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Agenda

1. Roll Call
2. Approve Minutes (April 22)
3. Review Action Items
4. Privacy
5. WD05 review
6. Update on FIX and ISO
7. New Business
8. Adjourn

Discussion

1. Approval of 4/22 minutes
   - Passed
2. Review action items:
   - skip
3. Privacy
   - Elysa working, out today.
4. WD05
   1. Rolf hasn’t had a read yet.
   2. Bill asked him to review sections 2 and 3
   3. Comments sent to email list, not all repeated here
   4. Section 1
      - Add ref to actor model, line 236
      - 305 YA def of services...
      - Still need more for privacy
      - Line 348, the EMIX committee not in operation, make any changes in EI. Use local simplified EMIX instead of EMIX Spec.
      - 381 Highlight which duration we are talking about (line 381)
      - 383 inheritance. Follow this on building up to instrument. Section might need addl tightening. Inherit a product to create an instrument. Submit a bid for a specific by creating a price.
• 413, wave at FSGIM
• B We could do a diagram of conformance links to FSGIM via EI EMIX WS-Calendar 1.0; after discussion does not seem useful at present.

5. Section 2
• 2.2 need Rolf’s review. Lots of blood on page.
• 2.3 CTS architecture vs. earlier architecture section. Maybe keep 511ff and delete 501-510. Bill—good enough. Request to Rolf to point out anything that is confusing or repetitive.
• 2.3.1 still struggling to call these services. 523 vs. 534—don’t like categories, don’t like types either. Types overloaded.
• Toby suggest to ask this question to programmer friends.
• eiTender is a service with service messages. Families of messages.
• Table 2-2 are all services. But we are doing an actor model, not SOA.
• We’ve gone from defining interactions, skipped over focus on payload (REST vs. SOAP or SBE) since that is irrelevant, so abstract away comms, but lurking underneath are SOA interaction patterns. Look at payload, not how it gets there.
• Actors and sub actors? One entry point, spawn sub actor to deal with interactions with market, one for quotes and history?
• Strong typing - traffic cop.
• Next 2.3.2 mostly benign. Keep it.
• 2.3.3 responses copied from EI. Anyone using it? Doesn’t impact rest of document. OADR uses them.

6. Sect 3—the things we build messages out of.
• 576 resources. is it clear what’s in EMIX and what’s in CTS?
• 586 Warrant discussion - loathe to toss overboard, but CTS markets may not have them.
  o committee discussed notions of going to warrants - what does that mean?
  o interop vs. market reality. Cautionary note is a start, but more discussion required. Don’t want back doors to evolve the meaning of what you are buying and selling, but that impacts interop. Add a warrant then changes the product.
  o B concerned about damaging simplicity.
  o T want anybody’s client to interact with anyone else.
  o If someone has a warrant on their product definition do we want the agent that doesn’t support warrant.
  o Principle of interior - accept almost an thing, messages should be tightly conformed.
  o B wizard who understand, not interoperable.
  o Different product = different market
  o Reality, some strip warrants and then sell in different market.
  o Generator can sell into whatever market it can (highest value) and a customer might buy energy from different markets with different warrants/flavors.
  o Instrument is product pinned down with time.
Problem is optional warrant that changes nature of product. How does a DER address those issues?
- Brooklyn neighborhood—buying power from a neighbor.
- Warrants may be a bad way to start
- B concerned that we might ignore the core compatibility issues where the energy is the same, but a different product.
- B saying warrants may be the wrong mechanism.
- T confusion to either
  1. haven’t defined the resource product instrument clearly enough
  2. Haven’t made it clear that combination is a different product
- Leave text for now. But warrant seems to change product.

• Think about terms. Examples? Terms in marketcontext? No. But what is the point of terms outside market context? I don’t care what your limitations are unless you can’t deliver. “in CTS all terms go with the market”
• Terms - mostly how you effect a particular transformer’s interactions with a wholesale market...
• T: Have anything be imported into standard behavior of the market but doesn’t require it.
• Some terms may be ignorable.
• Standard terms - could go in table 3-6.
• Terms EMIX vs. EI. Optimization—standard terms from EMIX—review and ask if they have any place in CTS.
• B perhaps keep with services and operations - may be better than categories and types.
• T discussion of term “facet” – ACTION Bill review and modify consistent with EI service and service operation content.
• Difference between not preferred and obnoxious

5. Other business
   1. EITC webpage needs an update.
      • Brief description of current work
      • Rolf wants to talk about what we’re doing
      • Include what Alliance is doing
   2. Rolf’s request for info for book chapter
      • Book chapter on standardizing DR and DSM. Brief history of DR, then OADR traditional DR, then where we think it’s going—DER apps, storage, EVs, then interesting to describe TE stuff, difference between P2P, utility-customer, CA RATES, conclude with work in EITC. Why we care why we are doing this. Interact with any market
      • Implementations. Project underway but NDA.
      • OADR2 fine now for non-TE world. A more TE world could put out an offer to provide power in place of utility.
   3. OpenFMB
      • Opensourse effort in LFE
      • TE makes decisions, then OFMB implements.
      • DOE project
      • PNNL and Robert Tucker June TEWG
Can CTS talk to OFMB?
Agg control of facility DER, using what protocols? Sunspec, BACnst, modbus, or proprietary.
Can OFMB be operated from the edge.
OFMB on Github, no contributions
IPTF and OCPP, maybe Sunspec or 2030.5?
In NAESB now.

ACTIONS

1. Notes on edits for Toby.
2. Toby talk to programmers about service/category/type
3. SOA execution interaction patterns - think about text. Bill.
4. Bill review and modify service operation payload text possibly using facet terminology. Ensure consistent with EI service and service operation content.
5. All review WD06 and WD07 when available

Adjourned 12:30pm EDT
DGH