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Attending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Cox, chair</td>
<td>Cox Software Architects, EML</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Holmberg, co-chair</td>
<td>NIST</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby Considine, secretary</td>
<td>TC9, EML</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolf Bienert</td>
<td>OpenADR Alliance</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elysa Jones</td>
<td>Datacast Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Thomas</td>
<td>EPRI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Agenda

1. Approve minutes (April 22) Deferred to May 27 meeting
2. Review action items
3. Update on FIX, ISO relationships
4. Privacy—OASIS options and what we want to do
5. Review and discussion of WD04
   a. Comments
   b. Direction
   c. Solicit detailed comments for WD05 to be posted by May 25 for May 27 meeting
6. New business
7. Adjourn

Meetings

- Approval of 4/08 EITC minutes (we did not meet on 3/25) with minor corrections

- Review action items
  - New
    - Bill Toby David sketch public meeting on current work on CTS
    - ALL review and provide comments leading to WD05 for next meeting

- Privacy and Security Section (Elysa + Toby + TC)
  - Privacy and security – RFC8322 and earlier 6973.
  - Document security and privacy concerns.
  - Toby: STIX is kind of old?
  - Out of Band (OOB) contracts are part of the exchanges; relevant to how the actor concept is fleshed out.
  - Bill—is it viable to separate these concerns?
  - Rolf—OpenADR2 went through a lot of reviews with NIST, IEC and others related to privacy and security.
  - Bill—what do I need to know to craft a specification? Example of food manufacturers buying things they don’t use or need to confuse watchers.
➢ Toby—Tenders – if a tender is published, scrub the parties? Only if not advertised? Tenders may be visible in market information, which we’ve not defined, so describe as a concern?
➢ Design information so don’t share about individuals and choices.
➢ Toby if tender public but respecting privacy - encrypted between market and party. Market must know.
  ▪ Some actor has to know, no one else has to know.
  ▪ When I buy stocks see High/Low/last - don’t know who bought them. Not my business as a participant in the market. Clearly the exchange knows - must distinguish precisely between market as everyone in the room, or exchange trading floor, or something else.
  ▪ Not distinguishing between those.
  ▪ A participant makes a tender, should it be exposed to other participants in the market.
  ▪ David—are exchanges encrypted?
➢ Is the “individual” any actor? –yes
➢ Focus on messages and payloads. If a message is required so that the market works, then it should be there, otherwise not.
➢ Bill—presuming that a published tender has additional information; we still need to examine issues.
➢ Encryption of exchanges necessary?
➢ Toby—Start by describing the nouns, then message types, so we get to understanding implications.
➢ Elysa—A good start, with evolutionary changes to follow.
➢ Next steps: Review RFCs, may provide guidance on which elements of a message MAY need protection or privacy concerns addressed.

❖ Comments on WD04
  ➢ Detailed notes available; actions taken in detailed comments post-meeting
  ➢ Delivery—after online discussion (PENDING)
  ➢ SiScale – historical, based on possible standard. Didn’t happen, suggest backing out to exponent (e.g. 3 = kilo, -2 = centi). Not mantissa – core value should be integer/long, not float.
  ➢ Detailed comments David prior to meeting; Bill to provide marked up DOCX post-meeting.

❖ New Business
  ➢ Rolf – are we getting to the point where we should schedule a call with the OpenADR Alliance members to present the TC’s high and low level plans?
    ▪ Discussion—sound like late June/early July is the right time frame
    ▪ ACTION Bill Toby David sketch public meeting on current work on CTS

❖ Adjourned 12:40pm EDT