



C03003

**REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OR INTERPRETATION**

Date: **February 26, 2003**

Requester Name: **Pete Whatley**  
Company: **Dynegy, Inc.**  
Phone, Fax, E-mail: **office 713-507-3646**  
**cell 281-850-7537**  
**fax 713-356-2028**  
**email [pete.whatley@dynegy.com](mailto:pete.whatley@dynegy.com)**

NAESB Standard Number: **EDM Implementation Guide**

Clarification or interpretation request:

In the GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism Related Standards dated June 18, 2001, GISB modified the existing GISB EDM to “*support standards convergence with Internet Engineering Taskforce “HTTP Transport for secure EDI” (a.k.a. EDIINT standard AS2)*”. The reason for this was that “*HTTP Transport for Secure EDI (AS2) is an emerging standard, largely based on the original GISB EDM, that is being developed by the Internet Engineering Task Force, the Internet standards body. Adherence with a formal, international Internet standard, such as AS2 ensures that the specification will not change without due process and any changes that do occur will be the result of a broad consensus.*”

The problem that exists is two-fold:

1. AS2 is NOT a standard. AS stands for Applicability Statement. Applicability Statements are drafts that are considered working documents and periodically expire and are replaced by subsequent documents until such time as they are submitted to the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) and ultimately approved as a standard.

The document GISB referred to was IETF EDIINT AS2 draft v11, which expired in November of 2002. The document that obsoleted it, IETF EDIINT AS2 draft v12 (January 2003), has had all references to GISB, the GISB model, and PGP as well as two of the authors, Dick Brooks and David Fischer, removed. This change occurred outside the IETF process making it **NOT** due process **OR** result of a broad consensus.

This form is to be submitted to the NAESB office, both in electronic and written form.



2. All of the specific portions of IETF EDIINT AS2 draft v11 to which GISB refers were not included in the GISB Electronic Delivery Mechanism Related Standards dated June 18, 2001.

Given the above, NAESB is now faced with the situation of having NAESB standards versions 1.5 and 1.6 referencing a “standard” that does not, nay, never did exist.

Possible interpretations or clarifications, if known:

It is Dynegy’s position that NAESB needs to give clarification as to just what the EDM consists of in its entirety. Following are a few suggested courses of action:

1. IETF EDIINT AS2 draft v12 suggests that if “the GISB requirement still exists” that AS3 be developed to satisfy that requirement. NAESB could support an AS3 specification recognizing that it competes directly with AS2 and the EDM specification accordingly.
2. NAESB could adopt the IETF EDIINT AS2 draft v12 and revise the EDM specification accordingly.
3. NAESB could forego any attempt to rally behind an IETF standard and simply define an energy industry EDM standard under the NAESB banner.
4. NAESB could actively seek convergence between IETF EDIINT AS2 draft v11 and IETF EDIINT AS2 draft v12. This could be done by protesting the publication of IETF EDIINT AS2 draft v12 without due process.