



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, 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 – March 26, 2003

DATE: April 18, 2003

**NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
WGQ INTERPRETATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL
March 26, 2003, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. CST**

1. Welcome & Administrative Items

Ms. Munson welcomed meeting participants. Mr. Oncken gave the antitrust advice. Ms. Munson reviewed the agenda. Absent modification, the agenda was adopted by acclamation. Review and approval of the draft minutes from February 28, 2003 was deferred to a subsequent meeting.

2. Discussion and potential vote on request C03001

Ms. Munson noted four sets of comments have been submitted on Request C03001 prior to this meeting. Participants discussed the submitted work papers. Mr. Brooks noted the findings of the Caminus work paper paralleled Systrends' findings on the HEAD command issue. Ms. Chen presented the Caminus work paper, noting the method of testing performed on the HEAD command. In short, testing using the HEAD command in conjunction with data transaction transmission resulted in rejection of the entire transaction since all data following the HEAD is viewed as a single data stream. Conversely, Caminus reported that when the HEAD post was completed first, then the transaction was reopened and data was transferred, the transaction was successful. Ms. Munson clarified that as the server is set up today, if the HEAD and POST command are in the same stream, the server will ignore the HEAD command but process the POST; but, by turning off the ability for the server to accept the HEAD command, the server will reject the entire stream of information.

Mr. Whatley expressed concern with the highly technical discussion. He stated the real issue that should be addressed is how standards are set. Mr. Whatley explained standards explain how to complete an implementation, thus implying an absent element should not be implemented. Mr. Whatley cautioned the potential precedent that could be set – if an element is not explicitly excluded from a standard it is implicitly included. Mr. Whatley stated this is not an interpretation issue. Ms. Munson agreed with Mr. Whatley's assessment that the issue before the subcommittee is a process question, not a technical issue, but noted the technical discussion might be necessary to raise the subcommittee's understanding of the issues.

Mr. Buccigross stated the issue is properly before the Interpretations Subcommittee, because arguably the language was not clear. Mr. Buccigross expressed concern with the prospect of NAESB retroactively finding use of the HEAD command is impermissible. However, Mr. Buccigross did not oppose a decision from the Interpretations Subcommittee on a going forward basis from Version 1.6, as long as the language is clear.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Mr. Novak, seconded by Ms. McVicker, proposed the following motion:

The use of the HTTP HEAD command in NAESB EDM is an option, and as such it's implementation between trading partners is solely on a "mutually agreed to" basis, i.e. the Requester is free to propose the use of the HEAD command to its trading partners, but the Requester cannot insist upon its use. Moreover, the Requester must still provide for transmission and receipt, via the standards, to those trading partners that do not consent to the use of the HEAD command. If the Requester seeks the use of the HEAD command as an explicit requirement of NAESB EDM, they are directed to submit a Request for Standard to NAESB. This interpretation does not create changes to or additional requirements upon existing NAESB EDM implementations that currently use the HEAD command. New implementations of Version 1.6 or higher should employ use of the HEAD command on a mutually agreeable basis.

Participants discussed Mr. Novak's motion. Mr. Novak asserted this motion would be a fair compromise to address all concerns. Mr. Novak suggested if this motion does not pass, the Interpretations Subcommittee should refer Request C03001 to the WGQ Executive Committee, noting the subcommittee is not prepared to address the request.

Mr. Whatley stated he fails to see the ambiguity in the existing standard. He said it was a coincidence that default server settings processed the HEAD command. Mr. Whatley contended that the instance of new servers more strictly interpreting HTTP does not produce ambiguity in a standard that is not ambiguous. He noted this is not a case of saying use of the HEAD command was permissible and now it is not, it is a case where use of the HEAD command was never allowed and companies are seeing the results of the new servers. Mr. Brooks concurred he had not seen NAESB specifically approve the use of the HEAD command.

Mr. Brooks expressed concern that the motion would grandfather use of the HEAD command, asserting the grandfathering is contrary to the concept of mutual agreement. Mr. Spangler stated the grandfathering language was unnecessary because the standard has not changed. Conversely, Mr. Young expressed concern about the going forward language of the motion, noting the Interpretations Subcommittee has never taken that action.

Mr. Brooks proposed an amendment to Mr. Novak's motion, which Mr. Novak declined.

Ms. Munson suggested Version 1.5, Standard 4.3.87 might bring the subcommittee to common ground. In essence, the standard provides that when there is an existing relationship, the trading partners must be provided notice of changes in protocol. Mr. Novak concurred the language of this standard could address Version 1.5 forward.

As several Interpretations Subcommittee members left the call early, Mr. Novak withdrew the motion due to the loss of voting quorum.

Mr. Whatley noted that returning the decision that no interpretation was warranted since mutual agreement should dictate would allow for existing implementations while not dictating the use of the HEAD command for new implementations of NAESB EDM standards.

3. Initial Discussion of requests C03002 & C03003

This item was not discussed.

4. Other Business

No other business was discussed.



North American Energy Standards Board

1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.naesb.org

5. Adjourn

Ms. Munson invited participants to submit draft interpretation language for Request C03001 and adjourned the call at 2:17 p.m. CST.

6. Meeting Attendees:

Name	Company	Notes
Dick Brooks	Systrends	
Jim Buccigross	Group 8760	
Jennifer Chen	Caminus	
Kate Fiedler	Group 8760	
Ron Kerver	Consumer's Energy	
Paul Love	NGPL	Interpretations Member
Debbie McKeever	Encore	
Rae McQuade	NAESB	Administrative
Diane McVicker	SRP	Interpretations Member
Sylvia Munson	Ecom	Interpretations Chair
Michael Novak	National Fuel	Interpretations Member
Todd Oncken	NAESB	Administrative
Vijay Seschadri	PSEG	
Lee Spangler	Latitude Technology	
Pete Whatley	Dynegy	
Randy Young	Gulf South	