



North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com

Home Page: www.naesb.org

via email and posting

TO: NAESB WGQ Interpretations Subcommittee: Sylvia Munson, Keith Sappenfield, Sheri Heslington, Paul Keeler, Paul Love, Shelley Corman, Tina Burnett, Diane McVicker, Mike Novak, Steve Sullivan, and Posting for Interested Parties

FROM: Todd Oncken, NAESB Staff

RE: Wholesale Gas Quadrant Interpretations Subcommittee Meeting Minutes - February 28, 2003

DATE: March 19, 2003

**NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
WGQ INTERPRETATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL
February 28, 2003, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. CST**

1. Welcome & Administrative Items

Ms. Munson welcomed meeting participants and called the role of subcommittee members. Mr. Oncken gave the antitrust advice. Mr. Lander, the previous Interpretations Subcommittee chairman, welcomed Ms. Munson as the new chair of the Interpretations Subcommittee. Ms. Munson noted there have been three interpretations requests submitted to date. Ms. Munson proposed the subcommittee proceed to discussion of each item.

2. Review and Discussion of two requests C03001 and C03002

Interpretation Request C03001

The question is whether individual implementations are free to use the http HEAD command, prior to using the POST command to deliver the NAESB payload. When implementing a NAESB EDM solution, the standard clearly relies on the http protocol spec for details of how to implement the protocol. It is also clear that the http POST command should be used, and not the GET command. Submitted by Group 8760.

Mr. Buccigross provided a brief description of Interpretation Request C03001. He explained the question is whether it is appropriate to send a HEAD command prior to using the POST command that transmits the NAESB payload. Mr. Buccigross noted substantial disagreement on the propriety of using the aforementioned protocol, and that NAESB EDM specifications do not specifically address this issue. Draft interpretations were prepared by Group 8760 and Systrends. Both draft interpretations are posted on the NAESB web site as work papers for this meeting.

Mr. Buccigross stated the proposed interpretation presented by Group 8760 would preserve the existing implementations under versions 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 of the EDM Standards. Mr. Buccigross stated the goal should be to make the transactions work for all parties. However, Mr. Buccigross said the issue should be definitively handled for EDM Standards subsequent to v. 1.6 through the standards development process.

Mr. Lander stated his understanding of the issue. Mr. Lander stated this becomes an issue when transactions are rejected because they do or do not contain the HEAD element. He said that since NAESB has not specified the presence or absence of the HEAD, it should be ignored. Further, he stated the presence or absence of the element should not cause a transaction to fail for currently published standards.



North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Mr. Brooks spoke on the draft interpretation submitted by Systrends. Mr. Brooks stated the Systrends interpretation relies on standard HTTP protocol. Mr. Brooks explained HTTP views a HEAD request as identical to a GET request. Mr. Brooks stated the EDM Standards make it very clear a GET request should never be used. Accordingly, Mr. Brooks said a HEAD request should never be used.

Additionally, Mr. Brooks stated connection protocol defines the manner in which certain events will happen. Under EDM, he said the first element transmitted should be the POST. Mr. Brooks asserted the servers are designed according to this protocol. When a HEAD command is sent prior to the POST, the protocol breaks down.

Mr. Whatley stated discussion to this point has been very technical. However, he said the base issue is whether something not specifically excluded by a standard is permissible. Mr. Whatley answered in the affirmative, noting this would be exceeding the standard. However, Mr. Whatley stated exceeding the standard with the consent of your trading partners is different than exceeding the standard without consent. Ms. Munson noted the parallel to X12, where NAESB never took a position, but instead left it to the trading partners to determine.

Ms. Van Pelt initiated discussion on the benefits of using a HEAD command. Ms. Fiedler stated using the HEAD allows the establishment of communication with the server prior to sending the data. However, Ms. Fiedler stated sending a HEAD when the receiving computer is not expecting it would cause a transaction failure. Mr. Whatley said it has been implied it is better to connect prior to sending data. He said as a practical matter, a company is saving data transmission resources a very few times. Accordingly, he did not see this as a gain in efficiency.

Ms. Van Pelt asked why, after EDM Standards have been used for many years, this problem has surfaced. Mr. Brooks responded the issue arose through work Systrends was doing for ERCOT on the implementation of security standards for homeland security. Mr. Brooks said that problems began to result when all unnecessary services of the ERCOT server were turned off. Mr. Brooks said ERCOT did not want to leave the HEAD command open because its only purpose is to send user names and passwords. Mr. Brooks said HTTP HEAD is not necessary for an EDM transaction.

Mr. Whatley stated that in the setting of standards and building of models, the drafted text describes the way the builders want something done, not the opposite. Protocol generally does not dictate what cannot be done. Mr. Whatley said the standard is clear in not mandating the use of http HEAD, so companies should not be required to use the HEAD items.

Due to the technical nature of the discussion, Interpretations Subcommittee members scheduled a subsequent meeting to take action on Interpretation Request C03001.

3. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

4. Adjourn

Ms. Munson adjourned the call at 3:10 p.m. CST.



North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com

Home Page: www.naesb.org

5. Meeting Attendees:

Name	Company	Notes
Dick Brooks	Systrends	
Jim Buccigross	Group 8760	
Christopher Burden	Williams Gas Pipeline	
Tina Burnett	Boeing	Interpretations Member
Shelley Corman	TransWestern Pipeline	Interpretations Member
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	
Bill Griffith	El Paso	
Bill Hebenstreit	El Paso Merchant Energy	
Sheri Heslington	Dominion	Interpretations Member
Theresa Hess	Reliant Energy Retail Services	
Steve Hinton	Skipping Stone	
Greg Lander	Skipping Stone	
Paul Love	NGPL	Interpretations Member
Rae McQuade	NAESB Executive Director	Administrative
Debbie McKeever	Oncor	
Diane McVicker	Salt River Project	Interpretations Member
Sylvia Munson	Ecom	Interpretations Member
Michael Novak	National Fuel	Interpretations Member
Todd Oncken	NAESB	Administrative
Maria Onufro	Caminus	
Keith Sappenfield	EnCana Corp.	Interpretations Member
Kate Fiedler	8760	
Leigh Spangler	Latitude Technologies	
Kim Van Pelt	Panhandle Eastern Pipe Lines	
Pete Whatley	Dynegy	