

Energy Market Information Exchange Technical Committee

Minutes for Thursday, 14 January 2010, 11:00am EDT

Agenda:

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approve Minutes of 2010-01-07 meeting
4. Action Items (http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/emix/members/action_items.php)
5. PAP03 Status Meeting summary (Ed Cazalet, Bill Cox, Toby Considine)
6. Progress in scheduling CIMTool/IEC TC57 CIM session (Bill Cox)
7. How to work on the specification (Toby Considine)
8. Review EMIX Working Draft 2 (Bill Cox)
<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35925/emix-1%200-spec-wd-02.pdf>
9. Adjourn

Attendees: Member / Company (* = voting)

Timothy Bennett	Drummond Group Inc.
Edward Cazalet*	The Cazalet Group
Toby Considine*	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*
William Cox*	Cox Software Architects LLC
Anne Hendry*	Individual
David Holmberg*	NIST
Perry Krol*	TIBCO Software Inc.
Alex Levinson*	Lockheed Martin
Jeremy Roberts	LonMark International
Sharon Dinges	Trane

Minutes:

1. Call to Order

Ed C: Call to order.

2. Roll Call

Anne H: Roll Call. Meeting achieved quorum (51%).

Voting Members: 7 of 13 (**53%**)

Individual Attendance Members: 10 of 44 (**22%**)

3. Approve Minutes of 2009-12-17 meeting

Ed C.: Motion to approve; Toby C. second; Bill C.: Objections? None. Minutes approved.

4. Action Items

#001 Schedule discussions of modeling tools. Scheduling jointly with EI. In progress.

#006 Develop white paper on pricing structure/model. No update today.

5. PAP03 Status Meeting summary (Ed Cazalet, Bill Cox, Toby Considine)

Details on this Priority Action Plan are at

<http://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sggrid/bin/view/SmartGrid/PAP03PriceProduct>

This was a public meeting to give a brief review on overall progress and an opportunity for discussion related to Priority Action Plan 3, Price and Product Definition.

Ed C. : There was a fair amount of discussion on which set of actors to use circling back to what's on NIST web site. Will follow up separately on uniformity in actor names.

Bill C. : Had joint meeting yesterday. Decision made to meet more or less monthly as events warrant. The priceaction@nist.gov email list is the place to find out about that. Send mail to David Holmberg to join.

6. Progress in scheduling CIMTool/IEC TC57 CIM session (Bill Cox)

Bill C.: We had a good response to the poll to schedule time on either Mon Feb 1 or Fri Feb 5. Expect to announce date early next week. Might use webinar capabilities as used for PAPs.

7. How to work on the specification (Toby Considine)

Please submit comments through the group list, tied to line numbers. There is enough to start looking at what we have now. Bill working on schema content.

8. Review EMIX Working Draft 2 (Bill Cox)

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35925/emix-1%200-spec-wd-02.pdf>

Toby C.:

Section 2.1 Intro is meant to give justification for why there may be a wholesale element, or some way to identify if we're looking at wholesale, retail, etc. At some point it may be a data item (eg. wholesale a proxy for 'not=everything-included')

Bill C. :

Section 2.2 Table 1 are required elements. Some blanks in 'Note' column because had editing problem with getting content into cells -- not purposeful.

Section 2.3 Table 2 are optional elements, here more speculative.

Even in required elements you can subset.

e.g. If you're a device that can understand context, do you need to carry currency code?

Some may be more complex than need to be in other environments (like microgrid)

Toby C. :

Page 9 -- only boiler plate; need conformance statements and clauses here also important to have things related to conformance through out document may be part of 'to conform you must include following elements ...'

The rest is template and placeholder -- unproductive to discuss front matter.

The meat is Section 2 and start of work in 1.3 and 1.4 on references.

Still much editorial work to do there -- will pick things up as we go.

Ed C. :

What are we trying to do with the required elements? If I'm operating in an open, competitive, mature market, I don't need details of source of power. If I buy power from an ISO they don't know where the power came from. In many markets, environmental aspects are stripped off and traded separately as renewable energy cert or carbon cert. So some elements such as source might be subsumed under MarketID.

On other hand, if looking at energy interoperation to dispatch energy resources and want to know what's behind the meter so I know how to operate it, is that inclusive, or is that beyond scope?

Bill C. :

One of the key notions is that you need actionable info; at the end point, whatever that is, you need to know what you have and definition of a product. An indirect definition of product through the MarketID is a problem because it doesn't bring out market characteristics; you need differentiation of sources -- if sources are combined then percentage of everything you get is combined. The motivation for emix was to have differentiation of source as part of actionable information. There may be situations where you only know x% -- that's why I put source detail. If what I want to buy is a certain class of power at a separate price the only way to do that is to have submarkets, so find the use of source to be critical. Now, ISO New England assumes 10% of what they have is legally defined renewables (wind/solar), making 5% solar as solar and 5% wind as wind and 90% may be divided between coal, hydro, nuclear, etc. So by differentiating the source we can create separate markets and incentives for different sources. That's why source is in there; about the 3rd thing that was in the working drafts after price, units, and quantity. View is to be able to express that situation. So differentiation of source, with that argument, how can aggregator say 'we're selling you wind power'. This allows you to look beyond the aggregation and look to the source.

Ed C. :

The way it works now in the ISOs -- they will designate a "green product" and create "renewable energy certificates" so if I have solar, wind, small hydro, MWatt-Hours from those are separately tagged, certificates created, then can be sold to anyone who wants to be assured. Electrons are sold separately. Attributes are accounted for and separately traded. Recognize that as a current practice.

Bill C. :

Would be grate to have those thoughts written and send them in referencing line numbers.

We need to be informed by certain existing practices but can't let them control what we do.

Toby C. :

The goal is to look forward, not just at how current markets are operating, but beyond current markets. Useful to think of what Moldak said - these are all terms and conditions.

Bill C. :

Element location -- we talked about point of use, point of delivery, tied to structure of some markets. So one work item is to clarify what 'location' is; something to do with price, but what form that is described in, or alternate form, so someone interested in that should write this up. Issues and tradeoffs. Another is currency code -- reason is that already there is a currency codes in use; standardized and listed here. but other types of currency that are not tradable. What if using emix in a microgrid. What would be the currency? Want people to step up for specific sections so we can have this type of detailed discussion.

Toby C. :

Some of the topics already brought up in this morning's email; want to go back to earlier agenda: one topic per thread; need paper trail so better in email not meeting minutes.

David H.:

Market id and contract id. Possibly combined? May change the price depending on customer/contract; retail may be coupon or non-profit. Modifiers for contract (say I'm a non profit) make price dependent on the customer/contract.

Bill C. :

Interesting point: almost the counterparty discussion that we had a while back. Think that in terms of use, counter-parties belong in the things surrounding (the data element that would include the emix pieces). Also, in market, doesn't depend on who customer is, but what customer has purchased may play in to adapting to current markets. Complicated area inspired by DR program in EI -- nature of what you're doing and paying depends on the contract, which may say who or what you are.

Toby C. :

If one thing we're buying is existing blended package, may want wind and reliable; then may be buying on flat curve, but according to a contract or program that is not necessarily environmental. Agree generally but may be conditions that blur that. If I'm a hospital buying the blended power option, someone else may be doing arbitrage. Definitely contract terms associated with things, particularly in a blended market.

Bill C. :

The base philosophy of emix price needing to be actionable is what has guided what's in 'required' vs 'optional'

Ed C. : Please explain what is an 'actionable price' vs 'non-actionable price'?

Bill C. :

The term as I have been using it means:

Information that can help end point (consumer) to make choices of action or inaction

eg. price that says 'here is your current price and there may be a price break if you buy less /more but here is the price and contract identifier (information)

eg. tariffs' don't provide actionable price because of the complexity so getting to a point where anyone that can't understand six pages of tariffs can make a choice as to whether to accelerate or decelerate consumption, that is actionable information. Need to keep in mind price responsive devices and buildings.

Bill C. :

Page 8: carbon or carbon units correlated to source; reasonable extension to working markets.

Toby C. :

Attributes for certain markets. If certificates of carbon eligible here, should have the same sort of WS-Calendar attributes as EMIX itself. Some markets may be water credits because water is more expensive to extract. Might be general certificates, stripped, resold, used, reused, with or without. Is emix a single thing or a stack; as simple as here is power/price or complex as here is power with x,y,z attached. This is the first illustration of that question.

Bill C. :

Good point. Also design questions such as with counterparty (external or internal).

Is it something that makes sense to combine, or not? Have an extension mechanism.

Toby C. :

Part of the problem of EMIX is to address the issue of certificates, and the information exchange that certificates raise, sold with or without the electrons.

Ed C. :

I think of a certificate, once stripped, is just another product which can be described in this framework.

Bill C. :

Various cap and trade proposals looked at through lense of actionable info: a carbon credit or tax, that is determined in a year or so is much less actionable than what's carried with a product when the product is sold.

Toby C. : Information needs to be revealed proximate to the decision to use or produce the resource.
Ed C.:

California tried to pass through tax to consumer, but was too complex;
at that point in time question of whether valuable to carry carbon information in that market.
Unless you internalize the external cost of carbon all the decisions up the chain become complex.
If ISO NE wants to do a dispatch that is environmentally sensitive, how do they do that unless the
total price includes the price of carbon.

Jeremy R.:

Does this mean we should not address this on a technical level just because it was not implemented
in practice?

Bill C. : Good discussion but have to wrap up by pointing out the many things here not thoroughly
thought out (eg. diff between program contract id and market id -- a broad discussion) and remind
everyone to write up their ideas as parts of the spec and send to the list so they can be discussed and
included in the document.

Als for everyone: write it down, send it to list, craft a paragraph, each item needs discussion;
keep them single message for each item.

9. Adjourn

Bill C.: Motion to adjourn. Anne H: Second. Bill C: Objections? None.

Adjourned 12:13 EST

Next meeting January 21, 2010