

## Inside

- Steering Committee Elections (p. 2)
- PESC Fall 2007 Membership Meeting (p. 2)
- PESC Fall 2007 Summit in Montreal (p. 3)
- Schools Do Not Need To Comply with FOIA Requests (p. 3)
- Technology Tidbits (p. 4)
- SIFA and ADL Join Forces (p. 5)
- Liberty Alliance & Electronic Authentication Partnership merge (p. 7)

Volume 9 ~ Issue 9 ~ September 2007

## DTS and XML Transcript Request and Response - Out for Vote!

On June 23, 2005, the Data Transport Workgroup submitted a Letter of Intent notifying PESC and the education community of its desire to develop a specification for data transport that would be approved and recognized as an education-wide community standard. The need and a significant foundation for the specification were born out of the National Council of Higher Education Loan Program's (NCHELP) Electronic Standards Committee (ESC) and once the Letter of Intent was submitted, the Workgroup was officially formed under PESC's Standards Forum for Education. In following PESC's Policies and Procedures, version 1.0.0 of the specification was approved by the Change Control Board (CCB) of the Standards Forum for Education, made available for public comment, and on May 25, 2006 after a PESC Member Vote of Approval, released as a PESC approved standard. The Workgroup continued development of DTS and in version 2.0.0 built in an additional ability to provide secure and encrypted data transport without an out-of-band key exchange. That work too was approved by the Change Control Board (CCB) and made available for public comment. Public comments and the responses can be found on page 9. The next step in the process is to hold a PESC Member Vote of Approval for which ballots were issued on October 2, 2007. The voting period for PESC Members is 10 business days and expires on October 17, 2007.

Concurrently, in May of 2007 the XML Transcript Request & Response Workgroup completed its development efforts for version 1.0.0, had its XML schemas approved by the CCB, successfully completed public comment, and is also ready for a PESC Member Vote of Approval. Comments and responses from the schemas are on page 12. The need and a significant foundation for the specifications were born out of the National Student Clearinghouse.

With both efforts in the same process step - PESC Member Vote - both have been placed on a single ballot (see page 15). PESC Members are asked to APPROVE, NOT APPROVE, or ABSTAIN both candidates. If not approving, PESC asks for the reason(s) why approval is not being provided.

All ballots must be received by PESC by 5pm PDST Wednesday October 17, 2007.

Email: [Michael.Sessa@PESC.org](mailto:Michael.Sessa@PESC.org)

Fax: 202-261-6516

Mail: Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council  
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 200  
Washington DC 20036

Celebrating Our 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary in 2007

1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20036  
Executive Director  
Michael Sessa  
[Michael.Sessa@PESC.org](mailto:Michael.Sessa@PESC.org)

Editor  
Heidi L. Weber  
[heidi.weber@comcast.net](mailto:heidi.weber@comcast.net)

The Standard is the electronic newsletter published monthly by The Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC). The Standard covers news and events that impact information technology and data exchange, and promotes PESC's goals of improving service, controlling costs, and attaining interoperability within higher education. For information about subscriptions, advertising, and article submissions, please visit [www.PESC.org](http://www.PESC.org).  
© 2007 PESC

# Steering Committee Elections

Elections for the Steering Committee, the body that leads and provides oversight for the Standards Forum for Education, will be held during PESC's Fall Membership Meeting and Luncheon scheduled for Monday October 15, 2007 from noon - 1:30 pm EST at the Ritz Carlton Hotel in Montreal.

Membership meetings are open to all PESC Members and Affiliates, and with prior notification, other interested parties. Note though that only Members (with dues paid current) can vote. As nominations are closed, please find a proxy ballot (page 17) for elections to PESC's Steering Committee.

The Members are electing seven (7) nominees to serve two-year terms starting January 1, 2008. If voting by proxy ballot, please ensure that PESC offices receive your proxy ballot by close of business Wednesday October 10, 2007. Proxy ballots can be:

- emailed to Michael.Sessa@PESC.org
- faxed at 202-261-6516, or
- mailed to PESC, 1250 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Nominees will be provided with a brief period to address the Membership at the beginning of the Membership Meeting, before elections. If you are attending the Fall 2007 Membership Meeting in person, proxy ballots can still be submitted and then can either be replaced with an official vote on Monday October 15, 2007 or remain as the official vote.

The overall schedule for elections is as follows:

**Friday August 31, 2007** - Nominations Open

**Friday September 28, 2007** - Nominations Closed, Proxy Ballots Issued

**Wednesday October 10, 2007** - If not attending the Membership Meeting in person, this is the date by which Proxy Ballots must be received in PESC's offices

**Monday October 15, 2007** - Elections held at noon EST

We encourage all of PESC Members and Affiliates to attend as Membership Meetings are your chance to influence the direction of your organization! If you have yet to register for the free Workgroup Summit in Montreal, please visit [www.PESC.org](http://www.PESC.org). The Summit is made possible by our generous sponsors: American Student Assistance, Datatel, National Transcript Center, Oracle, SIFA, and USA Funds.

## PESC Fall 2007 Membership Meeting

Please be advised that a meeting of the PESC Members and Affiliates has been scheduled for Monday, October 15, 2007 from noon - 1:30 pm. This meeting will be held at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in Montreal during PESC's Fall 2007 Workgroup Summit which kicks off on the same day at 8:30 am.

Tentatively scheduled for the agenda at this time:

- Board of Directors Update
- Elections for the Standards Forum for Education Steering Committee
- Standards Forum for Education Update

This year, we are combining the Membership meeting with a buffet lunch. If you are planning on attending the Membership Meeting and luncheon, please complete the registration form on page 16, and submit it to Michael Sessa at [michael.sessa@pesc.org](mailto:michael.sessa@pesc.org) or by fax at 202-261-6517.

## PESC Fall 2007 Summit in Montreal!

REMINDER: Join fellow colleagues in the higher education community as we celebrate PESC's 10th Year Anniversary!

While the meeting in which PESC was actually launched took place on August 18, 1997 at the National Center for Higher Education, we'll hold the festivities during the Fall 2007 Summit being held at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in Montreal Canada.

In addition to meetings usually scheduled during PESC Summits including Workgroups and Boards of the Standards Forum for Education, the PESC Board of Directors, PESC Fall Membership, & AACRAO's SPEEDE Committee, the Electronic Authentication/Electronic Authorization Task Force (EA2) will also convene. Plus we're hosting a special reception which will include tasty hors d'oeuvres and beverages via the Ritz Montreal!

The draft agenda is posted on the PESC website and it lists all the meetings, activities and events that will occur. In the meantime, please make travel plans and reserve your hotel room.

The Summit begins Monday morning October 15 at 7:30am with continental breakfast and concludes by Tuesday afternoon October 16 at 5pm. The dress code is business casual.

Ritz Carlton Montreal  
1228 Sherbrooke Street West  
Montreal (Quebec) H3G 1H6  
800-363-0366  
1-514-842-4212  
reservations@ritzmontreal.com  
\$179 CAD/night

### Get Your Passport Now!

Under the new requirements of the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI), beginning January 23, 2007, ALL persons, including U.S. citizens, traveling by air between the United States and Canada, Mexico, Central and South America, the Caribbean, and Bermuda will be required to

present a valid passport, Air NEXUS card, or U.S. Coast Guard Merchant Mariner Document, or an Alien Registration Card, Form I-551, if applicable.

**To obtain a passport for the first time**, you need to go in person to one of over 8,000 passport acceptance facilities located throughout the United States with two photographs of yourself, proof of U.S. citizenship, and a valid form of photo identification such as a driver's license.

**To renew a passport**, you can renew by mail if: Your most recent passport is available to submit and it is not damaged; you received the passport within the past 15 years; you were over age 16 when it was issued; you still have the same name, or can legally document your name change.

For more information, visit [http://travel.state.gov/passport/passport\\_1738.html](http://travel.state.gov/passport/passport_1738.html).

## Schools Do Not Need to Comply with FOIA Requests

A recent ED-issued Dear Colleague Letter states, "The [Federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. §552] only applies to Federal agencies and their employees. Institutions that participate in the Title IV, HEA programs are not subject to the Federal FOIA and therefore are not required to release any student information under this law."

We would like to remind institutions... Under [Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C. §1232g], a postsecondary institution may not have a policy or practice of disclosing personally identifiable information from a student's education records without his or her prior written consent, except as specified by law."

The full letter may be accessed at <http://ifap.ed.gov/dpclatters/attachments/GEN0705ReleasingStudentInfo.pdf>

# Technology Tidbits

## and Standards Snippets

■ **Federation is perhaps the most important emerging technology in SSO for governments worldwide.** The main champions of federation are the Liberty Alliance and OASIS. They jointly support an Internet language called Secure Access Markup Language (SAML), which was designed to extend single sign-on across organizational boundaries using a federated model. 'Federation itself is about the portability of identity,' said Brian Campbell, a software engineer at Ping Identity, which makes federation software, and co-chairman of the OASIS technical committee that worked on SAML. For the full story, visit [http://www.gcn.com/print/26\\_24/45041-1.html](http://www.gcn.com/print/26_24/45041-1.html).

■ **The Shibboleth team recently announced the availability of the first public beta release of the next major version, v2.0, of the Internet2 Shibboleth software.** Note that this initial v2.0 beta release is not suitable for production use. The default profile of Shibboleth 2.0 is a fully compliant implementation of the SAML 2.0 Web Browser SSO Profile. Attributes are now by default included in an encrypted SAML 2.0 assertion sent from the IdP to the SP. This does not affect the privacy or security features of Shibboleth and should result in easier deployment. For more information, visit <https://spaces.inter->

[net2.edu/display/SHIB2/Announce-Shib-2.0-Beta](http://net2.edu/display/SHIB2/Announce-Shib-2.0-Beta).

■ **Members of the U.S. National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) Program Management Office (PMO) released Draft Version 1.2 of the "National Information Exchange Model Naming and Design Rules.** The document defines the data model, XML components, and XML data for use with NIEM version 2.0. For additional information, visit <http://xml.coverpages.org/ndr.html#niem>.

■ **The final installment of a three part article exploring Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) explores implementation in an enterprise where Enterprise Architecture is already established or being concurrently developed.** This installment presents a case study based on experience with a large account for which EA and SOA were developed concurrently. The article may be accessed at <http://www.ibm.com/developer-works/webservices/library/ws-soa-enterprise3/>.

■ "Converting XML Schemas to Schematron: Part 1" explores the benefits and procedures associated converting XSD to Schematron. At its

core, the prime reason is to get better diagnostics: grammar-based diagnostics basically don't work, the last two decades of SGML/XML DTD/XSD experiences makes plain, according to the author. The article may be accessed at [http://www.oreillynet.com/xml/blog/2007/09/convertng\\_xml\\_schemas\\_to\\_schehtml](http://www.oreillynet.com/xml/blog/2007/09/convertng_xml_schemas_to_schehtml).

■ **The SPEEDE Server will handle XML now as long the same format is used by the sender and the receiver.** UT is rewriting on the Quick&Easy software...and then will look closer at the utility to translate between EDI and XML, yet no dates are currently available for this functionality.

### UT Austin Internet Server 'SPEEDEs' Along

September 2007 volume included:

- 45,433 TS130 transcripts
- 33,857 TS131 acknowledgements
- 5,635 TS997 Functional acknowledgements
- 33,068 TS189 Admission Applications
- 16,476 TS138 test score reports
- 156,529 total transactions



**PRESS RELEASE**  
**For IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

For Additional Information,  
Contact: Jill Abbott  
202.491.8214 [jabbott@sifinfo.org](mailto:jabbott@sifinfo.org)

## **The Schools Interoperability Framework Association (SIFA®) and Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL®) Announce Formal Relationship to Develop Schools Focused “Core SCORM”**

*Washington, DC September 14, 2007* - The Schools Interoperability Framework Association (SIFA) and the Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Initiative announce the formal partnership expanding on their current positive working relationship by outlining development activities focused on better enabling teaching and learning for schools across the globe.

The partnership activity is focused on the development and implementation of a new version of the widely-implemented *SCORM®* reference model into school software applications by enabling its use with the successful *Schools Interoperability Framework Implementation Specification*.

ADL's Sharable Content Object Reference Model's (SCORM) aim has been to foster creation of reusable learning content as "instructional objects" within a common technical framework for computer-based and Web-based learning. SCORM describes that technical framework by providing a harmonized set of guidelines, specifications, and standards based on the work of several distinct eLearning specifications and standards bodies. ADL has recently announced its interest in defining a version of the SCORM that is 100% based on open *de jure* standards and has given this version the working name of "Core SCORM".

Core SCORM will form the foundation of this ADL-SIFA partnership activity. The two organizations will leverage the SIF Association's community - made up of hundreds of schools, states, national and international governments and vendors – to convene around the successful development and implementation of a Core SCORM for schools. In the tailoring of this new specification to address the specific needs of the school educational software marketplace, a key deliverable will be the use of Core SCORM within the SIF Specification and extending to meet the needs of educators worldwide. The SIF Specification is not a product, but a technical blueprint for school software that will enable diverse applications to interact and share school data seamlessly. The SIF Specification is an open standard that any technology provider or schools can develop to and implement.

The initial activities will include pilot activities of the use of SCORM within the SIF Specification and bringing together, as SIFA has done for over 10 years, the entire education community to

further define specific needs and challenges with interoperability between these teaching and learning applications. The bringing together of teachers, administrators, vendors and developers is vital in meeting the needs of the educational community.

“As pK-12 educational organizations, government agencies and vendors utilize educational technology more comprehensively for teaching, learning and administration, the need for interoperability becomes paramount. With the increased accountability and expectations in schools today, linking accurate interoperable educational data to the right learning resources for individuals is the “holy grail” for using technology for real and measured improvements in learning. The development of “Core SCORM for Schools” and SIFA’s commitment to collaboratively developing and leveraging standards will make that quest become a reality.” said Dr. Larry Fruth, Executive Director of SIFA.

“Core SCORM will help bring together the collection of Profiles based on open “de jure” technical standards and harmonize them into a common set of practices, policies and requirements across the global learning community. The SIFA-ADL partnership will leverage the work that SIFA and ADL have done, gather requirements unique for schools, facilitate how school applications fit into the Core SCORM framework and further enable interoperability for schools.” stated Paul Jesukiewicz, Deputy Director of ADL.

A Joint Executive Brief will be available shortly on the SIFA web site [www.sifinfo.org](http://www.sifinfo.org) and the ADL web site [www.adlnet.gov](http://www.adlnet.gov). For additional information, please contact Jill Abbott, [jabbott@sifinfo.org](mailto:jabbott@sifinfo.org) or Paul Jesukiewicz, [paul.jesukiewicz@adlnet.gov](mailto:paul.jesukiewicz@adlnet.gov).

### ***About the Advanced Distributed Learning Initiative***

The ADL Initiative, sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), is a collaborative effort between government, industry and academia to establish a new learning distribution environment that permits the interoperability of the learning tools and course content on a global scale. ADL promotes collaboration in the development and adoption of tools, specifications, guidelines, policies and prototypes that make distributed learning accessible, adaptable, affordable, durable, interoperable, and reusable. For further information, visit <http://www.adlnet.gov>.

### ***About The Schools Interoperability Framework Association (SIFA)***

SIFA is a unique, non-profit collaboration composed of over 600 schools, districts, states, the U.S. Department of Education, international government agencies, software vendors and consultants who collectively define the rules and regulations for educational software data interoperability. The SIF Specification enables diverse applications to interact and share data efficiently, reliably, and securely regardless of the platform hosting those applications. SIFA has united these education technology end users and providers in an unprecedented effort to give teachers more time to do what they do best: teach. For further information, visit <http://www.sifinfo.org>.

## **Liberty Alliance Builds Global Trust Framework for Identity Federations Spanning Industries and Regions**

### **Electronic Authentication Partnership (EAP) and Liberty Alliance Form New Global Expert Group to Drive Trusted Federations and Identity Assurance Internationally**

Liberty Alliance – September 10, 2007 -- Liberty Alliance, the global identity consortium working to build a more trusted Internet for consumers, governments and businesses worldwide, today announced it has formed a new expert group to deliver the Liberty Trust Framework, an organizational framework designed to fill industry requirements for standardized identity assurance criteria for use in a broad range of federation scenarios. Liberty's Identity Assurance Expert Group (IAEG) was established by the recent merge of the Electronic Authentication Partnership (EAP) into Liberty Alliance, and consists of representatives from the worldwide financial services, government, healthcare and service provider sectors working collaboratively to release the Liberty Trust Framework for public review and input later this year.

The Liberty Trust Framework will remove a major barrier to global inter-federation deployments: the complexity of assessing the level of identity assurance among all organizations participating in federated relationships. Currently, different federations have varying policies and processes governing identity operations, the interpretation of which adds to the cost and complexity of deploying assured identity services. The Liberty Trust Framework will provide a standard set of criteria so that identity transactions, with assurance requirements ranging from leaving a comment on a blog to high-value financial transactions, can take place based on a standard framework for managing identity assurance levels and associated business processes and technologies. With common criteria for determining accurate identities in place, the Liberty Trust Framework will make it easier to bring new members into existing federations as well as simplify how federations themselves can interoperate.

Liberty's IAEG is co-chaired by Jane Hennessy, Senior Vice President, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., and Michael Sessa, Executive Director, Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC), with founding members including representatives from Adobe, BT, the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, Fidelity Investments, HP, PESC, SanDisk, Sun Microsystems, Symlabs, the US GSA and Wells Fargo. The IAEG is leveraging Liberty's diverse membership, the work of its global expert and special interest groups (SIGs) such as the eGovernment, eHealth, Identity Theft Prevention and Japan SIGs, and leadership in addressing the technology, business and privacy aspects of digital identity management to collaboratively drive the development of the Liberty Trust Framework.

"Today's news is about members of the global identity community coming together to develop a universal framework for building and managing federations

based on identity assurances and a foundation of trust,” said Roger Sullivan, president of the Liberty Alliance Management Board and vice president of Oracle Identity Management. “With the technologies for wide-scale federation in place, the Liberty Trust Framework provides the necessary business structure that will allow organizations of all sizes and in every market sector to better manage and protect identity information across all identity federations.”

### **Extending the work of the EAP and US E-Authentication Federation**

Initial major contributions to the Liberty Trust Framework are coming from the Trust Framework of the EAP and the Credential Assessment Framework of the US E-Authentication Federation. Liberty Alliance acknowledges the importance of these contributions in allowing the IAEG to rapidly create the Liberty Trust Framework. The Framework will be defined in a way that scales, empowers business processes and benefits individual users of identity services among federations potentially supporting billions of simultaneous transactions across devices, industries and regions.

“We are very pleased that work of the EAP is moving forward within Liberty Alliance where individuals and organizations from around the world can participate in driving successful inter-federations forward,” said Sessa. “We encourage the global identity community to join Liberty’s new expert group to help organizations worldwide better address the business and technical issues involved in building trusted inter-federations.”

### **A call for participation in the development of the Liberty Trust Framework**

“The formation of the Liberty Alliance Identity Assurance Expert Group helps to ensure the broadest possible industry support for advancing online identity assurance interoperability,” said Hennessy. “Liberty Alliance welcomes the participation of individuals and organizations to collaborate on developing the next generation of resources and tools designed to reduce the complexity and costs of identity assurance among identity federations.”

IAEG is Liberty’s fifth expert group, joining the Business Marketing Expert Group (BMEG), Technology Expert Group (TEG), Public Policy Expert Group (PPEG) and Strong Authentication Expert Group (SAEG). The development of the Liberty Trust Framework within Liberty Alliance will be based on the Liberty model of creating open, secure and interoperable identity standards, business and policy deployment guidelines and best practices for managing privacy in a collaborative environment where all organizations and individual members are invited to participate. This proven approach helps to ensure the output of Liberty Alliance meets real world business and user requirements for interoperable, secure and privacy-respecting digital identity management solutions. More information about Liberty’s IAEG is available by visiting

[http://projectliberty.org/liberty/strategic\\_initiatives/identity\\_assurance](http://projectliberty.org/liberty/strategic_initiatives/identity_assurance)



### About Liberty Alliance

Liberty Alliance is the only global identity organization with a membership base that includes technology vendors, consumer service providers and educational and government organizations working together to build a more trusted Internet by addressing the technology, business and privacy aspects of digital identity management. The Liberty Alliance Management Board consists of representatives from AOL, Ericsson, Fidelity Investments, France Telecom, HP, Intel, Novell, NTT, Oracle, and Sun Microsystems. Liberty Alliance works with identity organizations worldwide to ensure all voices are included in the global identity discussion and regularly holds and participates in public events designed to advance the harmonization and interoperability of CardSpace, Liberty Federation (SAML 2.0), Liberty Web Services, OpenID and WS-\* specifications. More information about Liberty Alliance as well as information about how to join many of its public groups and mail lists is available at [www.projectliberty.org](http://www.projectliberty.org)

###

### CONTACT:

Russ DeVeau  
Liberty Alliance  
508-487-6102 – Office  
908-251-1549 – Mobile  
[russ@projectliberty.org](mailto:russ@projectliberty.org)  
russ deveau @ comcast dot net (no spaces)  
AOL IM (Russ DeVeau): devcommruss



# Public Comments and Responses

## Data Transport Specification

October 2, 2007

On June 23, 2005, the Data Transport Workgroup submitted a *Letter of Intent* notifying PESC and the education community of its desire to develop a specification for data transport that would be approved and recognized as an education-wide community standard. The need and a significant foundation for the specification were born out of the National Council of Higher Education Loan Program's (NCHELP) Electronic Standards Committee (ESC) and once the *Letter of Intent* was submitted, the Workgroup was officially formed under PESC's Standards Forum for Education.

On February 6, 2006, the Data Transport Workgroup, after having completed its development efforts, submitted its Data Transport Specification to PESC with the objective that it become an approved and recognized education standard. On February 17, 2006, PESC posted the Data Transport Specification on its website, made all corresponding announcements and communications regarding this submission, and opened a 30-day public comment period so that the education community could review and publicly comment on the Data Transport Specification. During the public comment period, which expired on March 20, 2006, a number of public comments were received. Those public comments were routed to the Data Transport Workgroup and the Standards Forum for Education's Change Control Board (CCB). Both groups reviewed the public comments, discussed each thoroughly and meticulously, and on April 21, 2006 provided responses.

With public comment period successfully addressed, the Data Transport Specification was presented to the PESC Members for a *Vote of Approval* on May 1, 2006. On May 19, 2006, PESC Members that approved Data Transport Specification v 1.0.0 included: AcademyOne, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), AES, Citibank, Coalition of Higher Education Assistance Organizations (COHEAO), The College Board, Community College of the Air Force, Consumer Bankers Association (CBA), Datatel, Edfinancial Services, ELM Resources, Florida State University, Iowa State University, Law School Admission Council (LSAC), Miami University – DARS, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), National Association of Student Loan Administrators (NASLA), National Career Assessment Services Inc. (NCASI), National Council of Higher Education Loan Programs (NCHELP), National Student Clearinghouse, Nelnet, Oracle Corporation, Pearson Government Solutions, Sallie Mae, Student Loan Servicing Alliance (SLSA), SunGard Higher Education, TG, University of Illinois at Chicago, University of Illinois Student Financial Services, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, University of Mississippi, University of Oklahoma, University of Texas at Austin, USA Funds, U.S. Department of Education, and XAP Corporation. On May 25, 2006, after ratification by the PESC Board of Directors, the Data Transport Specification was released to the public as a national education community standard.

To improve upon v 1.0.0, the Data Transport Workgroup developed and submitted on April 13, 2007, Data Transport Specification v 2.0.0. On May 21, 2007, PESC posted the Data Transport Specification v 2.0.0 on its website, made all corresponding announcements and communications regarding this submission, and opened a 30-day public comment period so that the education community could review and publicly comment on the Data Transport Specification. During the public comment period, which expired on June 20, 2007, a number of public comments were received. Those public comments were routed to the Data Transport Workgroup and the Standards Forum for Education's Change Control Board (CCB). Both groups reviewed the public comments, discussed each thoroughly and meticulously, and on July 17, 2007 provided responses. All comments and responses are provided below.

As public comment period has been successfully addressed, the Data Transport Specification v 2.0.0 is now presented to the PESC Members for a *Vote of Approval* on October 2, 2007. The voting period for PESC Members is 10 business days and expires on October 17, 2007.

## Public Comment 1

Issue: We noticed that the DTSRequestPayloadBytes and DTSResponsePayloadBytes elements are defined as xsd:string.

Reason: The data contained in the element is a numeric value.

Proposed Solution: Shouldn't these be defined as integers?

Response: DTSRequestPayloadBytes and DTSResponsePayloadBytes were defined as xsd:string due to data type interop problems in version 1. "xsd:string" is the easiest data type to handle from both .Net and Java and easily converted to integer or long in either technology. Leaving it "xsd:string" will allow companies that have already implemented v1 to leave their code intact when dealing with these 2 header elements.

## Public Comment 2

Issue: I was wondering if, when we were reviewing available standards and implementations to meet the needs of DTS, whether we ever looked at AS2? AS2, or Applicability Statement 2, is an EDI standard that is published in RFC 4130 : <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc4130.txt>. Here is the Wikipedia page: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AS2>.

From the Oracle site, I found another good definition of AS2:

- AS2 (Applicability Statement 2) is a specification for Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) between businesses using the Internet's Web page protocol, the Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP). The specification is an extension of the earlier version, Applicability Statement 1 (AS1). Both specifications were created by EDI over the Internet (EDIINT), a working group of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) that develops secure and reliable business communications standards. The AS2 standard provides Secure Multi-Purpose Internet Mail Extensions (S/MIME) and uses HTTP or a more secure version, HTTPS, to transmit data over the Internet. AS1 uses a slower protocol, SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol). The use of HTTP or HTTPS allows communication in real time rather than through e-mail delivery. Security, authentication, message integrity, and privacy are assured by the use of encryption and digital signatures. Another important feature, non-repudiation, makes it impossible for the intended recipient of a message to deny having received it. The AS2 standard allows businesses to use a common, single communications solution. This eliminates the complications and costs involved when different businesses in a network use different transfer protocols. A Web server, an EDI transfer engine, and digital certificates are required for data exchange using AS2. Almost any type of data can be transmitted..

Reason: If we didn't already, shouldn't we look at AS2 as an existing standard that could meet the defined business and functional needs, is available in commercial products (for those who prefer to buy), and has a defined specification to allow construction for those who prefer to build? I realize that AS2 isn't necessarily a "web services" (WS-\*) implementation, but as you can see below it does leverage the submit-response approach, uses HTTPS, S/MIME, encryption, digital signatures and non-repudiation.

Proposed Solution: Look at AS2 instead of continuing with DTS.

Response: See response below comment #3, the general remarks apply to this comment as well and there is a specific paragraph related to AS2.

## **Public Comment 3**

Issue: Need for additional security and exchange models – particularly pull models not just push.

Reason:

Proposed Solution: Suggest option to support ebXML messaging and particularly the 2.xx and new 3.xx work. Because there are now several mature open source implementations and also Oracle and IBM both now supporting ebMS - this means that many PESC members can use this "out-the-box" with their existing infrastructure. The push interchange models - plus ability to use secure and signed exchanges with reliable delivery options - provide a significant level of benefits to PESC organizations.

Response: The below response addresses general issues to both comments #2 and #3 while addressing specific aspects of each comment.

General Response to #2 and #3:

DTS version 2 is the culmination of an effort to answer the original business requirements for a transport standard for the higher education community. DTS v 1.0.0 was proven interoperable between Java and .Net implementation platforms. V 1.0.0 answered all of the requirements except one: make the "Key Management and Exchange" easier and simpler. V 1.0.0 of DTS was approved as a PESC standard (May 2006). Version 2 is a major enhancement, adding closer adherence to the standards that create the foundation for Web Services (WS-\*) and answers the final business requirement concerning key management and exchange. The significant advantages attained with adoption of version 2 come with minimal actual changes to any existing DTS version 1 implementations. The DTS Technical Workgroup recommends that PESC approve version 2, as a standard superseding the existing version. Version 2 meets all requirements given to the DTS workgroup, including the additional ability to provide secure and encrypted data transport without an out-of-band key exchange.

The DTS Specification was produced during the same time frames as both specifications mentioned in the comments above; Version 1 at the same time as AS2 and ebMS version 2, Version 2 at the same time as ebMS version 3. While there are competing general data transport mechanisms, including AS2 and ebXML, none are widely used. Both DTS version 1 and 2 are designed to be compatible with existing higher education processing systems that currently rely on e-mail or FTP transport.

Future work and discussions of the Technical Workgroup will involve researching and potentially creating reference implementations of other standards-setting organizations' (OASIS, IEEE, IETF) output, including ebMS version 3. DTS is known to be interoperable and the same advances in the development toolkits that allowed closer adherence to the WS-\* specifications should allow ebMS to be interoperable as well. However, neither the DTS Technical workgroup nor the PESC Technical Advisory Board has proven ebMS to be interoperable at this time.

Comment #2 Specific:

AS2 is not a Web Service or based upon SOAP. While there was nothing in the business requirements that specified using SOAP and a Web Service approach for the solution, it was widely agreed upon that these technologies would

## Public Comments and Responses

Data Transport Specification

October 2, 2007



provide the best solution. DTS version 1, an approved standard, uses SOAP and Web Services so it stands to reason that the continued direction use the same type of technology.

### Comment #3 specific:

Additional security concern: DTS version 2 and ebMS version 3 both implement the Web Services – Security (WS-S) specification.

Pull exchange model: DTS is a specification for transport framework. Exchange models, such as Push or Pull, are implementations of the transport mechanism. There is not anything in the DTS specification that limits the use of any of the same exchange models discussed in the ebMS (version 3) specification; in fact the implementation of DTS defined in the NCHelp – Technical Manual provides scenarios and expected behaviors of DTS for the same exchange models described in ebMS.

ebMS: While the ebMS standard does have merit for solving the transport issue for which DTS was created, keeping DTS as a higher education community specific standard allows our community to focus the evolution of the standard used by our specific industry. DTS was developed through extensive experience of transporting data within the higher education community.

After additional research, ebMS may have the ability to replace DTS as a transport standard and future versions of DTS could conceivably be replaced by ebMS. However, DTS was created based on the same basic Web Services standards that ebMS was and proven to work to solve all the business requirements the group was presented. This same proof of concept effort should be done for ebMS prior to adoption, it is expected that ebMS would need to be extended beyond the current specification to meet the needs of the higher education community.

With the publication/ratification of version 3 of ebMS occurring on July 12th, 2007; it is highly speculative that an “out of the box” solution exists today for ebMS. It is more likely that version 2 of ebMS, which does not implement the WS-S specification, is supported by off the shelf products. It is also expected that there will be packaged solutions available for DTS version 2 as well. The “out-of-band” key management process used by the current data exchange mechanisms (including ebMS version 2) requires extensive personnel resources and discourages periodic (highly recommended) security key updates. The adoption of WS-S by DTS version 2 is pivotal to providing a streamlined and automated solution to the key management/exchange process..



## Public Comments and Responses

### XML Transcript Request and Response

October 2, 2007

On May 7, 2007, the XML Transcript Request & Response Workgroup, after having completed its development efforts, submitted its specifications to the Change Control Board of the Standards Forum for Education with the objective that they become approved and recognized education standards. The need and a significant foundation for the specifications were born out of the National Student Clearinghouse.

On Tuesday May 22, 2007, PESC posted the XML Transcript Request & Response Specifications on its website, made all corresponding announcements and communications regarding this submission, and opened a 30-day public comment period so that the education community could review and publicly comment on Specifications.

During the public comment period, which expired on June 21, 2007, a number of public comments were received. Those public comments were routed to the XML Transcript Request & Response Workgroup and the Standards Forum for Education's Change Control Board (CCB). Both groups reviewed the public comments, discussed each thoroughly and meticulously, and provided responses. All public comments and responses are provided below. This document listing all public comments and responses will be posted on the PESC website.

As public comment period has been successfully addressed, the XML Transcript Request & Response Specifications are presented to the PESC Members for a Vote of Approval on October 2, 2007. The voting period for PESC Members is 10 business days and expires on October 17, 2007.

## Public Comment 1

Issue: AgencyAssignedID

The Person block contains the element AgencyAssignedID which CCCTran populates with a statewide student ID (CSIS) number. The usefulness of this element would be enhanced by the addition of a companion element that describes the source of the value. We propose that AgencyAssignedID be changed to an optional complex element consisting of "AgencyAssignedIDCode" (alphanumeric, 1-30, required) and "AgencyAssignedIDQualifier" (alphanumeric, 1-30, required). This is similar to the structure of "LocalOrganizationID" in the School block.

CCCTran would populate AgencyAssignedIDCode with a 14 numeric character value that is a unique statewide student identification number and would populate AgencyAssignedIDQualifier with the value "CSIS".

Reason:

Proposed Solution: See above.

Response: With regard to the AgencyAssignedID, a new simple element called AgencyAssignedIDQualifier will be added to the Person block to accommodate your request to indicate the agency that assigned the AgencyAssignedID to the person. While your suggested approach to change the AgencyAssignedID to a complex element is a more structured approach, it causes compatibility issues with approved standards that are already using the current Person definition. The Change Control Board will take your suggestion into consideration when planning future major releases.

## Public Comment 2

Issue: BirthCity

CCCTran project representatives have previously requested that Birthcity be included along with Birthdate and Birthday as one of the components of the complex element "Birth". The addition of BirthCity would be very helpful since many CCCs use it to assist in student identification. It was our understanding that Request and Response Workgroup was favorably disposed to this suggestion and indeed we find that BirthCityType is now available in the core schema and is used in the HighSchool Transcript. (We note that the HighSchool transcript uses AcRec:BirthType while the Postsecondary transcript uses core:BirthType). Of course BirthCity should be optional in the Postsecondary transcript as it is in the HighSchool transcript.

Reason:

Proposed Solution:

Response: With regard to the BirthCity, the Person block used by the Transcript Request and Response will be changed to use the definition of BirthType from the Academic Record instead of the definition from Core. The definition in the Academic Record includes BirthCity.



# BALLOT

## Data Transport Specification and XML Transcript Request & Response

October 2, 2007

The Data Transport Specification version 2.0.0 and the XML Transcript Request & Response candidates are presented by the Standards Forum for Education to the Members of the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC) for a vote as official PESC Member-Approved National Education Community Standards. Please indicate your vote by checking one of the boxes below in each column and submitting your ballot to PESC:

### Data Transport Specification v 2.0.0

### XML Transcript Request & Response

APPROVE

APPROVE

NOT APPROVE

NOT APPROVE

ABSTAIN

ABSTAIN

If not approved, please indicate reason(s) below. Attach more sheets if necessary:

---

Your Name:

Your Organization:

Date:

***All ballots must be received by PESC by 5pm PDST Wednesday October 17, 2007.***

**Email:** [Michael.Sessa@PESC.org](mailto:Michael.Sessa@PESC.org)

**Fax:** 202-261-6516

**Mail:** Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council  
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 200  
Washington DC 20036





# Fall 2007 Membership Meeting

October 15, 2007

Noon – 1:30pm

Ritz-Carlton Hotel ~ Montreal, Canada

## Registration Form

Please use this form to register for the PESC Membership Meeting.

---

Attendee Full Name

---

Title and Organization

---

Street Address

---

City, State and Zip

---

Phone

Fax

E-mail Address

Please complete this form and send it along to:

Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW

Suite 200

Washington DC 20036

Fax: 202-261-6517

Email: [Michael.Sessa@PESC.org](mailto:Michael.Sessa@PESC.org)

PESC's tax ID# is 52-2179499.

\*\* Registration for the Fall 2007 Summit must be made online at [www.PESC.org](http://www.PESC.org). \*\*



# PROXY BALLOT

STANDARDS FORUM FOR EDUCATION  
STEERING COMMITTEE ELECTIONS  
JANUARY 1, 2008 – DECEMBER 31, 2008

PLEASE VOTE FOR SEVEN (7) NOMINEES:

- |                          |                 |                                      |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | BARRY BILLING   | ONTARIO COLLEGE APPLICATION SERVICES |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | ADRIANA FARELLA | COLLEGE BOARD                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | HOLLY HYLAND    | US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | ROBERT KING     | CITIBANK                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | ADELE MARSH     | EDUCATION FINANCE COUNCIL            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | RICHARD MOON    | SUNGARD HIGHER EDUCATION             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | EDDIE UPTON     | UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI            |

YOUR NAME:

YOUR ORGANIZATION:

DATE:

**ALL PROXY BALLOTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY PESC  
BY CLOSE OF BUSINESS WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 10, 2007:**

EMAIL: [MICHAEL.SESSA@PESC.ORG](mailto:MICHAEL.SESSA@PESC.ORG)

FAX: 202-261-6517

MAIL: POSTSECONDARY ELECTRONIC STANDARDS COUNCIL  
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW  
SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON DC 20036



STANDARDS FORUM FOR EDUCATION  
STEERING COMMITTEE ELECTIONS

## NOMINEE BACKGROUND

### **BARRY BILLING**

ONTARIO COLLEGE APPLICATION SERVICES  
(OCAS)

#### SENIOR BUSINESS ANALYST

Barry has been with OCAS for 12 years, working in various application development positions and has been the Canadian Representative on the ACCRAO SPEEDE Committee since March 2005. Over the last four years, Barry has also been the project manager and business analyst for a college-wide initiative to convert Ontario's 28 community colleges from producing paper transcripts to being able to send and receive electronic transcripts. To date 25 colleges have become electronic trading partners. Within the last year, Barry has also been involved in promoting the PESC XML High School transcript solution within Ontario. Presently three of the largest provincial school boards (representing over 200 schools) have been using XML solutions. Barry's goal is to have 20 boards submitting XML transcripts within the next 18 months.

### **ADRIANA FARELLA, INCUMBENT** COLLEGE BOARD

#### EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, STRATEGY & ANALYTICS, ENROLLMENT

Adriana Farella has spent her entire career working with colleges and universities in the use of technology to support their academic mission. Whether working directly on a campus or for a technology company, Adriana has held key leadership positions. Since February, 2007, she has served as The College Board's Executive Director, Strategy & Analytics for the Enrollment Division. Prior to that, she was the Director of Product and Industry Strategy at Xap Corporation, and spent 8 years at PeopleSoft as the Director of Product Planning for the PeopleSoft Student Administration Solution suite. Prior to her work at software companies, Adriana spent fifteen years working on campuses in New England in the area of Enrollment Services, at the University of Massachusetts/Boston, and Wellesley, Pine Manor, and Hampshire Colleges. She has been active in NEACRAO, AACRAO, Educause, and PESC, where she is currently chairing the Admissions Application Workgroup, and serving on the Steering Committee for the past two years.

### **HOLLY HYLAND, INCUMBENT** OFFICE OF FEDERAL STUDENT AID US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

#### MANAGEMENT ANALYST

Holly has over 20 years of experience in financial aid. For 16 years, she worked in colleges and universities aid offices with a concentration in financial aid systems. She worked for one year at KPMG where she was lead of the Common Record initiative. She has worked for FSA for six years where she serves as liaison for standards organizations. In addition, she remains lead for the Common Record initiative and is the business owner of the XML Registry and Repository for the Education Community.

### **ROBERT KING, INCUMBENT** CITIBANK, THE STUDENT LOAN CORPORATION

#### DIRECTOR OF INDUSTRY INITIATIVES

Bob has been with Citibank for over 29 years, with the last 24 of those dedicated to the student loan industry. Over the years, he has managed most operations and technical areas at one time or another. He is completing his 6<sup>th</sup> term on the PESC Standards Forum Steering Committee, is currently serving as co-chair of the NCHelp Electronic Standards Committee (ESC), and also serves as the lender representative on the NCHelp ESC Steering Committee. Bob also chaired the NCHelp Default Management Committee.

### **ADELE MARSH, INCUMBENT** EFC

#### VICE PRESIDENT OF E-COMMERCE INITIATIVES, AES

Adele is the AES Vice President of e-Commerce Initiatives and has over 30 years of experience in the financial aid industry. Adele actively participates in numerous industry initiatives and is the Mapping Your Future Data Exchange Team Leader, Co-Chair of the Meteor Advisory Team, and



## STANDARDS FORUM FOR EDUCATION STEERING COMMITTEE ELECTIONS

### NOMINEE BACKGROUND

(CONTINUED)

presently serves on the Standards Forum for Education Steering Committee.

#### **RICHARD MOON**

SUNGARD HIGHER EDUCATION

#### PRODUCT MANAGER, INTEGRATION & SOA

Richard has been delivering software solutions for more than 23 years. He has worked for SunGard Higher Education for 17 years and has filled various roles including Banner Human Resources Development Manager, Workflow Developer, Professional Services Project Manager and Luminis Portal Consultant. In his current role Richard is responsible for the future direction and planning of the Banner Unified Digital Campus with regard to Systems Integration and Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) adoption. As SunGard Higher Education continues to move forward in developing a SOA based platform for institution-to-institution information exchange it is vitally important to us that we contribute to, and take full advantage of, industry standards such as those developed by the PESC organization.

#### **EDDIE UPTON, INCUMBENT**

UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

#### SYSTEMS ANALYST MANAGER

Eddie Upton earned a Bachelor in Management Science, Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis Emphasis from California State University – San Bernardino. From September 1993 to October 2002 he worked at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff, Arizona in the Office of Institutional Research in the position of Management Analyst, Senior Management Analyst Principal, and the University Data Administrator. Currently Eddie is the Systems Analyst Manager at The University of Mississippi as development lead for Student Administration and Academic Structure.