer Activities EBB/EDM sites should ensure that the site operates on the "Technical Characteristics of the Client Workstation" described in the appendix of the Electronic Delivery Mechanism Related Standards manual. This appendix, listing examples of hardware and software configurations that providers should meet, should be reviewed and updated by the Future Technology Task Force, at a minimum, by the spring of each year and presented to the GISB Executive Committee for adoption by the June meeting of that group.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as a recommended standard. (4.3.x)

The FTTF task force should address a review of port numbers possibly needed to be opened on the client-side for certain protocols to be used. They expect to arrive at a limited list on which users may rely to be able to access many TSP sites. Along with this, will be some other firewall administration notes addressing items such as applets. Any suggested standards regarding this issue will be available for the October 17 EII meeting.

The motion was made to adopt proposed standard 9A<sup>2</sup>:

- 9A. Private network connections to access GISB EDM\* sites may be at any point on the TSP firewall boundary at the TSP's discretion on a non-discriminatory basis. The specific type and speed of these connections should be mutually agreed. It is at the discretion of the TSPs on how multiple private network connections should be managed[, so long as such management is done on a non-discriminatory basis]. TSPs are not responsible for any additional security exposures when using these private network connections.

\* This includes all GISB standardized Internet communication.

ACTION: The motion was withdrawn for consideration after lunch.

The motion was made to adopt proposed standard 8A:

- 8A. Access to the "Customer Activities" site should be protected by HTTP Basic Authentication or similar logon/password mechanism(s) using 40-bit SSL. A "Customer Activities" site should typically require a single logon/password pair for each user session.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as a recommended standard (4.3.x).

As a note to the EII task force, the FTTF noted visibility options:

- Provide a link to the "Customer Activities" site from the "Informational Postings" site.

---

<sup>2</sup> FTTF noted that the cost of implementing these private network connections is recognized as an issue but was determined to be out of the scope of FTTF.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

- Provide a link to the "Customer Activities" site from the "Informational Postings" site at the option of the TSP.
- Provide a link to the "Customer Activities" site from the "Informational Postings" site only after a user has been authenticated into the "Customer Activities" site.
- Do not allow a link to the "Customer Activities" site from the "Informational Postings" site.

Discussion on risks of displaying link to "Customer Activities" site:

It has been suggested that the "Informational Postings" site include a link to the "Customer Activities" site. Additionally, a link to the "Informational Postings" site would be included in the menu of the "Customer Activities" site. These reciprocal links would add a natural navigation between the transactional and non-transactional areas of a site provider. Thus, a user who is working on a transaction would easily be able to transition to viewing a posting or other content provided in the non-transactional area or site. This transition is without question a good idea and poses no technical risk.

The converse link, showing the "Customer Activities" link on the "Informational Postings" is the one that raises concern. If the link to "Customer Activities" is displayed on a public site (which the Informational Postings site is) there is concern that it advertises the existence of a transactional system to hackers, vandals, or possibly parties wishing to attack the energy infrastructure from abroad. This concern focuses on the fact that the first step in attacking a site is to know that such a site exists. If this "Customer Activities" site is not visible as a link from the "Informational Postings" site, it would be possible to conceal the very existence of the transactional site. The argument that opposes this is that the risk in showing a site is not significant compared to the convenience provided in the reciprocal links described above.

The technical ramifications of this debate are actually quite simple. The assertion that "*a site that is not directly visible on a companies public sites is safer*" is only partially true. For the "casual hacker" looking for an entry point to attack a company, this would likely be an effective first layer of security. For a concerted attack from skilled "hackers" or even countries, this would probably present little protection. Obviously, this could be argued at some length and neither type of event has been prevalent in our industry thus far. But the fact remains that a site not seen is safer to a degree.

Based on the security concerns mentioned above, EII should weigh the risks of showing the link against the convenience provided by the link.

The motion was made to adopt proposed standard 8B:

- 8B. At a minimum, data communications for the "Customer Activities" sites should utilize 40 bit encryption. Where possible, 128 bit encryption is strongly recommended.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as a recommended standard (4.3.x)

The motion was made to amend recommended standard 8A:

- 8A. Access to the "Customer Activities" site should be protected by HTTP Basic Authentication or similar logon/password mechanism(s) using 40-bit encryption. A "Customer Activities" site should typically require a single logon/password pair for each user session.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as a recommended standard (4.3.x).

The motion was made to adopt proposed standard 8C:

- 8C. Custom downloadable modules presented by a "Customer Activities" site should be signed by the author. The signatures on these modules should be communicated in advance to site users.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
 PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
 HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as a recommended standard (4.3.x)

The motion was made to adopt the proposed implementation guide additional text:

Implementation Guide Content under Security for Customer Activities Sites:

**THE LIST OF PRODUCTS BELOW REPRESENT A NON-COMPREHENSIVE SET WHICH A CLIENT MAY USE. THIS LIST IN NO WAY SHOULD BE CONSTRUED AS AN ENDORSEMENT BY GISB OF ANY SPECIFIC PRODUCTS. OTHER PRODUCTS MEETING THE MINIMUM TECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLIENT WORKSTATION MAY BE USED.**

(FTTF will review this on an annual basis during the version check cycle.)

Minimum

40 bit\* SSL or 40 bit\* RSA Java communications or 40 bit\* Secure ICA

\*128 bit encryption is strongly recommended where possible.

**[THE ABOVE TEXT WILL BE REVIEWED FOR TRADEMARK, COPYRIGHT AND OTHER LEGAL CONSIDERATION PRIOR TO NOTICE FOR INDUSTRY COMMENT.]**

**SPECIFIC PRODUCTS SHOULD BE REVIEWED PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION FOR YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE.**

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as an addition to the implementation guide.

The FTTF noted that although non-repudiation is a very important feature, it is impractical to implement on the "Customer Activities" Web sites using currently available non-proprietary technology. GISB should continue to evaluate potential tools, and create standards and guidelines for its implementation as soon as the technology will support it. FTTF will review this on an annual basis during the version check cycle.

The FTTF noted that although the Camel Model specifies that client-side certificates should not be required; they may prove necessary for non-repudiation. Topics such as certificate authorities remain to be researched. GISB should not require client-side certificates at this time, but will probably be necessary in the future. FTTF will review this on an annual basis during the version check cycle.

The motion was made to adopt the proposed standard forwarded by Duke Energy:

8D In the Navigational Area of the Informational Postings Web Site, the navigational link for "Customer Activities" should appear directly above the navigational link for "Site Map."

VOTE: The motion passed as a recommended standard through the following vote:

Segment	For	Balanced For	Against	Balanced Against
End User	1	1	0	0
LDCs	1	1	0	0
Services	7	1.75	1	0.25
Producers	2	2	0	0
Pipelines	16	1.68	3	0.32
TOTAL	27	7.43	4	0.57

[BREAK TAKEN FOR LUNCH]



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

---

The motion was made to adopt revised proposed standard 9A:

- 9A. Private network connections to GISB EDM\* sites may be at any point on the TSP firewall boundary at the TSP's discretion on a non-discriminatory access basis. The specific type and speed of these connections should be mutually agreed. It is at the discretion of the TSPs on how multiple private network connections should be managed, so long as such management is done on a non-discriminatory access basis. TSPs are not responsible for any additional security exposures when using these private network connections.

\* This includes all GISB standardized Internet communication.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as a recommended standard (4.3.x).

The motion was made to adopt proposed principle 10A:

- 10A. Trading partners should maintain redundant connections to the public Internet for GISB EDM\* sites. These redundant connections should be topographically diverse (duality of) paths to minimize the probability of a single point of failure.

\* This includes all GISB standardized Internet communication.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as a recommended principle (4.1.x).

The motion was made to adopt the following text for the Implementation Guide Content under Redundancy:

#### Implementation Guidelines for Redundancy\*

*\*In this context redundancy refers to normal operations redundancy (as opposed to disaster recovery contingencies).*

#### Customer Activities Sites

Users and providers should consider but not be limited to the following possibilities to achieve redundant connectivity:

- 1 Multiple dial-up connections
- 2 Multiple leased line connections
- 3 Multiple Internet service providers
- 4 Combinations of the above
- 5 Geographically diverse connections
- 6 Topographically diverse connections; i.e., connections which result in Internet pathways that do not pass through a single point/service/router
- 7 Multiple power sources for network equipment

Items 1-5 are potential means of achieving the defining characteristic of item 6. The intent is to eliminate the possibility of a single point of failure.

#### EDI/EDM Sites

Three possible approaches are:

- 1 Maintain multiple ISPs and multiple points of connectivity, each of which was identified by the same URL making the process of redundancy transparent to the sender.
- 2 Maintain different Internet connectivity URLs (presumably on topographically different ISPs). For this to result in communication redundancy, the sender should know of the existence of the secondary URL and have programming in place that will automatically switch



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

---

batch-browser transmissions to the secondary URL when the primary URL is unavailable.

- 3 Maintain multiple connections to the same ISP. This involves only one URL but the presumption would be that the ISP would provide alternate diverse paths for the URL.

Receivers may maintain multiple URLs and, if such have been disclosed, the sender should attempt to use these during primary URL outages. The redundant public Internet connections can be through a single ISP or multiple ISPs.

If multiple URLs are provided for EDM access, the following conditions should be met:

- The information provided by each URL should be exactly the same, although trans-ids can be different.
- The trading partners should be informed of both URLs and their availability by system wide notice or by TPA.

The URLs should be identified as primary and secondary if either:

- There is a TSP connection speed difference between the URLs (The faster connection listed as primary).
- or
- One URL is only available when the other is down (primary URL being the most available).

The URLs should be listed as primary and alternate if:

- The URLs have the same TSP connection speed.
- and
- The URLs are customarily available simultaneously.

Note: A URL is considered available (in the context of communication redundancy) if all the IP facilities are properly functioning up to and including the HTTP service. This would include any TSP provided facilities including firewalls, DNS servers, routers, hubs, LANs, etc. that are between the TSP's HTTP server and the ISP's point of presence.

VOTE: The motion on the addition to the implementation guides for guidelines for redundancy on Customer Activities sites passed unanimously.

## V. Contact Information

Mr. Novak introduced the agenda item which is related to ANR's survey responses. The EII task force is asked to resolve "Where should this development occur -- as part of an already defined area such as nominations related standards or as a new development area such as contact information related standards?" The discussion centered on whether contact information is a nomination function or to be considered as its own function.

## VI. Review of work paper for pathed, non-pathed, and pathed non-threaded nomination models

Mr. Buccigross reviewed the document "NOMINATION DATA DICTIONARY - Usage for ALL MODEL TYPES", provided by the Information Requirements Subcommittee, (See attachment). It was noted that in consideration of the work paper, the task force is not considering the usage information provided. It was further noted that while the Information Requirements Subcommittee provided recommended data groupings, it did not address placement on Web Pages as the Information



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

Requirements Subcommittee determined that placement or ordering was included as part of the EII Task Force's responsibilities.

The motion was made and seconded to accept groupings from "NOMINATION DATA DICTIONARY - Usage for ALL MODEL TYPES" as presented by the Information Requirements Subcommittee. EII participants should review the document and make recommendations for additional standards. The motion passed unanimously.

After discussion on common code usage, which is embedded within "NOMINATION DATA DICTIONARY - Usage for ALL MODEL TYPES", the issue was raised on when entities and locations are displayed on EBBs, are they displayed only as Common Code, only as Proprietary or some combination? The motion was made and seconded that:

53 The industry should use common codes for location points and legal entities when communicating via EDI/EDM, EBB/EDM and/or FF/EDM. The corresponding common code name should also be used in EBB/EDM.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously as a recommended standard (4.3.x).

The motion was made and seconded that the EII Task Force requests the IR Subcommittee to group the data elements for the remaining nomination related data sets. The motion passed unanimously. It was noted that this work should be completed by for EII Task Force action on October 16, 1998.

## VII. Proposed Standards 34.4 and 4.3.B

Proposed standard 34.4 was deferred for later resolution. Proposed standard 4.3.B was partially covered by 4.3.Q and the remainder will be brought up again in the Contracts discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

## SEPTEMBER 18, 1998

### I. Administrative

The meeting opened at 11:00 a.m. Mr. Caldwell opened the meeting, welcomed the attendees , and introduced and thanked the hosts, American Gas Association. Mr. Buccigross gave the antitrust advice. Each attendee introduced himself or herself. These minutes will reflect the decisions made. For a full accounting of the discussion, the transcripts can be ordered from Ms. Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting at (512) 882-9037. Items which are noted for future assignments are noted in bolded italicized text.

### II. IR questions/issues for EII-TF regarding grouping and data dictionaries

The Information Requirements Subcommittee requested responses to the following questions:

- 1) Does EII-TF want IR to do discrete data elements in the EBB column of the data dictionary for displayed data on EBBs that do not have comparable data elements in EDI but may be derived from existing EDI data elements (e.g., total quantities)?  
Response: No. The response was endorsed unanimously.
- 2) Same issue with "borrowed" data elements (e.g., fuel quantities).



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

---

Response: No. The response was endorsed unanimously.

- 3a) Do usage categorizations for EBB data elements indicate that the data element must be input by the user? May be displayed only (i.e., defaulted) and not necessarily input?
- 3b) In other words, does Mandatory mean that the data must be input or only that the data must be displayed on the screen irrespective of where the mandatory data came from.
- RESPONSE: No to 3a and Yes to 3b. The responses were endorsed unanimously.

### III. Review of "EBB-Internet Implementation Task Force - Principles, Definitions and Standards Cleanup - September 11, 1998" presented by Kim Van Pelt (cleanup.doc)

Ms. Van Pelt reviewed the recommended standards from the task force with clean up modifications red-lined. The motion was made to adopt the red-lined changes which was passed unanimously, (See attached document).

### IV. Additional Proposed Standards -- Proposed Standard 35

The motion was made and seconded to request the Information Requirements Subcommittee to determine standard abbreviations for data elements in Nominations related datasets for display on Customer Activities Web sites. The motion passed unanimously. It was noted that the work product should be available for action by the EII Task Force on October 16.

Ms. Tupper reviewed the following concepts:

- "Header" is the term used to describe the area at the top of the Content Area of the browser display.
- "Detail" is the term used to describe the area directly below the Header in the Content Area of the browser display.
- On Customer Activities Web pages, data entry may be performed in the Detail of the Content Area via a matrix and/or a single transaction format.
- Customer Activities Web page entry should support the maximum length for valid data.
- Customer Activities Web page field lengths can be displayed in a manner to minimize left to right scrolling.
- On Customer Activities Web pages, informational display fields can be displayed with related data.
- On the Customer Activities Nominations entry Web page the Header may contain elements from the following data groups: Contract, Date, Location, Business Entity Data.
- The Detail area of the Customer Activities Nominations entry web page may contain elements from the following data groups: Receipt, Delivery, Date, Location, Contract, Transaction Specific.

Mr. Whatley and Mr. Hahn reviewed the following concepts:

- Group Hierarchy Standards
  - Group 1. Contracts Data
  - Group 2. Dates
  - Group 3. Receipt/Delivery Data
  - Group 4. Transaction Specific Data



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925. HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 757-4175, FAX - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
HOME PAGE: www.gisb.org

- 
- Groups should be laid out in certain areas on the screen
  - Within a the Contracts Data group, for example, only Contract Number would have a required location/order.
  - Concept: TAB ordering for data entry

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the following as definitions:

54 "Header" is the term used to describe the area at the top of the Content Area of the browser display.

55 "Detail" is the term used to describe the area directly below the Header in the Content Area of the browser display.

VOTE: Proposed standards 54 and 55 were adopted unanimously as definitions (4.1.x)

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the following as a standard:

56 On Customer Activities Web pages, data entry may be performed in the Content Area via a matrix and/or a single transaction format.

ACTION: Motion is deferred, parties should investigate performance issues associated with providing data entry options at user or TSP choice.

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the following as a standard:

57 Customer Activities Web pages should support entry of the maximum length for valid data, however, display can be done in a manner to minimize left to right scrolling.

VOTE: Proposed standard 57 was adopted unanimously as a standard (4.3.x)

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the following as a standard:

58 On Customer Activities Web pages , informational display fields can be displayed with related data.

VOTE: Proposed standard 58 was adopted unanimously as a standard (4.3.x)

## V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held on October 1 and 2 in San Antonio.