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Agenda

1. Approve minutes (2/25, 3/11)
2. Review action items
3. Privacy—OASIS options and what we want to do
4. CTS design principles discussion: CTS WD3 Section 2.2 Tables 1, 2, p12-13
5. Plan for moving CTS to public review
6. Update on FIX, ISO relationships
7. New business
8. Adjourn

Discussion

1. Approval of 2/25 and 3/11 EITC minutes (we did not meet on 3/25)
   - Looked at minutes documents and unanimous approval.
   - March 11 Toby moved to approve minutes as amended. David seconded.
   - Feb 25 Elysa moved to approve. Bill second. Unanimous consent.
2. Review action items:
   a. Carryover:
      1. BILL Look at OpenADR RegisterParty service.
         - Useful, setup interaction. Done.
      2. BILL send notes on the Position Service to list.
         - Not done.
   b. New
      3. ACTION TOBY Ensure this design principle and application approach is expressed.
         - Today’s discussion. Closed.
      4. ACTION BILL write down avoid TP issues - failover is OK.
         - Not done.
      5. NOTE ACTION BILL TOBY list of necessary terms for CTS. Do we need transport?
         - Today’s discussion. Transport is a product.
      6. Bill dig into schema and clean up UML expression
         - Working on it. Closed.
      7. check on use of Newton-anything in EU
• not an issue. Closed.
8. REREAD 2.3 - must understand for this to make sense. Schema complies with 2.3
  • No problems. Discuss today. Closed.

3. Privacy
  • Action: Elysa will look at this and make recommendations. Toby will support.
  • Discussion:
    o OASIS board required section addressing privacy implications for this standard. Template “to do” currently Appendix B.
    o What is the privacy expectation for market exchanges? Expect privacy, although resulting transaction is public.
    o Different markets may have different rules.
    o Expect privacy upstream. Fractal microgrid market will only pass aggregated data upstream.
    o We can point out possible security/privacy traps in implementation to help implementers avoid these.

4. CTS design principles
  • We reviewed CTS WD03 section 2.2 tables. Some language needs adjusted in Table 1.
  • Action Bill to rewrite 2.2.1 including Table 2.
  • Action all to review section 2.2
  • Discussion:
    o Idea that CTS spec is an “application profile” for EI, and that the audience is implementers. We should be able to give this to NJIT students to get grounded on what they are working on.
    o Table 1 does not mention “resource” but uses “commodity”. Toby agreed this was an error. Action Toby to replace.
    o Market engine belongs directly under Market
    o Add reference for “actor”
    o Some discussion of market context, but didn’t want to delve into that. Agree we need some example in the table 1 definition.
    o Some discussion of Table 2
      ▪ “core” functions (most important operational services) of tender and transaction.
      ▪ We also have config service like registration (or that may be an ongoing thing in OADR). And market context access.
      ▪ And then Quote, which we are still trying to see if we need. Seems not a core service. One use case raised by Toby is to serve the function of a next day event notice, “prices will be high”. If we only have real-time prices—then how to alert about likely high prices tomorrow? But if only RTP, then do we have a market at all? Still not clear.
      ▪ Table 2 column heading should not be “message categories”
      ▪ EI defines the services, not CTS. And CTS is agnostic on the network layer, rather only care about semantics.
      ▪ Discussion of each entry:
        • Registration is about getting a PartyID
        • Quote
Accomplished now through a variety of ways. Could be via a market ticker or reporter. Could be via an approach to submitting tenders at different prices similar to a load curve (what I am willing to pay for a certain amount of power).

And how reliable is the quoter?

Could also use the Transactive State as “indication of interest” for a tender (?) but then implementers have to pay attention to this. Not clear it is a better solution.

Back to “who needs this?”

- Market context, just a URI. Maybe not resolvable.
- Delivery
  - problematic. Do we want to define or even require a service to implement when no one needs it (now)? Maybe wait until later when someone needs it.
  - For now, get meter data in different ways, typically from the meter owner (utility).
  - TeMix uses this it seems. How?
  - Toby made the point that people are confused about how CTS works until they see “delivery”. But David made comment that we could explain the whole process in CTS spec without introducing a delivery service.
- Position—Bill thinks we don’t need it (certainly not core), that any client could monitor transactions to track position. Toby says he thinks we need it.

5. Getting CTS to public review
   - Don’t think we can push this out until we believe we have agreement on 2.2
   - Bill suggested sending the spec out to NJIT students and others who might implement this and get their informal input prior to a PR.
   - Once these tables start to stabilize, can look at the payloads - this is what we need, or that’s irrelevant.
   - Want the stuff small and light. All our goals about widespread energy systems have to rely on actor systems, small number of simple messages.

6. ISO and FIX
   - Waiting on OASIS counsel for draft liaison agreement.

7. New business
   - none

**ACTIONS**

1. Carryover:
   a. BILL send notes on the Position Service to list.
   b. ACTION BILL write down avoid TP issues - failover is OK.
   c. Bill dig into schema and clean up UML expression

2. New
   a. ACTION ALL—review CTS WD03 2.2 and provide feedback
   b. Action Toby, edit 2.2 and Table 1, per notes above
   c. Action Bill, edit 2.3.1 and Table 2, per notes above
d. Action: Elysa will look at OASIS privacy statement requirements and make recommendations. Toby will support.

Adjourned 12:38pm EST

DGH