Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approve minutes of 19 May 2011
4. Definitions review
5. Issues from Public Review Draft 02
6. Plans for Public Review Draft 03
7. Adjourn

Attendees  Member / Company (* = voting)

Bruce Bartell*  Southern California Edison
Ed Cazalet*  Individual
Toby Considine*  University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
William Cox*  Individual
Phil Davis*  Schneider Electric
Anne Hendry*  Individual
David Holmberg*  NIST
Gerald Gray*  Southern California Edison
Joshua Phillips  ISO/RTO Council (IRC)
Jeremy Roberts*  LonMark International
Aaron Snyder*  NIST

Minutes

1. Call to Order
   Bill C: Call to order.

2. Roll Call (Anne H)
   Voting Members: 10 of 11 (90%)
   Members: 11 of 41 (26%)
   Meeting achieved quorum.

3. Approve minutes of 19 May 2011
   Deferred.

4. Definitions Review
   Anne H: Working through definitions. Could use more people for review. Many need updating to make sense in context. Aaron S and Ed C offer to help.
   Dave H: Would like to make make full pass first, triage, then can hand off.
5. **Issues from Public Review Draft 02**

Issue 407: Power Quality Definitions – needs more review.

**New Issues**

410: References to NAESB M&V business practices – needs input; please look and comment.
409: CIM definition sources w.r.t. MRID – needs more investigation.
406: Basic definitions from Haynes – Aaron is processing.
405: Separability of Price and Quantity –
    Perhaps Price, Product, Quantity are fully separable; may be able to do a better job of
    inheritance. Welcome discussion. Ed C: Is there a use case?
    Bill C: I'll set up a discussion on this.
403: Miscellaneous Business Rules not yet dealt with – deferred.
402: Improve clarity in example illustration – Dave H sent specific change to Toby C.
400: Marty Burns comments – Toby is responding.
398: Table 14 Transport Product 'Factor' – Added back 'Factor'
    Toby C: updated definition as per Anne H
    Ed C:
    There are different types of loss factors and other charges. When we lump them all together
    we have things that are duplicative which makes it confusing. Transport loss as used here is a
    general term referring to either transport or distribution. In some cases we talk about
    accounting for losses themselves. This is done several ways in different markets. We have a
    reasonable set of terms now where we can do almost any of them.
    Toby C:
    We deliberately stayed away from statements describing how energy markets worked in 2007.
    We want the definitions to be general and descriptive rather than tied to an old model.
392: Transactive States table
    Bill C:
    We're not defining processes but this allows for ensuring the EMIX payload conforms to
    certain transactions.
    Joshua P: Transactive sound like it refers to transactions - is that EMIX or EI related?
    Bill C: This is needed in the information artifact.
    Toby C:
    In EMIX it's a state – what info I'm giving you. Could go from A to D - different market
    patterns. The individual "this is what I'm doing now" is a single statement, and closer to a
    state than a process. If it were a process it might be in EI.
    Anne H:
    The part of the definition that says it is 'used to aid parsing and conformance' wasn't helpful.
    I changed it to what it is now as part of this issue. The term "state" in terms of transactive
    state was not the best term – sounds like more phases in a business process.
    Toby C: It's part of an interaction process...
    Anne H:
    Another point is that this is an important piece of information but is buried back in this table.
    If this defines interactions that are happening in EMIX this should go earlier in the document.
    It sounds like it refers to parts of the business process that you go through to have transactive
    interactions for the energy exchanges.
    Toby C: EMIX describes what's going on now – state transition diagrams would go in EI.
Anne H:
Is this a name for a set of information that is the payload for an exchange that's defined elsewhere? Unclear what information is being exchanged and whether this was a definition of an activity or the data that is being exchanged in an activity.
Joshua P: These looked like activities – state of the artifact in a transaction.

391: UID – What is this?
A unique identifier for an EMIX object. IRC specified MRID as the only identifier for conformance.
Toby C:
We need a unique (unambiguous) way to refer to an EMIX object. Should we add conformance rules for constructing and defining and using UIDs?
Bill C: Should we add a conformance statement for an implementation to say what a UID is?
Ed C:
EI and EMIX conformance testing vendor A and B may differ in how they set up testing.
Toby C:
Identify in conformance statement that you MUST have an ID.

390: Section 3 – being restructured.

383: Overuse of word 'entity' suggest changing to 'organization'
Toby C:
Don't want to perfect today's markets, want tomorrow's markets. Do we call them 'parties' or 'entities'? Is there an instance where a resource is not represented by an organization? TBD.

379: Naming and Design Rules
Useful, but can be done post-1.0 as separate non-normative white paper.

376: Price, Quantity, and Duration in Base Product
Bill C:
Ties to price and quantity. If fully separable may make things cleaner. Felt strongly that it shouldn't be that way for some time, now not certain. Hold offline discussion.

304: powerProductData extension to expose Block and Tier to parallel SEP 2
Bill C:
Have a variety of issues, some technical, some non-technical. SEP2 not able to construct all tariffs in today's model.
Ed C:
Goes back to underlying price and product, but not how computed – about how tariff is written and properly conveyed. Conform to simple EMIX – send prices and if you're at a certain tier the price changes. Send to HAN. Make sure EMIX can convey this.
Bill C: Can't convey cost - not computable.
Toby C:
It is the job of EMIX to convey a specific set of abstract actionable things, and we believe that by definition tariffs are not simple abstract things. Could deliver as a separate packet so SEP could try to enroll it.
Bill C: Is that adequate for anything above a certain level of complexity?
Toby C:
To the extent of my understanding of "block and tier tariffs" I did this in the existing XML. To the extent of my knowledge ... not certain if it's actionable.
Ed C: Ideally every price is a tender with an associated quantity.
Toby C: Normalize price and quantity. Never conveying multiple EMIXes at the same time. Just convey that precise scenario.
6. **Plans for Public Review Draft 03**
   Deferred.

7. **Adjourn**
   Adjourned 12:37 EDT.