100 Barr Harbor Drive ■ PO Box C700 ■ West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959
Telephone: 610-832-9500 ■ Fax: 610-832-9555 ■ e-mail: service@astm.org ■ Website: www.astm.org

Committee D02 on PETROLEUM PRODUCTS AND LUBRICANTS

Chairman: W. JAMES BOVER, ExxonMobil Biomedical Sciences Inc, 1545 Route 22 East, PO Box 971, Annandale, NJ 08801-0971, (908) 730-1048, FAX: 908-730-1197, EMail: wjbover@erenj.com
First Vice Chairman: KENNETH O. HENDERSON, Cannon Instrument Co, PO Box 16, State College, PA 16804, (814) 353-8000, Ext: 0265, FAX: 814-353-8007, EMail: kenohenderson@worldnet.att.net
Second Vice Chairman: SALVATORE J. RAND, 221 Flamingo Drive, Fort Myers, FL 33908, (941) 481-4729, FAX: 941-481-4729
Secretary: MICHAEL A. COLLIER, Petroleum Analyzer Co LP, PO Box 206, Wilmington, IL 60481, (815) 458-0216, FAX: 815-458-0217, EMail: macvarlen@aol.com
Assistant Secretary: JANET L. LANE, ExxonMobil Research and Engineering, 600 Billingsport Rd, PO Box 480, Paulsboro, NJ 08066-0480, (856) 224-3302, FAX: 856-224-3616, EMail: janet_l_lane@email.mobil.com
Staff Manager: DAVID R. BRADLEY, (610) 832-9681, EMail: dbradley@astm.org

Reply to:

Scott Parke
ASTM Test Monitoring Center
6555 Penn Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

June 23, 2003

To: The Data Communications Committee

Enclosed are the minutes of the Data Communications Committee teleconference held June 18, 2003.

Scott Parke
Secretary, DCC

Attachments
cc:
ftp://ftp.astmtmc.cmu.edu/docs/Data_Communications_Committee/Meeting_minutes/20030618_teleconference.pdf

distribution: Email

TELECONFERENCE MINUTES

DATA COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

HELD JUNE 18, 2003

13:30 CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Frank Farber began the teleconference by running through a role call (attachment 2) and reviewing the meeting agenda (attachment 1). In response to emailed requests, Frank added to the agenda the topics of T8/T8E dual referencing and RSI ability to handle superfluous fields.

13:34 ADDITION OF RSI DECLARATION FORM TO TEST REPORT PACKAGES

Frank explained that the purpose for this teleconference was primarily to address the Technical Guidance Committee's (TGC) decision to direct all effected surveillance panels to add the RSI declaration form to their test report package (attachment 3). He proposed that the most efficient way to proceed might be to run down the "Items to resolve" in the agenda and solicit John Beck's response.

Test Laboratory: John would like the existing SUBLAB field used for test lab identification. In fact, he felt that the list of mnemonics put together by Mark Griffin (attachment 4) would work fine and addresses most of the items under "Items to resolve".

The YESFULL/NOFULL style mnemonics are a break from usual practice. This is two fields and only one or the other would be populated with a tick mark of some sort. In similar circumstances, past practice was always to have only one field and populate it with one of several data values ("yes" or "no" in this case). John said he didn't really care how the database was configured so long as the appearance of the form wasn't changed. Not altering the form means that the two mnemonic approach (YESFULL/NOFULL) will have to be used.

John was asked about his preference for the location of the RSI declaration page within the test report. After some discussion, the group agreed to add the form at the end as the last page.

13:49 HOW WILL DUAL TESTS (T8/T8E) BE HANDLED?

A test report that registers 2 distinct test types using a single test report will create a problem. Currently, the T8 and T8E are the only tests that report both test types on the same test report. It is possible for the responses to the RSI declarations to be different for the two test types. Mark Griffin and John Beck proposed adding a duplicate set of fields to the T8 report. Mike Kahn argued that this approach would cause problems for the user. For example, one of the fields that will be added to all ACC registered test types is NODEV. The duplicate field approach proposed using NODEVT8 and NODEVT8E. Obviously, this will trip up a user looking for NODEV. Mark moved to accept the

fields as he and John proposed; the motion passed unanimously. In order to address Mike Kahn's concerns, the group agreed to keep the primary fields non-specific (NODEV) and denote the duplicate fields in some way to be worked out later (possibly NODEV2 for instance). Ordinary, full length test data will go in the NODEV-like fields. The NODEV2-like fields will only be used to report supplemental data. For example, for a T8-only test, NODEV will be populated and NODEV2 will be blank; for a T8-only test, NODEV will be populated and NODEV2 will be blank; and, for a combined T8 and T8E test, NODEV will contain the T8E data and NODEV2 will contain the T8 data.

14:05 REVIEW OF RSI TELECOM TRANSMISSION GUIDELINES

TESTNUM field issue is addressed by the Mark Griffin proposal already discussed.

RSI will accept transmissions containing superfluous fields. Jody Fromer asked John Beck about occurrences of blank repeating fields. All agreed to continue the current practice of sending at least one occurrence of all repeating fields even if the field is blank. Additional, unused occurrences of any repeating field should not appear in the flatfile transmission.

14:11 SSL SSC DOCUMENT APPROVAL

Dave Hood, SSL Standardization Subcommittee Chairman, reported that he received no negative comments on his draft of the SSL document (attachment 5). Dave moved to accept the document for inclusion as an ETRTM appendix and to disband the SSL SSC. The motion received unanimous approval.

14:15 IMPLEMENTATION OF RSI DECLARATION PAGE MNEMONICS

Eighteen (18) different test areas are registered with RSI and will require the additional declaration page mnemonics. Implementing revised report packages for all of these tests at the same time would impose an undue burden on everyone concerned. Accordingly, Frank Farber will work with the surveillance panels to stagger the effective dates of the changes.

Chairman Frank Farber adjourned the meeting and ended the teleconference at 14:23.

June 18, 2003
DCC Teleconference Agenda

1. RSI ASTM Technical Guidance Committee (TGC) ballot on adding *Code of Practice Test Laboratory Conformance Statement* mnemonics to appropriate test area report packet and data dictionary. See attached word document.

   Items to resolve:
   A. Test Laboratory: Is this a two character code? If not, specify length.
   B. Test Sponsor: Can existing TSTSPON1 mnemonic be used for this item?
   C. Test Start Date, Time and Time Zone need to be broken into three mnemonics.
   D. Can mnemonics like YESRQMET and NORQMET be combined into one mnemonic?
   E. Are YESFULL and NOFULL necessary? TESTLEN specifies test length currently. Existing mnemonics VALID and OPVALID already specify that the test was run according to the procedure.
   F. Can existing test report signatures,typed name and titles be used for ACC declaration sheet?
   G. Should the declaration page be the last or should it proceed the downtime comment sheets?
   H. Other Issues?

2. Review of RSI telecomm transmission guidelines (attached).

   Items of concern:

   A. TESTNUM Header field must be blank

   B. FieldCount error: Files must contain an exact number of fields as determined by the standards HDR and DD

   C. Any other concerns?

3. SSL SSC Task Force Document Approval: Dave will address approval of SSL document.

Attendance:

Frank Farber	Test Monitoring Center
Sally Lloyd	PerkinElmer
Ralph Grace	Imperial
Mike Burk	ExxonMobil
Jeff Logan	ExxonMobil
Harry Sopko	PARC
Mark Griffin	Southwest Research
John Beck	RSI
Dave Hood	ChevronTexaco
Mike Kahn	ChevronTexaco
Jeff Robinson	ChevronTexaco
Lika Barnabishvili	Infineum
Mark Slepsky	Lubrizol
Phil Sattele	Lubrizol
Roger Broadway	Ethyl
Doni Grande	Ethyl
Jody Fromer	Lubrizol
Scott Parke	Test Monitoring Center

Date: May 23, 2003
To: Gordon Farnsworth, Technical Guidance Committee Chairman
ASTM Surveillance Panel Chairmen
From: Rick Oliver on behalf of RSI
Subject: Additional Report Package Form and Data Dictionary Fields

The American Chemistry Council (ACC) requires submission of *Code of Practice Test Laboratory Conformance Statement* (see scanned form on page 2) with reports for ACC registered tests. This form is typically created separately from the ASTM defined report package and flat file, and is appended when presented to the sponsor and RSI. Implementation of Electronic Data Transmission (EDT) of test reports to RSI requires inclusion of fields defining the Conformance Statement (see page 3) in the flat file. Including the *Conformance Statement* in each test type data dictionary and report package allows the complete flat file and test report to be generated in one step at minimal cost to the test labs. The *Conformance Statement* form will be added as the last form to avoid renumbering forms within existing report packages.

RSI is requesting that The ASTM Technical Guidance Committee formally request the TMC to incorporate the *Conformance Statement* into the data dictionaries for all ASTM Engine tests.

Subject to change as we gather more information and guidance from stakeholders, Beta Testing is scheduled to commence in mid-June 20003. We are therefore requesting that the TGC address this issue on a priority basis.

AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL CODE OF PRACTICE
TEST LABORATORY CONFORMANCE STATEMENT

Test Laboratory: _____
Test Sponsor: _____
Formulation/Stand Code: _____
Test Number: _____
Test Start Date and Time (Include time zone): _____

DECLARATIONS

No. 1 All requirements of the ACC Code of Practice for which the test laboratory is responsible were met in the conduct of this test. Yes_____ No _____*

No. 2 The laboratory ran this test for the full duration following all procedural requirements; and all operational validity requirements of the latest version of the applicable test procedure (ASTM or other), including all updates issued by the organization responsible for the test, were met. Yes_____ No _____*

If the response to this Declaration is "No", does the test engineer consider the deviations from operational validity requirements that occurred to be beyond the control of the laboratory? Yes _____* No_____

No. 3 A deviation occurred for one of the test parameters identified by the organization responsible for the test as being a special case. Yes _____* No_____ *(This currently applies only to specific deviations identified in the ASTM Information Letter System.)*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE CONCLUSION

( ) Operational review of this test indicates that the results should be included in Multiple Test Acceptance Criteria calculations.

( ) *Operational review of this test indicates that the results should not be included in Multiple Test Acceptance Criteria calculations.

NOTE: *Supporting comments are required for all responses identified with an asterisk.*

Comments: _____
_____
_____
_____

_____ _____
(Signature) *(Date)*

_____ _____
(Typed Name) *(Title)*

ACC TEST LABORATORY CONFORMANCE STATEMENT data dictionary

SEQ	FORM NUM	TEST TYPE	FIELD NAME	FIELD LENGTH	DEC SIZE	DATA TYPE	FORMAT	DESCRIPTION
10	99	DECLAR	YESRQMET	1	0	C	X or blank	DECLARATION NO. 1 REQUIREMENTS WERE MET
20	99	DECLAR	NORQMET	1	0	C	X or blank	DECLARATION NO. 1 REQUIREMENTS WERE MET
30	99	DECLAR	YESFULL	1	0	C	X or blank	DELCARATION NO. 2 DID RUN FULL DURATION
40	99	DECLAR	NOFULL	1	0	C	X or blank	DELCARATION NO. 2 DID NOT RUN FULL DURATION
50	99	DECLAR	YESNODEC	1	0	C	X or blank	DELCARATION NO. 2.5 YES
60	99	DECLAR	NONODEC	1	0	C	X or blank	DELCARATION NO. 2.5 NO
70	99	DECLAR	YESDEV	1	0	C	X or blank	DELCARATION DEVIATION DID OCCUR NO. 3
80	99	DECLAR	NODEV	1	0	C	X or blank	DELCARATION DEVIATION DID NOT OCCUR NO. 3
90	99	DECLAR	INCLUDE	1	0	C	X or blank	CONCLUSION INCLUDE IN MULTIPLE TEST ACCEPTANCE
100	99	DECLAR	DONOTINC	1	0	C	X or blank	CONCLUSION DO NOT INCLUDE IN MULTIPLE TEST ACCEPTANCE
110	99	DECLAR	ACCCOMM1	70	0	C		COMMENT 1
120	99	DECLAR	ACCCOMM2	70	0	C		COMMENT 2
130	99	DECLAR	ACCCOMM3	70	0	C		COMMENT 3
140	99	DECLAR	ACCCOMM4	70	0	C		COMMENT 4

Page header

FIELD NAME	LENGTH	DECIMAL	DATE TYPE	UNITS / FORMAT	DESCRIPTION
SUBLAB	40	0	C		TESTING LABORATORY NAME
TSTSPON1	40	0	C		CONDUCTED FOR, FIRST LINE
FORM	38	0	C		FORMULATION/STAND CODE
TESTNUM	30	0	C		TEST NUMBER
DTSTRT	8	0	C	YYYYMMDD	START DATE
STRTTIME	5	0	C	HH:MM	TIME STARTED
TZONE	3	0	C	AAA	TIME ZONE OF TESTING LABORATORY

Page footer

FIELD NAME	LENGTH	DECIMAL	DATE TYPE	UNITS / FORMAT	DESCRIPTION
SUBSIGIM	70	0	C		TESTING LABORATORY VALIDATORS SIGNATURE
SUBNAME	40	0	C		TESTING LABORATORY VALIDATORS NAME
SUBTITLE	40	0	C		TESTING LABORATORY VALIDATORS TITLE

Appendix I

Electronic Data Transmission Method (ETRTM) Guidelines Using Secure Sockets Layer

INTRODUCTION:
The Electronic Data Transmission Method (EDTM) described in this document enables information exchange between trading partners using Secure Sockets Layer (SSL).

SSL is used to encrypt network packets between the client desktop and the server. This protects the files from being ~~"sniffed"~~compromised while traveling over the Internet. By using an SSL certificate from a recognized 3rd party Certificate Authority, the clients are assured they are actually connecting with who they think they are.

Note: This guideline is based on an implementation using specific technologies and infrastructure. While alternate implementations could work, this is the recommended guideline for the ASTM Data Communications Committee.

ARCHITECTURE:
The data store utilized by this method is file based. All files are stored in a hierarchical folder structure, which is exposed to users and other automated tools by using HTTP/S protocols. In order for a user or an automated tool to use the SSL system, a user id and password is required; this user information may be stored in various forms: local server id, LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) directory, database and even web services such as Microsoft Passport. The implementation of each of these would be dependent on the current infrastructure of the trading partner. There may be advantages and disadvantages of an individual implementation, but for the purposes of this document, they are all acceptable.

The ~~recommendedbasic~~ file hierarchy is as follows:

Administrative Level - Top level folder admin access only

Trading Partner folder Level 1(Lab or Data Consumer 1)
Sublevel folder(In Box)
Sublevel folder(Out Box)

Trading Partner folder Level 1(Lab or Data Consumer 2)

Appendix I

Electronic Data Transmission Method (ETRTM) Guidelines Using Secure Sockets Layer

Sublevel folder(In Box)
Sublevel folder(Out Box)

Trading Partner folder Level 1(Lab or Data Consumer …n)
Sublevel folder(In Box)
Sublevel folder(Out Box)

The owner/admin of the site will have full access at the top level folder and all folders below.
Each trading partner's folders will have their own authorized user(s). Within this context, users will be able to read and write files. There can be any number of these folders below the top level. The owner/admin will maintain this structure, however it is suggested all participating companies should agree to the same structure and directory naming conventions, as described above in the basic file hierarchy.

Non-administrative users (trading partners) will only have access to their designated folders, and will not see any others.

IMPLEMENTATION EXAMPLE:
This EDTM uses ~~the Microsoft Internet Information Services (IIS) server.~~ HTTPS ~~with a SSL enabledis used for~~ browser~~-based for trading partners'~~ access via the Internet.

~~The Microsoft IIS server~~You ~~will~~ require~~s some form of~~ an upload component to permit a web browser to upload a file to the web server. ~~SAFileUP from Software Artisans is an example of a commercially available upload component.~~ This particular component allows control of the security context so that unauthorized users cannot exploit the function to access the server. ~~This component may be purchased or can be built inhouse.~~

Implementation also requires a SSL certificate (VeriSign is a commonly used certificate provider).

A separate component should be used to handle authorization and authentication. Users are challenged for an ID and password when first

accessing the site. This authenticates the user to the site and allows authorized access to the proper document folders (SiteMinder from Netegrity is an example of this type of software). Native operating system security could also be used.