Energy Market Information Exchange Technical Committee  
Minutes for Thursday, 16 June 2011, 11:00am EDT

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approve minutes from 19 May 2011  
4. Working Draft 30 overview  
5. Review Jira Issues from Public Review Draft 02
   Jira Issues - Need Volunteers  
   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-465  
   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-467  
   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-470  
   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-471
   Jira Issues for TC Decisions:  
   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-403  
   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-404  
   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-409  
   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-468  
   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-469
   others as required
6. Review Schedule 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
Sharon Dinges  Trane
Gerald Gray*  Southern California Edison
Anne Hendry*  Individual
David Holmberg*  NIST
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: 11 of 11 (100%)
   Members: 12 of 41 (29%)
   Meeting achieved quorum.

3. Approve minutes from 19 May 2011
   Phil Davis moves to approve.
   Josh Phillips seconds.
   Jeremy R and Aaron S: Abstain.
   Joshua P: I should have been counted as a voting member on 19 May.
   Anne H: Not listed in Kavi as a voting today either.
   ACTION: Bill – check and update Joshua's voting status.
   Minutes approved with correction as needed to Joshua P's voting status.

4. Working Draft 30 overview (Toby C)
   Bill C: Aaron and Toby redid this draft. This is a release candidate draft.
   Toby C: Substantial edits but none of that general shuffling as before. Primarily readability edits.
   Bill:
   Need complete full, in order, coherent draft to work with so need to get issues clarified in next day or two. Also need to finish to some extent the remaining Jira issues.

5. Review Jira Issues from Public Review Draft 02
   Bill C:
   Don't assume that if you mention an issue on a call it will be addressed.
   Any issues that you want addressed must be put in Jira.

   Jira Issues - Need Volunteers:

   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-465
   Aaron S:
   Note I volunteered for this issue. I noted which elements had already been addressed, cloned the issue to address those left over and recommend putting them into wd31. Now it is issue 471.
   Bill C: No longer need volunteer – covered by Jerry Gray's comments.

   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-467  (Ancillary Services)
   Toby C: Entire chapter is 3 paragraphs. Needs review. Can anyone can speak to this?
   Phil Davis: I can.
   ACTION: Phil Davis will review this section of wd30 per issue 467.

   http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-470
   Seeking someone who knows something about “Offer Segments” to take a look
   Phil D. and Joshua P. will look at table 13-5, line 1048.
http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-471
Toby C:
All taken care of except IEC TC57 reference. Someone who knows the CIM better could run through and send me which are the ones to reference?
Bill C:
Might be better to reference in the two or three places where used then leave it up to others to find specific documents if we don't have fine references.
Jerry G:
In this draft all TC57 references were correct except for one reference to IEC 61970-301 as noted.
ACTION TOBY clean up references to TC57.
Accept issue 471.

Jira Issues for TC Decisions:

http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-403 (17.2 Miscellaneous Business Rules)
Toby C:
We put rules at the end of the conformance section but haven't reviewed so need to decide on each and what to do with the section.

* If the first Interval in a series has a Price only,
  all Intervals in the Sequence have a Price only and there is no Price in the Product.
* If the first Interval in a series has a Quantity only,
  all Intervals in the Sequence have a Quantity only and there is no quantity in the Product.
* If the first Interval in a series has a Price & Quantity,
  all Intervals in the Sequence MUST have a Price and Quantity
  and there is neither Price not Quantity in the Product.
* All Intervals in a Sequence may be restricted to single service location.

Ed C:
What happens if no intervals have Price and quantity? Other things vary by Interval...what if there is Price and some other element – like a ramp rate? Or some other aspect?
Toby C: If there is anything beyond a Price then you get full inheritance.
Ed C:
If I make a tender that has 1mw, 2mw, 3mw, 4mw, each with a different price, can I buy any one, or all? What's the connection?
Toby C: It's ok to have a different EMIX Delivery for each.
Bill C: Changes as discussed, no objections.

http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-404
Jerry G: Yes, this is good.
Bill C: Fixed, close.

http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-409
Jerry G:
IEC WG13 does 61970-301 which has the specification for MRID. I'm not aware of separate document that addresses MRID, but I can check to see if there is anything showing how to build an MRID.
Bill C: We don't want a cookbook for an MRID.
Jerry G:
The other piece of the issue, then, is a bit more of a sticky wicket. The ramp rate curve described in 13.1 (line 989) isn't the CIM ramp rate curve. The challenge is the class structure. CIM uses very simple constructs with one attribute that describes the curve “style/shape”. Then use X and Y units and multipliers. So the classes themselves do not map.
Bill C: Suggestions?
Jerry G:
If EMIX is handling this differently, then we should delete reference to the CIM because it could potentially lead people down the wrong path. That is the simplest solution. The other solution is more complicated. We could put the CIM ramp rate type definitions representation into EMIX. This is problematic, though, because then there would be 2 ways to represent this information. The other way is to figure out a mapping. Currently these do not look the same.
Bill C:
We could harmonize/rationalize this, but it would be more work and don't know if we can fit that in to the timeline. Rather we could demonstrate how it could be mapped and leave that to the implementer. That is probably all we need. Suggest a non-normative appendix. The deeper question is ‘what is the value of the different approaches’. We're not talking about class structures, we're talking about expressing ramp rates. The EMIX description does express change over time, so does the CIM model. This feels like a non-normative excursion to find a way to say 'here is an equivalent', but not claiming a normative transform.
Jerry G:
But then are we pushing off a problem to the future? If we have people following/implementing both the 301 ramp rate in the CIM and the EMIX method it may cause problems later.
Bill C:
In a perfect world we'd nail down every potential issue, but think this is the second comment we've received on this through two reviews. Is this an issue for the IRC for 1.0?
Joshua P:
Not sure how much involvement it would take to test the mapping. We rely on the CIM pretty heavily. We did have several comments generally on use of CIM.
Bill C: We do need to get the non-normative equivalent narrative correct.
Jeremy R: Is it reasonable to assume SEP uses the same ramp rate curve?
Bill C: Think that's irrelevant.
Bill C:
Need a small group to look at this and make decision and put it in prd03, do one more pass. ACTION: Bill, Toby, Joshua, and Jerry meet Friday 3pm EDT to sort this out, create narrative.

Bill C:
We need this as a final candidate so we can have it out by Sunday night and have Monday/T/W to look at it before a potential vote on Thursday. Don't want major changes to the schema Sunday. EOB this week would be best.

http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-468 (Peak Time Rebate is blank)
Ed C:
This is a Demand Response type program wherein you have a Full Requirements rate then offer a high price to buy back through certain hours and pay as a rebate against what was forecast.
Bruce B:
Peak Time Rebate (PTR) C&I, ResidentialIncentive rate in which the utility pays Customers to reduce demand during peak periods on critical days.
Bill C: So how it's paid and verified is out of scope? Ed C: Yes, I'd say so.
http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-469 (Duration in RampSegment -> Ramp Duration)

Aaron S:
May be nice if Duration in RampSegment is called RampDuration. It's the impulse between bracketing things with more and more unique XML or keeping as native types. Why say Object:Ramp:RampDuration rather than Object:Ramp:Duration?

Bill C: It's better if left as is.

Aaron S:
I don't mind leaving Duration but need to have it "defined" the same everywhere or say "see Duration Section x.y". Then the application of "Duration" can be explained at each instance. The underlying issue is that "Duration" appears several times and appears to be "defined" differently each time which makes it confusing.

Bill C:
Done with Jira issues. There were also editorial issues. Are those taken care of?

http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-472 Tiers

Bill C:
Just fine. If my accumulation period is 1st to 1st and I'm on the 13th, to act on that I'd like to say already used 70% of the month and I need to be more aggressive, or first days only 5%, the same.

Bruce B: It's a meter read issue - not a requirement. Close, no fix.

6. Review Schedule for Public Review Draft 03

Bill C:
- All diagrams need updating
- Completion of processing and changes to editorial comments
- All big issues needed to be addressed for PRD 03 (targeted as final)
- IRC comments
- Closing issues (mostly editorial)

What else to discuss right now? None.

7. Adjourn

Jerry G: Move to adjourn.

Phil D: Second.

No objections.

Adjourned 12:18 EDT.