

Subj: Clarification question from FTTF on Camel Strawman Directives 9 and 10
Date: 98-08-10 16:36:11 EDT
From: spcroley@duke-energy.com (Susan P Croley)
To: cpcaldwe@aol.com, novakm@natfuel.com, thopkins@enron.com, dgussow@fpl.com, pkeeler@br-inc.com
CC: gisb1@aol.com, mdray@duke-energy.com (Mike Bray), hahnge@texaco.com

Dear Internet Implementation Task Force Chairs,

Out of FTTF's review of the four directives that took place in a teleconference today, the following question was generated from our discussion on items 9 and 10. The original directives read as follows:

9) FTTF should define any necessary standards for connecting with third party communication networks.

10) FTTF should define redundancy recommendations for Internet connections which allow the TSP to choose the options that are most cost effective for meeting its customer's requirements.

Clarification question:

Was the intent of these two directives to address the interactive application model only or was the intent to include the Internet EDM/EDI model in their scope as well?

Though most of us in FTTF interpreted the scope to cover both interactive applications as well as Internet EDM of EDI transactions, some disagreed. Although, technically, a single solution may not meet the needs of both the interactive and the Internet EDM models, those of us who thought that EDM is part of the scope feel that the intent was to include both models in our research for items 9 and 10.

I am requesting as chair of FTTF that the above-mentioned clarification question be placed on the agenda for the Aug. 13-14 meetings so that it is resolved before the end of the Aug. 13-14 meeting. An answer to this question is necessary before further work may be done by FTTF on items 9 and 10 the following week. I appreciate your prompt attention on this issue.

Susan P. Croley
FTTF Chair