

[<< Back to previous view](#)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-1] 35-36, 26? - Sentence is not complete** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 and Farrokh Albuyeh		

Resolution: Editorial issue corrected in next draft

**[ENERGYINTEROP-2] 33 - Nothing that limits it to DR. (Correct) Broader than DR.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Sean Crimmins</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 and Sean Crimmins		

Resolution: Sections entirely re-written

Description

See lines 37-41. Market quotes, reliability, bids, markets, load/generation. Days when more customers are engaged in energy markets. Also aggregators, interactions.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Sep/10 04:11 PM ]

Please make specific comments on current version as relates to this comment

**[ENERGYINTEROP-3] 33 - Combined heat and power - thermal. Later talk about Smart Grid, not just DR. Should be broad enough.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd13</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 and David Katz		

Resolution: Added a paragraph (3rd below illustration in intro) to meet this request.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 19/Aug/10 12:48 PM ]

Need to make sure we consider non-electricity energy products and services as we re-draft. While I'm thinking of it, the intro section needs to cover Scope, and call this out specifically.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Sep/10 04:16 PM ]

Added a paragraph (3rd below illustration in intro) to meet this request.

Do you approve?

**[ENERGYINTEROP-4] 49, 35 - OASIS SOA and TC - don't have the doc. Is there list of definitions and abbreviation.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 12/Apr/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 John Schwartz

<b>Resolution:</b>	It is against OASIS practices to redefine information from referenced standards, lest it create an inadvertent fork in the standard. The SOA Reference Architecture is normatively referenced in the document; please follow that reference for definitions and abbreviations.
--------------------	--

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 06/Sep/10 04:19 PM ]
It is against OASIS practices to redefine information from referenced standards, lest it create an inadvertent fork in the standard. The SOA Reference Architecture is normatively referenced in the document
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 12/Apr/11 08:39 PM ]
Edit, reopen, resolve, and apply to clean up Jira issues log.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-5] 33 - Lines 44-47 like the comments, didn't use elsewhere.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerry Gray		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-6] TOC - Section 1 - through. 2. guiding principles, philosophy. Section 3 vocabulary, specific services. 4 is architecture.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 15/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 David Holmberg		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Addressed with restructuring in WD13
--------------------	--------------------------------------

Description

Addressed with restructuring in WD13
--------------------------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-7] Conf - Conformance language - collaborate with SGIP SGTC?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Section re-written
--------------------	--------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-8] 208-240 - Question on diagram: Generator I assume is the power plant, not the DER? Not customer? Include the ISO to generator?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu

<b>Resolution:</b>	Noted comment. No assumption that generator and consumer are only parties. Someone selling, someone buying energy.  Noted comment. No presumption that the market Description DH Assumption for now, not trying to limit it. Smaller generator with some communication. Someone selling, someone buying energy. Show »
--------------------	--

Description  
DH Assumption for now, not trying to limit it. Smaller generator with some communication. Someone selling, someone buying energy.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-9] 212 - Should this be showing balancing operators as well, they have to coordinate the scheduling of generation resources.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Farrokh Albuyeh

Description  
Should this be showing balancing operators as well, they have to coordinate the scheduling of generation resources. If DR is being used as provider of ancillary services there has to be some coordination. Market, balancing operator in coordinating ancillary services.

Comments  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 03:04 PM ]  
Diagram is illustrative, not comprehensive. Comment noted.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-10] 212 - Should we be using info model that's already developed?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Rich Kalisch, David Katz

<b>Proposal:</b>	DH: When did figure, trying to show scope of EI, doesn't cover the whole of the 7 cloud diagram. Trying to simplify it.
<b>Resolution:</b>	When did figure, trying to show scope of EI, doesn't cover the whole of the 7 cloud diagram. Trying to simplify it.

Description  
Should we be using info model that's already developed? Under SGIP several pictures - including the Conceptual Model. Take actors relevant to DR in bold, others shaded. More than DR

**[ENERGYINTEROP-11] 252 - Should ref TCP, etc** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Dave Robin

<b>Proposal:</b>	Validate
<b>Resolution:</b>	Web services do not imply or require TCP or IP. See OASIS Public Review Draft, Reference Architecture for 283 Service Oriented Architecture Version 1.0, April 2008 285 <a href="http://docs.oasis-open.org/soa-rm/soa-ra/v1.0/soa-ra-pr-01.pdf">http://docs.oasis-open.org/soa-rm/soa-ra/v1.0/soa-ra-pr-01.pdf</a>

**[ENERGYINTEROP-12] [Non-Norm - Link for TeMIX, need other requirements](#)** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Link added in WD14
--------------------	--------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-13] [332 - Energy Information Service Provider should be EISP \(not ESP\). Possible typo.](#)** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Change made
--------------------	-------------

<b>Description</b>	Change made
--------------------	-------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-14] [316 - All electricity, gas and other energy industries are not included.](#)** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 David Katz		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Added Natutal Gas
--------------------	-------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-15] [316 - IRC - not sure if wholesale document. Done work in summarizing all the DR types of programs in the whole US.](#)** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

**Resolution:** IRC contributions were critical to development of this draft

Description

IRC - not sure if wholesale document. Done work in summarizing all the DR types of programs in the whole US. Do you know what I'm talking about. Albert will provide a list/reference. Adopt 1-3, serve as good example of what 1-3 means.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-16] 316 - National action plan for demand response. Tom send link/reference** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd12](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd14](#)

**Type:** Improvement **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Toby Considine](#) **Assignee:** [Toby Considine](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** SGIP-PAP09 Tom Grabowski

**Resolution:** Section re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-17] 343 - Says "chain of electricity" - in light of potential of Smart Grid should make as broad as possible.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd12](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd14](#)

**Type:** Improvement **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Toby Considine](#) **Assignee:** [Toby Considine](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** SGIP-PAP09 David Katz

**Resolution:** Section re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-18] 2.2.1 - Energy Interoperate support transaction energy, DR... broader than DR.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd12](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd14](#)

**Type:** Improvement **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Toby Considine](#) **Assignee:** [Toby Considine](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** SGIP-PAP09 Rich Kalisch

**Resolution:** Section re-written

Description

Energy Interoperate support transaction energy, DR... broader than DR. Eventually would encompass all transactional ... long term? Wholesale markets for ancillary services, energy itself. Bids and offers, confirmation of awarding bids. Transactions going back and forth. Is that intended? If there's a broader scope (don't have answer) eventually, maybe that needs to be explained. Understanding is initial scope is something smaller.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-19] 357 2.2.2 - Bullets not consistent. First bullet on 359, implies indentation. 362-363 - just for clarity, information (H/P/Projected) put that in front of load and usage. Not limited to... not connected to just load and usage.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd12](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd14](#)

**Type:** Improvement **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Toby Considine](#) **Assignee:** [Toby Considine](#)

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerry Gray
<b>Resolution:</b>	Agreed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-20] 372-405 - 383 is not the name of the information model - need to figure out what to call it. Probably get the name of the TC or Information Model -- will look it up and email. Rish: Like 61968/70 for example?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

<b>Resolution:</b>	POWER SYSTEMS management and associated information exchange
--------------------	--

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 03:19 PM ]  
 POWER SYSTEMS management and associated information exchange

**[ENERGYINTEROP-21] 383 - Second sentence. What does deep integration mean?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Terry Saxton		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Just say CIM can be used in light, loosely coupled integration where you don't know much about either end systems. Drawing on common semantics for that small subset, and then mapped at each end. Implies application to application where it depends on that platform.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-22] 390 - Say "Does include other forms.." - make it positive.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron, David Katz		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Section re-written
--------------------	--------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-23] 396 second sentence - "Capabilities..." seems to miss something - not a sentence.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Dave Jollota

<b>Resolution:</b>	Section re-written
--------------------	--------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-24] 400-404 - Not literally speaking? "Defined in the SOA sense." Clarify with line 404, what you mean there.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerry Gray		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Section Re-written
--------------------	--------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-25] 427 - Electricity on demand. More concerned about CHP, selling thermal energy. On CABA, building automation people this is critical. Nature of controls.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 David Katz		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Section removed
--------------------	-----------------

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]  
 Sections re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-26] 420 - In double quotes - quote - cite Stephanie Hamilton.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerry Gray		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Section removed
--------------------	-----------------

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]  
 Sections re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-27] 420 - Is that only in the case of collaborative energy? How does it apply?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Scott Coe		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Section removed
--------------------	-----------------

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]
Sections re-written

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-28] 432 - Mention a project - good to have a citation.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Detailed mention of Olympic Peninsula Project
--------------------	---

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 16/Nov/10 04:38 PM ]
Detailed mention of Olympic Peninsula Project

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-29] 434 - Threw the skunk on the table - mentioned purging of heading defining managed energy. But you use it on 434. Making a comparison to something not defined.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Dave Robin		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Substituted "direct load control"
--------------------	-----------------------------------

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-30] 441 - "PCs" - what do you mean? Personal Computers? Clarify and correct. If intent, based on powerful computing platforms rather than a thermostat.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>		

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron, Dave Robin		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Accepted proposal
--------------------	-------------------

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-31] 439 - "commercial" - others that are large - e.g. municipal. What's a hospital? DH Commercial and institutional? DK Schools and hospitals aren't buildings? C&amp;I =- institutional.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 David Katz, David Holmberg		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Followed suggestion
--------------------	---------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-32] [section 2.4.x - Consider using the term "non-residential"? DaveK Also subways, other systems.](#)** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu, David Katz, Aaron		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Maybe service types, rather than do buckets (water customer knows the res svc, gas does, whether commercial building, subway, understand and categorize as doing business not where someone lives. DK Maybe to the rate structure of the utilities, all about energy information. It's the meter/price DH Rather be more specific. Commercial+Institutional.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-33] [449-452 - Can schedule long running processes in advance. Assume you mean "industrial process" but not the "DR Process" - long DR, curtail for a long time, or do something with their "long industrial process"](#)** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Section removed
--------------------	-----------------

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]
Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-34] [450 - Because of...manage internal process. Commercial can do the same, depends on level/type of load shape you're talking about and the level of balancing.](#)** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu, David Holmberg		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

Description

Not sure I agree with that statement unless you say "relatively easier to manage their load shape." DH: Scale - not the real issue, it's business process and the fact that you're big.
---

**[ENERGYINTEROP-35] 439 - Contrast 2.4.2 and 2.4.3- commercial, a lot that you can do. In industrial processes, may be more limited opp. How relevant is it to what we're trying to do? GG: Why on this level of detail. SC: If captured, ref to a paper.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed		
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>		
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>		
Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Rich Kalisch, Girish Ghatikar, Scott Coe		
Resolution:	Sections entirely re-written		

**[ENERGYINTEROP-36] 452 - How is this related to the grid? Part of why someone would spend money on CHP. Not just a stressed grid.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed		
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>		
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>		
Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Won't Fix		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 David Katz		
Resolution:	Section removed		

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]  
 Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-37] Collaborative - Point being made about the benefits of collaborative energy. Someone mentioned a FERC report and response (national assessment and action plan) that makes a case for price responsive demand. Maybe that should be used. Rich will send also.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed		
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>		
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
Fix Version/s:	None		
Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Rich Kalisch		
Resolution:	Did not receive promised submission of reference, so moving on....		

**[ENERGYINTEROP-38] 501 - A bit of editorial stretching. E.g. I514. This should be a more technical document.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed		
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>		
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>		
Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Won't Fix		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		
Resolution:	Section removed		

Description

Traditional ...muddle market signals. Use price. Are we saying price is a barrier to transactions? Some is unclear when using to frame the argument. This section has two sets that are more editorial than technical.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]

Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-39] 511 - Most energy trans are small...must be automatable. Improve wording and clarify section.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

**Resolution:** Section removed

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]

Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-40] 536 - Is the principle of parsimony well understood? Is it a technical term that doesn't need definition?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

**Resolution:** Section removed

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]

Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-41] 568 - EMIX intervals - refer to WS-Calendar instead.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		

**Resolution:** Section removed

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]

Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-42] 563 - Subsections under 3.1 are normative definitions. But none appear to be definitions of terms. Descriptions and pointers.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Won't Fix		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

Resolution:	Section removed
-------------	-----------------

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]
Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-43] 559 - Would you/should you be putting a reference to those actors here, or listing those actors? Terms of actors for service definitions only have three actors that are somewhat generic. If not explicitly using actors, may strike the paragraph.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Won't Fix		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Gerry Gray		

Resolution:	Section removed
-------------	-----------------

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]
Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-44] 573 - SOA - "oriented" should be capitalized.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

Resolution:	Section has been re-written
-------------	-----------------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-45] 575 - State that these terms are defined by reference to EMIX without saying which . Need reference. Don't remember the point "Real Time Price" or "Forward Price" of other terms. Better binding would be useful.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Won't Fix		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

Resolution:	Section removed
-------------	-----------------

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]

Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-46] 585-586 - Not sure it's a sentence. DH Clause, bullets in a larger sentence. Should be formatted more clearly or rewritten. 580 says "essential issues are" - nice to know where they came from?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Rich Kalisch		

**Resolution:** Section removed

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]

Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-47] 587 - Suggest bullets to be consistent.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerry Gray		

**Resolution:** Section removed

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]

Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-48] 587 - A: Reduction contracts. But first two sentences talk about market ops. Confusing.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

**Resolution:** Section removed

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]

Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-49] If we've def diff between "energy" and "smart energy" -- I think we should, don't know the energy.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>

Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

Resolution:	Section re-written
-------------	--------------------

Comments
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Nov/10 10:05 PM ]
Section re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-50] 599 - Reference NAESB standards for verification. One option. Ratified 2 years ago. Set of wholesale and retail standards that define verify techs. If were to be included.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Won't Fix		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Scott Coe		

Resolution:	NAESB is working on specifications for Enrollment and for M&V. Until that work is done, those services are out-of-scope for this specification.
-------------	---

**[ENERGYINTEROP-51] 599 - Discuss whether M&V in scope or not. Utility settlement, separate transaction. Not sure whether in the scope. Active discussion. NAESB Wholesale and retail M&V, bigger issue to look.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Won't Fix		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

Resolution:	Section removed
-------------	-----------------

Comments
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 16/Nov/10 04:54 PM ]
Section removed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-52] 600 - Is this ESI definition in sync with OpenHAN and SEP 2.0 or the other references? Rish: Use NIST definition of ESI. NIST has very clearly defined in the Framework.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Won't Fix		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu, Girish Ghatikar		

Resolution:	Language is consistent with NIST roadmap definition
-------------	---

**[ENERGYINTEROP-53] 607 - Define party as a Party, use it everywhere capitalized. Same with the word Actor.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-54] 640 - Figure numbers under the figures and the text don't line up.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-55] 640 - After outlining that Party is either, why not use it instead of "Entity"? Use "Party".** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Dave Robin		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-56] 640 - Interactions - is it important or worthwhile to note that interactions are always in a context, and if so, should we say that the parties play different roles in a given context?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		

**Environment:** SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch

**Resolution:** Re-write of Chapter two addressed this

Description

See Party B, and Party C are playing different roles in two different interactions. I look and say presumably, in two different contexts--say two different programs or tariffs. Not necessarily playing dual roles in a single context. Need email thread to discuss.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-57] 674 - At very end said Figure 5, seems to refer to Figure 6.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd12](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd15](#)

**Type:** Improvement **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Toby Considine](#) **Assignee:** [Toby Considine](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** SGIP-PAP09 Aaron

**Resolution:** Sections entirely re-written

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]  
 Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-58] 674 - Context again - not drawn here.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd12](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd15](#)

**Type:** Improvement **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Toby Considine](#) **Assignee:** [Toby Considine](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch

**Resolution:** Sections entirely re-written

Description

Context again - not drawn here. Say showed E interacting with H, and H with L, and E with L. I think we should go so far as to say never have E interact with H and L - if part of the same context there's a problem. And an implementation issues. If part of same program/tariff could be a problem.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]  
 Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-59] 674 - Don't have two bosses. More than two?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd12](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd15](#)

**Type:** Improvement **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Toby Considine](#) **Assignee:** [Toby Considine](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** SGIP-PAP09 David Holmberg

**Resolution:** Sections entirely re-written

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]  
 Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-60] 674 - Can have two bosses - say AC program, lighting program, could have two different companies controlling that resource with potentially different programs.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Scott Coe, Ed Koch		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

**Description**  
Columns differ? Could be random collection of blue dots and have the same relationship? Ed: Agree, multiple bosses in different contexts.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]  
Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-61] 674 - Incorporated same concepts in SRS from the EPRI paper.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Terry Saxton		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

**Description**  
My understanding - address your questions after the first part – this is meant to show different possible hierarchies that could exist. Not intended to show a signal for a DR event traversing all paths. Show diff hierarchies. Looked and said first column is maybe a utility operator (UDC), second might be aggregator one level down. On the right the DR resources that have to respond. Might have a sig from A to B to G to L - go through an aggregator, but A might go directly to E, bypass.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]  
Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-62] 674 - Different program in that case** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]  
Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-63] 674 - Last part - situation, follow A=E=L. Single context could be a single event issued by A. Go to E, playing role of an asset. A node could be both participant and ERM. I think that could be ok.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
----------------	--------

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Terry Saxton, Ed Koch		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]
Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-64] 674 - Last part - situation. follow A=E=L. Single context could be a single event issued by A. Go to E. playing role of an asset. A node could be both participant and ERM. I think that could be ok.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Terry Saxton, Ed Koch		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]
Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-65] 674 - Wholesale reducing energy. Could have two different aggregator. one with a set of pool pumps and another with a set of Air Conditioners. Might bifurcate down the chain, higher converse. If blue circles taken out of columns might be easier to read.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Scott Coe		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]
Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-66] 674 - Entity A when I look in columns, says BE and E are in the same program. Or enrolled as Participants. (in the same program)** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 David Holmberg		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
Comments	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]	
Sections entirely re-written	

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-67] 674 - Maybe add shading or a box to indicate a program to make this more clear.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerry Gray		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
Comments	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]	
Sections entirely re-written	

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-68] 674 - General comment - defined two actors. NOT two CLASSES of actors.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
Comments	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]	
Sections entirely re-written	

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-69] 690 - Diagram could be more clearly.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
Comments	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]	
Sections entirely re-written	

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-70] 699 - Recursive pattern - should it visible in this diagram? It needs to be stated more clearly.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron, Bill Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]  
 Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-71] 690 - Have a figure like that in the SRS where we model the logical components.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Terry Saxton		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

Description  
 Have a figure like that in the SRS where we model the logical components. One we called the controlling entity - any level - showed recursive relation so that component could be used to rep whoever the players are in the middle of the hierarchy/graph. That's how we modeled it.

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]  
 Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-72] 710 - Challenge in sentence "derived from..."** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerry Gray		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Removed "derived from" language
--------------------	---------------------------------

**[ENERGYINTEROP-73] 717 - General thought. Did you have a standard naming convention for the service names.?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerry Gray		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

Description

Some examples at the end of previous section. Looking at the service names - found in service def team and why we created a naming convention. In a NS expectation on what developers will see. And if extend the work done, create a framework in which they can add to an additional version. Not saying right/wrong - use CIM as model for the verbs. Like Create, Created, Send, Receive, Execute, and info object in response to a request. The other way - some names imply ESB which may not be applicable. For example, another way to do service name is follow the information name being used. Say DR event, inside a svc have operations and operation names. Initiate, cancel, modify inside the service names. Pattern for how design the WSDLs down the road. Use of verb "Modify" and "Update" - those two words are synonymous. Probably need consistent .

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]

Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-74] 717 - Follow the ISO/ED design pattern. Your point Gerry was that the pattern was to follow on a data element.**

Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

**Resolution:** Sections entirely re-written

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]

Sections entirely re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-75] 718 - General is really more DR services and needs to be more clearly defined.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]

Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-76] 738 - "Dr" should be "DR". If service name blank, should be Dr, but in text DR.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Dave Holmberg		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]

Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-77] 731, 735 - Third row in each table. In my understanding the delete attribute - disappears and destroys.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Avy Moishe		

Resolution:	Sections replaced
-------------	-------------------

Description  
 Third row in each table. In my understanding the delete attribute - disappears and destroys. In the first makes sense. When delete an opt out state that's not something that's deletable - either opt out or not, could get the state. Is there another operation, e.g. delete and initialize where you access something that is still accessible?

**[ENERGYINTEROP-78] 742 - Invoking a DR reliability event. But say "DR event" - does this mean it can't be used for anything else? Only reliability event?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

Resolution:	Rewritten. EiEvent service applies to more than just reliability events, and artifacts can be subclassed/extended for other purposes. So-called Price events are addressed by the EiQuote service.
-------------	--

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 08:53 PM ]  
 "program Events" (whatever that means) may not be reliability, but they can be called.  
 Contracted "Because I hate you and you are taking a shower" events are a perfectly legal contract.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-79] 744 row 2 and 6 - Different between adjust and modify** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Avy Moishe		

Resolution:	Recommendation accepted. Adjust removed
-------------	---

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:01 PM ]  
 Accepted. Adjust removed.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-80] 750-751 - Not sure what this means? Doesn't seem like a sentence. May be missing a period after Participant. Don't understand what you're saying.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron
<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
Comments	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:39 PM ]	
Sections entirely re-written	

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-81] 754 - Punctuation problem. And spurious highlight.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization		
Comments			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]			
Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-82] 754 - "set and retained until deleted" - are we talking about who deletes it? Do we need to clarify?</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section re-written in WD16 with all new response sections		
Comments			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Nov/10 10:10 PM ]			
Section re-written in WD16.			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-83] 754 row 1 - Consistency across document.</b> Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Avy Moishe		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Names for all services and operations were rationalized and made consistent with CIM service/operation naming conventions.		
Description			
Normally when look at Object Oriented (OO) programming have put/get. Here we see "submit and "set" - if you set something that's a form of submission? Reduce complexity. Level back on Real Time trans des, 6 fundamental - initialization, destroy, set, get, put, read			

**[ENERGYINTEROP-84] 756 - Table talks about Event states and transactions; the text talks about "outstanding events" - kind of a state of an event, unless you say transactions are equiv to outstanding events.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Clarified language
--------------------	--------------------

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:34 PM ]  
 C:arified language

**[ENERGYINTEROP-85] 762 - M&V reason pap10 is here - usage models. For M&V? When I look at it, not sure of connection.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

<b>Resolution:</b>	All such issues are held off intil delivery of standard by NAESB. So noted in document
--------------------	--

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:42 PM ]  
 Re-wrote language surrounding PAP10

**[ENERGYINTEROP-86] 760 - Didn't see anything on DR enrollment processes.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Rich Kalisch		

<b>Resolution:</b>	NAESB is working on specifivations for Enrollment and for M&V. Until that work is done, those services are out-of-scope for this specification.
--------------------	---

Description

There should be something said. Don't have programs. Market product like energy can bid generation, DR, etc. That's the way our programs work. If someone - work with Aggregator/LSE that acts as Aggregator. As part of process of enrollment have to know specific resources - premises, meter points. Part of the process, and transactions passed between us and the aggregator. Don't know if different when talk about retail program.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:33 PM ]  
 NAESB is working on specifivations for Enrollment and for M&V. Until that work is done, those services are out-of-scope for this specification.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-87] 760 - Not programs; NAESB is doing a spec** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
--------------	-------------	------------------	-------

<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		

**Resolution:** NAESB is working on specifications for Enrollment and for M&V. Until that work is done, those services are out-of-scope for this specification.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:33 PM ]  
 NAESB is working on specifications for Enrollment and for M&V. Until that work is done, those services are out-of-scope for this specification.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-88] 760 - Last week in NAESB meeting discussions about ISO and RTO do not have programs. You have products. And that kind of thing.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

**Resolution:** NAESB is working on specifications for Enrollment and for M&V. Until that work is done, those services are out-of-scope for this specification.

Description

How we're addressing this is by the NAESB process, phase 2 will hopefully come up with a data element table with all retail and wholesale data elements, feed into this document. Exactly how load or aggregator signs up to provide that product is not in the EITC scope. Should be, my answer.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:33 PM ]  
 NAESB is working on specifications for Enrollment and for M&V. Until that work is done, those services are out-of-scope for this specification.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-89] 760 - I understand that this may come up out of NAESB process that should be addressed. Not just initial, it's the constant updating. Aggregator moving in/out their participants in/out of their relationship.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Rich Kalisch		

**Resolution:** NAESB is working on specifications for Enrollment and for M&V. Until that work is done, those services are out-of-scope for this specification.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:33 PM ]  
 NAESB is working on specifications for Enrollment and for M&V. Until that work is done, those services are out-of-scope for this specification.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-90] 764 - Add something about the work in ASHRAE** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 David Holmberg, Ed Koch		

**Resolution:** ASHRAE is another process

**[ENERGYINTEROP-91] 764 - Need to clarify load and usage projections - at facility, constraint area level. ISO/RTOs look at it differently.**

Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-92] 764 - In this and previous, don't think PAP10 will cover the ISO/RTO perspective.**

Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Sean Crimmins		

**Resolution:** All such issues are held off until delivery of standard by NAESB. So noted in document

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:42 PM ]  
 Re-wrote language surrounding PAP10

**[ENERGYINTEROP-93] 869 - Mentioned in the introduction, OpenADR Task Force in the process of formalizing SRS. Then will work on OpenADR issues. That work would be very useful for the EITC to collaborate**

Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

[We have to have some better variant on Conformance when we release Energy Interoperation for public review](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-239)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-94] 886 - Note in regard to performance expectations. Talks about performance parameters in terms of seconds. Is this suitable within this document given that some networks are and have been deployed.**

Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Avy Moise		

**Resolution:** Section being rewritten. Performance criteria of this nature will be deleted.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-95] 886 - Name DRAS should be out.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-96] 886 - Don't belong here. DRAS, timing are not general. Is there something that may not permit market-demanded response?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-97] 886 - Some way to characterize/clarify what the potential applications of this standard may be.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Description  
 When you talk from wholesale/ISO/Ancillary svc, some require second response times and so forth. If not put in performance specs, may need to make clear that this can be applied. Push/pull, some things are network specific. May want to specify other interactions modes e.g. push versus pull to address issues.

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

[We have to have some better variant on Conformance when we release Energy Interoperation for public review \(ENERGYINTEROP-239\)](#)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-98\] 874 - My question - assuming conformance related to testing and cert - not clear what we're trying to certify here?](#) Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd24</a>

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

**Resolution:** The editor placed business requirements for Energy Interoperation in this section, so they would not be forgotten, and to be a seed for conformance. The Technical Committee expects most conformance requirements to come from early adopters.

Description

What needs to be conformance? Device in the facility level, standards for network infra, facility level? Company that develop DRAS, needs to conform? Or integrators providing energy interoperation services to ISO and Utility. Could name 50 things. Scope is broad in general.

[We have to have some better variant on Conformance when we release Energy Interoperation for public review \(ENERGYINTEROP-239\)](#)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-99\] 874 - If there's a testing and conformance process, could be referenced.](#) Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd24</a>

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

**Resolution:** The editor placed business requirements for Energy Interoperation in this section, so they would not be forgotten, and to be a seed for conformance. The Technical Committee expects most conformance requirements to come from early adopters.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 01:33 PM ]

The testing and conformance processes and organizations that are working that direction are not in scope for this specification, in part because there may be many, in part because only high level conformance statements are to be part of this specification.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-100\] 874 - True for entire document. Def scope and divided the sections. Within each could be much bigger conformance scopes, or a separate entity might be addressing each.](#) Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd12</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]

Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

[We have to have some better variant on Conformance when we release Energy Interoperation for public review \(ENERGYINTEROP-239\)](#)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-101\] 874 - Pile on. In conformance, reference the IETF document with SHALL, etc. Line 923 is something you can't really test for conformance.](#) Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron

<b>Resolution:</b>	The editor placed business requirements for Energy Interoperation in this section, so they would not be forgotten, and to be a seed for conformance. The Technical Committee expects most conformance requirements to come from early adopters.  Conformance has been expanded in wd24. Closed as fixed.
--------------------	--

Description  
Those kind of statements don't build a conformance clause - that's just language. Can I test the statement I just wrote to make sure it's a conformance statement? should be the guide.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-102] All - Albert Chiu Wants his name on the acknowledgements. Ed K: a party not a participant?** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu

<b>Resolution:</b>	Added acknowledgments of OpenSG, IRC, and NAESB
--------------------	---

Comments  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 08:54 PM ]  
Asked Albert who he wanted cited

**[ENERGYINTEROP-103] All - The section on TeMIX - TBD - is that valid in this standard? Only reviewed the TeMIX white paper, a way of using this.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Sean Crimmins

<b>Resolution:</b>	Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization
--------------------	--

Comments  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-104] All - Terminology; see how the next draft is.** Created: 11/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd12</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox

<b>Resolution:</b>	Sections entirely re-written
--------------------	------------------------------

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-105] Line 261 Wording Change</b> Created: 19/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section removed		
<b>Description</b>			
261 Change following sentences beginning on this line from Tariffs may continue to be complex, derived through political processes. The results of tariffs, which defined products that are available within markets, and they prices at which they can be bought or sold, can be conveyed more easily. to In regulated electricity markets, price and products are often defined by complex tariffs, derived through political processes. These tariffs convey the price and product information to making buying and selling decisions easier.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 08/Sep/10 01:20 AM ]			
This comment was intended for emix and has been entered there.			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]			
Sections re-written			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-106] w09 line 279: Change Transactional to Transactive</b> Created: 19/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section removed		
<b>Description</b>			
274: Suggest changing "transactional" to "transactive" in this paragraph. Ultimately I will update the White Paper with the new EMIX and EnergyInterop Information Models etc. and change the title to "Transactive" which has the same meaning as "Transactional".			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-107] 280: Suggest we say Even so, some energy purchasers desire to distinguish .....</b> Created: 19/Aug/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section removed		
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 08/Sep/10 01:22 AM ]			
This comment was intended for EMIX and has been entered there.			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]			
Sections re-written			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-108] Indication of how firm a quote is</b> Created: 05/Sep/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	New Feature	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Moving to EMIX
--------------------	----------------

**Description**  
 Brining it here to make sure it is not lost in EMIX issues

This is an important attribute of a power contract in many markets. Firm power typically carries with it reserves. Non firm power requires the receive to provide necessary reserves if it is to be considered a firm source of power.

Other attributes are whether it is a power contract @ 100 % load factor (fixed rate of delivery) or a contract with a specified load factor. There can be other variations.

We need to have a general way of specifying such attributes whether in emix or energy interop.

[ Show » ] Edward Cazalet added a comment - 25/Jul/10 11:34 PM This is an important attribute of a power contract in many markets. Firm power typically carries with it reserves. Non firm power requires the receive to provide necessary reserves if it is to be considered a firm source of power. Other attributes are whether it is a power contract @ 100 % load factor (fixed rate of delivery) or a contract with a specified load factor. There can be other variations. We need to have a general way of specifying such attributes whether in emix or energy interop.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:11 PM ]

Ed

Please suggest a resolution during the comment period

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 23/Nov/10 12:23 AM ]

Original question: Need indication of how firm a quote is.

I think I misinterpreted the question. I answered a question about firmness of the delivery of power and the reserves that is an emix issue that can be address in product implementation perhaps with warrants.

The other interpretation of the question is related to the uncertainty in forward quotes of prices. This could also be an emix question.

If the forward prices for future intervals are based on actual priced offers, then one can have reasonable certainty that forward transactions at these prices can be carried out. However, markets change and the foreword quotes will change as one approaches delivery. Quotes based on offers are what they are and no measure of uncertainty of firmness in the quotes makes sense.

If the quotes are based on forecasts (perhaps informed by forward quotes) then the party making the forecast and an estimate of uncertainty in the forecast could be described in a new emix artifact. Multiple forecasts by different parties such as forecasting services could be provided for . How a party would use these forecasts is outside the scope of emix.

Conclusion: submit to emix.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 23/Nov/10 12:47 AM ]

Moving to EMIX

**[ENERGYINTEROP-109] [Line 328 Section 2.1 Does scope only include transactive energy, DR and DER interactions](#)** Created: 08/Sep/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	I think we should not limit the scope of interactions in EI although we may prioritize working on the details of some interactions while also allowing for new interactions to be covered.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section removed

**Description**  
 Does the scope now or in the future include interactions with ISO/RTO markets, interactions among wholesale trading parties, interactions between customers and regulated and open retailers, for example.

Transactive Energy covers some of these interactions using a restricted set of products.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]

Sections re-written

**[ENERGYINTEROP-110] [Line 466 : Actors are not buyer or seller, but actors are parties such as customers, generators, aggregators, ISOs that depending on the situation take on the role of buyer or seller](#)** Created: 08/Sep/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-111] line 492 says we will be begin with Transactive interactions but then we jump directly to DR interactions** Created: 08/Sep/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Proposal:** Begin with transactive interactions as stated.  
**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-112] Line 519 - this section seems to focus on transactive interactions but starts out with a description of the ERM and Participant roles that don't apply here.** Created: 08/Sep/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-113] Wd 13 General - we need to agree on a detailed outline - the document is too unstructured for further comments.** Created: 08/Sep/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Proposal:** 1. Work separately on service definitions transactive products.  
 2. Align service definitions for DR with 1.  
**Resolution:** Addressed in general re-write ans section reorganization

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:26 PM ]  
 Addressed in general re-write and section reorganization

**[ENERGYINTEROP-114] Lines 219-223 (Introduction) needs further clarity for communication of energy information and involved parties**

Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

The description tries to give a general description of the communication between energy suppliers and consumers. However, this description leaves out two things:  
 a) This specification should be about the communication of energy information, which should be explicitly stated (instead of simply saying communication -all or any - between suppliers and consumers of energy;  
 b) what about communications between parties of the same kind? (e.g. operators, as in operator to operator).

Comments

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:13 AM ]  
 Now lines 221-226 in wd14  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]  
 Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-115] Lines 220-222: Is there an assumption that the communications between the Generator and Consumer is direct?**

Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Comments

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:15 AM ]  
 Now lines 220-223 in wd14  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]  
 Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-116] Line 221: What does energy mean?** Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

Does it mean "energy market" or "energy ancillary services and capacity"?

Comments

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:16 AM ]  
 Now line 223 in wd14  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]  
 Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-117] Lines 33-41: Use of Web Services</b> Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">service</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

**Description**  
 This explicitly states use of Web Services, and although in EITC meetings it is said that this does not entail that the implementation needs to be using Web Services, this is not explicitly stated in the draft. If Web Services are not used for the implementation can an implementer be compliant with the OASIS Standard? Is the OASIS spec concrete enough to dictate Web Services?

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:31 AM ]  
 Lines 389 and 580 in wd14 have statements that this spec will define Web Services, but other mechanisms are out of scope and may be implemented. If so, can these non-'Web Service' implementations be compliant with the spec? Will interoperability be broken between actors if some use Web Services and some do not?  
 Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 15/Oct/10 01:33 PM ]  
 An option that may address this that we have leveraged in other work efforts is that the payload (XSD) is standardized and the web service (or other) is provided via an "implementation guide". Web services being one implementation, providing a REST-based implementation is another.  
 It may be useful to define what compliance means in regards to this work effort.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]  
 Sections re-written  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]  
 Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-118] Lines 328-381 - Section 2.1 Scope of Energy Interoperation</b> Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

**Description**  
 In EITC discussions there was a topic regarding whether the IRC Measurement and Performance Interactions (4.x series) were in scope and whether they would (or should) be covered by PAP 10. Line 330 says that EI "includes measurement and verification of curtailment" so it is unclear why would it be out of scope.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:34 AM ]  
 This section is now in Lines 332-462 in wd14. The previous statement reference in line 330 is now in line 335-336.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]  
 Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 05:44 PM ]  
 We need to get consistent language about whether M&V is in or out, and the use of PAP10, etc throughout the document  
 Toby agreed in meeting to discuss with Bill

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-119] Line 228: Hyphen market-based</b> Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

Hyphen: market-based

Comments

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:35 AM ]

Now in wd14 line 229.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]

Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-120] Line 230 - wording is a generalization without proper references** Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

It is the opinion of the IRC that such statement adds no value to the spec.

Comments

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:36 AM ]

Now in wd14 line 231

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]

Sections re-written

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]

Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-121] Line 231 - Needs better narrative** Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

Explain better.

Comments

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:37 AM ]

Now in wd14 line 232

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]

Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-122] Lines 231-232 - What does more granular mean?** Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a> [ 13/Oct/10 10:38 AM ]
Now in wd14 lines 232-233.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]
Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-123] Line 237 - What does "energy supply rights" mean?** Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a> [ 13/Oct/10 10:39 AM ]
Now in wd14 line 242.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]
Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 18/Nov/10 05:42 PM ]
ED:
Can you please speak to Energy Supply Rights, what they are, and perhaps suggest wording that speaks to this? This in line 224 / 225 of WD15

**[ENERGYINTEROP-124] Line 373 - Is this in the TeMIX white paper or some general concept? Clarify.** Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considen and Edgardo

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a> [ 13/Oct/10 10:40 AM ]
Now in wd14 line 378.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]
Sections re-written
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]
Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-125] Lines 386-389 - What is the purpose of this paragraph?** Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Proposal:** It should be removed.  
**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considen and Edgardo

Description

This paragraph adds no value.

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a> [ 13/Oct/10 10:41 AM ]
--

Now in wd14 lines 393-396.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]

Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-126] Line 34-35 - Semantic clarity between data model and information model** Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

Are we creating a data model or information model? Please clarify the differences and include the understanding of information model.

Comments

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:41 AM ]

same lines in wd14

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]

Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-127] Line 385 - (Section 2.3 Approach)** Created: 12/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

The approach section is "interesting" background, but is this an approach? We expect what is the approach taken and how are trying to accomplish the goals within the scope (not background information).

Comments

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 13/Oct/10 10:42 AM ]

Now in wd14 line 392

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 04:37 PM ]

Sections re-written

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]

Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-128] Lines 453-454: Impact of using WS-Calendar to wholesale markets** Created: 13/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

wd14 is not a choice for "Affected Version" at this time...???

Web Services might not be well-suited for wholesale markets implementations and it is unclear why NIST is directing a specific standards with a Web Service implementation. While the EITC wd14 now states that other Communications can be used, it is out of scope and unclear how one would achieve compliance and interoperability if not implementing Web Services. Since NIST is directing WS-Calendar independently of EITC, but there is a relationship between both WS-Calendar and EITC in OASIS, there is concern as to what will happen to the existing way in which ISOs/RTOs operate if Web Service implementations are expected.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]

Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-129] Line 590 (Section Event Services)** Created: 13/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Applied		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

wd14 is not an option in "Affected Versions"

This section does not contain sufficient information to understand how each services and operations are intended to be used, thus mapping them to the IRC Demand Response interactions cannot be done at this time.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:56 PM ]

Sections indicated have been completely re-written, and will be reviewed by Edgardo to see if issues still persist

**[ENERGYINTEROP-130] wd14 lines 662-665: Reference section 3 as appropriate** Created: 13/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Applied		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:56 PM ]

Sections indicated have been completely re-written, and will be reviewed by Edgardo to see if issues still persist

**[ENERGYINTEROP-131] Real-time price for any amount of energy is not just for EMIX** Created: 13/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Applied		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

wd13 line 611  
wd14 line 681

This is not specific to transactive energy. These are specific problems that everyone has to solve. Language needs to be placed outside this section in a more general section.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Nov/10 09:02 PM ]

Flr reference, these are in the intro of 7.1m Market Communications for Transactive Energy

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:56 PM ]

Sections indicated have been completely re-written, and will be reviewed by Edgardo to see if issues still persist

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-132] <a href="#">Line 603 (Section: Market Communication for Transactive Energy)</a></b> Created: 13/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considien and Edgardo		
<b>Description</b>			
Now in wd14 line 673			
Heavy focus on transactive energy in absence or any other model.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]			
Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-133] <a href="#">Lines 633-634: Standarnd seems to only allow for one way of doing business</a></b> Created: 13/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considien and Edgardo		
<b>Description</b>			
Now lines wd14 703-704			
Seems to suggest that this standard is not applicable to any other way of doing business. There is not similar section for other ways of doing business (e.g. wholesale markets, vertically integrated utility).			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]			
Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-134] <a href="#">Line 702: (Section Performance Signals) needs clarification on what performance is</a></b> Created: 13/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Applied		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considien and Edgardo		
<b>Description</b>			
Now lines wd14 769			
It's not clear what is meant by performance here. Is it dispatch in the IRC work terms or validation of the agreed contract?			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 18/Nov/10 04:56 PM ]			
Sections indicated have been completely re-written, and will be reviewed by Edgardo to see if issues still persist			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-135] <a href="#">Suggestion for new language for lines 420-438 of WD 14. Addresses types of prices in Energy Interop per our discusion at EI meeting on 10/13/10.</a></b> Created: 13/Oct/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10			
---	--	--	--

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	This applies to WD 14 that is not yet referenced in JIRA		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>I suggest revising as below:</p> <p>Other business models may combine services in novel ways. An aggregator can publish an indication of interest in to buy curtailment at a given price. A business willing to respond would offer a contract to shed load for a specific price. The aggregator may accept some or all of these offers. The performance in this case could be called at the same time as the offer acceptance or later.</p> <p>Communication of price is at the core all of the Energy Interoperation services. We identify four types of prices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Priced Offer: a forward offer to buy or sell a quantity of an energy product for a specified future interval of time the acceptance of which by a counterparty results in a binding contract. This includes tariff priced offers where the quantity may be limited only by the service connection and DR prices.</li> <li>2. Ex-Post Price: A price assigned to energy purchased or sold that is calculated or assigned after delivery. Price may be set based on market indices, centralized market clearing, tariff calculation or any other process.</li> <li>3. Priced Indication of Interest: the same as a Priced Offer except that no binding contract is immediately intended.</li> <li>4. Historical Price: A current price, past contracted price, past offered price, and statistics about historical price such as high and low prices, averages and volatility.</li> <li>5. Price Forecast: A forecast by a party of future prices that are not a Priced Indication of Interest or Priced Offer. The quality of a price forecast will depend on the source and future market conditions.</li> </ol>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Added recommended language to document

<b>Description</b>	<p>I suggest the following from energy interop WD 14 be revised to address all typors of price</p> <p>The current lines are:</p> <p>420 Other business models may combine services in novel ways. A grid operator can publish an indication of  421 interest in buying curtailment at a given price. Business and buildings willing to respond would  422 simultaneously offer and execute a contract to shed load. The performance in this case would be called at  423 the same time or later as contracted.  424 These four services work with and depend upon a core set of price services. Shortage and abundance of  425 electricity are indicated through price. Smarter grids will be to recognize scarcity and abundance faster,  426 and to thereby be able to price better.  427 A grid pricing service is able to answer the following sorts of questions:  428 1. What is the price of Electricity now?  429 2. What will it be in 5 minutes?  430 3. What will it be at other times in the future?  431 4. What was the highest price for electricity in the last day? Month? Year?  432 5. What was the lowest price for electricity in the last day? Month? Year?  433 6. What price will electricity have for each hour of the day tomorrow?  434 7. What was the high price for the day the last time it was this hot?  435 Each answer carries with it varying degrees of certainty. The prices may be fixed tariffs absolutely locked  436 down. The prices may be fixed tariffs, —unless a DR event is called. The prices may be wild guesses  437 about open markets. With a standardized price service, technology providers can develop solutions to  438 help grid operators and grid customers manage their energy use portfolios.</p>
--------------------	--

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-136] Line 714 - Clarify what is energy usage</b> Created: 14/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Applied		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo
--------------------	---

<b>Description</b>	<p>Now wd14 line 781.</p> <p>Better to refer more specifically to metered energy consumption if that is what is meant.</p>
--------------------	--

<b>Comments</b>	<p>Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 18/Nov/10 04:56 PM ]</p> <p>Sections indicated have been completely re-written, and will be reviewed by Edgardo to see if issues still persist</p>
-----------------	---

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-137] Line 719 (now wd14 786) - why events only for reliability?</b> Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>

Fix Version/s: [wd16](#)

Type:	Bug	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
Resolution:	Applied		

Resolution: Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considen and Edgardo

Description  
Why only reliability. Wouldn't these be the same for reliability or market based?

Comments  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:56 PM ]  
Sections indicated have been completely re-written, and will be reviewed by Edgardo to see if issues still persist

**[ENERGYINTEROP-138] [Line 722 \(now wd14 789\) - scope of feedback services is unclear](#)** Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd13</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd16</a>

Type:	Bug	Priority:	Minor
Reporter:	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
Resolution:	Applied		

Resolution: Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considen and Edgardo

Description  
These responses and seem to be based on database CRUD actions rather than WS interactions. What does it mean to set feedback? Submit, get, delete would be a better pattern, as used later. It would help to define the interactions, e.g. does some response have to follow an initiateDREvent?

Comments  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:56 PM ]  
Sections indicated have been completely re-written, and will be reviewed by Edgardo to see if issues still persist

**[ENERGYINTEROP-139] [CLONE -Line 722 \(now wd14 789\) - scope of schedule services is unclear](#)** Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd13</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd16</a>

Type:	Bug	Priority:	Minor
Reporter:	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		

Resolution: Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considen and Edgardo

Description  
These responses and seem to be based on database CRUD actions rather than WS interactions. What does it mean to set feedback? Submit, get, delete would be a better pattern, as used later. It would help to define the interactions, e.g. does some response have to follow an initiateDREvent?

Comments  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]  
Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-140] [Line 729 \(now wd14 796\) - Bids should also be for a particular time frame or market, before any DR event is declared.](#)** Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd13</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd16</a>

Type:	Bug	Priority:	Minor
Reporter:	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]  
 Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-141] Line 732 (now wd14 799) - What's a transaction?** Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd13](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd16](#)

**Type:** Bug **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Edgardo Luzcando](#) **Assignee:** [William Cox](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]  
 Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-142] Line 738 (now wd14 805) - PAP 10 does not apply to wholesale** Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd13](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd16](#)

**Type:** Bug **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Edgardo Luzcando](#) **Assignee:** [William Cox](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Description

PAP 10 was not developed with this scope in mind. It is defined for the three way interaction of real-time usage of end users. It is not applicable here.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:52 PM ]  
 Re-opening post meeting on resolution of IRC submitted issues

**[ENERGYINTEROP-143] Line 776 (now wd14 820) - Are these part of the standard?** Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd13](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd16](#)

**Type:** Bug **Priority:** Minor  
**Reporter:** [Edgardo Luzcando](#) **Assignee:** [William Cox](#)  
**Resolution:** Applied

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considine and Edgardo

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:56 PM ]  
 Sections indicated have been completely re-written, and will be reviewed by Edgardo to see if issues still persist

**[ENERGYINTEROP-144] Line 806 (now wd14 850) - clarify the meaning of baseline** Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 18/Nov/10

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [spec](#)

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Applied	<b>Environment:</b>	

**Resolution:** Line-by-line review of Current draft completed between Toby Considien and Edgardo

**Description**  
Baseline has a very specific meaning in DR. Please clarify the meaning here.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Nov/10 04:56 PM ]  
Sections indicated have been completely re-written, and will be reviewed by Edgardo to see if issues still persist

**[ENERGYINTEROP-145] [Line 919 \(now wd14 961\) - conflicts with the Service Provider definition from NIST](#)** Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 16/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None	<b>Environment:</b>	

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed	<b>Environment:</b>	

**Resolution:** Section re-written

**Description**  
Conflicts with the Service Provider definition from NIST. A utility or LSE is not a service provider in this context. They are in the distribution domain.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-146] [Line 921 \(now wd14 963\) - This approach precludes the three way communication between ISO, LSE and DRP which takes place today.](#)** Created: 15/Oct/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd13</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed	<b>Environment:</b>	

**Resolution:** Section was removed from document

**Description**  
There is a lack of non-functional requirements that the spec is meant to meet. How many transactions per second, total volume, distance is this web services based spec intended to meet?

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:51 PM ]  
Section was removed from document

**[ENERGYINTEROP-147] [217 - Should be a dotted from generator to the consumer.](#)** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix	<b>Environment:</b>	

**Resolution:** Diagram is a general diagram not describing any particular business model or extant market

**Description**

Comment made on previous draft. DH figures are not updated. TC if generator is in the building should it still have a dotted line? AC Good point. Looking at graphic, because of the domains -- first thing was domains. DH figure implies domains. R: rather than making a gen - make a local generation, clarifies a lot of confusion.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 04:48 PM ]

Diagram is a general diagram not describing any particular business model or exitant market

**[ENERGYINTEROP-148] 217 - Calling it "local generation" will clarify** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

Resolution:	Accepted recommendation
-------------	-------------------------

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:40 PM ]

Accepted recommendation

**[ENERGYINTEROP-149] 226 - granular is ambiguous** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Bug	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		

Proposal:	rewrite uses of "granular"
Resolution:	Gave two examples

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:52 PM ]

Gave two examples

**[ENERGYINTEROP-150] 231 - "Energy consumers" line.... Need better explanation. Unclear how manage your local energy supply. Seems curtailment is not part of their local energy supply.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd16</a>

Type:	Bug	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Unresolved		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Chris Kotting		

Proposal:	clarify
Resolution:	Language was hammered out between a lot of competing parties.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-151] General - In language for EI Scope and in the dirgram, transmission and distribution domains are ignored. Are we ignoring these from the rest 7 domains? Are we totally ignoring those interactions and the rest of the SG?** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Feb/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>

<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Later		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Farrokh Albuyeh		

**Resolution:** T&D have EMIX descriptions like anything else. At some level, EI is a way to move around EMIX's. Welcome suggestions of language as to how/where to explain better

**Description**  
 BillC; Brief response is "no". Needs clarification.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:55 PM ]  
 EMIX defines a Transport service for both transmission and distribution. An offer or transaction at different location may or may not include Transport and EMIX should indicate which.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-152] 352, 363 - Elsewhere use "consumer" - in REC "members".Here use "customer". "consumers" is more accurate.**  
Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron Snyder		

**Resolution:** Reviewed document for when Consumer and Customer are used. Energy Interoperation makes no presumption that the VEWN/Customer is a consumer, nor on how many market levels there are.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:58 PM ]  
 Reviewed document for when Consumer and Customer are used. Energy Interoperation makes no presumption that the VEWN/Customer is a consumer, nor on how many market levels there are.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-153] 341 - Rewrite section** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 David Holmberg		

**Resolution:** Section was re-written, based on comments from WEdgardo and Dave

**[ENERGYINTEROP-154] 377 - In scope - info models for contract and product distrib. Explain. Is product connection the product definition in EMIX?** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron Snyder		

**Proposal:** Adjust to show use of EMIX

**Description**

See section 2.4.2

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 07:11 PM ]

See section 2.4.2

**[ENERGYINTEROP-155] 374-5 - Also could include supply projections. And consider bidirectional energy flow.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd16</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	No Action		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Kendall Smith		

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:16 PM ]

As parties switch between VTN and VEN role, they can of course offer any product they wish to the market. No change needed.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-156] 383 - Comm method other than WS is out of scope - clarify that highlight. Defines a transport. Make sure to the casual reader that they can tell. Make sure that Web services is clear as transport protocol** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Aaron Snyder		

**Resolution:** Clarifications requested by IRC already addressed this issue

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:28 PM ]

Clarifications to support IRC comments addressed this issue.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-157] 414 - Moving target - rewrite to current "tender" etc** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** Change most, bot not all, offers to tenders

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 09:04 PM ]

Change most (but not all) offers to Tender

**[ENERGYINTEROP-158] 402 - Good intro - CIM alignment** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed	<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 David Holmberg

Description

Nest of different terms in W/R market in different parts of the country. Pick one to win. If realign, realign how describe, might as well use std terms of financial markets. That's the normal language - may not have hit mark everywhere

**[ENERGYINTEROP-159] 401-407 - Looking at 4 essential market activites. Where is (or is not) the distribution of day ahead price/RTP?**

Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Marty Burns

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:19 PM ]

Prices are managed in the Quote Service which was not prrsent in WD14. IN WD16, this (EiQuoteService) line 694 answers this question

**[ENERGYINTEROP-160] 404 - In EMIX we're moving from offers to bids; need to clarify here**

Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Toby Considine

**Resolution:** Terminology synchronized with EMIX Public Review Committee Specification Draft, November 2010

Description

EMIX moving fast; needs to be resolved

**[ENERGYINTEROP-161] 397 - Assumes timely automated metering? Also automated pricing information**

Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Kendall Smith

Description

qv 327. That's the principle for Auto-DR: to include both price and reliability. wd16 line 322

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:23 PM ]

EiQuoteService provides price distribution.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-162] 435, 454-455 - Are buyers and seller defined before? The place you get tripped up are words used every day.**

Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Kendall Smith		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Check other places in the document.		

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:48 PM ]

Good comment - we should define the obvious for some but not all.

The position for a party is the sum of all transaction quantities for an interval with buy transactions added and sell transactions subtracted.

Not all types of transactions result in a position. Transactive works only with transactions that are additive. Requirements tariffs are not additive; Constant power transactions are additive.

A party selling power relative to its current position is takes the role of a seller.

A party buying power relative to its current position takes the role of a buyer.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:27 PM ]

Definitions of Buuer and Seller added.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-163] 468 - Reference TEMIX and EMIX. More examples.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		
<b>Resolution:</b>	TEMIX is now directly referenced on ffirst (and several subsequent) references		

**[ENERGYINTEROP-164] 469 - Define terminology - define or reference.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Reworded in wd16 (subject to promissee/promissor confusion)		

Description

Coment on Option Transaction Roles.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-165] 472, 477 - Typo - promissee should be promissor** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Cazalet, Kendall Smith		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accepted wording as proposed by commenter
------------------	---

Description  
Alternate Section 3

Comments  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:31 PM ]  
E Cazalet:  
Please see 3.1.2 and send notes on Promissor / Promisee.  
Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Nov/10 11:56 PM ]  
In WD 16 line 498 which reads  
  
"right to invoke specific transactions (operations) that the Promisee promises to perform demand"  
change the word Promisee to Promissor

**[\[ENERGYINTEROP-166\] 492 - Redundant IJK,...in drawing. Why is \[last\] K and second level C & D shown? They're not doing anything.](#)**

Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Redrawn
--------------------	---------

Description  
Alternate Section 3

Comments  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 07:05 PM ]  
Re-drawn

**[\[ENERGYINTEROP-167\] 492, 500 - If A is a Distributed Generation fac - will it reverse roles? When does it? Incorporate in new section 3](#)**

Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Kendall Smith		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Included text in buyers/sellers discussion.
--------------------	---

Description  
Alternate Section I492

Comments  
Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:35 PM ]  
A distributed generator certainly can take on the roles of buyer and seller. If a distributed generator sells 2 MW forward of a given interval, it may later decide to buyback all or a portion of the 2 MW if the price is low enough. And obviously a distributed storage device takes on the roles of buyer and seller at different times.

**[\[ENERGYINTEROP-168\] 587-591 - Accidentally had a thought - when you have the service naming.On the operation - may want to insert EEvent to distinguish - objects should match the service name. Helps when you throw it over the wall to a software development.](#)**

Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
----------------	--------

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerald Gray		

**Resolution:** Service names adjusted in wd16, issue is addressed.

**Description**  
E.g. CreateEvent-->CreateEiEvent

**[ENERGYINTEROP-169] 610 - Looking at relationship of events for the deployment level.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bruce Bartell		

**Resolution:** Added explicit statement that event schedule can contain multiple intervals, and that each interval may have different parameters within the scope of the event message.

**Description**  
Looking at relationship of events for the deployment level. Have 1:1. Temporal model in OpenADR is a little different from wholesale - we don't ask for deployment for the entire event. May deploy to indiv dev for some period. So long as that applies we may have to adjust the cardinality to address the temporal aspect

BB using this? Not seeing rel between the gluon and the level? WC: Follow up.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:43 PM ]  
 Bruce, please update and clarify with respect to wd16. Is additional work needed?  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 22/Nov/10 11:45 AM ]  
 Within the Event duration, the objectives (i.e. deployment level) sent to a Resource can have multiple intervals, with each interval having a different deployment level. The event model in 5.1.1 is fine for the overall event as originally issued. For other interaction at different levels between VTN to VEN there could be multiple intervals within the event. This interaction could be supported by allowing 1..\* for intervals that each would have its own deployment level or by supporting an interaction that would identify that each interval within the event for the Resource or VEN is unique. i.e. Multiple messages that allow for an identifier for each interval.  
 This topic should be weighed in by the group.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:18 PM ]  
 I think this is addressed by the schedule (which is a sequence with 1..\* intervals) explicitly having the capability of different deployment levels for each interval.  
 Textually, I'd leave it up to Toby. Assigning to Toby.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:25 PM ]  
 Editing...

**[ENERGYINTEROP-170] 610 - In the event info you're limited to events relating to active power. Should be able to support any measurement. Quantity you're measuring by - why not gas, water, reactive?** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Marty Burns		

**Resolution:** Issue is actually an EMIX issue. Products Descriptions can be provided for all those products, and if so, Energy Interop will address them w/o change

**Description**  
WC Consider. Or any class of power? MB no, any measurement.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:23 PM ]  
 Issue is actually an EMIX issue. Products Descriptions can be provided for all those products, and if so, Energy Interop will address them w/o change

**[ENERGYINTEROP-171] 613 - One - issues about gluon** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Bill Cox		

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 06:48 PM ]
Comment is not actionable
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 21/Nov/10 10:39 PM ]
Comment in review. No action.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-172] Sections 6.3 and 6.4 - Sections list services. Documentation looks pretty good. Do you intend/would it be a good idea to present state machines that show the various states for this and the lifecycles?** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Marty Burns		

<b>Resolution:</b>	State engines delve into the processes behind the services. From SOA Reference: "Services are concerned with the public actions of each interoperating system. Private actions, e.g., those on either side of the interface, are considered inherently unknowable by other parties. A service can be used without needing to know all the details of its implementation. Services are generally paid for results, not effort."
--------------------	--

Description

WC Good point. Some in EMIX, others could be here.
--

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Nov/10 07:18 PM ]
State engines delve into the processes behind the services.
From SOA Reference: "Services are concerned with the public actions of each interoperating system. Private actions, e.g., those on either side of the interface, are considered inherently unknowable by other parties. A service can be used without needing to know all the details of its implementation. Services are generally paid for results, not effort."

**[ENERGYINTEROP-173] All sections, and 796 - Combine - each section where you have a class of services, have a structure where you present models, schema fragments, and sequence diagrams that illustrate how a service works. Easier to digest for the readers.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Marty Burns, Ed Koch		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Schemas will be produced in a separate file(s) as soon as the UML stabilizes
--------------------	--

Description

EdK adds to main comment "schemas in a separate file improve source control."
---

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Nov/10 08:56 PM ]
--

Will not combine.

Schemas will be produced in a separate file(s) as soon as the UML stabilizes

**[ENERGYINTEROP-174] Section 12 - Purpose of the section? Objective? Assumptions for martyr** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

**Resolution:** Section was deleted

Description

Holding place for requirements WTC - will be different. Put in non-normative appendix - req validation. TC - stuffed sources of perf requirements - each has specific bus reqs. Intent as services stabilize, go back to those business requirements. WTC. Risk note: OASIS standard conformance section is specific. Higher level of conformance specifications. Artifact of rough draft.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 09:34 PM ]  
 Section was deleted

**[ENERGYINTEROP-175] General - Not much time to analyze the UML. Didn't see references to EMIX** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

**Resolution:** No change. Section 6 completely rewritten in wd16, and uses EMIX extensively.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:40 PM ]  
 The uses of EMIX was in section 6 which was completely rewritten for wd16.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-176] 588 - Go back to I588. Meat so far. Need more gap analysis.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

**Resolution:** Unable to determine original issue

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:49 PM ]  
 Please clarify and update wrt wd16. WD17 has a different section order in services.  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:26 AM ]  
 I guess this was assigned to me, but I don't have a clue what this issue is or what the description means.

[General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible. \(ENERGYINTEROP-187\)](#)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-177\] 591 - Comment on I591 - dig deeper and understand what it means. If want to transmit a price...simpler. An EiEvent never contains a price. Agree with M should be able to include other data items. No notion of the simple levels of price from OpenADR.](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

Proposal:	Price change event. (WTC). Prices distrib in another way. SPLIT INTO SEPARATE ISSUES.
Resolution:	Define EiProgram service to deliver levels. Consider bundling of service operation messages for Events, Quotes, and Program calls in a future draft.

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:29 PM ]  
 Agreements now include progmas, and these program agreements can be communicated in event notifications with schedulability similar to that in contract-based events.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-178\] General - Going to have to have - BB argument -- a better undersanding of hosw the scheds/intervals are tied to the event info type.](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

Resolution:	Being closed as per commenter's request
-------------	---

Comments  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 10:50 PM ]  
 Please clarify and update wrt wd16.  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:17 AM ]  
 This comment is a duplicate of 227 and 235 and can be closed.

[General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible. \(ENERGYINTEROP-187\)](#)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-179\] 591 - Send all three - price rel, current, and H/L/M?WTC](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

Resolution:	Addressed with EiProgram call service.
-------------	--

Description  
 EdK PEV and rest of the home. Comm both of those prices as potentially part of the same.

Comments  
 Comment by [Gale Horst](#) [ 16/Nov/10 09:47 AM ]  
 Yes  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Nov/10 12:34 AM ]  
 Addressed with EiProgram call service.

[General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible.](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-187)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-180\] General - Simple levels - not semantically coupled to anything in the signals there](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

**Resolution:** Define EiProgram service to deliver levels. Consider bundling of service operation messages for Events, Quotes, and Program calls in a future draft.

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:29 PM ]  
 Agreements now include programs, and these program agreements can be communicated in event notifications with schedulability similar to that in contract-based events.  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 23/Nov/10 01:27 AM ]  
 I thought that what we agree upon in todays call was that we would define a new EventInfo type within EiEvent that could be used for defining an arbitrary set of levels. My understanding was that the EiProgram would be used for bundling in the future, not for defining levels.  
 Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 25/Nov/10 10:43 PM ]  
 My understanding as well. Since it was determined during TC call that the inclusion requires work, I suggest this as a priority for inclusions of levels in EiEvent.

[General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible.](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-187)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-181\] General - Don't see simple price levels -- can be an instance of the eventinfo type](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

**Resolution:** Define EiProgram service to deliver levels. Consider bundling of service operation messages for Events, Quotes, and Program calls in a future draft.

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:29 PM ]  
 Agreements now include programs, and these program agreements can be communicated in event notifications with schedulability similar to that in contract-based events.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-182\] General - Need a better understanding of how schedules are tied to eventinfo type.](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd14</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 09:47 PM ]  
 Schedules are part of each and every EMIX object.  
 EMIX objects are part of EiEvents.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-183\] General - Dyn price, not just real time prices.](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>

<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

**Resolution:** See [ENERGYINTEROP-214](#). Closed this item with no action due to similarity.

**Description**  
 Dyn price, not just real time prices. Not in this, will include. What about dynamic prices? CPP is commercial. Price multiple is an event that's being called. Don't see that degree of granularity in the existing event info - intended to be included later?

[General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible. \(ENERGYINTEROP-187\)](#)  
[↪ \[ENERGYINTEROP-184\] General - WRT the simplified L/M/H \(Normal/Mod/High\) has to be included - critical for compatibility and ease of use of information.](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

**Proposal:** Incorporate this and make clear that there is no exclusion  
**Resolution:** Define EiProgram service to deliver levels. Consider bundling of service operation messages for Events, Quotes, and Program calls in a future draft.

**Description**  
 Mentioned that the IRC uses, SEP uses it. One big reason (incl OpenADR) allows backward compat. Simple opps can translate for backward compatibility.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:29 PM ]  
 Agreements now include programs, and these program agreements can be communicated in event notifications with schedulability similar to that in contract-based events.

[General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible. \(ENERGYINTEROP-187\)](#)  
[↪ \[ENERGYINTEROP-185\] General - Direct reaction to Rish - understand toasters need HML, interact with those. What are the conformance rules for HML? If it's only kinda high or medium?](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** Define EiProgram service to deliver levels. Consider bundling of service operation messages for Events, Quotes, and Program calls in a future draft.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:29 PM ]  
 Agreements now include programs, and these program agreements can be communicated in event notifications with schedulability similar to that in contract-based events.

[General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible. \(ENERGYINTEROP-187\)](#)  
[↪ \[ENERGYINTEROP-186\] General - Even at edge conformance group. Go to OpenADR.](#) Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Girish Ghatikar		

**Resolution:** Define EIProgram service to deliver levels. Consider bundling of service operation messages for Events, Quotes, and Program calls in a future draft.

**Description**

Even at edge conformance group. Go to OpenADR. Very clearly defines simple and smart client information. Simple/smart - for a smart can send RTP (day ahead, current). If Simple - don't have sophisticated control, won't look. Can map into simple - from 10-20 all the time, 20-60 dim the lights, 60 or more do shedding and shifting. Directly map into simple clients. ON the conf side - clients receive, HML hourly, does this particular device say "certify" that EI OADR 2 - conform to simple or smart client information.

T : assume a market with simple sine waves. Evening down 10%, up 10% is high. In another market - wider swing. Say now have something on top? GG good point, not a conf statement. Impl is customer specific - what you can do at strat side is indep of conformance. Can't get it done - customer side - see dynamic price paper. Example on mapping prices to simple operation is just one example. Look at LMP - CAISO. Moderate may not be any more. How do you address price vol at the customer side. WTC: HML - only that H>M>L .

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:29 PM ]  
 Agreements now include programs, and these program agreements can be communicated in event notifications with schedulability similar to that in contract-based events.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-187] General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-177</a>	<a href="#">591 - Comment on I591 - diq deeper an...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-179</a>	<a href="#">591 - Send all three - price rel. cur...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-180</a>	<a href="#">General - Simple levels - not semanti...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-181</a>	<a href="#">General - Don't see simple price leve...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-184</a>	<a href="#">General - WRT the simplified L/M/H (N...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-185</a>	<a href="#">General - Direct reaction to Rish - u...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-186</a>	<a href="#">General - Even at edge conformance gr...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-188</a>	<a href="#">General - Talking to CAISO - they und...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-190</a>	<a href="#">General - Big request for BAS - give ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-192</a>	<a href="#">General - A toaster in CA that sheds ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine

**Resolution:** ProgramCall Service Added. Will consider potential bunding of Event, Quote, and ProgramCall Services in a future draft

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:29 PM ]  
 Agreements now include programs, and these program agreements can be communicated in event notifications with schedulability similar to that in contract-based events.

**General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible.** (ENERGYINTEROP-187)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-188] General - Talking to CAISO - they understand the logic behind this. They are looking into providing level for the different situations, rather than or on top of comm price.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Albert Chiu		

**Resolution:** ProgramCall Service added. Will consider bundled communications of Event, Quote, and ProgramCalls

**Description**

Point out - even the ISO realizes the constraint about comm price. Set up categories - set for sending to different customers.

WTC Data digestion - at which level? Range+number in range? AC: Up to the parties to determine how and what kind of signal to send. If go back to first few pages - all about the party interaction and agreement. If the parties agree 3 level HML. If agree there are 10 levels. then so be it. Critical to send the info in the data model. NOTE number of levels varies in California at least.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:21 PM ]

We should not rule out devices that are smart enough to directly repond to forward price quotes.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-189] General - Two interop you can give to a level that you exchanged. One is that you've exchanged/sent a price table, and the label is an index into the table. In scope for PAP09 and EI. The other is information for load shedding. Then DLC is another thing.**

Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Marty Burns		

**Resolution:** It is contrary to the philosopht of EI to rely on occult references to occult tables

Description

EdK deps on DLC - send a dispatch of 100MW is that a DLC sig? If say no? levels are a char of that info. Is it a lot or is it a little. Gives some qualitative char -- WTC - levels and the level. EdK set at 4 levels. Also a mech if someone wanted to def discrete levels of any bounded size could do that as well. CAISO uses 10

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 06:41 PM ]

It is contrary to the philosophy of EI to rely on occult references to occult tables

**General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible.** (ENERGYINTEROP-187)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-190] General - Big request for BAS - give us one standard, don't change it.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** Define EiProgram service to deliver levels. Consider bundling of service operation messages for Events, Quotes, and Program calls in a future draft.

Description

Big request for BAS - give us one std, don't change it. With arb number of levels and shapes - a square or triangular power load - guarantees no national market. Low level - EnergyStar Climate - Green, Yellow, Red as stds for all to support. Prob should have a blue - charge it now. Even aimed at home, more than the ES Climate 2 should be our default.

TC input to them for approp levels. So a big request of facility automation systems is "give us one type of levels"

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:18 PM ]

It seems to me facilities and their standards orgs should define their own standard levels and a translation from energy interop price and event signals that apply to any party. The translation should be out of scope for EI and more the role of OPNHAN for EI although EI might provide a generic mechanism.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 06:29 PM ]

Agreements now include progmas, and these program agreements can be communicated in event notifications with schedulability similar to that in contract-based events.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-191] General - One thing is a model : DR is done by having a building integrator spend 2 weeks.** Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Toby Considine		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Re-written
<b>Description</b>	
Model should be : if possible no building integrator should be called, just figure it out, so low barrier to entry. Too much creativity on this one point may create a barrier to entry.	
<b>Comments</b>	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Nov/10 07:07 PM ]	
Re-written	

<a href="#">General - Price means a lot to customer, not a lot to customer load shed strategies unless customer can respond to a spec price...has to be some exchange from a price to a level - up to the program to decide. Communication has to be possible.</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-187)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-192] General - A toaster in CA that sheds 10MW using simple levels. Address the issue - different system integrators for different programs.</a> <small>Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10</small>	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Ed Koch		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Define EiProgram service to deliver levels. Consider bundling of service operation messages for Events, Quotes, and Program calls in a future draft.
<b>Description</b>	
Customers in CPP/Dynamic pricing, programmed against the simple levels. Moved those same into a dispatch by CAISO - fundamentally different - give me 50kW/100kW - not a price. But prog their strat against the simple levels didn't have to change anything. Dispatch is simple levels	
What are the details? T: Pick one. B: different regions/VTNs. R: Finiet level, simple. In OpenADR picked 4 - not random. Done through 4-5 years of reasearch, go through consumer surveys on what they'd see inside the building, including control vendors, do with minimal effort to implmeent strategies. Red/Amber/Gree reflect in most devices. Basd on that - 3 + emergency were included on top. Years of reserach. 10MW has AB controleld systems. Industrial can use automation for RTP/DP.	
<b>Comments</b>	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Nov/10 06:29 PM ]	
Agreements now include progmas, and these program agreements can be communicated in event notifications with schedulability similar to that in contract-based events.	

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-193] General - Beat the horse - we've identified the issue with respect to levels</a> <small>Created: 16/Nov/10 Updated: 20/Nov/10</small>	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd14</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	SGIP-PAP09 Gerald Gray		

<b>Description</b>	
If one wants 3 and one wants 10. Don't have to think too much about those indiv means and what they mean -- in the context of who's providing and who's using --there would have out of band agreement.	
<b>Comments</b>	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 20/Nov/10 04:47 PM ]	
Agreed	

<a href="#">Figures 7, 8 need to lose the ERM and acquire a VTN...Verify service names in Figure 8</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-234)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-194] Figures 2,3,4,7 refer to ERM party. I do not see that term defined.</a> <small>Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10</small>	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Redrew figures.

[Service Defintion Improvements collector \(ENERGYINTEROP-325\)](#)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-195\] Lines 598, 604 where is the interaction for DR Standing Bid defined?](#) Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell wd16 lines 598-604		

**Proposal:** Add defintion for interaction in appropriate section. Replace in this section with something related to the table below.  
**Resolution:** Resolve per sibling subtask [ENERGYINTEROP-216](#)

**Description**  
 Is this similar or equivalent to DR Program Enrollment?

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 11:40 PM ]  
 I think this should be expressed in the language of the EMIX Option, i.e., a business schedule during which execution calls can be mase with a warranted response time.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Mar/11 11:27 AM ]  
 Clarify DR Standing Bid.  
 Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 04/Mar/11 07:38 PM ]  
 In a demand-bidding scenario for DR, a standing bid is typically set by the VEN (e.g., DR participant) within a particular DR service provider program with option to adjust or cancel the bid. If the bid is not adjusted/canceled, the standing bid will be submitted at the end of the bid period. This is also sometimes called (in Auto-DR terminology) as "auto bid, auto shed," meaning you set the bid one time (standing bid) and it will be submitted without any actions from the participant.  
 Page 83 of OpenADR 1.0 specifications state the following on standing bid -- "A standing bid is a bid that will be submitted by the DRAS for a participant if no other bid is submitted by the participant. The ability to automatically submit standing bids increases the level of participation in programs that require bidding. In some case the utility's or ISO's IT infrastructure will already support the notion of standing bids and in those cases it is not necessary for the DRAS to provide this functionality. In fact there may be scenarios where there are programs that require bidding, but all the bidding is handled by a different system than the DRAS, including the handling of standing bids. In this case, from the DRAS point of view, the program will not require bidding and all the DR events are simply issued by the utility or ISO as in the case of programs with no bidding. The utility or ISO will simply handle all the bidding as they normally would and use the DRAS to issue the DR events."  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-196\] Lines 649, 624 Figure 10 identifies EISend... and EISent payloads. There is no matching service in the table on line 624.](#) Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell wd15 lines 649 624		

**Resolution:** Delete EiSend class from figure. This was an error. See issue 210.

**Description**  
 Add to table.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-197\] Line 624. "a price event is performed using a SendQuote operation" is followed by table with xxEvent operations.](#)  
 Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell wd15 line 624		

**Resolution:** Changed text to reference the SendQuote operation in the EiOffer service.

Description

There is no reference to SendQuote in the document. I assume DR pricing messages are defined elsewhere with different terminology. Please add a table caption.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-198] Line 655 Feedback is provided by both Asset and Resource. Add Resource association or ID reference.** Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	Bruce Bartell wd15 line 655		

Resolution: Add resourceID [0..\*] to EiFeedback.

Comments

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:24 PM ]

+1

**[ENERGYINTEROP-199] Line 685: Constraints are applicable to Both Asset and Resource.** Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	Bruce Bartell wd15 line 685		

Resolution: Add resourceID: String to EiConstraint class.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-200] Line 689: Where is the class / complex data type EiConstraintBehavior defined?** Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd15</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd17</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	Bruce Bartell wd15 line 689		

Resolution: Add copy of EiConstraintBehavior to the class diagram for EiConstraint services. Add text describing EiConstraintBehavior to the EiConstraint section.

[Service Definition Improvements collector \(ENERGYINTEROP-325\)](#)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-201] Line 706: OptOut equivalent in IRC model includes: economic, emergency, must run, not participating, outage run status, override status, participating.** Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 12/Apr/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd18</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd19</a>

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	Bruce Bartell wd15 line 706		

<b>Proposal:</b>	The proposed resolution then is to leave everything as is, and get confirmation from the IRC that this meets their needs. (see comment below)
<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>(Public review 1 resolution that was not agreed upon by the committee: Added Reason string to OptOuts. A later activity will permit definition of constrained sets of strings.) [included in model]</p> <p>Use wscalendar:Vavailability to define Opt In, Opt Out and constraints (acceptSchedule and notAcceptSchedule) Add optReason string to renamed EiEoptInOut but not to EiConstraint</p> <p>Standard strings (as per IRC) plus x-strings</p> <p>Defined strings are economic emergency mustRun notParticipating outageRunStatus overrideStatus participating</p>

**Description**  
Group should respond on actual requirement. Does Retail DR really have opt-in programs? Are the remaining items applicable? Recommend expanding Option to be equivalent to commit or dispatch status and revising the service names accordingly.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:29 PM ]

Opt-in rights, Opt-Out rights, et al. are conditions of the Agreement (and its "sub-class" Program), and as such are outside the scope of this agreement. Constellation, at least, has publicly demonstrated user interfaces to support both opt-in and opt-out.

Energy Interop makes no assumptions about what it is appropriate to say, or what agreements should say, just what can be said.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 03:49 PM ]

Standards should also provide consumer choice as an explicit requirements and not subject that to service provider/agreement discretion. It goes back to the reliability of DR programs (not so much of an issue with RTP) where customers tend to consider participation if they're given choice. This should not be closed without agreement from the commenter or consensus from the TC.

Comment by [Eduardo Luzcando](#) [ 22/Nov/10 04:28 PM ]

Assuming that EiConstraint and EiOptout cover what in the IRC model labels as commit or dispatch status (as suggested by Bruce), these attributes can be part of an Enrollment (which I think in EI means part of an agreement) but it can also be overridden when an Offer (in the IRC) is submitted. hence it is not only in the Agreement.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 04:32 PM ]

Not clear where the disagreement is, Rish.

Standards cannot provide consumer choice, any more than TCP provides consumer choice if there is only one provider in town. Standardscan "support" consumer choice, especially when built into an application, or when they enable market rule-makers (PUC, etc.) to open up markets without undue re-casting and re-building.

Agreement maps to the Market Context.

For wholesale, that market context is likely to be each ISO or RTC. They have market rules, and all EI can do is enable them; A communication specification will not define the market rules.

For most retail, the market context is the program, which today is usually some sort of Tariff. Whether they can opt out or not is based on the terms of that tariff. We cannot enforce choice, there, with this specification. We can only enable it. FERC, even, cannot enforce choice there, they can only urge the PUC's to.

If the question is, should we use the same list as in Wholesale, I think that list is up to the VTN/VEN agreement. Bruce's list is a fine one. If the Oregon PUC mandates that the local utilities add "Bad Hair Day" and "Raging against the Machine" as options, then EI should support that (meaning no fixed list).

Perhaps I am being dense, but I am not sure what I am missing here.

Comment by [Eduardo Luzcando](#) [ 22/Nov/10 04:44 PM ]

For I just need to verify where in the model these attributes can be used when enrolling (i.e. registering in EI) or when submitting an Offer (in EiConstraint and EiOptout).

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 04:46 PM ]

Toby: I think the issue here is closing the item without sufficiently understanding the underlying rationale of the request. Please see other suggestions that I concur with.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 04:55 PM ]

All opt-out messages should include an optional string description which shall possibly be enumerated within the context of a given Agreement or Program

Question: As the EGetProgram (sic) call lets [dumb device-based ESI] ddbc change its ui based upon some key facts, (Your program has 7 levels, level 3 is "normal"), should it also include an optional list of strings?

Of course, my implementation of consumer choice would be to invoke

MYODB

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Feb/11 04:14 PM ]

Re-opening per Bruce's request

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 09/Feb/11 10:33 AM ]

I discussed this issue with Bill Cox, Toby, Bruce, and EdK. There is apparently a requirement in the NAESB req docs for an "Opt-In" approach, but Ed Koch did not know the source of that, whether there is really a need, or simply it was a use case discussed that might be useful. OpenADR is the basis for the current Constraint and Opt-Out approach, and the current approach has the blessing of the OpenADR TF (I believe). Bill pointed out that the EiConstraint service actually has both positive (acceptSchedule) and negative (notAcceptSchedule) views of the constraints, but Bill thought adding this positive/negative element to OptOut (or changing the name to something like "tempConstraint") would be problematic.

To the issue of text strings, which are presently covered with the "reason" attribute in the EiOptout class, Bruce didn't like the name "reason" since maybe it didn't express the idea of the project codes that would be passed in this text string (such as the IRC text items mentioned here, i.e., "economic, emergency, must run, not participating, outage run status, override status, participating.") We can change the name if there is a better suggestion that everyone agrees to.

The proposed resolution then is to leave everything as is, and get confirmation from the IRC that this meets their needs.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Feb/11 10:13 PM ]

Planned resolution is to use the constraints from EMIX, align the Ei Constraints (slow moving), and add OptIn in addition to OptOut. Needs careful definition of priority, e.g. Opt-In/Opt-Out beats Constraints, Relationship and conformance for incompatible Constraint In/Out and Opt In/Out must be addressed.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Mar/11 11:31 AM ]

Use WS-Calendar vavailability (EMIX Business Calendar) to define Opt In, Opt Out.  
Add a Reason string to Opt Out  
Standard strings (as per IRC) plus x-strings

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 10:54 PM ]

Included in 20110305 model.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 09:06 PM ]

Are these addressed and the standard strings used?

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell wd15 line 710 figure 16		

**Resolution:** Add resourceID to EiOptout class.

**Description**  
Add appropriate association or ID.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 03:45 PM ]  
+1

**[ENERGYINTEROP-203] [Line 718 Section 7.3.1 - Feedback vs. Status](#)** Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell wd15 line 718 wd16 line 807		

**Resolution:** Added language derived from Bruce's comment to both [6.2 was 5.2] and to 7.3

**Description**  
It appears that "Feedback" may refer to the status or state of the Asset or Resource as it responds to a DR Event signal. Status seems to refer to the status of the Event itself. If the group agrees to the definitions, the definitions should be added to sections 7.3 and 5.2

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:44 PM ]  
Accepting language

**[ENERGYINTEROP-204] [Line 721 Status is applicable to both asset and resource.](#)** Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Incorporated submitted definitions into the Glossary

**Description**  
Actually f the above defintion holds it is sent to Asset or Resource.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 09:06 PM ]  
What is the clean line between Assets and Resources?  
Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:13 PM ]  
Response to Toby's question is below:  
A DR Resource as a logical entity is a group of Assets that represents a dispatchable entity. A Resource may be an individual asset or a group of assets that represent a dispatchable entity.  
DR Asset is defined as an end device that is capable of shedding load in response to Demand Response Events, Electricity Price Signals or other system events (e.g. under frequency detection). DR Assets are only capable of consuming Direct Load Control and Pricing messages.  
  
In the context of the original comment, although the document is clear that this message is only applicable to Asset, is there an equivalent interaction required for a Resource? Or is the EIEvent the intended for consumption by a Resource? (See issue 169). If Resource can get the current status using an EIEvent service, then I withdraw the original comment.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:49 PM ]  
Thanks!

<a href="#">Service Definition Improvements collector</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-325) <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-205] Line 721: testEvent should be expanded from Boolean to allow for indication of other types of Events: Advanced (Normal), Immediate, Audit/Test</a> Created: 18/Nov/10 Updated: 05/Mar/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell wd15 line 721 wd16 line 809		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Make testEvent a string rather than a boolean. A particular installation would have to look at the strings for meaning, but the boolean treatment could be implemented as "null string" or "not present". Cardinality [0..1] . This should not only be in EiStatus but in EiEvent as well.		

<b>Comments</b> Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 21/Nov/10 08:30 PM ] Is the suggestion to make testEvent (attribute of EiStatus) an enum or something else? Comment by <a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a> [ 22/Nov/10 02:43 PM ] A String would work in the near term, but an enum is good candidate once the choices can be discussed and agreed upon. Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 23/Nov/10 01:07 AM ] Defer. New design, many issues, post PR1. Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 22/Feb/11 10:43 PM ] I think that an enum is a mistake, as it's not very flexible going forward. A string is the better choice for 1.0, per Edgardo's suggestion. Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 22/Feb/11 10:44 PM ] Make testEvent a string rather than a boolean. A particular installation would have to look at the strings for meaning, but the boolean treatment could be implemented as "null string" or "not present". Cardinality [0..1] Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 05/Mar/11 07:54 PM ] See also comment from Toby Considine on 212: "If you want the complete suite of Events in Test, wuldn't that argue instead for being able to put a Test flag on all Event, Quote, and Program services? " This includes testEvent as redefined on EiStatus and EiEvent classes; should it be in more places? Should it be an attribute in the schemas? Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 05/Mar/11 08:37 PM ] Added testEvent: string to EiEvent and EiStatus classes. See notes for <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-205</a> (this issue) for possible other places this should/could be used.	
--	--

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-206] Line 323 and Section 5: EI DR DLC approaches not addressed elsewhere in the document</a> Created: 19/Nov/10 Updated: 24/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell wd16 line 323 and section 5		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Message content is defined in document "OpenSG OpenADR 1.0 System Requirements Specification" contributed to EI on 2010-09-29. Payload defined in Section 3.4.2 All Direct Load Control Dispatches Direct Load Control is a Dispatch type that requests an Asset to be in a specific load control state (e.g., to turn it on or off). DR Asset ID An identifier of the DR Asset for which the control is intended. Status Check A signal to require the DR resource status to be sent back. Direct Load Control Type The type of DR Direct Load Control Command: e.g. Set Point Open/Close Heating Temperature -offset/setpoint Cooling Temperature -offset/setpoint Load adjustment offset Direct Load Control Value Value associated with the Direct Load Control Type. Same Event associations for Interval and Location as defined for Objective based message. Services and Operations for Direct Load Control are defined in the document "UCA OpenADR TF Service Inventory with OASIS EI" contributed to EI on 2010-09-30.		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Closing per request of Commenter		

<b>Description</b> Line 322: "EI also supports demand response approaches ranging from limited direct load control to override-able suggestions to customers." Section 5 only has objective based message. Need to add direct load control messages that are sent to Assets.	
--	--

<b>Comments</b> Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 20/Nov/10 08:04 PM ]	
---	--

For transactive, there is no direct load control except on the customer side of the Energy Services Interface (ESI). At the ESI or at the device, price quotes are turned into load control signals. This translation could also happen in the cloud where the price quotes are translated to direct control signals as if it were done at the device or ESI.

The translation of price quotes to control signals could be done in the cloud or at the ESI by an aggregator, LSE or the ISO but the process is the same. The same concept could be used to model the translation of prices and dispatch signals into simple price and quantity levels.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 23/Nov/10 02:43 PM ]

Can the deferral be in the form a deferral to another Standards Body? A footnote or section acknowledging that the DLC work is being done elsewhere and EI is deferring to that work?

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 24/Nov/10 07:58 AM ]

There is sufficient language elsewhere in the document for DLC. Please close.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Nov/10 09:42 AM ]

Per request of Commenter

**[ENERGYINTEROP-207] Critical: Include simple client information in EiEvent Service text and figure 9 (WD15, In. 619-644, figure 9)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 619-644 and figure 9		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Include a. DR Event status (EventStatus in OpenADR 1.0) - The EventStatus can take these values: NONE, FAR, NEAR, ACTIVE, CANCELED b. Operation Modes (OperationModeValue in OpenADR 1.0) - the OperationModeValue can take these values: NORMAL, MOD, HIGH, SPECIAL c. Current Time (currentTime in OpenADR 1.0)
<b>Resolution:</b>	Per Monday night meeting, making part of Program Call services, will consider bundling of Quites, Events and Program Calls at a later time

Description

OpenADR 1.0 EventState.xsd includes SimpleClientDREventData with following elements, which are similar to those offered by other standards (e.g., Zigbee/SEP):

- a. DR Event status (EventStatus in OpenADR 1.0)  
- The EventStatus can take these values: NONE, FAR, NEAR, ACTIVE, CANCELED
- b. Operation Modes (OperationModeValue in OpenADR 1.0)  
- the OperationModeValue can take these values: NORMAL, MOD, HIGH, SPECIAL
- c. Current Time (currentTime in OpenADR 1.0)

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 10:54 AM ]

(a) the EiEvent service allows getting all open events. Is there a need for Canceled events? Filtering can be done at the VEN.

Should filtering be optionally done at the VTN?

(b) The operation models are addressed in the Program definition pending for wd17. This is related to the discussion about levels for event response with the number of levels and the number that's "normal/moderate".

(c) I don't understand what's requested in this item. EI is not a time server, there are many other protocols for that. A timestamp in each message could achieve this, but lower levels in messaging tend to do that. Why is this application level?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 10:54 AM ]

Reassign for further comment/discussion.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:54 PM ]

c) Agree that NTP et al. are just fine for Time. It is an interesting question whether in a given program or given package, Assets should be required to use the VTN as their [NTP] server... In any case, that would be out of scope.

b) I thought that after Florida, and with Albert's guidance, Normal / Mod / High became the Program, that a Program was monotonic increasing on some severity / scarcity scale, and that any program could be defined with the information: Levels: 7, Normal Price: 3, [Current] Level: 4.

Rish: do you think the entire program set, as above, should be re-communicated in the EventStatus?

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:16 PM ]

Bill and Toby:

In OpenADR 1.0 and current commercial implementation, this request goes beyond sending NORMAL/MODERATE/HIGH prices. Please see LBNL contribution and consensus agreement on this issue, posted on the EI website some months back. Yes, this information need to be communicated as part of the EventStatus as there are many clients (200+ facilities and 80 MW) of load that relies on it and many in future will continue to.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:55 PM ]

Non-standard legacy implementations must not be part of the standard. Standards-based VTN servers are likely to need to communicate in Legacy language with legacy clients for some time, it is true, but that is something far different that including the legacy interfaces in the standard.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 03:11 PM ]

Standards must address legacy systems.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-208] Critical: Provide mechanism for events schedules inside of EiEvent Service (WD 15, In. 627-644)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
----------------	--------

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar WD15 lines 627-644		

<b>Proposal:</b>	- Add relation to notification time, start/end time, duration, etc. In OpenADR 1.0 described as scheduleType (pg 76)
<b>Resolution:</b>	This should be wscal::Sequence (if the reference is to the class in Figure 9 labeled "Emix::wscal::Sequence" containing a gluon.

Description  
 2. Provide mechanism for events schedules inside of EiEvent Service (WD 15, In. 627-644):  
 - Is this part of Emix::wscal::Sequence gluon?

Comments  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 09:49 PM ]  
 The comment for scheduleType in OpenADR 1 schemas for this enumeration (values None, Dynamic, Static) is

- None - there is no schedule and thus the Event Info does not change values during the entire DR event window.
- Dynamic - The time schedule is not fixed during configuration, but can be set when the DR Event is issued. =
- Static --The schedule is fixed when the DR program is configured within the DRAS

These correspond to

Static -- a fully bound wscal:Sequence  
 Dynamic -- a partially bound wscal:Sequence, and when the event is issue the sequence is bound to a starting time (e.g.)  
 None -- no schedule

Please explain how the example of scheduleType does something different than the (perhaps unclear) application of wscalendar Sequence.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 10:40 AM ]  
 Reassign for further comment/discussion.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:12 PM ]  
 The dynamic schedule types will include expansion of a specific schedule to suit a particular DR program/event. Example, A CPP program may have two different schedules (12-3 p.m. in 3x mode, and 3-6 p.m. in 5x mode OR 12-6 p.m. in 8x mode). The schedule must be flexible enough to handle such situations. If WS-Cal allows that, we should add clarity of that is addressed in EI.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:23 PM ]  
 That is precisely what WS-Calendar communicates. It applies a message to a sequence of intervals. Gluon isd the "applies to", each interval is the segment of time.

In the simplest case,  
 [Event][Interval]  
 [Program Event: 12:00][3 hours, 3x]

is nearly indistinguishable from no WS-Calendar at all.

In the more interesting  
 [Event][Interval][Interval]  
 [Program Event 12:00][3 hours, 3x][3 hours, 5x]

An since "an EMIX is a Description applied to a sequence", all communications (event, quote, status) include this capability.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:27 PM ]  
 Great -- let's add this context in the PR document to make sure the readers understand it.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:27 PM ]  
 It looks like there are multiple dimensions to an Event Schedule?  
 Specific to a Program and to "mode"?  
 Is this the way it needs to be expressed to the VEN or Resource? Or is there just a schedule of deployment objectives to the VEN or Resource?

**[ENERGYINTEROP-209] Critical: Remove dependencies to WSCal via EMIX (WD15, In 642-644, figure 9)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 642-644 wd16 lines 642-644		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Just use WSCal/ or provide no dependencies.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Ensure that the class does not show EMIX, but instead is wscal::Sequence. Add note that the Public Review version of WS-Calendar does not include a gluon in the definition of Sequence, so this has been submitted as a comment.

Description  
 EiEvent Service UML Class Diagram shows link to WSCal via EMIX object (Emix::wscal::Sequence).

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:11 PM ]  
 Rish: Please describe what your tyhinking is on this.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 20/Nov/10 11:35 PM ]  
 Toby: This was reference to TC consensus we reached. The UML diagram (figure 9) still shows call to WSCal glue-on using EMIX object. Need to clarify what the semantics and how this works. Leaving it blank is not a good idea.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 09:30 PM ]

The Emix::wscall::Sequence was a way of referencing a wscal:sequence when the published ws-calendar schemas from the public review did not bundle a gluon.

The correct reference will be (when ws-calendar is updated following the comments made about this) to wscal::Sequence, without EMIX in the middle.

I believe that this satisfies the concern. An alternate would be to create in the model a Sequence class in wscal, but that doesn't yet exist.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-210] UML Class Diagrams for EiEvent and Associated Classes, Operation Payloads (WD15, In. 643-649)** Created: 20/Nov/10

Updated: 08/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 643-649; wd16 lines 643-649		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-327</a>	<a href="#">Add mechanism for VEN to query the VTN...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Girish Ghatikar
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-328</a>	<a href="#">Clarify relationship between figures...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-329</a>	<a href="#">Describe the difference between EISen...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-330</a>	<a href="#">Allow mechanism for interactions betw...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Girish Ghatikar
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-331</a>	<a href="#">Add attribute for schema versions (sc...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Girish Ghatikar
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-332</a>	<a href="#">Add mechanism to identify test events</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox

**Resolution:** See subtasks.

Description

This issue is retained as a container for the listed subtasks. All comments prior to the subtask splits are here; the subtasks have independent resolutions.

- a. Add mechanism for VEN to query the VTN to find what signals to expect for a specific program (e.g. pg 76 of OpenADR 1.0 has name of the type from EventInfoType).
- b. Better describe the relationship between Fig 9 and Fig 10.
- c. Describe the difference between EISendEventPayload and EISentEventPayload
- d. Allow mechanism for interactions between VEN and VTN for transactions/ For example, the eventStateID in OpenADR 1.0 is intended to handle transactions by avoiding data payload issues. Other option (may be better) is to create a framework that allow creation of multiple XSDs for each of the types.
- e. Add mechanism to handle Schema versions? (schemaVersion in OpenADR 1.0)
- f. Add mechanism to identify test event (testEvent in OpenADR 1.0)

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 09:25 PM ]

Comments/questions interleaved.

- a. Add mechanism for VEN to query the VTN to find what signals to expect for a specific program (e.g. pg 76 of OpenADR 1.0 has name of the type from EventInfoType).

\*What specific operations and payloads do you suggest?

- b. Better describe the relationship between Fig 9 and Fig 10.

\*Figure 9 is a full class diagram for the EiEvent class and its associated classes. In Figure 10, the "associated classes" are not shown for clarity. The document should make that clear for all of the "Operation Payload" sections.

- c. Describe the difference between EISendEventPayload and EISentEventPayload

\*It's an error. The SEND version should not be in the figure. There is no such operation in the table on line 623.

- d. Allow mechanism for interactions between VEN and VTN for transactions/ For example, the eventStateID in OpenADR 1.0 is intended to handle transactions by avoiding data payload issues. Other option (may be better) is to create a framework that allow creation of multiple XSDs for each of the types.

\*Don't understand the comment/suggestion. Please create a new item including only (d). EventInfoTypeID is a class, eventStateID seems to be what you're suggesting but it's not clear how you suggest applying it.

- e. Add mechanism to handle Schema versions? (schemaVersion in OpenADR 1.0)

\* This is scaffolding. The use of schemaVersion is important and useful, but made some diagrams more cluttered. It should be in the next version.

- f. Add mechanism to identify test event (testEvent in OpenADR 1.0)

\*See also 212, 205

This is one of several comments related to test events. See 205, 210 (this item), and 212.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 10:40 AM ]

Reassign for further comment/discussion.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:10 PM ]

Bill,

- a. This query information is described in #214.
- b. Yes, adding some text as described will help.
- c. Agree - add all operations to table on ln 623.
- d. This reflects interactions between VEN and VTN for different types of DR events/programs (e.g., VEN participation in both CPP and DBP programs). In OpenADR 1.0, the eventStateID was intended to show different types of programs/events as part of one payload - in EI we should at least consider the OpenADR style, or even better allow multiple XSDs (one for CPP and one for DBP) that a VEN can poll. The architecture needs discussion.
- e. OK -- useful for client testing and conformance. We should at least mention.
- f. Yes!

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:55 PM ]

Note that this should be six separate issues.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Nov/10 01:22 AM ]

Deferred pending resubmissions. (e) is a new issue.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Feb/11 12:02 AM ]

Some have been entered as separate issues to ensure actions are addressed. Please enter each as a subtask in Jira so we can process.

F is addressed in another issue.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Feb/11 12:03 AM ]

Reassigned to Rish to create Jira subtasks for processing.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 16/Mar/11 05:11 PM ]

New issues created for resolution.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-211] Critical: Provide mechanism for dynamic pricing EventInfoTypeID (WD15, pg 642-644)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a> , <a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 643-644 wd16 lines 643		

**Proposal:** Including that there is a separate transaction (section 6 from EMIX) for a resource/asset to participate in DR pricing is not a good idea for extensibility of client development, conformance, and cost of implementation of a particular standard. Less likely option is to point to an EMIX object in the EiEvent service.

**Description**

Add PRICE\_MULTIPLE, PRICE\_RELATIVE, PRICE\_ABSOLUTE simple pricing mechanism for DR events as part of DR event/program as section 6 includes transactive pricing. Currently, the document (WD 16, In 692, 693) says, it "needs an offer and acceptance to reach a contract."

The DR CPP and PDP pricing that use above suggested pricing mechanism does not need offer or acceptance.

**Comments**

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 07:03 PM ]

DR CPP (critical peak pricing) and DR PDP (peak day pricing) are likely only useful in the context of requirements tariffs and should not be confused with full dynamic pricing which is address by EI as priced offers and quotes. Whether an acceptance is needed is a separate issue. I agree CPP and PDP prices being commiicated within a "DR" event.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 20/Nov/10 11:38 PM ]

Agree on CPP (PRICE\_MULTIPLE) and DBP (PRICE\_RELATIVE) prices. Additional comment for ABSOLUTE prices: If pricing information is sent as an event (as described in OpenADR V1.0), then semantics and payload need to be described or referenced in Fig. 9. If pricing event information is described in Chapter 6, then it leaves the contents of Chapter 5 incomplete and confusing.(i.e. are price quote events consistently treated as events?)

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 08:48 PM ]

One issue in this discussion is the combining of primary DR communications as "events". We've tried to more carefully define "event" as the performance under an agreement ("program"), and separate price distribution as "quotes".

I believe that the point in the comments is that there are changes in prices that may have similar effects to a curtailment reliability event, but that applies to price changes however communicated. And price communication only does not have all the attributes of an Event.

So "price quote events" is a mixture of terminology - there are Events (that cause something to be done under the overarching Agreement) and Quotes (that communicate a value/current/future price in a tender or a contract).

Other comments have suggested combining the sending of price with the sending or calling of an event as an optimization. See 237 for an example.

Finally, EiQuote can deliver price information. That information is understood in the context of the overarching Agreement (see other comments and wd17 for the clarified terminology). The acceptance took place when the overarching Agreement (including a Program) was accepted, so there's no need for a separate offer and acceptance, only receipt of the quote.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 10:38 AM ]

Reassignment for further comment/discussion.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:03 PM ]

**Bill:**

This request is different from EiQuote -- from many fronts. First we're NOT sending quotes or real prices per se. We're sending representation of those quotes and/or prices (multiple and relative of CPP and PDP should not be mistaken with absolute prices), which I think you're referring to. Agree, there are similarities to comments with #237. This comments goes beyond that to address separate transaction requirements for VEN participating in price and reliability events that are NON RTP-based.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Nov/10 01:09 AM ]

This comment should go to EMIX where the priceRelative is defined.

**UML Model and Diagrams Collector (ENERGYINTEROP-324)**

**[ENERGYINTEROP-212] UML Class Diagrams for EiEvent and Associated Classes, Operation Payloads (WD15, In. 643-649)** Created: 20/Nov/10

Updated: 05/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 643-649 wd16 643		

<b>Proposal:</b>	See desc.
<b>Resolution:</b>	(a) no action. (b) need to be done as part of string management (separate issue <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-333</a> created, so closing this one) (c) test events issues are elsewhere

Description

- a. Add provision for adding custom data (not critical)
- b. Describe and add a use case for VEN to respond to the event request (e.g., response that client is opting out).
- c. Describe and add a use case for VEN to participate in a test event.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 08:35 PM ]

(a) Where specifically would the custom data go? The figure has 6 classes. Is this related to the customData in OpenADR1 class EventState, modeled as a sequence?

(b) We had thought that the event wouldn't get to the VEN if the optout were visible at the VTN. Good catch. Should the filter mechanism from EiConstraint be used, or a simple response "venOptout"? In either case, this avoid a race condition and should be included.

Note that the responses/ACKs are not defined in wd16 but are application depended; this should be addressed in a future draft (i.e., the contents of the EiCreatedEventPayload [typo in figure] attribute eventCreatedAck can be a string "Opted out". Other values not defined). SEE ALSO 217 and 232.

(c) test events are only in EiStatus, and were copied from OpenADR 1.0. Other comments (e.g. [ENERGYINTEROP-205](#) for extension, your -210) address this construct.

Do we have an explanation of why test events are important or useful?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 10:39 AM ]

Reassign for further comment/discussion.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:54 PM ]

Bill:

a. The custom data (again, not critical comment) would go as a placeholder for commands by VTN to VEN (Clients). In OpenADR 1.0 (pg. 73) defines this as, "Custom data - this is a placeholder for information that is intended to be used for purposes beyond the scope of this document. It may be used to send proprietary commands or information to a DRAS Client."

b. I agree that it should be included. Remember, the opt-out state can also happen "after" the event is issued and hence the VTN may not have visibility until VEN takes the action.

c. Test events are extremely important. During the commissioning of the automation, for estimation of load shed potential (which translates to incentive payments and performance metrics), and continued maintenance of automation infrastructure.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:09 PM ]

a) Are you urging that we include room for complete atomic direct load control in Energy Interop?

b -

c) If you want the complete suite of Events in Test, wouldn't that argue instead for being able to put a Test flag on all Event, Quote, and Program services?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 08:38 PM ]

Only (b) is yet to be applied. testEvent - see 205.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 11:34 PM ]

Closing this as 333 addresses the general string standardization issue.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-213] Include non-norm reference for resource definition (EI/ EMIX)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Later		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd16		

**Resolution:** Add a non-normative glossary/description of Resource, quoting EMIX. See new section 14, and Glossary

Description

Currently resource is defined in EMIX and asset in EI.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 10:56 AM ]

Reassign for further comment/discussion.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:49 PM ]

Bill:

This was discussed at the workshop meeting and a consensus was reached to make the resource description as a non-normative reference to both EI and EMIX -- that way it eliminates too many dependencies to other standards.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 11:44 PM ]

New Section 4 added

The new section 4 describes the use of the EMIX Resource Description to describe capabilities.

**Service Definition Improvements collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-325)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-214] Add a mechanism for VEN to send status information to VTNs - a with request from VTN (WD15, section 5):**

Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 16/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>

<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 line 619 // wd16 line 618 Section 5		
<b>Proposal:</b>	See desc. need discussion.		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Status and Feedback should be clarified in the specification. Perhaps the names should change per TC discussions. There is a need for a time-periodic response from the VEN on progress and the degree of curtailment/generation.		

## Description

EiFeedback Service (WD 15, In 652), where the VEN sends feedback information that aids DR market requirements (e.g., real-time telemetry of energy usage for Ancillary services.). Separating feedback from status gives a way to add mechanism for separate transaction and requirements that are independent of each other. For Status, the VTN request the VEN status anytime (VTN responds), which will include following information on the VEN status (OpenADR 1.0, pg. 31):

a. DR Event Status (includes outstanding events, feedback information, event logs, etc.).

## Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 07:10 PM ]

If an asset or resource is capable of separt metering of energy useage, then we could use the usage services (PAP 10) for that purpose. Of course, usage services for ancillary services would have to be fast and would normally be transmitted on a faster communication channel then settlement meter data but the services and payloads can be consistent.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 08:14 PM ]

Outstanding events can be queried by the EiEvent service operation EiSendEvents. This should be adjusted to ensure that VTN-to-VEN is acceptable.

We have not defined "event logs"--is there a proposal? A string?

Feedback information is at line 652 in wd16, and includes an XSD "any" for feedbackInfo. What do you suggest be included as "feedback information"? The attributes of EiFeedback are the same as those for OpenADR 1 Feedback plus feedbackInfo.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:47 PM ]

Bill: I agree with Ed Cazalet that we could leverage PAP10/OpenADE for FEEDBACK information as it relates to real-time energy usage. This request was not related to feedback 0 it was "STATUS" information. For the sake of clarity, in OpenADR 1.0 (pg. 27) the feedback information is included as following (and might go beyond the PAP10/OpenADE requirements):

"5. The DRAS feedback client (VEN in EI) at the participant site sends the system load status to the DRAS (VTN in EI). This is a feedback mechanism that is used to record how the participant site responded to the DR event or status of the facility outside an event (e.g. near real time load). It includes the following information:

- Program identifier
- Facility identifier
- Date and time of the event (shed or shift)
- Shed data in kW/kWh
- Near real time load
- Load reduction end uses (Heating, ventilation and air conditioning [HVAC], lighting)
- Event Type (Day-ahead, Day-of)

6. The utility program settlement program measures usage in a facility and conducts the settlement activity in the Utility Information System. This process is beyond the scope of this document."

The STATUS information goes beyond this --

A participant (VEN manager) can get status information from VTN anytime and include the following (see OpenADR 1.0 pg. 27):

- a. Event status (for all participants): o
- current outstanding events such as load reduction potential based upon all participants in program (optional) and Feedback from DRAS Clients (for those that have optional feedback)
  - Eventlogs (I think it's important to have this for the sake of accountability).

The program manager (VTN manager) can also get status information from the VTN anytime and may include (see OpenADR 1.0, pg 27, 28):

- a. DRAS Client (VEN in EI) communications status
- Currentstatus
  - Last contact
  - Current signals levels (included in simple client information requirements)
  - Current participant manual control levels(opt-out)
  - Communication logs
  - Signal logs
  - Manual control logs

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:27 PM ]

I just want to point out that PAP 10 (at least in NAESB) is not applicable to wholesale, so if there is a specific suggestion of how it can be leveraged in EITC it should be clear that retail is covered and wholesale is not. Similarly with the notion of a DRAS, which is a concept common to retail but not wholesale.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Feb/11 10:56 PM ]

Rephrasing and changing for security and privacy:

A VEN can get status information from its VTN anytime and may optionally include the following (see OpenADR 1.0 pg. 27):

Includes:

- Event status (for all VENs of the VTN [is this secure? I'd say for the requesting VEN only])
- current outstanding events [feedback is from VEN to VTN; why would you request it from the VTN?]
  - Event logs

A VTN can also get status information from its VENs anytime.

Includes:

- communications status
- Currentstatus
  - Last contact
  - Current signals levels (included in simple client information requirements)
  - Current participant manual control levels(opt-out and opt-in)
  - Communication logs
  - Signal logs
  - Manual control logs

The use of parts of NAESB PAP10 for feedback doesn't seem to be wholesale/retail related per Edgardo's note, but rather the confirmation and performance information. DRAS is not relevant to EI, so I've eliminated references in the above. The telemetry information used in wholesale markets would seem to perform a similar function.

This needs to be re-evaluated in terms of the M&V discussion with Edgardo, Donna Pratt, and Bill Cox on February 18.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Feb/11 10:59 PM ]

Please evaluate comments and proposed resolution.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 04/Mar/11 07:52 PM ]

Bill: I generally agree with your suggested revisions for status information requests from VTNs (to VENs) and VENs (to VTNs) and responses. We need to make sure the information exchange is consistent with key requirements identified in OpenADR. Otherwise, this issue can be closed.

**Service Definition Improvements collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-325)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-215] Remove 0-\* as optional requirements/services/elements as it creates interoperability challenges (WD15, In 643-649)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 line 643 wd16 line 643		

<b>Proposal:</b>	See desc.
<b>Resolution:</b>	No change in wd17. Investigate issues of conformance in a later draft. Optionality in information does not necessarily create interoperation issues.

Description

Remove 0-\* as optional requirements/services/elements as it creates interoperability challenges (WD15, In 643-649).

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 08:06 PM ]

0..\* cardinality is in one place in Figure 9 (EiEvent)

Locations 0..\* (there may be many locations, or none if the event is for a set of VENs.)

Was something else intended? Optionality in other attributes is open to suggestions.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:33 PM ]

Bill:

The 0..\* cardinality also exists in Figure 10. In general, it's not a good idea as this parent/child relationship exposes to orphans. This will create issues later with conformance and testing and interoperability requirements. We should try to address "optionality." If we want a relationship/attribute, let's have it. Otherwise, exclude it.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Feb/11 11:01 PM ]

This needs to be part of the broader conformance discussion. In general, there seems to be no harm in 0..\* within a complexType; are you suggesting nillable or something else?

Please describe specifically the conformance issues you raised.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 04/Mar/11 07:33 PM ]

Bill,

My comments was more in reference to to nillable, which will lead to optionality. In this case, I was referring to a cardinality where 0 (indicating none) when applied to interoperability compliance, which is looking for test cases against a set of standard specifications, may not result similar response in different implementations. One implementation may not have any attributes, the other may (cardinality allows that) and it's hard to be interoperable against such requirements. We need to make sure that such instances are well described -- not a big issue. For DR, I still prefer if the locational attributes have a location (even if it's a set of VENs). Broadcast scenario may be different story.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 02:10 PM ]

I don't see any difference in parsing (and correctness of parsing).

In general I prefer absense to NIL.

I seem to be missing the point.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Mar/11 12:08 PM ]

Ensure schemas match resolution

**Service Definition Improvements collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-325)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-216] Critical: Provide a mechanism for load bidding information in EiEvent (WD15, 643-649)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar		

<b>Proposal:</b>	See desc.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Ensure that pure demand bidding is addressed in an example (see example issues). Added a new examples issue for demand bidding.  Demand bidding must be clearly addressed in the combination of EMIX and Energy interoperation.

Description

Current proposal does not seem to handle pure load bidding requirements (not price/load bidding). There are current implementations of commercial DR programs (e.g., PG&E and SCE demand-bidding program) that require it.

See also [ENERGYINTEROP-195](#)

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 07:13 PM ]

emix which is used by ei for offers allows offers of price only, quantity only (market offer), price and quantity (limit order), ISO-like bid curves with multiple price . quantity pairs, and ISO-like 3 part bidding for resources ( Load curtailment and generation)

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 08:00 PM ]

Demand bidding needs to be addressed in an example.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-217] Create a support service (WD 15, 16; section 7)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a> , <a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd16 Section 7		

<b>Proposal:</b>	There should be a service for that, similar to OpenADR 1.0.
<b>Resolution:</b>	A VEN can be created to send email or any other notification as a message transducer.

Description

There is no e-mail notification service (from VTN to VEN). I think this is critical as LBNL experience has shown that people feel more comfortable to participate in DR programs if they're notified.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 07:17 PM ]

It would seem than any notification and event should also be capable of email distribution, twitter, sms, radio carrier, etc. broadcast where security and acknowledgement requirements can be met.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:22 PM ]

Good. We need to describe how those requirements must be met and what's "required" as part of EI.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 03:18 PM ]

EEmail may be a critical part of a successfull OpenADR Application built using the Energy Interoperation Specification, but it is completely out of scope of the Energy Interoperation Specification. Phone banking might be critical, but that, too, is out of scope. Or twitters.

This is a different question than whther messages might be transported by SMTP, or Twitter.

< smile on>I still think that for the Killer Load App, everyone in San Francisco should just friend PGE on Facebook...</smile>

Comment by [Gale Horst](#) [ 23/Nov/10 10:20 AM ]

I would word the resoltion slightly different. Perhaps noting that "A VEN can send email, other notifications or cause a notification to take place." But as Toby noted, email is not something addressed by this specification.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 25/Nov/10 10:38 PM ]

Agreed. Adding that comment will ascertain that a VTN can send notifications.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-218] line 460: "This work assumes that there is no direct interaction across the ESI." However there are assets on the other side of the ESI that have direct interation in eiEvent and eiConstraint.** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet wd16 line 460		

<b>Proposal:</b>	I have no problem with direct interaction for DR related services but we just need to make the distinctions clear.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Added definitions of Assets and Resources to (what is now Section 5), i.e., the introduction to the services. Also added whole new Section 4 discussing composition and the use of EMIX as a messege payload.

Description

Direct Interaction across the ESI appears to be permitted for DR related scvices. Transactive services do not require and should not facilitate such direct interaction across the ESI.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:09 PM ]

EI should not access the Assets directly. The EIS can always opt to ignore any request to invoke an asset if it wants to . There is no unmediated access to the Asstt, so there is no direct interaction with the Asset.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 10:57 AM ]

Reassign for further comment/discussion.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:21 PM ]

OK as long as the transactive services does NOT imply all price communications.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-219] Line 402 : "call for performance" need further clarification** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet wd16 Line 402		

**Resolution:** Removed phrase "implimented as services" which left the false impression that each market activity might be a single service.

**Description**  
 For transactive services there is no need for a "call for performance" of an executed contract unless that contract is a put or call option.  
 For DR contracts there is always a need for a call for performance. This call is typically an EIEvent.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-220] line 517: Structure of Interactions is different for Transactive Services and VTN/VEN Services** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet wd16 line 517		

**Proposal:** Clearly distinguish the VTN/VEN view and the Transactive view in Chapter 3 and then explain where they overlap. For example, transactive services model DR as a call option. And DR allows demand bidding.  
**Resolution:** Closed because addressed in other issue

**Description**  
 Line 518 states that EI views interoperation as taking place between two of more actors. Are the interactions pair wise, one to many, many to one or many to many? Not clear.  
 Line 519 states that actors are designated as VTN or VEN. VTN and VEN designations are appropriate in some circumstances such as DR but not in all circumstances such as transactive services.  
 For example, a Party that owns no resources (generation or loads) such as an Energy Trader or Marketer may buy and sell energy. A VTN is described as invoking operations on a VEN (see line 554 and 555). Energy Traders or Marketers don't invoke operations in the normal course of trading except in the case where two parties have agreed by contract to an option or DR contract.  
 For transactive services all parties play the same roles as traders or marketers in the above description.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Nov/10 12:45 AM ]  
 Please provide suggestions for specifications with respect to wd17 by Friday, November 26.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 08/Feb/11 12:35 AM ]  
 Suggest reword "two or more actors" to two actors". The interactions are all pairwise at least for TeMIX.  
 I suggest we should have separate sections for TeMIX / transactive and VTR/VEN/DR and then a section that addresses what is common and different. This should be less confusing to readers.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 05:43 PM ]  
 Recomende resolution

**[ENERGYINTEROP-221] line 611 and Chapter 6 : move event services and chapter 5 to follow Transactive Services** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">service</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Tobv Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet wd16 Line 611 and Chapter 6		

**Resolution:** Make it so. Order is Transactive Services, Event Services, Support Services, which is much more natural.

**Description**  
 Chapter 6, Transactive Services has registration and other services used by both DR and Transactive Services and logically precedes Event Services.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-222] line 660: Change Transaction Services to Transactive Services consistent with first line of section.</b> Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Done		
Comments			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Nov/10 06:51 PM ]			
Done			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-223] line 697 and line 702 (table): There is no operation to delete a quote yet the table has EIDeleteQuote</b> Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet wd16 line 697-702		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Change EiDeleteQuote/EiDeletedQuote in table to EiCancelQuote/EiCanceledQuote. Also change figure 15 in the same way.		

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-224] line 716 regarding possible change of "Contract to Agreement"</b> Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	For *this* document Agreement is broader context, that incorporates market context and programs. Contracts are the individual transactions under an agreement.		

**Description**

In the EI and EMIX documents and schemas we use the following three terms somewhat interchangeably:

- 1: Transaction
- 2: Contract
- 3: Agreement

All three terms are overloaded terms in various domains. It will be helpful to select our terms and define our usage of the three terms clearly. Below are definitions of the three terms from <http://dictionary.reference.com/> (various dictionaries have varying definitions).

**trans-act-ion**  
/træŋ sækʃən, -'zæk-/ Show Spelled[tran-sak-shuh n, -zak-]  
-noun  
1.  
the act of transacting or the fact of being transacted.  
2.  
an instance or process of transacting something.  
3.  
something that is transacted, esp. a business agreement.  
4.  
Psychology . an interaction of an individual with one or more other persons, esp. as influenced by their assumed relational roles of parent, child, or adult.  
5.  
transactions, the published records of the proceedings, as papers read, addresses delivered, or discussions, at the meetings of a learned society or the like.

**con-tract**  
/n., adj., and usually for v. 15-17, 21, 22 'kɒn trækt; otherwise v. kən 'trækt/  
-noun  
1.  
an agreement between two or more parties for the doing or not doing of something specified.  
2.

an agreement enforceable by law.

3. the written form of such an agreement.
4. the division of law dealing with contracts.
5. Also called contract bridge . a variety of bridge in which the side that wins the bid can earn toward game only that number of tricks named in the contract, additional points being credited above the line. Compare auction bridge.
6. (in auction or contract bridge)
  - a. a commitment by the declarer and his or her partner to take six tricks plus the number specified by the final bid made.
  - b. the final bid itself.
  - c. the number of tricks so specified, plus six.
7. the formal agreement of marriage; betrothal.
8. Slang . an arrangement for a hired assassin to kill a specific person.

**a•gree•ment**  
 /ə ˈɡri mənt/ Show Spelled[uh-gree-muh nt]  
 -noun

1. the act of agreeing or of coming to a mutual arrangement.
2. the state of being in accord.
3. an arrangement that is accepted by all parties to a transaction.
4. a contract or other document delineating such an arrangement.
5. unanimity of opinion; harmony in feeling: agreement among the members of the faculty.
6. Grammar . correspondence in number, case, gender, person, or some other formal category between syntactically connected words, esp. between one or more subordinate words and the word or words upon which they depend; selection by one word of the matching formal subclass, or category, in another word syntactically construed with the first.
7. collective agreement.
8. Law .
  - a. an expression of assent by two or more parties to the same object.
  - b. the phraseology, written or oral, of an exchange of promises.

The term transaction is also used in database terminology to assure that multiple changes to a database are done as a unit or not at all in case one of the changes fail. Transactions as business transactions are used in e-business specifications. EMIX and TeMIX use the term "transaction" throughout. Ei currently uses both "transaction" and "contract" and now "agreement" is proposed. The terms "contract" and "agreement" seem in the above definitions to define something more of a legal document or more general agreement. In power, most transactions take place under the terms of an enabling contract or agreement. For example, a market participant in an ISO signs a participant agreement that determines the obligations of the participant and ISO in processing bids, making awards (transactions) and settlement. Electricity trading counterparties typically have enabling agreements and contracts that facilitate telephone and electronic bilateral trading so that each offer and transaction is contractually defined.

My vote is to use the term "transaction" and clearly define it as a business transaction term and not a database transaction term. This follows transaction definition 3 above: "something that is transacted, esp. a business agreement"

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 07:09 PM ]  
 For "this" document  
 Agreement is broader context, that incorporates market context and programs.  
 Contracts are the individual transactions under an agreement.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-225] Promote venID and vtnID to be attribute of EiEvent(WD16 - 647)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">service</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

**Resolution:** No action for PR1 per discussion with commenter.  
 wd24:  
 VTN ID is not in EiEvent; it should be included.  
 VEN ID should NOT be in EiEvent, as there may be a large number of VENs involved. This is information maintained by the application that presents the VTN service interface and not part of the service.

Description

Should promote the the venID and vtnID so that they are attributes of EiEvent and common to all payloads.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 06:50 PM ]  
 Is a VEN defined by a Party and Resource ID or a Party and Asset ID.  
 If we use Party then the reference also works for Transactive and for Transactive Resource and Asset ID are nil but can be active for VENs.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 07:54 PM ]  
 venID and vtnID are in the payloads. Is this a suggestion to add them (mandatory) to all payloads for the EiEvent service operations? Pushing them into EiEvent would mean a different instance for each VEN, which does not seem desirable.

"Is a VEN defined by a Party and Resource ID or a Party and Asset ID.

If we use Party then the reference also works for Transactive and for Transactive Resource and Asset ID are nil but can be active for VENs. "

A partyID and a venID and a vtnID are all of the same form (basically an mRID); the role is reflected in the attribute name in the UML.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 22/Nov/10 12:54 AM ]

Yes it was a suggestion to make it mandatory. I think it is important for all VEN to know where the message is coming from. I think this is necessary when a single VEN is receiving messages from multiple VTNS, but if you think there are data structure issues that are better served putting it in the payload then that may be OK. I just think that after further consideration we may find that we are putting it in all the payloads, thus it should be promoted.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 06:14 AM ]

What should we do with a "broadcast event"? Is this no longer in scope? I ask because while sender is presumeably knowable, receiver may not always be.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 22/Nov/10 12:12 PM ]

Yes of course we should support a broadcast event. I don't think that effects the issue of promoting the VEN ID attribute. It only effects the semantics of it.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 01:05 PM ]

Adding the VEN ID attribute goes beyond broadcast (which EI must support) -- the aggregation and enterprise operations all need to know the source and to whom it is addressed to.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 17/May/11 11:10 AM ]

My understanding in closing this issue was that the attributes would be reflected in the payloads. I am unable to find them in the payloads which has prompted me to re-open this issue.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:27 AM ]

Add VTN ID to EiEventType or EventDescriptorType

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]

As voted in meeting

[UML Model and Diagrams Collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-324)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-226\] Add descriptions of UML attributes to the document](#) Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">service</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Place in Schema when Published. Also put in the specification (may be deferred after publication of schemas)

Description

There is insufficient description of the various attributes in the UML model. These descriptions should either be explicitly in the doc or there should be pointer to some other docs where the descriptions exist.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 09:08 PM ]

These comments should be in the schema when published

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]

As voted in meeting

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-227\] Need more explicit definition of how wscal::Sequence is used to describe the EiEvent time periods \(WD16 - 642\)](#)

Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch wd16 line 642		

**Resolution:** Create examples of how core concepts from WS-Calendar and EMIX (schedule and terms) are used in Energy Interoperation. See also Issue 238. Addesection describing core concepts.

Description

There does not appear to be enough definon of how the wscal:Sequence is used to describe the different time periods associated with EiEvent. I think this issue goes beyond just adding a descriptobn of wscal, but requires us to further identify the time periods such as "StartTime" and "EndTime" and show how wscal is used to represent them. For the overall EiEvent we need as a minimum:

Notification time

Start time

End time - note that some dispatches that may use EiEvent may be open ended with no edn time to this could be optional

Optinally we could add the various ramp times.

We also need to further show how a sequence of EventInfo instances are represented as a sequence wthin the the Starttime - Endtime interval.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 07:20 PM ]

Notification time, start time, end time, ramp up times, ramp down times are all explicitly characterized in the emix information model.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 20/Nov/10 08:14 PM ]

We must be careful to avoid anything that might redefined either EMIX or WeS-Calendar in those documents. Those standards are normative in their respective areas.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 20/Nov/10 09:20 PM ]

I haven't seen how emix defines the event periods so it may be OK. Even so the current UML does not show the relationship between the EventInfo values and a schedule of those values during the ACTIVE period (OpenADR 1.0 term) of an event. See comment 235 for further elaboration.

Question: Does the scheduling mechanism in emix handle open ended periods, i.e. start time, but no end time?

**[ENERGYINTEROP-228] Line 618: Need to be clear that events can be raised for any valid reason agreed to by the parties to a transaction.**

Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Add the following text to EiEvent:  
 "For transactive services, two parties may enter into a call option. Invocation of the call option by the Promisee on the Promisor can be thought of as raising an event. But typically the Promisee may raise the event at its discretion as long as the call is within the terms of the call option Contract." to the

**Description**

For transactive services, two parties may enter into a call option, for example. Invocation of the call option by the promisee party on the promissor party can be thought of as raising an event. But typically the promisee may raise the event at his discretion as long as the call is within the terms of the call option.

An ISO that has awarded an ancillary services contract to a party may issue dispatch orders which can also be viewed as events.

We need to make clear in the text that these types of events are covered.

The EventInfoTypeID refers to loads but not generators as used in Ancillary Services dispatch. And the event points to a program but not to an option or ancillary services transaction. Changes to extend the EventInfoType and to point to a transaction instead of or in addition to a Program should be straightforward.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-229] Location attributes within EiEvent are weak. (WD16 - 642)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 05/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Used EMIX reference to CIM InterfacePricingPoint for location in EiEvent. Includes serviceArea and more.

**Description**

The EiClasses::Location attributes need further refinement and definition. There are clearly many missing attributes associated with the gridCoordinates and the geoLocation. The gridCoordinates should be extracted from the UCA/IRC and/or CIM model and the geoLocation probably requires more discussion. For the GeoLocation we can either use something from the OGC (e.g. KML) or take a closer look at what they do in the CIM for geolocation. Personally I prefer KML.

**Comments**

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 07:21 PM ]

We should use Service Location as defined in EMIX whcih has KNL and much more.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 11:52 PM ]

Open issue as of March 2011 - [EMIX-340](#) - and a continuing issue as part of [ENERGYINTEROP-207](#).

Need to make a decision; others (CIM, Emergency Management) use GML and we use KML in EMIX and EI.

Further discussion in [ENERGYINTEROP-207](#)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-230] Figures 2, 3, and 4 are labeled ERM and Participant. They should be labels VTN and VEN** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

Due: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 20/Nov/10 07:38 PM ]
We need to make clear in the text that these types of events are covered. The EventInfoTypeID refers to loads but not generators as used in Ancillary Services dispatch. And the event points to a program but not to an option or ancillary services transaction. Changes to allow this should be straightforward.
Notification time, start time, end time, ramp up times, ramp down times are all explicitly characterized in the emix information model.
The Figure numbers in Chapter 4 are messed up : There is no figure 1, and two figure 2s. and two figure 3s. If as declared elsewhere in EI, all interactions in EI are pair wise among parties, then why do we need such complex figures when we can explain both transactive and VEN/VTN with simple figures? If a diagram with multiple levels is used then we need to be clear that it is just an example. For transactive we could have an LSE in the role of seller making an offer to a customer and as a buyer to an ISO, simultaneously, or in some order. For VEN/VTN we could have an LSE making issuing a DR event to reduce load to save money for customers overall with no event by the ISO other than high clearing prices in its markets. Or the ISO could issue a reliability event directly to customers. (This interaction also works for transactive). We can give specific examples but pair wise definitions appear to be all we need.
Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 20/Nov/10 07:39 PM ]
Sorry, the first two paragraphs in my previous comment do not apply here.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Nov/10 06:42 PM ]
Re-number, re-drew, re-wrote

**[ENERGYINTEROP-231] Need a location for the permanent location of the EPRI/Horst paper** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10 Due: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

**Resolution:** [http://my.epri.com/portal/server.pt?Abstract\\_id=00000000001020432](http://my.epri.com/portal/server.pt?Abstract_id=00000000001020432) is the link per Gale Horst in comments.

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Gale Horst</a> [ 22/Nov/10 05:27 PM ]
This is a public document on the epri.com site. This link should be what we need:  <a href="http://my.epri.com/portal/server.pt?Abstract_id=000000000001020432">http://my.epri.com/portal/server.pt?Abstract_id=000000000001020432</a>

**[ENERGYINTEROP-232] Need more detailed specification of the interaction models, specifically around the acknowledgement of the reception of DR signals (WD16 - e.g. 642)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch
<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>

**Proposal:** Create sequence diagrams that show the interactions between the VTN and VEN with respect to the services that have been specified and show how the interactions in the sequence diagrams fulfill the requirements of acknowledgement.

**Resolution:** Use the cited document (<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/40053/Requirements%20for%20VEN%20Responses%20to%20DR%20Signals.pdf> ) and include responses. Consider interaction diagrams. Defer to wd18.

Description

It is still unclear to me how the acknowledgement requirements of some of the services are fulfilled. Note that I earlier put together a document that outlined the various types of acknowledgements

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 21/Nov/10 07:52 PM ]
Please supply the document link. The acknowledgment requirements are (except for push price distribution) are met by a response message, e.g., EiCreateEvent has the EiCreatedEvent operation invoked which ACKs the EiCreateEvent.
Comment by <a href="#">Ed Koch</a> [ 22/Nov/10 12:49 AM ]
<a href="http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/40053/Requirements%20for%20VEN%20Responses%20to%20DR%20Signals.pdf">http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/40053/Requirements%20for%20VEN%20Responses%20to%20DR%20Signals.pdf</a>
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 22/Nov/10 11:42 PM ]
May need to defer past Public Review draft.
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 22/Feb/11 11:08 PM ]
Address with extended interaction models. Reassigning to Ed Koch.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]
As voted in meeting

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-233\] Figures 7, 8 need to lose the ERM and acquire a VTN...Verify service names in Figure 8](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-234)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-233\] Figure 6 is a repeat of of figure 1. This is OK, the narrative reprise works with the text. Figure 6 should probably be decorated with the VTN/VEN labels to show development, and not an error.](#) Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Redrew figures.

**Description**  
 Figure 6 is a repeat of of figure 1. This is OK, the narrative reprise works with the text. Figure 6 should probably be decorated with the VTN/VEN labels to show development, and not an error.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Nov/10 07:49 PM ]  
 VTNs and VENs are just parties playing a given role. In figure 6t the parties are playing transactive roles as buyer and seller not as VEN and VTN. A VTN is defined at 574 and elsewhere as invoking a services on one or more VENs. Once two parties have agreed (or are forced by (regulatory fiat) into a VTN/VEN relationship where the VTN can invoke services on the VENS, the a diagram like Figure 7 and the first figure 2 are applicable.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 03:28 PM ]  
 Redrew figures.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-234\] Figures 7, 8 need to lose the ERM and acquire a VTN...Verify service names in Figure 8](#) Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-194</a>	<a href="#">Figures 2,3,4,7 refer to ERM party. I...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-233</a>	<a href="#">Figure 6 is a repeat of of figure 1...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox

**Resolution:** Figures redrawn, subissues closed.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 03:30 PM ]  
 Subissues addressed by redrawing figures.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-235\] Change cardinality of EventInfo within EiEvent \(WD16- 642\)](#) Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">service</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch wd16 line 642		

**Proposal:** Further clarify how sequenes of EventInfo values are tied to wscalendar and depending upon how that is done allow for mutiple EventInfo types (i.e. multiple EventInfo sequences). In order to support multiple EventInfo types within a single EiEvent we need to add an addition name parameter so that if the two EventInfo types are the same base type (i.e. LOAD\_AMOUNT) they can be differentiated. For example there may be one EventInfo instance called "Local Generation" level that has a type of LOAD\_AMOUNT while there may also be another EventInfo type called "Local Load" ALSO of type LOAD\_AMOUNT. "Local Generation" would have its own sequence of scheduled values, while "Local Load" may have its own set of scheduled values. The 1.0 version of OpenADR supports this mechanism.  
**Resolution:** Cardinality 1..\* for EventInfo (which should probably be EiEventInfo).  
 Also, a 1..1 association to a schedule is part of each EventInfo.  
 Done

**Description**

The cardinality of EventInfo should not be 1..1. For a particular instance of an EventInfo there can be a sequence of EventInfo values between the Start and End time of an event. For example an EventInfo type of LOAD\_AMOUNT may take on a scheduled sequence of values between the start and end time of the event. Furthermore the OpenADR 1.0 spec supports multiple EventInfo types defined for a single EIEvent instance so that there would be a sequence of values associated with each type.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 09:32 AM ]

++1

**[ENERGYINTEROP-236] Requires Program communication services to match price communication services** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	New Feature	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine wd16		

**Resolution:** Create EiProgram service, cloning EiQuote and modifying appropriately.

Description

Create EiProgram service for calling events. Similar in function to EiQuote for price distribution.

[Service Definition Improvements collector \(ENERGYINTEROP-325\)](#)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-237] Incorporate use of emix price models into EiEvent (WD16 - 642, 709)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

**Proposal:** We should expand the EventInfo types within EiEvent to include a price model in addition to the LOAD level types. This can be accomplished in a couple of ways that is completely consistent with the EiQuote service. We can either expand the EventInfo types to include the appropriate references to emix just like we have done in the EiQuote service payloads OR if we find that the price based data model used for EiQuote and EiEvent are identical then I recommend we create a common data model that can be used with BOTH the EiEvent and the EiQuote. This would maintain consistency between the models for prices and how emix is used, but allow prices to be sent using more than one service which I think solves our problem of how emix is used for both priced based DR programs and the newer transactional based interactions described in section 6.

**Resolution:** Consider a PRICE EiEvent type. Associate an emix object with the EiEvent payload  
We (or profilers) may consider constraining the use of the emix object within this context to keep it simple. If we need anything more complicated or transactional in nature then we use the EiQuote service.

Description

Many DR programs (i.e. CPP) don't need all the transactional services defined in section 6 and specifying the sending of prices in a single service like EiQuote which is separate from EiEvent unnecessarily complicates the interactions with devices that use EiEvent and makes it harder for them to migrate between price based and non-price based DR programs.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Nov/10 07:49 PM ]

The later part of the proposal seems to suggest that EiQuote messages can be bundled with EiEvent messages, and that they should be able to be decoupled. The proposed solution is worth investigating.

Please clarify.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 11:49 PM ]

Will investigate "bundling" of services (Events, Program Calls, Prices) into a single service after the services gel.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 14/Feb/11 12:38 PM ]

I'm re-opening this issue because this is my proposal for how we include price communications in the EiEvent data type.

Although bundling was proposed as one way of dealing with this, I propose that we do not use the currently proposed bundling mechanism as in my opinion it is more complicated than necessary and will obsolete the EiEvent service. I propose that we simply create a PRICE EiEvent type and reference an emix object from with the EiEvent structure. Further I propose that we profile the use of the emix object within this context to keep it simple. If we need anything more complicated or transactional in nature then we use the EiQuote service.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Feb/11 05:34 PM ]

Assigning to Cox to implement as Ed suggested

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 06/Mar/11 12:12 AM ]

Added an association to an emix class from EiEvent.

Left (for further review) the PRICE\_RELATIVE and PRICE\_MULTIPLE in the EventInfoTypeID, but I think they should possibly be removed.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 06/Mar/11 12:13 AM ]

Applied to 20110305 EI model; text changes will follow.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-238] There is not enough clarity in how ws calendar and emix are used within the context of EI.** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add further specifications and examples of how emix and ws calendar is used within emix.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Create examples of how core concepts from WS-Calendar and EMIX (schedule and terms) are used in Energy Interoperation. See also Issue 227. (New Section 4)

Description

There are two issues with the way we are referencing ws calendar and emix within the EI doc. The first is that we are making wholesale references without any examples of how it is used to satisfy the requirements of EI so it is hard to evaluate whether their use is appropriate. The second is that presumably emix and ws calendar are standards that have their own scope and could be used for things other than EI. Therefore it is important to further specify how those standards are constrained and instantiated within EI. I made a comment related to this earlier related to references to ws calendar within EiEvent, I have the same concerns with emix.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 03:12 PM ]

Any detailed description of them risks creating a "pseudo-normative" definition. I have created a Glossary in a new appendix, with high level descriptions that will in part address this.

Sample data will be difficult, until EMIX comes out of review, at the risk of creating bad examples. If EA stabilizes, then we can get stub schema to elaborate which would be very helpful.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 22/Nov/10 03:55 PM ]

There were a lot of comments from a lot of different people related to how ws-calendar is used in EI. If we assume that we aren't all that dense then perhaps the relevant information is more in the editors head than it is on paper. Just making a broad reference to ws-calendar and saying that it is used for all scheduling is akin to saying we are writing a standard that uses Language::English. While it may be correct it isn't very enlightening. I'm not looking for a re-definition of ws-calendar in the spec, but presumably we are using ws-calendar in some fairly specific ways that should be depicted somewhere. For example I see nothing in the UML that shows the multi-dimensional nature of the schedules associated with the EventInfo instances. I agree that we should use ws-calendar for that purpose, but the UML does not depict that aspect of the schedule which in my opinion should show that aspect of our EiEvent schedules. Again this is not an argument on whether we should be using ws-calendar, but simply further specification on how "EI" is using ws-calendar.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 11:39 PM ]

resolve 238 and 227 together--same solution.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-239] We have to have some better variant on Conformance when we release Energy Interoperation for public review**

Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11 Due: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-94</a>	<a href="#">886 - Note in regard to performance e...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-98</a>	<a href="#">874 - My question - assuming conforma...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-99</a>	<a href="#">874 - If there's a testing and confor...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-101</a>	<a href="#">874 - Pile on. In conformance, refere...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine

**Resolution:** The editor placed business requirements for Energy Interoperation in this section, so they would not be forgotten, and to be a seed for conformance. The Technical Committee expects additional conformance requirements to come from early adopters.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:35 AM ]

All subissues resolved.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-240] Section 6 uses "contract" while sections 5 and 7 use "agreement"; they should be consistent and use "contract"**

Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Environment:</b>	WTCox
<b>Proposal:</b>	Change "agreementID" and "agreementName" and other instances of UML attributes with "agreement" in the name, respective to "contractID" and "contractName" and so forth.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Through the document change the terminology. The overarching agreement that provides context for interactions might be called a market context, market rules agreement, a program, etc.  Note in document that a context is always present; a "counterparty" may or may not be.  We use the term "transaction" for "contract" and "tender" for "offer" to be consistent with the EMIX Public Review of November 2010; comments welcome during the EI Public Review.

Description

Where a "program" was used in OpenADR, Sections 5 and 7 use "agreement" e.g. agreementID and agreementName as a generalization.  
Section 6 uses the term "contract", e.g. contractID.  
Since all of these are either agreements or contracts, both should use the same term. I suggest "contract" be used for all definitions.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-241] Clarify intent and semantics of SendQuote operation (WD15, In. 624)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 Line 624		

**Resolution:** Add description and example of price distribution via EIQQuote service.

Description

the SendQuote operation is undefined. It relates to adding dynamic pricing information as part of event services (Section 5)

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Nov/10 10:03 AM ]  
Rish:  
Has this been addressed to your satisfaction?  
Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 04/Mar/11 07:42 PM ]  
Toby: I think the issue with sendQuote operation is the bundling of messages via EMIX for dynamic pricing information as it relates to DR event. For the purposes of flexibility and long-term reduction on transaction costs that come from referencing many standards to do a simple task, I suggest that we detach the bundling requirements for price-responsive DR notifications (as we did with PRICE\_MULTIPLE and PRICE\_RELATIVE for EIEvent and associated classes.  
Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 04/Mar/11 07:42 PM ]  
By the way, this issue is from a larger umbrella of bundling and referencing other standards as part of DR messages and can be closed if being considered elsewhere.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]  
As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-242] Clarify relationship between EIFeedback Services and EIEvent Services (WD 15, In 653-655)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 653-655		

**Resolution:** Rewrite portions of EIFeedback section to address; evaluate in PR01.

Description

Are Feedback Service interactions first class events or subsidiary to Events? Provide information model elements that bind Event and Feedback events - e.g. if Feedback Services stateless with respect to Events, etc.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Nov/10 01:59 AM ]  
Please look at rewritten section for wd17.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-243] Include some form of glossary or descriptive text for terms such as Asset (WD 15, fig. 11 and 12)** Created: 20/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** A glossary will be included as an appendix.

**Description**  
Example, Scope and granularity of "asset" important to understanding semantics of Feedback Services.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Nov/10 10:43 AM ]  
 A glossary would be a good idea, but not high priority for public review.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:56 PM ]  
 A glossary will be included as an appendix.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-244] Line 717: Change VTN and VEN to Party in Table** Created: 21/Nov/10 Updated: 21/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		

**Resolution:** In this case, these cotracts are already directional (as per the prevailing agreement) and so can properly use VTN/VEN rather than Party [ Show » ] Toby Considine added a comment - 21/Nov/10 08:49 PM I don't think so. In this case, these cotracts are already directional (as per the prevailing agreement) and so can properly use VTN/VEN rather than Party

**Description**  
The services in 6.3 apply to transactive as well as VTN/VEN. Consistent with other tables in Section 6 the table should refer to Party and not VTN and VEN.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Nov/10 08:49 PM ]  
 I don't think so.  
 In this case, these cotracts are already directional (as per the prevailing agreement) and so can properly use VTN/VEN rather than Party

**[ENERGYINTEROP-245] line 681: What distinction is implied by the term partyEndPoint vs. Party URI?** Created: 21/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet wd16 line 681		

**Resolution:** Remove partyEndPoint from the model and schemas.

**Description**  
partyEndPoint was a reference to WS-Addressing; deleting it does not affect the model.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-246] Sections 5.6,7 : The service definitions in 5.6,7 use "invoked by" and "service provider". Please define these terms as used here.** Created: 21/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		

<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet wd16 Sections 5, 6, 7		

**Resolution:** Add definitions suitable to the service operations going both directions. Explanation added to Section 4. Correct all Service tables to the new terminology.

**Description**  
 I am not an expert in SOA so help me understand.  
 [SOA-RM] line 192 states the following:  
 In general, entities (people and organizations) offer capabilities and act as service providers. Those with needs who make use of services are referred to as service consumers. The service description allows prospective consumers to decide if the service is suitable for their current needs and establishes whether a consumer satisfies any requirements of the service provider. (Note, service providers and service consumers are sometimes referred to jointly as service participants.)  
 For the tables in Sections 5,6 7 the use the terms "invoked by" and "service provider". Would it be better to use the term "service consumer" instead of "invoked by"?  
 [SOA-RM] line 482 of the same reference states:  
 The action model of a service is the characterization of the actions that may be invoked against the service.  
 So it seems that some services result in actions invoked by the service provider but not directly by the service consumer.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-247] (line 825)...the DRAS is retail specific, not wholesale. Does conformance imply that a DRAS is required for compliance with the spec?** Created: 22/Nov/10 Updated: 22/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Critical
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Eliminate DRAS from this section

**Description**  
 WD16, Section 8.2.1 (line 825)...the DRAS. Isn't using something like a DRAS expected in retail but not necessarily wholesale? I guess when I read conformance it almost sounds like we are pushing DRAS to those that need to comply with the EITC spec.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 22/Nov/10 02:42 PM ]  
 Agree that DRAS is a term used in OpenADR 1.0 and the term not applicable to EI -- its services as a VTN are relevant (with additional requirements from wholesale).  
 The conformance applies to VTN and VEN -- an aggregation facility may act as VTN and VEN underneath the service provider.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Nov/10 03:27 PM ]  
 The editor placed business requirements for Energy Interoperation in this section, so they would not be forgotten, and to be a seed for conformance. The inclusion of the word DRAS in this release was unfortunate - it is being deleted from the next release.  
 We are light on Conformance, and expect that we will not have enough until folks get sa stable ersion in their hands to try to develop to.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-248] Asset and Resource need to be defined early in the document** Created: 22/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox all wd16		

**Description**  
 Asset and Resource need definition early in the document. Draft glossary has confusing definitions.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 23/Nov/10 12:11 AM ]  
 Explanation added to Section 5 (was4)

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-249] Each Ack String and Optout reason string may need to have a defined list</b> Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 02/Mar/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** As a general approach, any status strings defined in the specification must have "Ei" as a prefix, allowing others to extend as needed, and the TC to evolve the specification in the future.  
Close - no fix, addressed elsewhere

**Description**  
See issue 201.  
Consider strings (e.g.) starting with "Ei" to be normative, others are extensions.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-250] schemaVersion should be added to all schemas</b> Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 08/Mar/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Later		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox for Girish Ghatikar		

**Resolution:** Add schemaVersion (as attribute) to UML diagrams and schema definitions. Include namespace management for values.

**Description**  
See 210. Add schemaVersion as specified.  
Needs to be done during the next major diagram revision, as all diagrams are affected.

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Nov/10 02:05 AM ]  
What should the scope of schemaVersion be? Assume a single version for all schemas together, e.g. 1.0, 1.1, ... or a date such as 20101122?  
Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 25/Nov/10 10:40 PM ]  
Suggest moving from 1 to 2 for major revisions or inclusions. For incremental, it can be either 1.1 (minor revision to 1) or 1.1.1 (minor revision to the minor revision in 1.1).  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 10:11 PM ]  
schemaVersion is used in a non-obvious way in OpenADR 1.  
Looking at (e.g.) UtilityProgram only that class has schemaVersion. Likewise for classes used for ProgramConstraint, OptOutState, EventState (except EventStateConfirmation has it also).  
Could you please explain the logic?  
I'm applying only to "primary" classes in each area, and not to message payloads.  
Also, there are not multiple schemas planned, so I think this is the "overall schema version".  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 10:11 PM ]  
Assigning to Rish to address how schemaVersion is applied in OpenADR 1.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 11:20 PM ]  
Applied. Comments welcome on how it was applied.  
Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 08/Mar/11 07:46 PM ]  
It looks like there is a version attribute in multiple classes. If the version is for the schema, it should be a in a single root element applicable to the entire schema. Changing the namespace for a version is not recommended. It causes backward compatibility issues.  
The format used by CIM is: <date><version> where date is Form is YYYY-MM-DD for example for January 5, 2009 it is 2009-01-05.  
version is Form is IEC61970CIMXXvYY\_IEC61968CIMXXvYY\_combined where XX is the major CIM package version and the YY is the minor version, and different packages could have different major and minor versions. For example IEC61970CIM13v18\_IEC61968CIM10v16\_combined.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-251] EiEvent uses EiClass "Location" but should use CIM InterfacePricingPoint</b> Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 05/Mar/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd16</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
--------------	-----	------------------	-------

<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Use EMIX reference to CIM InterfacePricingPoint for location in EiEvent. Includes serviceArea and more.		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Correct diagrams and model to use InterfacePricingPoint		
<b>Description</b>			
Uses "EiClasses::Location" but should use EMIX reference to CIM InterfacePricingPoint for location in EiEvent. Includes serviceArea and more. See Issue 229.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 24/Nov/10 04:27 PM ]			
Diagrams need updating and should refer to the EMIX::Power:interfacePricingPoint			
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 05/Mar/11 10:35 PM ]			
Included in 20110305 model (and earlier).			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-252] EMIX support for a "contract" flag should be verified if needed.</b> Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine Section 6.3.1, Information Model for Contract Services		
<b>Proposal:</b>	EMIX support for a "contract" flag should be verified if needed. If not adequate, submit comments the EMIX Review Process. This seems to be covered in TransactiveState in EMIX. Verify and make changes as needed,		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Close no change		
<b>Description</b>			
EMIX support for a "contract" flag should be verified if needed. If not adequate, submit comments the EMIX Review Process. See 6.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Mar/11 11:45 AM ]			
Contract s.b. Agreement if it did exist.			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-253] Program Call Services section is missing from document</b> Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 23/Nov/10			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17.1-EiProgram</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Missing section prepared as 17.1, incorporated into WD18 Working Draft		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Missing section prepared as 17.1, incorporated into WD18 Working Draft		

<b>Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas</b> (ENERGYINTEROP-389)			
<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-254] Need to add name attribute to EventType (WD17 - 922)</b> Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">service</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Add the name attribute to EventInfo		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Make a string name in addition to an mRID more consistent across all of Energy Interoperation.		
<b>Description</b>			

Need to add a name attribute to the EventInfo class to support identification and differentiation between multiple EventInfo instances in a single EiEvent.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Nov/10 10:14 AM ]

Name, or ID?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-255] [Line 335 : add link to TeMIX White Paper](#)** Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 12/Apr/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	link is: <a href="http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/37954/TeMIX-20100523.pdf">http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/37954/TeMIX-20100523.pdf</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Accepted recommendation

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 08:23 PM ]

Reopening to apply issue (step seems to have been skipped).

**[ENERGYINTEROP-256] [Section 3 : Inconsistency in defintions of Actors and Roles.](#)** Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 24/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	For consistency VTN and VEN should be called roles and not actors. The actors are the parties (consumers, generators, ISOs, etc ) that take on roles of VTN, VEN or buyer and seller.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Changes made, and traced throughout Section 3

Description

Section 3: Comments on Actors and Roles Inconsistencies

532 The actor for all EI interactions is a Party. An actor is a Party that can take on a number of roles.

587 The Energy Interoperation architecture views interoperation taking place in the context of an interaction between two or more actors, where one designated actor is (for that given interaction) called Virtual Top Node (VTN) and the remaining one or more actors are called Virtual End Node(s) [VEN(s)]. .

**[ENERGYINTEROP-257] [586 Section 3.2 applies only to DR and Resource Dispatch Interactions and not to Transactive Interactions](#)** Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazaket		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendations
------------------	------------------------

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 06:07 PM ]

Revise text of document to clearly separate interactions based on the role of a party as VTN/VEN from interactions based on the role of a party as a Buyer or Seller including their roles in an Option Transaction.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 26/Feb/11 04:40 PM ]

The EI editor has requested suggestions and text for the EI draft.

The EI definitions of services clearly distinguishes between Transactive Services in Section 7 and Event Services. in Section 8. This is helpful to the reader.

In Section 8, Event Services are defined with the Service Consumer as a VTN and the Service Provider as a VEN where a Party takes the VTN or VEN role.

In Section 7 Transactive Services use Party as a Service Consumer or a Service Provider and the Party takes the role of a buyer or seller.

For Transactive Services the interaction patterns among the Parties follow the Transactive Services and Roles defined in the document.

For Event Services the VTN/VEN interaction patterns are also well defined in the document.

To make the document easier for the reader to follow and to make necessary distinctions between

- (1) Interactions for Transactive Services between Parties taking the role of Buyer or Seller, and
- (2) Event Services between Parties taking the role of VTN or VEN I suggest the following outline for Section 3.

3 Energy Interoperation Architecture

3.1 Transactive Interactions

- 3.1.1 Buyer and Seller Party Roles
- 3.1.2 Transactive Interactions
- 3.1.2 Retail Service Interactions
- 3.2.3 Wholesale Power Interactions
- 3.3.4 Transport Interactions

3.2 Event Interactions for Demand Response and Resource Dispatch

- 3.2.1 VTN and VEN Party Roles
- 3.2.2 VTN/VEN Interactions
- 3.2.3 Sample VTN/VEN Interactions
- 3.2.4 VTN/VEN Roles and Services
- 3.2.5 Demand Response Interactions

It would be better if section 3.1 became Section 3 : Transactive Interactions and Section 4: Event Interactions so that Transactive Interactions Section would directly map to the Transactive Services Section (currently Section 7).

And, it would be better if Section 3.2 became a new Section 4 :Event Interactions so that it would directly map to the Event Services Section (currently Section 8).

Most of the rewrite for this suggestion is reordering and renaming of existing text with editing of transitional text among the sections.

I would be happy to provide a draft to the editor of the affected sections should the committee request me to do so.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-258] 643: Figure 3-7 and discussion duplicates Figure 3-1 and discussion and leads to confusion.confusion** Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Delete Figure 3-7 and discussion.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Modified figure 3-7 so no lnger a duplicate

**[ENERGYINTEROP-259] line 459 to 464: Suggested clarifications of market activities.** Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 24/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Reolace text as suggested above.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Replaced text as suggested above.

Description

1. There is an indication of interest (trying to find offers to buy or sell) when a Party is seeking partner Parties for a demand response curtailment event or for an energy source.
2. There is an tender of a service, e.g. production of energy or curtailment of use
3. There is an execution of a contract (agreement to purchase / supply) generally caused by the acceptance of an offer
4. There is a call for performance of a contract at the agreed-upon price, time, and place.

Replace with

1. There is an indication of interest (trying to find tenders to buy or sell) when a Party is seeking partner Parties for a demand response contract or for an energy source or sale.
2. There is a tender (offer or bid) to buy or sell a service, e.g. production of energy or curtailment of use.
3. There is an execution of a contract (transaction to purchase / supply) generally caused by the acceptance of a tender.
4. For some contracts such as Demand Response, there may be a call for performance of a contract at the agreed-upon price, time, and place.

Bold the appropriate terms as in the original to replace the bolds taken out by JIRA.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-260] Section 5: Energy Interoperation Services: Suggest edits to first three paragraphs to provide balance to Demand Response and Transactive Services overview.** Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Replace the first three paragraphs of Section 5 as suggsted above.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Replaced the first three paragraphs of Section 5 as suggsted above.

Description

Suggest replacing

In the following sections, we define Energy Interoperation services and operations. All communication between the VTN and the VEN is through the ESI.

From the perspective of the VTN, each ESI is the interface to a dispatchable resource (Resource), that is to a single logical entity. A Resource may or may not expose any subordinate Assets.

An Asset is an end device that is capable of shedding load in response to Demand Response Events, Electricity Price Signals or other system events (e.g. under frequency detection). Assets are under the control of a Resource, and the resource has chosen to expose it to the VTN. The VTN can query the State of an Asset, and can call on an asset for a response. The Resource (VEN) mediates all Asset interactions, as per its agreement with the VTN. Assets, by definition, are only capable of consuming Direct Load Control and Pricing messages, and then only as mediated by the Resource.

If an Asset, in turn, has its own Assets, it does not reveal them through the VEN. The Asset has not direct interactions with the VTN.

with

In the following sections, we define Energy Interoperation services and operations. All communication between the VTN and the VEN is through the ESI.

From the perspective of the VTN, each ESI is the interface to a dispatchable resource (Resource), that is to a single logical entity. A Resource may or may not expose any subordinate Assets.

An Asset is an end device that is capable of shedding load in response to Demand Response Events, Electricity Price Signals or other system events (e.g. under frequency detection). Assets are under the control of a Resource, and the resource has chosen to expose it to the VTN. The VTN can query the State of an Asset, and can call on an asset for a response. The Resource (VEN) mediates all Asset interactions, as per its agreement with the VTN. Assets, by definition, are only capable of consuming Direct Load Control and Pricing messages, and then only as mediated by the Resource.

If an Asset, in turn, has its own Assets, it does not reveal them through the VEN. The Asset has not direct interactions with the VTN.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 23/Nov/10 09:42 PM ]

Sorry for cut and paste error, the replacement section is as follows:

In the following sections, we define Energy Interoperation services and operations. All communication between customer devices and energy service providers is through the ESI.

For transactive services the customer will receive tenders (priced offers) of service and possibly make tenders (priced offers) of service.

If the customer is a participant in a demand response program, each ESI is the interface to a dispatchable resource (Resource), that is to a single logical entity. A Resource may or may not expose any subordinate Assets.

Under a demand response program, an Asset is an end device that is capable of shedding load in response to Demand Response Events, Electricity Price Signals or other system events (e.g. under frequency detection). Assets are under the control of a Resource, and the resource has chosen to expose it to the VTN. The VTN can query the State of an Asset, and can call on an asset for a response. The Resource (VEN) mediates all Asset interactions, as per its agreement with the resource manager or VTN. Assets, by definition, are only capable of consuming Direct Load Control and Pricing messages, and then only as mediated by the Resource.

If an Asset, in turn, has its own Assets, it does not reveal them through the VEN. The Asset has no direct interactions with the VTN.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 25/Nov/10 10:34 PM ]

We will have to flush out details on how an asset can interact directly with the VTN. The asset can have a virtual ESI to communicate -- need some architecture references.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-261] line 797 : Proposed minor clarifications as to roles and relationship of Transactive to VTNs and VENs.** Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 24/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Replace as suggested.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Replaced as suggested.

Description

Suggest replacing:

For transactive services, the actors are Parties and Counterparties; as, if, and when a contract is concluded, the Parties adopt a VTN or VEN role for subsequent interactions. The terminology of this section is that of business agreements: tenders, quotes, and contract execution and (possibly delayed) performance under contract.

The negotiation, quotes, tenders, and acceptances that may lead to a contract also serve to define the VTN and VEN roles for higher-level services.

With:

For transactive services, the roles are Parties and Counterparties; as, if, and when an option contract or a Resource (Demand Response) contract is concluded, the Parties adopt a VTN or VEN role for subsequent interactions. The terminology of this section is that of business agreements: tenders, quotes, and contract execution and (possibly delayed) performance under called contract.

The negotiations, quotes, tenders, and acceptances that may lead to a contract also serve to define the VTN and VEN roles.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-262] line 851: Table 6-4 Service Consumer and Provider should be Party** Created: 23/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Replace VTN and VEN in table with Party
<b>Resolution:</b>	Accepted proposes action

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 24/Nov/10 12:49 PM ]

Sorry I missed this one - you're absolutely right.

**Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas** (ENERGYINTEROP-389)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-263] Additional types needed in EventInfoType plus name and association changes** Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17.1-EiProgram</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox wd17 section 7.1 EiEvent Service		

<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Perform the following changes:</p> <p>In figure 7-1:</p> <p>(a) Change EventInfoTypeID to EiEventInfoTypeID and EventInfo to EiEventInfo</p> <p>(b) change the cardinality of the association from EventInfo to Sequence to 0..1 (it's optional)</p> <p>(c) add the following to the EiEventImpTypeID enumeration: PRICE_RELATIVE and PRICE_MULTIPLE to allow for offset from known base prices (per VEN) and a multiple of those known base prices</p> <p>Addition of price (emix artifact) to EiEvent adjusts some of the above. See <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-237</a></p>
--------------------	---

Description

Certain types should be added for the Public Review and comment period to the following classes to enable communication of relative price in a simple form consistent with OpenADR 1 experience. Changes are in the proposal section.

Note that the information proposed to add may be duplicative, but should be part of the first Public Reivew for evaluation. Also, some of the information may relate to the EiProgram metadata service as suggested by Ed Koch; again, PR01 comments should guide the TC.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 09/Feb/11 11:43 AM ]

need to solve how to represent price as part of Events, first. Ed and Bill (and Rish) agree on proposed resolution.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Mar/11 11:51 AM ]

OK to proceed, using EMIX.Price, not ready to resolve because it needs development

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas** (ENERGYINTEROP-389)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-264] update line 897 per issue 263** Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>

<b>Proposal:</b>	rewrite
<b>Resolution:</b>	Rewrite consistent with <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-263</a>

**Description**  
is this still true? Can be either way for now.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 11/Feb/11 09:34 AM ]  
 see subtask--agree on approach to price relative, price multiple  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Feb/11 12:10 AM ]  
 Subtask of [ENERGYINTEROP-263](#)  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:31 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-265] remove RequestTransactions** Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 18/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Delete the paragraph line 1007. Take Request Transactions out of table.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Suggestion accepted

**Description**  
line 1009 and table 8-3, remove RequestTransactions

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 18/Feb/11 12:32 AM ]  
 This is a message to request from counter parties or a repository the a set of transactions by a party assuming the party has the necessary authorization. If it is out of scope, fine, but what is the reason.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-266] address security** Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Added discussion of using Coposition to incorporate and evolve security as needed
--------------------	---

**Description**  
Just as WS-Cal got dinged by the CSWG for not addressing security and how it will be addressed, same issue for EI. We need a sub section that addresses it similar to WS-Cal.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 24/Nov/10 09:51 AM ]  
 The IRC Information Model has the basic notions of what would cover NERC CIP concerns for information classification. Namely a suggested way to tag data in the envelope of an interaction using high, medium, and low for the attributes of Confidentiality, Availability, and Integrity.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Nov/10 10:01 AM ]  
 Apples (WS-C) and Oranges (EI) here. WS-Calendar was a format only. w/o any use. These are communications that must be used in customer interactions, and that specify customer data.  
 C, A, & I, as Edgardo said, is a good place to start.  
 Context is also impotent. Are we using EI between ISO and Aggregator? Integrity and Assured Delivery may be most important. Between Utility and Consumer? Confidentiality may trump all.  
 For WS implementations, there is a host of WS-Security approaches, different covered icings to cover the cake for all circumstances., For non WS Implementations, these may be on secure back channels, and other security considerations apply.  
 I think all we can do is identify what might be security flecion points, why they exist, and guide the implimenters in choosing their tools wisely.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-267] Redo Section 9 Conformance</b> <small>Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10</small>	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Section 9 should reference a testing and conformance standard for EI and discuss its role in an interoperability testing process.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Used description as basis for call for comments and suggestions in Section 9.

**Description**

What's currently in Section 9 Conformance is a collection of requirements. Section 9 of EI should not be addressing requirements—that should be in an appendix, but rather Section 9 should point to a testing and conformance standard for EI and discuss how it is used and its role in an interoperability testing process. As for the use case requirements—they have a role in the interoperability testing process, as discussed below. But conformance is whether someone is implementing the spec according to the spec, not whether the spec meets requirements.

The SGIP SGTCC has just release v1.0 of their Interoperability Process Ref Manual:  
[http://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sqgrid/pub/SmartGrid/SGTCCIPRM/SGTCC\\_IPRM\\_Version\\_1.0.pdf](http://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sqgrid/pub/SmartGrid/SGTCCIPRM/SGTCC_IPRM_Version_1.0.pdf)

In section 2 they state,  
 In the context of interoperability, product certification is intended to provide high confidence that a product, when integrated and operated within the Smart Grid, will function as stated under specific business conditions and / or criteria. The IPRM defines criteria, recommendations and guidelines for product interoperability and conformance certification. It is important to understand "Interoperability" has no meaning for a single product but for a relationship among two or more products. Alternatively, conformance does have meaning for one product as it applies to its meeting the requirements of the standard or test profile.

So, looking at use case requirements is important for product certification, but not for conformance testing. Section 5 of the IPRM v1.0 goes on to show that conformance testing precedes Interop testing, and it part of it.

- conformance testing is a part of the interoperability testing process (per line 175 of the IPRM v1.0)
- Line 187 states "Prior to interoperability testing, a product is tested for conformance to the specification at each relevant OSI layer."
- Line 203 "conformance testing is in general "orthogonal", or separate from interoperability testing. Nevertheless, conformance and interoperability testing are interrelated in a matrix relationship."

The statement on Line 187 (bullet 2 above) raises the issue of conformance in the context of some implementation, which may be web services or something else, with its own security, message requirements (what part of EI to implement), and some other requirements. Conformance testing requires that any product that claims to implement EI (as detailed in its PICS statement, which might indicate a limited set of services), can in fact implement these services according to the standard, correctly forming each supported service request, and consuming responses, producing responses as needed, with acceptable parameters, without barfing on bad data (i.e., returning required error messages), etc. Thus, Section 9 of EI should, I propose, point to a testing and conformance standard for EI and discuss its role in an interoperability testing process.

(separate item, note--The SGTCC is recommending that one organization serve at the Interop Testing and Cert Authority for a particular standard. Who will serve as the ITCA for EI? Perhaps the OpenADR Alliance?)

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Nov/10 09:46 AM ]  
 Absolutely agreed.

We stuffed all sorts of requirements into "Conformance" as potential sources for conformance issues. This was fine last August, but is horrid right now.

What shall we do before PR?

A simple "Watch This Space" or what...

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 24/Nov/10 10:08 AM ]  
 I had stated similar concerns in this issue: <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-247>, which was closed but might need reconsideration.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 25/Nov/10 10:24 PM ]  
 To David's comments - The OpenADR Alliance Goals are to address the sections as they relate to OpenADR 2.0 (includes WS-Cal extensions). How it maps to EMIX is still TBD once the document is near completeness.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-268] Improve and Simplify description of WS-Calendar as a building block for EI</b> <small>Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10</small>	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Propose adding <a href="http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/40400/EI%20message%20Doodles.pdf">http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/40400/EI%20message%20Doodles.pdf</a> Before, after, or to replace Section 4.1.1
<b>Resolution:</b>	Accepted proposal

**Description**

The optionality of WS-Calendar still seems to detract from its simple application in EI confusing readers. Suggest something simpler be placed in specification

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 24/Nov/10 12:48 PM ]  
 Add as a non-normative section.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-269] Discussion of Bundling or message optimization or ...</b> Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 05/Mar/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	New Feature	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		

<b>Proposal:</b>	During a potential PR, with the specification temporarily "frozen", it would be useful to have general discussions on which approaches to "bundling" (a term chosen for "NO" technical semantic meaning) these calls, for optimization of interaction and simplification of processing. These discussions would lead to guidance to the TC on edits for the next round of edits.
<b>Resolution:</b>	We are not addressing bundling of messages in general. The prime candidate, bundling price distribution messages with EiEvent messages, was addressed by including the (possibly constrained) EMIX artifact in the EiEvent payloads as needed. See <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-237</a> . No action on bundling.

**Description**  
Current document distinguishes between (to avoid the word Events) different kinds of Notifications.

There are Quotes, to notify of changes of Prices, now or in the future.  
There are Program Calls, to notify that some status of the energy program the VEN signed up for is in effect, and that the VEN should do this  
There are Events, which include both reliability events and critical support for legacy OpenADR.

There is inadequate attention to publishing information that affects several of these at once.

**Comments**  
Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 04:41 PM ]  
Needs more committee discussion. Leave unresolved--dependent issue.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-270] Appendix write-up suggestions</b> Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Maybe something like, "Wholesale energy markets have coordinated supply and demand; however, there is a significant disconnect between customer load and the value of energy. That is, the demand is not sensitive to supply constraints; the load is not elastic; the market fails to govern consumer behavior.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Accepted new wording, will try to trim (A) and (B) after other edits done in WD18

**Description**  
Line 1071 "Energy markets have been characterized by poor coordination of supply and demand." Is this true? Someone from an ISO might take this as an attack. The markets work, and the grid is stable, so why say it so negatively? The problem is historical lack of elasticity in n load, with no communication of electricity value and thus no response from customers. The whole system was not set up to be market driven.

1136, "The groundbreaking Olympic Peninsula Project disproved that assumption". There are other reports by the Brattle Group addressing price pilots.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Edgardo Luzcanda](#) [ 24/Nov/10 10:16 AM ]  
I support the idea for more positive language because some ISOs, while recognizing that current practices might not be optimal when compared with more "forward thinking markets", have previously stated that electricity prices are much lower in their footprints.  
Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 24/Nov/10 10:19 AM ]  
Sections A and B (lines 1070 to 1192) were helpful in guiding the early work of the TC but are more appropriate to a white paper than a specification. I suggest removing A and B from the document.  
Comment by [Gale Horst](#) [ 24/Nov/10 10:40 AM ]  
Ed I see your point. But A and B may help new readers understand better via some background information. It took us a while to get focused via these items which would seem to indicate importance to a new reader who may not have the background understanding that we would like to assume. It seems that A and B could use a revision and could probably be scaled back a bit.  
Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 25/Nov/10 10:18 PM ]  
Adding a positive language of what exists and how the EI adds value by including dynamics to the market through automation would be better way to suggest. We need good references.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-271] Missing updated non-normative references to the IRC and updated acknowledgements</b> Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 25/Nov/10	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">SPEC</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Added references as per request

**Description**  
This was discussed offline and targeted for the version that goes out for PR. I think it is now in WD18, but the IRC would like these updates in the version that goes out for PR, whichever it is.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-272] level indication for "wind blowing"** Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17.1-EIProgram</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	New Feature	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Proposal:** ? I think what we have is OK for PR now.  
**Resolution:** Entire section moved to non-normative appendix on background and history prior to Pr01. No longer relevant.

**Description**  
requested by some dishwasher manufacturer, as related by AHAM.

**Comments**  
Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 04:36 PM ]  
I think the issue was that some appliance vendor might want to serve the "green" folks who want to only use power when the wind is blowing. This implies they have an agreement to buy green power from some provider or even from some specific generator. So, there is a contract in place for green power and that needs to be communicated down with a price (perhaps) as the indication that the wind is blowing now and power is cheap.  
Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 04:36 PM ]  
might be worth some further discussion.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Feb/11 03:27 PM ]  
Add formal language concerning source content communications in EMIX as delivered by EI

**367: Missing Interactions (ENERGYINTEROP-281)**  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-273] General - Not able to map all the IRC interactions to the current spec** Created: 24/Nov/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd17</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Make changes to services, including addition of resource enrollment/verification, and measurement as agreed in EL/WTC/BB meeting on February 18.

**Description**  
As of right now I am not able to map all the IRC requirements for interactions identified as needed for Demand Response in wholesale. here is what I was able to map so far:  
[http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/ora/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/40404/Mapping\\_IRC-to-EITC\\_Interactions\\_20101124.docx](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/ora/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/40404/Mapping_IRC-to-EITC_Interactions_20101124.docx)  
I cannot determine right now if services and operations are missing or additional translation is needed.

**Comments**  
Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 04:16 PM ]  
This sounds like a meeting required between Edgardo and Bill, which probably already took place.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 16/Feb/11 12:18 AM ]  
See [ENERGYINTEROP-285](#) for comment string. This appears to be a duplicate and should be set as a subtask.  
Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 16/Feb/11 01:11 PM ]  
Agree that this can merged with [ENERGYINTEROP-285](#).  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-274] 189: Loose Integration and Security** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Added to following to the end of the Architectural Background.</p> <p>Loose integration using the SOA style assumes careful definition of security requirements between partners. Size of transactions, costs of failure to perform, confidentiality agreements, information stewardship, and even changing regulatory requirements can require similar transactions be expressed within quite different security contexts. It is a feature of the SOA approach that security is composed in to meet the specific and evolving needs of different markets and transactions. Security implementation must be free to evolve over time and to support different needs. Energy Interop allows for this composition, without prescribing any particular security implementation.</p>		

**Description**

Loose integration in different ownership domains (per the SOA-RA, 2751) needs further clarification pertaining to security to make it clear that EI can embrace a security model that explicitly covers the IRC's concerns around Confidentiality, Integrity, Availability (per NERC CIP, <http://www.nerc.com/page.php?cid=2|20>). See IRC model ([http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/39898/IRC%20Smart%20Grid%20EA%20Models%202010-10-14\\_Rev1-FinalRelease.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/39898/IRC%20Smart%20Grid%20EA%20Models%202010-10-14_Rev1-FinalRelease.zip)) for details of how the spec is expected to allow compliance with the NERC CIP standards for Information Protection.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Feb/11 03:30 PM ]  
 Refer to section for discussion of security, and review whther section needs expansion

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Feb/11 06:15 PM ]  
 Added to following to the end of the Architectural Background.  
 Loose integration using the SOA style assumes careful definition of security requirements between partners. Size of transactions, costs of failure to perform, confidentiality agreements, information stewardship, and even changing regulatory requirements can require similar transactions be expressed within quite different security contexts. It is a feature of the SOA approach that security is composed in to meet the specific and evolving needs of different markets and transactions. Security implementation must be free to evolve over time and to support different needs. Energy Interop allows for this composition, without prescribing any particular security implementation.

<a href="#">367: Missing Interactions</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-281) <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-275] Scope of enrollment</a> Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Include new services for Enrollment of Resources per IRC/WTC/BB meetings.</p> <p>Correct text to eliminate references to Direct Load Control which is not supported in v1.0.</p>		

**Description**

The scope described in "from limited direct load control to override-able suggestions to customers" does not explicitly include the IRC notion of Enrollment, which was the foundation for all other Interaction defined in the IRC model ([http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/39898/IRC%20Smart%20Grid%20EA%20Models%202010-10-14\\_Rev1-FinalRelease.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/39898/IRC%20Smart%20Grid%20EA%20Models%202010-10-14_Rev1-FinalRelease.zip)) and XML Schemas (<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/39998/IRC%20CIM%20Project%20Workspace.zip>).

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 16/Feb/11 12:25 AM ]  
 See comments on [ENERGYINTEROP-295](#)

<a href="#">367: Missing Interactions</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-281) <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-276] 250: Scope of enrollment</a> Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Edgardo Luzcando		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Address per <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-284</a> to include new services for Enrollment of Resources per IRC/WTC/BB meetings.		

**Description**

Enrollment (or registration) should be part of the scope per the IRC requirements.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Feb/11 06:29 PM ]

Edgardo,

Please make some proposals as to how to move in this direction

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 16/Feb/11 12:26 AM ]

See comments on [ENERGYINTEROP-295](#)

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-277] 265: "Approach"** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Re-wrote section for clarity, re-titled

Description

This does not constitute an approach. It just reads as background information.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 04:06 PM ]

editorial, let Toby deal with it. Just say "background" rather than "background and approach"

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Feb/11 06:31 PM ]

Agreed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-278] 338: Boundary between EMIX and EI** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** EMIX is quite mature at this point, in large measure due to the significant interactions with the Energy Interoperation Technical Committee.  
The factoring is necessary, as Price+Product Definition and Common Schedule Communication are standards that cut across the entire smart grid, so Energy Interoperation needs to use them.  
Clarify the cut points more clearly in the text, consistent with this resolution.

Description

It is difficult to fully understand the appropriateness of using EMIX within EI when EMIX is not fully defined and in flux. Since most EI interaction have a dependency on EMIX it is incomplete to ascertain the validity of any given EI Interaction.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 04:04 PM ]

This is a comment on the process, not the spec, so recommend closing it. Can be discussed along with issue 282: "power and load mgmt in EI is not just about EMIX and WS-Cal"

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Jul/11 11:43 PM ]

Reviewed EMIX language post EMIX-PR03

**[ENERGYINTEROP-279] 348: EI specification and ES** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Clarify narrative
<b>Resolution:</b>	279 Paragraph replacedwith  The Energy Services Interface (ESI) is the external face of the energy consuming node. The ESI may be directly on an energy management system in the end node, or it may be mediated by other business systems. The ESI is the point of communication whereby the entities (e.g. utilities, ISOs) that produce and distribute electricity interact with the entities (e.g. facilities and aggregators) that manage the consumption of electricity. An ESI may be in front of one system or several, one building or several, or even in front of a microgrid.

**Description**  
The ESI is presented as the facilitator of communications, but it is not clear then if ESI is merely another party (either a VTN or VEN) or an intermediary between them. Who then needs to conform with the EI? The VTN, the VEN, the ESI, all of the above?

**Comments**  
Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 04:01 PM ]  
reference the B2G ESI white paper here.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Feb/11 06:30 PM ]  
Language dows sound as if the ESI is some third party floating out there...

<a href="#">367: Missing Interactions</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-281)	
<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-280] 363: Where are the actual actors defined by NAESB?</a> Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Edgardo Luzcando		

**Resolution:** Add table to an Appendix showing the mapping of NAESB actor names to Energy Interoperation role names.

**Description**  
The actors defined by NAESB and present in the IRC model and XML Schemas are not defined or referenced.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
As voted in meeting

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-281] 367: Missing Interactions</a> Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-273</a>	<a href="#">General - Not able to map all the IRC...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-275</a>	<a href="#">Scope of enrollment</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Edgardo Luzcando
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-276</a>	<a href="#">250: Scope of enrollment</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Edgardo Luzcando
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-280</a>	<a href="#">363: Where are the actual actors def...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-294</a>	<a href="#">360 et al: Actors, roles, and intera...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
<b>Proposal:</b>	281 and all sub-tasks should be handled in conversation between WTC and EL				

**Description**  
The roles and interactions of Enrollment (per the IRC) are not defined or explained.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Mar/11 11:24 AM ]  
Following all its sub-tasks into resolution  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-282] 505: Power and load management in EI is not just about EMIX and WS-Calendar** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendations
<b>Resolution:</b>	Clarified that while EI relies on emix and WS-calendar, EI and WS-Calendar do not make up all EI communications.

Description

There is value in stating that EMIX and WS-Calendar can be leveraged in EI to address the areas where price and schedules apply. However, as introductory paragraph for messages and services this fails to speak of the broader range of scope of EI, which includes additional drivers other than price. Language should be adjusted accordingly to specify that EMIX and WS-Calendar have a function within EI, and not that EI is dependent on EMIX and WS-Calendar to solve all interoperation issues.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 03:57 PM ]  
 might need some discussion in the group.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-283] 528: Language is confusing** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Rewrote the introduction of the use of iCalendar as follows:</p> <p>4.1 WS-Calendar in Energy Interop                  WS-Calendar defines how to use the semantics of the enterprise calendar communications standard iCalendar within service communications.                  WS-Calendar allows for ways to express a related group of time intervals as a sequence. It additionally allows for a way to abstract certain information of related intervals to avoid repetition of such information in every interval of the sequence. This abstraction is called a WS-Calendar gluon, and it can be related to a group of intervals in a sequence to represent the same information present in intervals, but applicable to all intervals in a sequence. Gluons can represent interval information such as "start time" and "duration" that would stay constant over time inside all the intervals in the sequence. Energy Interop uses EMIX to exchange descriptions of energy resources and products.                  WS-Calendar is also used directly within Energy Interoperation, to specify contracts such as availability and option call windows. For example, generation reserve may make themselves available only on summer afternoons on weekdays. Some tariffs may specify that suppliers may call for performance on Demand Response events only during a fixed schedule which may span times of day over several months. While these schedules can be difficult to communicate unambiguously, they are common in iCalendar; it is a common to schedule a meeting for Mondays and Wednesdays for the next two months. Because WS-Calendar is derived from iCalendar, it is able to express this availability.                  WS-Calendar gluons associate with intervals in a sequence and share information with them. Gluons can control the start time and duration of intervals in a sequence. Gluons can contain the same artifacts as do intervals. A complex artifact may be shared between Gluon and each Interval in a sequence, so that invariant information is expressed only once, in the Gluon, and the information that changes over time, perhaps price or quantity, is the only part of the Artifact in each interval.                  Practitioners should read [WS-Calendar] to fully the expressiveness of that specification.</p>
--------------------	--

Description

"Either this paragraph is re-written so it makes sense within EI, or removed - provided that the reference to WS-Calendar is left (line 533). As it is it attempts to distill the technical aspects of WS-Calendar instead of using simpler language, which adds to value to section that is simply stating that EI will use WS-Calendar. Even the current definition of Gluon (WS-Calendar 1.0) is difficult to understand without the WS-Calendar specification context: ""A Calendar Gluon is essentially the Interval component profiled down to minimal elements for which inheritance rules are then defined for the sequence.""

Instead the paragraph could use language as follows:

WS-Calendar allows for ways to express a related group of time intervals as a sequence. However, it additionally allows for a way to abstract certain information of related intervals to avoid repetition of such information in every interval of the sequence. Such abstraction is called a WS-Calendar gluon, and it can be related to a group of intervals in a sequence to represent the same information present in intervals, but applicable to all intervals in a sequence. Gluons can represent interval information such as ""start time"" and ""duration"" that would stay constant over time inside all the intervals in the sequence related to a Gluon."

**[ENERGYINTEROP-284] 539: Comma should be removed** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept modification
<b>Resolution:</b>	Accepted

Description

Sentence should be: The simplest power description in EMIX is transactional power.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-285] 554 Is this true for Retail and Wholesale?** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Clarify and formalize language
<b>Resolution:</b>	Changed sentence to Many communications, particularly in today's retail market, involve information about or a request for a single interval.

Description

Is this general claim applicable to both retail and wholesale? If not, it should be qualified accordingly since this is just an example.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 03:56 PM ]

"Most communications, particularly those in Demand Response, communicate requirements for a single interval. When expressing market information about a single interval, the market object (Power) and the single interval collapse to a simple model."

**[ENERGYINTEROP-286] 574: It is not clear how a strike price (in wholesale) is expressed without a sequence during Enrollment** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Description

"While the notion of a strike price can be associated with a sequence during an event (e.g. to compare it against an LMP), by itself the strike price needs to be communicated in an Interaction (see Wholesale model and XML Schemas) during Enrollment that is not related to a sequence, nor related to a schedule or offer.

This seems to be a misleading aspect of the Information Model that EMIX proposes where it seems that to represent something like a strike price, EMIX constructs (which have a sequence) require the presence of a sequence. It appears that EMIX and EI are focusing mostly on events, but there are other Interactions that have different information needs. "

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 03:51 PM ]

needs some further discussion. Part of the price vs. DR discussion.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 16/Feb/11 12:07 AM ]

Perhaps not quite on point, but the wording on line 574 "calling the EMIX Option...defines a strike price" seems odd. Options would have the strike price defined when agreed, unless it's "at market" or "relative to market". The wording quoted suggests that the "strike price" is determined on call, which seems wrong.

The text in EMIX PR01 line287 is correct; it's the paraphrase here that's wrong.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 05:51 PM ]

Revised EMIX schema for strike price in emix options to be posted shortly.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-287] 644: ISO's need to comply with NERC CIP, which should be clear in the example** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 02/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Critical
--------------	-------------	------------------	----------

<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-288</a>	<a href="#">715: Information classification for...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Edgardo Luzcando

**Proposal:** Define an attribute (cardinality [0..1]). The definition will mirror the IRC proposal, i.e., three topics, and high medium or low for each. The CSWG strongly recommends using this as a deployment descriptor, rather than something included in each message. The class model should address how a deployment descriptor is related to a message type or types.

**Resolution:** Security risk to add to messages (rather than transport and interaction)  
Close, no change

**Description**  
While line 640 mentions security, privacy, and reliability the section speaks of security at the communication layer only. ISO's need comply with NERC CIP Information Protection guidelines that should be described in the Information Model (see IRC Information Model and XML Schemas) to classify information, not only protect it.

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 16/Feb/11 12:03 AM ]  
The information structure correctly describes the information classification for NERC CIP, but including the "value" of the message in the message seems to increase risk by flagging more valuable messages. (From discussion with CSWG members)  
This would be a useful "deployment descriptor", rather than a message component.  
This seems to be relevant information in deciding what security/reliability to compose for specific types of interactions.

**644: ISO's need to comply with NERC CIP, which should be clear in the example** ([ENERGYINTEROP-287](#))  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-288\] 715: Information classification for NERC CIP is in-scope for the IRC](#) Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Critical
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Proposal:** Accept recommendations

**Resolution:** Accept recommendations. See [ENERGYINTEROP-287](#).  
Include an optional attribute (cardinality [0..1]) in each message. The definition will mirror the IRC proposal, i.e., three topics, and high medium or low for each.

**Description**  
The IRC Information Model describes a suggested way to classify information for each of the XML Schemas for the 35 Demand Response Interactions.

**Comments**  
Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 03:47 PM ]  
Toby talk to Edgardo to discuss best resolution. Perhaps including NERC CIPs in an example would help.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 15/Feb/11 11:59 PM ]  
The information structure correctly describes the information classification for NERC CIP, but including the "value" of the message in the message seems to increase risk by flagging more valuable messages. (From discussion with CSWG members)  
This would be a useful "deployment descriptor", rather than a message component.  
This seems to be relevant information in deciding what security/reliability to compose for specific types of interactions.  
Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 16/Feb/11 01:09 PM ]  
I am open to suggestions in how to best manage this according to the CSWG. The IRC suggestion is to include a the CIA (Confidentiality, Integrity, and Availability) for each interaction with a high,medium, low. However, I thought that these would be optional in any interaction. Would that satisfy the concern about including the "value"? I understand that calling out this information within an interaction might increase risk, but there is the risk that the same information with no "values" (or labels) can be exposed because its information classification is not understood. As long as EI addresses the NERC-CIP requirement somehow, the IRC's requirements should be satisfied.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Feb/11 12:31 AM ]  
I've tried to address this in the resolution for the parent task, [ENERGYINTEROP-287](#), by having a reference to a message type to which the NERC-CIP levels would apply. I think that this satisfies the IRC issue, but better to look at the proposed implementation when its complete.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Mar/11 11:11 AM ]  
No change recommended during meeting  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-289] 745: "Assets are under the control of a Resource" is misleading** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Blocker
--------------	-----	------------------	---------

<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Description

"The relationships between Assets (or EndDeviceAssets in CIM) and Resources in the IRC Information Model presents a slightly more complete picture of this relationship. The IRC model (borrowing concepts from CIM) describes an EndDeviceAsset, DistributedStorageAsset, and DistributedGeneratorAsset (all types of Assets) as being part a Resource either directly or via an EndDeviceGroup. In either case, the Resource is related to a specific ServiceDeliveryPoint, which in turn is related to a ServiceLocation. In the model, the Asset is then related to EndDeviceControls which define the ""controllable"" aspects of the Assets that belong to a Resource which is enrolled in a Program.

Assets are then not under the control of a Resource, but rather expose ""controllable"" attributes to a Resource and its corresponding enrollment in a program that are specific to a ServiceDeliveryPoint, ServiceLocation (and other geographical constructs such as Zones)."

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">David Holmberg</a> [ 03/Feb/11 03:43 PM ]
I have assigned to Edgardo to propose a resolution to this issue. It seems like what is needed is a text change, but not any service change, so hopefully simple to resolve.
Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 08/Feb/11 01:17 AM ]
I am trying to understand. Is a Generation or DR Resource a "capability" that is offered into an ISO market that may be awarded energy purchases and sales by the ISO market. Behind the resource may be several assets that the Resource "operator" may call on and are known to the ISO, but the ISO does not directly dispatch these assets.
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 15/Feb/11 11:46 PM ]
Agree that the text is confusing. I am creating an issue in EMIX, where the definition of Resource is found. The primary use of "asset" is in EnergyInterop. This needs to be clear and consistent.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Feb/11 05:56 PM ]
Clean up language in WD19

[1113: Appendix should be removed](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-291) [\[ENERGYINTEROP-290\]](#) [1060: Appendix should be removed](#) Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendations
<b>Resolution:</b>	Removed Appendix on Collaborative Energy

Description

Once the specification is validated for completeness and ability to support the OpenADR and IRC requirements, it will speak for itself and this information will not be of any value.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-291\]](#) [1113: Appendix should be removed](#) Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-290</a>	<a href="#">1060: Appendix should be removed</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendations
<b>Resolution:</b>	Removed Collaborative Energy Appendix

Description

Once the specification is validated for completeness and ability to support the OpenADR and IRC requirements, it will speak for itself and this information will not be of any value.

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">David Holmberg</a> [ 03/Feb/11 03:39 PM ]
not clear which appendix, but we should consider which appendices belong in CSD2. If we remove the appendix on "collaborative energy" then we have to define uses of the term in the text.
Comment by <a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a> [ 04/Feb/11 04:06 PM ]
Agree that the appendix can be left during reviews, but it should be removed in the final version.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-292] 271: "While Energy Interoperation aims for future flexibility while it addresses the problems of today."** Created: 23/Dec/10

Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendation
<b>Resolution:</b>	Accepted Recommendation

Description

The first "while" appears to be superfluous.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-293] 297: "offer a agreement"** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendation
<b>Resolution:</b>	Accepted Recommendation

Description

Should be "offer an agreement".

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Feb/11 05:56 PM ]

Accepted Recommendation

**367: Missing Interactions** (ENERGYINTEROP-281)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-294] 360 et al: Actors, roles, and interactions** Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Include a table of NAESB roles in an appendix, and show how the NAESB roles are used and addressed in the specification.
------------------	--

Description

Are the roles defined or assumed? Are the interactions defined or assumed? The NAESB definitions should be leveraged here.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 03:36 PM ]

Not clear to me that we need to define roles, here, but we should reference the NAESB definitions.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 08/Feb/11 12:51 AM ]

For TeMIX/Transactive any NAESB actor is a party that may or may not take on the role of buyer, seller or both. There is no need for any further definition except in the context of an option transaction.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 16/Feb/11 12:24 AM ]

This should be reflected in the NAESB actor mapping list for the appendix.

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 16/Feb/11 12:50 PM ]

Agree with the proposal to " Include a table of NAESB roles in an appendix, and show how the NAESB roles are used and addressed in the specification. "

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 06:04 PM ]

As discussed at the 2/26/2011 meeting I think this is ready for proposed text by the editor.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

<a href="#">Service Definition Improvements collector</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-325)			
<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-295] 247: Missing Interactions and Data Elements</a> Created: 23/Dec/10 Updated: 16/Mar/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Critical
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edgardo Luzcando</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	IRC		

## Description

"The service definitions provided by the IRC cannot be fully mapped to the existing specification. See details of current mappings here: [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workaroun/energyinterop/download.php/40404/Mapping\\_IRC-to-EITC\\_Interactions\\_20101124.docx](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workaroun/energyinterop/download.php/40404/Mapping_IRC-to-EITC_Interactions_20101124.docx). All 35 Interactions need to be accounted for to account for the IRC requirements. The payloads of the interactions are largely missing as well. There is an understanding that the Interactions (and corresponding payloads) currently missing are not there because they specification is still under development, but there is concern of when this will be incorporated into the specification to allow sufficient time to review.

This issue affect a large portion of the specification (namely sections 7, 8 and 9) where all the current EI services are defined. These services do not currently include the IRC Interactions and corresponding data elements."

## Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 15/Feb/11 11:19 PM ]

The EiRegister service was, as observed, designed for Party registration. The items with \* below seem to be specialized Parties (with the role being more specifically described).

Among the suggested changes:

Section 1.0 of the linked document includes registration of:

Service Location  
 Asset Group  
 Resource  
 Scheduling Entity\*  
 Meter Authority\*  
 Load Serving Entity\*  
 Transmission/Distribution Service Provider\*

Items marked with \* have a separate enrollment verification described as asynchronous; the synchronous response to a EiRegisterParty does not directly address the request.

It would appear that the rejection details could be part of the response payloads by adding an attribute eiResponse: String [0..1] to each response payload, similar to other services. Would that address the rejection details and qualification rejection?

Moving to the issue of asynchronous registration/enrollment, this is part of the general pattern issue and should be addressed. One approach would be for the the initial service operation response with registeredParty to optionally have a "EiConfirmRegistration" step. In the alternative, a service (e.g.) EiEnrollParty would have parallel and explicit token return, status update check, and confirmation of verification.

For the following suggest the items in square brackets:

Service Location [use interfacePricingPoint as in [EMIX-130](#)]  
 Asset Group [how does this differ from Resource?]  
 Resource [agree that it's not a Party except in a very general sense. use EMIX Resources. Is registration necessary?]

Comments welcome.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 15/Feb/11 11:25 PM ]

Comment on Section 2 of referenced document

Is "Service Provider" in the referenced document an aggregation service provider? Award - service provider would seem to be done by delivering an EiEvent. Need more discussion on addressing (e.g. 2.1.2 and 2.2.2).

Examples for how EiTender, EiQuote, EiContract would lead to the award and notification should be worked through.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 15/Feb/11 11:30 PM ]

Section 3 of the referenced document:

Examples are needed; can this section be described as only deployment? The communications are addressed in the service operations and can be implemented with whatever communication characteristics are required (e.g. reliability, security)

Re Section 2: the separation of Award, Schedule, and Event/Notification needs discussion. Award would seem to be a market notification (addressed via EiTransaction, but I'm not clear as to the distinction between Schedule and Event/Notification—is Schedule a function in the VTN (the ISO in these examples) that is reflected in the sending of an Event that tells the VTN when to perform>

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 15/Feb/11 11:34 PM ]

Section 4 of the referenced document.

The terminology for Feedback and Status needs to be more clear. The OpenADR Feedback is a periodic response on performance; the relationship to EiUsage (which is a one time response for a particular schedule. This is a Post contract service, rather than live monitoring as is EiFeedback.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 15/Feb/11 11:35 PM ]

Feedback is both for DR and DER events/performance; this is not clear in the text.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 15/Feb/11 11:37 PM ]

Meter Data Rejection 4.2.2 seems to be out of scope. What is the suggested interaction here? A discussion is needed (Bill Cox, Edgardo, Donna Pratt) on meter quality. This seems to be closer to low level data filtering; would not the VTN/VEN use a higher level approach?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Feb/11 08:15 AM ]

There are some potentially thorny issues in the use of an unconstrained interface pricing point.

Node, anode, service location, and service delivery point are all essentially fungible as "a meter or a place where things could/should/would be metered. Service area is something different.

Service areas were conceived of a way to advertise regional availability of a price. "DR Price event for the industrial area between Highway 7 and the bypass this afternoon." Any particular node is theoretically a part of an infinite number of service areas.

If it is the intent that a registration imply "I am asserting that I qualify for the event in this region", as part of a dynamic process, and perhaps a step toward micro-auctions, then one can imagine a conversation such as:

"Congestion event in region x,y,z,w - looking for DR proposals"  
 "I'm registering as within region bounded by x,y,z,w"

"here are the bid signals"

If this is what is intended, then the unconstrained Interface Pricing Point is fine. Otherwise, this should be conformed to exclude Service Area.

Comment by [Edgardo Luzcando](#) [ 16/Feb/11 12:45 PM ]

@ Bill The registration of: Service Location, Asset Group, and Resource addresses the IRC concerns. From there it is just a matter of having the model support the necessary relationships to support the payloads of each registration.

@Bill

For 'Service Provider' the IRC used the definition (from NAESB work I believe): "An entity that coordinates demand resources to deliver demand response services", which makes no distinction of whether or not aggregation is used.

@Bill

The IRC model has DemandResponseEvent, DispatchInstruction, Schedule and Award as specializations of Notification. In essence, the aforementioned four classes are types of Notifications, but their relationships (within the model) and payloads vary. This could be modeled differently, but for the IRC it was important to note the differences because these interactions have different non-functional requirements (See [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/39645/Non-Functional%20Requirements%20Rev1\\_20100930.pdf](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/39645/Non-Functional%20Requirements%20Rev1_20100930.pdf))

@Bill

I think that Feedback and Status differences were addressed in a more recent conversation, thought I am not sure where to find this information now.

@Bill

We are meeting with Donna this Friday to discuss and finalize issues around MeterData rejection.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Mar/11 11:13 AM ]

Addressed as part o other issues, including enrollment service, per meeting, 3/2/2011

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 06/Mar/11 12:16 AM ]

See also [ENERGYINTEROP-304](#)

[Service Defintion Improvements collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-325)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-296\] EiOptout contract name scope](#) Created: 24/Dec/10 Updated: 16/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendations
<b>Resolution:</b>	The contract name is a synonym for "program name", which in turn is relevant to the VEN, its VTN in a particular relationship, and an agreement that binds them. As such, the model could be more clear. Modify the text and the model to make the relationship more clear.

Description

Unclear what the scope of the contract name is within the EiOptout and the EiConstraint classes. Is it used to specify the type of constraint or is it used to specify the entity that that constraint is associated with. If it is the former then there are attributes missing to describe the latter and vice versa.

[UML Model and Diagrams Collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-324)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-297\] Need better grid coordinate specifications in EiEvetn class \(line 892\)](#) Created: 24/Dec/10 Updated: 16/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Should simply take what is already defined in the CIM to specify the attributes of the grid location. If necessary we can identify the attributes we used in the OpenADR TF SD document.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Using GML profile for use in WS level 0 (the most restrictive).

Description

the Location:gridCoordinates attribute needs to be flushed out with more detail on how to specify a "grid location"

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 29/Dec/10 12:43 PM ]

OSG model as contributed is using the following from the CIM:  
 InfGMLSupport::GmlPosition  
 InfOperations.CircuitSection  
 Customers::ServiceLocation (probably be ServiceDeliveryPoint or UsageLocation)  
 The Event location needs to be defined as an area, so these alone would not be sufficient  
 Also including PNode and Zone.

There is some correlation between the Event location (starts as Zone from SO/MO?) and the Resource location for purposes of determining the Resources nominated iby aggregator. Would that correlation be

considered back-end? Therefore, Resources would register with a point location, and Events would be areas that are eventually divided for objectives and would be objectives to individual Resources at final VTN->VEN dispatch?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Feb/11 10:38 AM ]

I didn't find an issue on KML versus GML; that also needs to be discussed as one of the "locations".

Note that the CIM types include "GmlPoistition" -- is this a place for early harmonization in moving from KML to GML? Emergency Management is also using GML I believe.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Feb/11 11:26 AM ]

Bill Cox requested information from experts on grid coordinates 3/5/2011

[Service Defintion Improvements collector \(ENERGYINTEROP-325\)](#)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-298\] Should add a test indicator to the EiEvent model. \(line 892\)](#) Created: 24/Dec/10 Updated: 05/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add a test flag to the EiEvent class.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Apply resolution for <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-295</a> , which adds a string. Boolean effect is reflected by an absent or null string.

Description

Need to have a mechanism to indicate wether the payload is for test purposes.

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 29/Dec/10 11:26 AM ]

See issue 205.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 08:36 PM ]

Added testEvent: string to EiEvent and EiStatus classes.

See notes for [ENERGYINTEROP-295](#) for possible other places this should/could be used.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-299\] Need better consistency in the notion of an ID versus a name \(line 892\)](#) Created: 24/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Ensure that the definition and use of ID and name (that includes the intended purpose of the attribute and possibly specifies other characteristics such as uniqueness etc.) is uniformly applied through the document.  After that definition is established we may find that we have to add other name attributes to some of our classes so that there is both a name and an ID much like we have done with the EiProgram.programName and EiProgram.programID to ensure consistency.
--------------------	--

Description

Within the EiEvent class, the EiConstaint class, and the EiOptout class there are names and ID attributes. The presumption is that an ID is some sort of object reference and a name is some sort of human readable representation. In some cases such as EiProgram.programID and EiProgram.programName we use both. It is unclear where a name versus an ID is required and perhaps in some cases where both should be there.

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 29/Dec/10 10:39 AM ]

Use of identifiers and names should be considered in the context of inheritance from IdentifiedObject from IEC61970. All objects in CIM are inherited from IdentifiedObject for common semantics on identifiers and names. See contents of the class below. All objects in the model submitted by OSG use .mRID as the identifier when possible. Name as teh readable text name.

IdentifiedObject aliasName The aliasName is free text human readable name of the object alternative to IdentifiedObject.name. It may be non unique and may not correlate to a naming hierarchy.  
 IdentifiedObject description The description is a free human readable text describing or naming the object. It may be non unique and may not correlate to a naming hierarchy.  
 IdentifiedObject localName The localName is a human readable name of the object. It is only used with objects organized in a naming hierarchy. The simplest naming hierarchy has just one parent (the root) giving a flat naming hierarchy. However, the naming hierarchy usually has several levels, e.g. Substation, VoltageLevel, Equipment etc. Children of the same parent have names that are unique among them. If the uniqueness requirement cannot be met IdentifiedObject.localName shall not be used, use IdentifiedObject.name instead.  
 IdentifiedObject mRID A Model Authority issues mRIDs. Given that each Model Authority has a unique id and this id is part of the mRID, then the mRID is globally unique.  
 IdentifiedObject name The name is a free text human readable name of the object. It may be non unique and may not correlate to a naming hierarchy.  
 IdentifiedObject pathName The pathName is a system unique name composed from all IdentifiedObject.localNames in a naming hierarchy path from the object to the root.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 08/Feb/11 12:46 AM ]

This general approach sounds good to me. What is the proposal for EI?

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 23/Mar/11 06:03 PM ]

Stil and issue in the Opt schema element.  
 Using eventID instead of DemandResponseEvent.mRID  
 Using programID insead of DemandResponseProgram.mRID  
 Using programName instead of DemandResponseProgram.name  
 Using resoruceID instead of Resource.mRID (mrid is being using in EMIX schema - we at least must have an exact match there)

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

[Service Definition Improvements collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-325)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-300\]](#) **May need to define the enumerated values for the EiEvent Status (line 892)** Created: 24/Dec/10 Updated: 06/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	far, near, initiated, completed, cancelled
<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>After Ed Koch, with changes:                  If there's a restricted set of strings (or pre-defined strings) it should be in the specification, not only conformance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EiEvent.status should be of type string and have the following [restricted] values (lower case; extensibility is indicated by an "x-" prefix)                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o none - meaning no event pending.</li> <li>o far - meaning event pending in the far future. The exact definition of how far in the future this refers is dependent upon the DR program, but typically means the next day.</li> <li>o near - meaning event pending in the near future. The exact definition of how near in the future the pending event is active is dependent on the DR program</li> <li>o active - The event has been initiated and is currently active.</li> <li>o completed - The event has completed.</li> <li>o canceled - The event has been canceled.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>These predefined strings have the defined meaning, which should be inserted in the document and schemas, but it must be an extensible list.</p> <p>See also <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-332</a> and its references for documentation of the overall solution.</p>

Description

Try to pin down the enumerated values of EiEvent:status.

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 29/Dec/10 11:23 AM ]

Identified in OSG model as:  
 cancelled  
 completed  
 far  
 initiated  
 near

SEP 2.0 is (as of November 2010)  
 Bit Type

- 0 Scheduled
- 1 Active
- 2 Modified
- 3 Cancelled
- 4 Cancelled with Randomization
- 5 Other

SEP does not modify an event. It is cancelled and re-scheduled. This is for DRLC, only, so it would seem mappability may not be an issue.

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 01/Feb/11 02:18 PM ]

dgh-needs discussion in committee.

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 03:19 PM ]

Propose a set of enumerated values that meets the SEP and OpenADR needs.

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 03/Feb/11 03:24 PM ]

Also, how do we address "no event", in a pull architecture?

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 20/Feb/11 03:51 PM ]

It might be ok to put the specifications for this in the conformance section. Currently I am doing this for OpenADR and am making as per the following:

- The EiEvent.status should have the following restricted values:
  - o NONE - meaning no event pending.
  - o FAR - meaning event pending in the far future. The exact definition of how far in the future this refers is dependent upon the DR program, but typically means the next day.
  - o NEAR - meaning event pending in the near future. The exact definition of how near in the future the pending event is active is dependent on the DR program
  - o ACTIVE - The event has been initiated and is currently active.
  - o COMPLETED - The event has completed.
  - o CANCELLED - The event has been cancelled.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 23/Feb/11 10:53 AM ]

Why do we need an Ei in front of these values?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 11:59 PM ]

Agree with Bruce. The strings should be (lower case) as Ed defined in his comment; I'm updating the resolution and putting in the model and spec.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 06/Mar/11 12:04 AM ]

Applied in 20110305 model

[Service Definition Improvements collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-325)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-301\]](#) **Section 7: Register Services should include register Resource and Asset** Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 12/Apr/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Add additional services for Register Resource, Register Asset (Create, Delete, Change)		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Add services to Enroll Resources in the standard pattern. Use Resource definitions from EMIX as payloads.  No asset registration or definition in 1.0		

Description

Registration process also includes the Registration of Resources and Assets.

Registration of Resources and Assets is for the purpose of:

- identify a DR Resource for communications purposes;
- establish DR Resource accounts for accounting purposes;
- collect information from DR Resources prior to DR events for the purposes of determining which DR Resources to call upon during a DR Event; and to determine the nature of the DR signals to send to the DR Resources.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 01/Feb/11 02:15 PM ]

dgh-need some discussion on the registration issue in committee (or small group)

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Feb/11 10:57 AM ]

Toby to make comments, develop SODA-based proposal (DPWS) to address.

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 09/Feb/11 12:20 PM ]

Bruce suggests sticking to resources only. Assets and SEP, plus IRC notions of assets--argues assets should be abstract.

Toby propose a resolution, call Bruce if needed. incorporate details from EMIX.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 20/Feb/11 10:55 AM ]

Should Registration in general be in or out of scope in EI?

We have considered registration of parties, but we could register generators, delivery points, pnodes,etc.. Where would we stop?

In the case of DR we may consider enrollment in a program for already registered customers of a retail provider. In that context there seems to be a desire to also "enroll" DR resources.

In TeMIX an option transaction is used to define who, what and when for a call option that is DR-like. So "enrollment" occurs in the context of a transaction. Enrollment is not a necessary construct for TeMIX.

My suggestion is that registration is out of scope for EI and DR enrollment of Resources and possibly Assets may be in scope in EI.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Feb/11 10:31 PM ]

Assigning to Bruce Bartell for verification.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Feb/11 10:32 AM ]

Typo on assets in the resolution, updated.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 06/Mar/11 12:15 AM ]

This is part of [ENERGYINTEROP-205](#).

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Mar/11 12:05 PM ]

per 3-16 meeting

[Service Defintion Improvements collector \(ENERGYINTEROP-325\)](#)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-302\] Multiple Elements Defined in Service Inventory & Data Model submitted by OSG are not defined in CD01](#) Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 16/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add elements defined in the OSG Model from the mapping document that do not have a mapped value in the "EI Name" column.
<b>Resolution:</b>	From the referenced spreadsheet: Line 4-5 addressed in 201 and 316. Believe covered. No further change Line 41-44: suggests changing contractName to Program.programID. No change; a program is a contract. Line 46: suggests adding resourceName: string to Resource definition. This is acceptable, but is it needed?

Description

Several elements as defined in the Service Inventory and supporting data model and xml schemas are not defined in the latest EI draft. A mapping document has been uploaded.  
Document link: [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document\\_id=40727](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=40727)

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:56 PM ]

dgh-Bill and Bruce address.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Feb/11 10:45 AM ]

Bruce: Please submit specific proposed language

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 03/Feb/11 10:56 AM ]

Elements that are missing are highlighted in the document submitted and the same ones we reviewed in last week's workshop.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Feb/11 10:29 PM ]

Assigning to Bruce Bartell to verify that the resolution works and addresses the spreadsheet items.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 11:57 PM ]

Note that we are using emix:resource as the definition, so change is in EMIX.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Mar/11 12:03 PM ]

Hold un-resolved until schemas are available for inspection

**[ENERGYINTEROP-303] lines 404-406: The description of the VTN and VEN roles don't match the accompanied figure (figure 3-2).** Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	: "Abdulla, Ghaleb M." < <a href="mailto:abdulla1@lnl.gov">abdulla1@lnl.gov</a> >		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendations
<b>Resolution:</b>	Numbering comments suggest this is actually a reference to an earlier draft, perhaps wd17. Section has been re-written, drawings re-generated since then.

Description

The VTN is assigned to the promisee and the VEN is assigned to the promissor. I think the figure should be corrected since the statement in the paragraph makes sense to me.

A minor comment: earlier the figures were referenced as figure 2 and 3, however, the figures are labeled as figure 2-2 and 2-3.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:50 PM ]

dgh-editorial.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-304] Version 1 does not address security - suggestions for security implementation in version 2** Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 12/Apr/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Tom Markham		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Addressed in Section 5
--------------------	------------------------

Description

See: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/201012/msg00001.html>

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:49 PM ]

dgh-this was added in section 5. Maybe needs an example? change to minor.

**Perhaps, Figure 1-1 should be updated with inclusion of a cloud representing T&D Utility, as retail consumers are typically served by a distribution utility.** ([ENERGYINTEROP-305](#))  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-305] Figure 1-1: Representative Communications for Energy Interoperations, is missing the distribution (and perhaps transmission) utility.** Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ali Ipakchi		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Editor should add text to reflect points in comments.
------------------	---

Description

Consumers can directly interact with Generators only in regions that have Direct Retail Access (e.g., Texas), in other regions consumers buy energy from their electric utility under a retail tariff. ESPs/DRPs are typically in a DR aggregation business, only.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:44 PM ]  
 dgh-discuss and see if we can resolve or if changes required. change to minor.h  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 08/Feb/11 12:39 AM ]  
 Interactions that are possible in an open market may be prohibited in other less open markets. EI should focus on all interactions. In market swhere some interactions are prohibited, EI should be designed to still apply without the prohibited interactions.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 06:00 PM ]  
 EMIX has artifacts for transport products which can be transacted using most EI services. When a product is offerre to a retail customer who pays for and who buys the necessary transport services must be made clear in the tender and of course in compliance with the local retail electricity service regulations. Editor should add text to the document to reflect this.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 06:02 PM ]  
 Based on comments issue is ready for new text in document by the editor.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-306] Perhaps, Figure 1-1 should be updated with inclusion of a cloud representing T&D Utility, as retail consumers are typically served by a distribution utility.** Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ali Ipakchi		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-305</a>	<a href="#">Figure 1-1: Representative Communic...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	David Holmberg
<b>Proposal:</b>	Either remove graphic or find a way to not conflict / cross-talk to NIST SG Diagram Update: Use 7 cloud diagram, and develop a one-paragraph description of how this (EI) applies to the cloud.				
<b>Resolution:</b>	Use 7 cloud diagram, and develop a one-paragraph description of how this (EI) applies to the cloud.				

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:37 PM ]  
 dgh-consider in small group. change to minor.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-307] The EI specification places a strong emphasis on a Transactive Energy model with a (retail) market-based dynamic tariff. This is a new emerging concept, and is not generally adopted by the PUCs/Utilities.** Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 18/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ali Ipakchi		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendations
<b>Resolution:</b>	Prior changes already addressed this

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:36 PM ]  
 dgh-change to minor  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Feb/11 10:02 AM ]  
 We should have some clear language for today and tomorrow, focus on tomorrow. Paragraph in into on changing.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Feb/11 06:22 PM ]  
 Agreed - prices are not widely communicated dynamically today. Supporting doing so is the intent of this document. Rewrites in introductory material in response to other suggestions may have solved this. If not, commenter can suggest specific areas where confusion is introduced.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 18/Feb/11 12:20 AM ]  
 If the smart grid is restricted to implementing today's PUC and Utility practices then there may be only cost and little or no gain to customers. The transactive approach provides alternative proven approaches for customers, PUC's and utilities transactions. It is up to them where to go with it. It does not preclude current practice.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-308] It will be helpful if a clear distinctions between the tariff for energy consumption and the tariff for DR/distributed generation is made.** Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ali Ipakchi		

**Proposal:** Suggest the editor make the distinction clear in the EI document.

**Description**  
The Transactive model could well suite DR based products, e.g., feeder load relief, ancillary services, etc. but it may be difficult to generalize it for basic energy consumption.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:35 PM ]  
 dgh-needs some discussion in small group to see if any text changes required. change to minor.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 08/Feb/11 12:28 AM ]  
 Small group discussion ok but I don't understand the need for the question.  
 Basic energy consumption at a price offered under a transactive model is straightforward for customers. Similarly a DER can buy and sell at prices offered to it. Under the transactive (TeMIX model a DR contract is a call option contract that pays a premium to the promissor and is called by the promisee with a strike price paid by the promisee to the promissor.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 05:50 PM ]  
 Suggest the editor make the distinction clear in the EI document.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 23/Feb/11 10:22 AM ]  
 While there are several adjurations to the editor to make distinctions there is a conspicuous lack of suggestions....it's already clear to me.  
 Suggestions, or better, text anyone?  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-309] Most of the discussions in the document imply that there is no distribution grid delivery constraints (i.e., no distribution congestion).** Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 05/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ali Ipakchi		

**Proposal:** Accept recommendations  
**Resolution:** 3.3 Scope of Energy Interoperation Communications  
 While the bulk of examples describe the purchase of real power, emerging energy markets must exchange economic information about other time-sensitive services. For example, delivery of power is often constrained by delivery bottlenecks. The emergence of distributed generation and plug-in Electric Vehicles (PEV) will exacerbate this problem. EMIX includes product definitions for tradable congestion charges and transmission rights. Locational market prices in distribution may come to mirror those already seen in transmission markets.  
 Other services address the direct effects of distribution congestion, including phase imbalances, voltage violations, overloads, etc. These market needs introduce different market products, yet the roles and interactions remain the same. Intelligent distribution elements, up to an intelligent transformer, could be sometimes a VEN, sometime a VTN.  
 A description of the tariffs or market rules to support these interactions is outside the scope of this specification. The interactions patterns were developed to support them in markets in which they are required.

**Description**  
With unbalanced nature of the distribution grid in the North America, and with emergence of distributed generation and plug-in Electric Vehicles (PEV), the grid reliability will be playing an important role in establishing pricing signals. Similar to the wholesale markets that transmission congestion led to the concept of locational pricing (LMPs), distribution congestion (phase imbalances, voltage violations, overloads, etc.) could play an important role determining locational retail pricing signals as well.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:32 PM ]  
 dgh-more detail same as issue 310. Change to minor.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-310] I believe it will be helpful to make a reference to the distribution grid constraints and its impact on the pricing signals.** Created: 11/Jan/11 Updated: 18/Feb/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ali Ipakchi		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Accept recommendations
------------------	------------------------

Description

3.3 Scope of Energy Interoperation Communications  
 While the bulk of examples describe the purchase of real power, emerging energy markets must exchange economic information about other time-sensitive services. For example, delivery of power is often constrained by delivery bottlenecks. The emergence of distributed generation and plug-in Electric Vehicles (PEV) will exacerbate this problem. EMIX includes product definitions for tradable congestion charges and transmission rights. Locational market prices in distribution may come to mirror those already seen in transmission markets. Other services address the direct effects of distribution congestion, including phase imbalances, voltage violations, overloads, etc. These market needs introduce different market products, yet the roles and interactions remain the same. Intelligent distribution elements, up to an intelligent transformer, could be sometimes a VEN, sometime a VTN. A description of the tariffs or market rules to support these interactions is outside the scope of this specification. The interactions patterns were developed to support them in markets in which they are required.

Comments

- Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:31 PM ]  
dgh-minor. could say something by way of context, but out of scope.
- Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Feb/11 06:19 PM ]  
Add something on Congestion and Rights to section 3
- Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 18/Feb/11 12:23 AM ]  
Transport rights in EMIX that are passed to EI provide a straightforward way to manage distribution constraints and impact on pricing which is what will support customer response to distribution grid stress.

[Plenty of Examples Collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-322)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-311\] Wholesale Products and Prices - Price Responsive Demand - Example 1](#) Created: 12/Jan/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Centolella		

Description

PJM is considering a revision to its Tariffs and Reliability Assurance Agreement (RAA) to account for Price Responsive Demand (PRD) in its capacity markets. In PJM, PRD is defined as demand that is served under a dynamic retail rate structure that is linked to or triggered by real-time locational marginal prices (LMP) in PJM markets and that meets other specified conditions. PRD is designed to account for the effects of dynamic retail pricing in the wholesale market. The most recent PJM Staff proposal on PRD is briefly summarized in the attached PowerPoint Presentation (Attachment A). The proposal is described in greater detail in proposed Tariff and RAA provisions (Attachment B), and in the proposed PJM Business Manual (Attachment C). In the proposed PJM approach for PRD, Load Serving Entities (LSEs) forecast their anticipated PRD and, if a Generation Emergency occurs, the LSE has an obligation to ensure in real time that demand was no higher than a specified level. This level could be as low as the LSE's selected Maximum Emergency Service Level (MESL). The LSE's commitment to a MESL ensures that the system remains reliable in a generation emergency. In actual an emergency, however, any curtailments are carried out on a non-discriminatory basis by curtailing affected price responsive and non-price responsive demand on the basis of relative capacity deficiency. PRD differs from a conventional interruptible load in that 1) consumers must be served under a dynamic retail rate; 2) any mandatory curtailments apply only in a generation emergency; and 3) in such emergencies, PRD is not curtailed first, or necessarily to its MESL, but only on a non-discriminatory basis. The question of how an LSE with PRD reaches its MESL in a generation emergency remains subject to state regulatory authority. Under this approach, changes in the retail price are triggered on a location-specific basis. Thus, at a specific time, the retail price for a consumer connected to a given RTO commercial node in the transmission system may be different from the price for a consumer on a different circuit served off a different node in the transmission system; even if the two retail consumers are served by the same LSE and are taking service under the same retail tariff.

For further information, see <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/40642/Centolella-%20Comments%20on%20EMIX%20Product%20Specification%20Standard%20complete%20FINAL.zip>

Comments

- Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Feb/11 04:12 PM ]  
Please develop explicit language for use in developing these examples
- Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 16/Feb/11 10:57 AM ]  
This example should focus on the communication of the price and the resulting usage. How the price may be set is out of scope. Examples in process in EMIX.
- Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 05:49 PM ]  
Out of scope because example is focused on price calculation and not price communication.
- Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
As voted in meeting

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-312\] Wholesale Products and Prices - Price Responsive Demand - Example 2](#) Created: 12/Jan/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major

<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Centolella		

**Resolution:** Should be resolved in a white paper addressing these issues.

**Description**

A 2009 paper by PJM Senior Vice President for Markets, Andrew Ott, and I, described the need to incorporate PRD in RTO tariffs and operations and provided for an overall framework for doing so (Attachment D). While in many ways similar to the more recent proposal discussed in the PJM stakeholder process, the paper approaches a key issue in a different manner. Instead of relying primarily on an LSE's commitment that demand will not exceed its MESL in a generation emergency, the paper proposes the development and use of a forecast demand curve. The forecast demand curve is designed to forecast peak demand at different price points. The curve is continuously reviewed based on actual experience and improved over time. This type of review process already occurs for traditional single point forecasts of peak demand. To ensure system reliability, LSEs hold planning reserves for forecasted residual firm demand at a high price point on the forecasted demand curve. A proposal based on this approach was further developed into a potential tariff change (Attachment E) for the Midwest ISO. A summary of how the approach would work was presented to the Midwest ISO Supply Adequacy Working Group (Attachment F). Midwest ISO has taken the position that LSEs can submit forecast curves under its existing tariff. This approach could be reflective of how PRD will be recognized in RTOs as utilities and RTOs acquire experience with forecasting the impacts of dynamic retail pricing.

For further information, see:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/40642/Centolella-%20Comments%20on%20EMIX%20Product%20Specification%20Standard%20complete%20FINAL.zip>

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Feb/11 04:12 PM ]

Please develop explicit language for use in developing these examples

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 16/Feb/11 09:50 AM ]

This issue deals with how PJM will forecast the response of load to price. Other examples will deal with the communication of dynamic prices. So I suggests this example is not in scope for EI.

**Plenty of Examples Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-322)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-313\] Wholesale Products and Prices - Shortage Pricing](#) Created: 12/Jan/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Centolella		

**Description**

In response to FERC Order 719, 1 RTOs reviewed, and in some cases revised, their pricing for periods when available supply cannot meet both energy and operating reserve requirements. For example, PJM has a compliance filing pending before the FERC which aims to create jointly co-optimized operating reserve and energy markets and incorporate operating reserve penalty factors to reflect value of energy to consumers during shortage periods (Attachment G). The filing led to a counter proposal by the Independent Market Monitor (IMM) for the PJM region. The IMM's proposes creation of resource specific pricing during an operating reserve shortage and preservation of a \$1,000/MWh price ceiling (Attachment H). Other parties proposed variations on one or both of these proposals through comments in the case. For example, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO) proposed a middle ground position (Attachment I). Among other things, the PUCO proposes making payment of scarcity revenues dependant on whether: 1) the resource had been accepted in PJM's forward capacity markets, 2) the resource had made a competitive offer in PJM's Day-Ahead Market; and 3) PJM had committed the resource in the Day-Ahead Market. This case is currently pending before the FERC with a decision anticipated in 2011.

For supporting detail, see <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/40642/Centolella-%20Comments%20on%20EMIX%20Product%20Specification%20Standard%20complete%20FINAL.zip>

**Comments**

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 05:26 PM ]

dgh-has EdC proposed changes to address all the Centolla comments?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Feb/11 04:12 PM ]

Please develop explicit language for use in developing these examples

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 16/Feb/11 10:59 AM ]

Example only needs to focus on communication of the price and not bidding into the PJM markets or not.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 05:48 PM ]

The is out of scope for EI per discussion at 2/16/2011. This proposal related to price calculation and not price communicaiton.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**Service Defintion Improvements collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-325)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-316\] CLONE -Line 706: OptOut equivalent in IRC model includes: economic, emergency, must run, not participating, outage run status, override status, participating.](#) Created: 26/Jan/11 Updated: 05/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell wd15 line 706		

**Resolution:**

Add a Reason string to Opt In/Outs. A future (post 1.0) version may define constrained sets of strings, but these seem to be program/contract specific.  
 See final resolution in [ENERGYINTEROP-201](#) from which this was cloned. That issue is applied and closed.

Description

Group should respond on actual requirement. Does Retail DR really have opt-in programs? Are the remaining items applicable?  
 Recommend expanding Option to be equivalent to commit or dispatch status and revising the service names accordingly.

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 26/Jan/11 12:16 PM ]

Could not re-open Issue 201. Clone does not carry the history.  
 Original Issue was closed without the consensus of the committee.

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 31/Jan/11 04:24 PM ]

dgh-quick addition if we agree to this. Still major.

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 11/Feb/11 09:43 AM ]

See proposed resolution in sub-task

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Feb/11 10:18 PM ]

This issue addresses only the comment string.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-317] Ensure that terminology from ws-calendar is similar to or the same as that used in EMIX** Created: 06/Feb/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	None
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd25</a>

Type:	Bug	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Rewrite and review the ws-calendar narrative for clarity and precision, including a discussion of inheritance earlier in document.  
 Use WS-Calendar Gluon in first reference in each section.  
 Add conformance section on inheritance to last section.  
 Terminology needs to be consistent; e.g., a Gluon acts as a handle to a Sequence  
 Capitalize Interval, Gluon, Sequence throughout as defined terms.

Description

Many comments in EMIX raise issues about the clarity of terminology. The resolution for (e.g.) Issue [EMIX-280](#) is as follows. The same approach, and preferably the same words, should be used in both EMIX and Energy Interoperation.

Quoting the resolution of [EMIX-280](#) in the Resolution for this issue.

Applying the resolution requires coordination among the two TCs.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Jul/11 11:41 PM ]

Adopted language from EMIX PR03 for Defining terms, beginning conformance

**[ENERGYINTEROP-318] We have generally used transaction in EMIX and EI and not contract to represent an "agreement" between two parties. The term Contract should be used to represent an enabling agreement among parties under which specific transactions might be entered.** Created: 08/Feb/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	None
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd25</a>

Type:	Bug	Priority:	Minor
Reporter:	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		

**Proposal:** Edit the EMIX and EI documents to use Transaction and NOT Contract for consistency. Use Contract only where we describe an enabling agreement for transactions. DR usually uses the term program. And events that lead to curtailments would be viewed by TeMIX/Transactive as a transaction butt this language may not fit the DR model very well. Suggest DR and TeMIX/Transactive use their own language and then we compare and contrast.

Description

We have generally used transaction in EMIX and EI and not contract to represent an "agreement" between two parties. The term Contract should be used to represent an enabling agreement among parties under which specific transactions might be entered.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 09/Feb/11 12:30 PM ]

EdC look at EMIX glossary of transactional terms  
 make sure consistently dealt with across EI and EMIX

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 18/Feb/11 01:15 AM ]

Glossary states the following:

Agreement is broad context that incorporates market context and programs. Agreement definitions are out of scope in Energy Interoperation. See Contract.

Contracts are individual transactions entered into under an Agreement.

Suggest rewrite second sentence as follows:

A transaction binds two parties to a transact a product in the context of an Agreement.

There is no need to introduce the word Contract if the broader interaction is an Agreement.

Energy Transaction is a common industry term.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 21/Feb/11 05:56 PM ]

This issue was assigned to me at the 2/16/2011 meeting to review the glossary. Comments attached by me attached suggest glossary revisions and also will require a global replaces (mostly) of contract with tranction where transaction is not already the term used.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

[UML Model and Diagrams Collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-324)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-319\] EMIX Resource defintions does not include all elements required for EI/ADR for Registered Resource and Feedback](#) Created: 14/Feb/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Added missing (unmapped) items to EMIX resource attributes/elements defined in EMIX Spec. Resource elements should also be defined in EMIX schemas for use by EI schemas.
--------------------	---

Description

Document Summary of Mapping of Resource from UCA/IRC Model to EMIX contains the following:

Resource related attributes that may be missing from EMIX.

Note: Some of the Resource related attributes that are applicable to Resource Registration may also apply to Resource Feedback (a.k.a. Offer vs. Dispatch). The attributes should be identified for appropriate applicability. The document "Service Inventory Mapping OADR to EI" identifies mapped attributes, which are not identified in this issue. We may want to review for semantic consistency. e.g. is Load always applicable to load reduction and Power applicable to Generation? Minimum and Maximum definitions do not always contain the words reduction and generation.

CapacityInfo.capacityComments  
 CapacityInfo.capacityType  
 CapacityType.availableCapacity  
 CapacityType.monthlyCapacity  
 CapacityInfo.capacityTypeDescription  
 CapacityInfo.nominalCapacity

Constraints in EMIX (and much of CIM Market Ops) are identified as separate attributes. The UCA/IRC model identifies as a list of identifiers for Constraint Type with an associated value.

Constraint.constraintInterval  
 ConstraintInterval daily  
 ConstraintInterval date  
 ConstraintInterval hourly  
 ConstraintInterval weekly  
 Constraint.constraintType  
 ConstraintType blackOutDate  
 ConstraintType maximumCallsPerDay  
 ConstraintType maximumConsecutiveDays  
 ConstraintType maximumDuration  
 ConstraintType maximumEnergy  
 ConstraintType maximumStarts  
 ConstraintType minimumDuration  
 ConstraintType minimumStarts  
 ConstraintType operationalMaximumRuntime  
 ConstraintType operationalMinimumRuntime  
 ConstraintType scheduleMinimumRuntime,  
 ConstraintType timeOfDay  
 Constraint.constraintValue  
 Constraint DateTimeInterval end  
 DateTimeInterval start

Demand Response Program - Capacity and Constraints are applicable to a time frame and Demand Response Program, and can be modified applicable to a DR Event period.

DemandResponseProgram mRID  
 DemandResponseProgram name  
 DemandResponseProgram type  
 DemandResponseProgram validityInterval  
 Enrollment - The enrollment of a Facility or Resource for participation in the DR Market.  
 Enrollment changeDate  
 Enrollment effectiveDate  
 Enrollment endDate  
 Enrollment mRID  
 Enrollment name  
 Enrollment programEnrollmentStatus  
 ProgramEnrollmentStatus approvedEnrollment  
 ProgramEnrollmentStatus denied  
 ProgramEnrollmentStatus pendingEnrollment  
 ProgramEnrollmentStatus seperated  
 ProgramEnrollmentStatus underReview

Ramp Rate attributes are identified in EMIX, but there are some notable structural and semantic differences. CIM and IRC/UCA models identify a direction attribute and associated values, rather than separate ramp up/down (Drop/Raise in EIX?).

RampRate rampRateType  
 RampRateType emergency  
 RampRateType normal  
 RampRateType regulation  
 RampRateDirection both  
 RampRateDirection downward  
 RampRateDirection upward  
 RampRateSegment segment  
 RampRateSegment value

Resource.resourceGroupID Grouping of Resources that can respond to the same DR Signal. (mapped to resourceClass, not too sure this maps)

For Resource Type, need to look at DR Objectives dispatch to insure that the value and direction would not be ambiguous or just backwards if the same resource could be generation or load at different times. And look at ramp rates for this as well.

Resource.resourceType  
 ResourceType combination  
 ResourceType generation  
 ResourceType loadReduction

Remaining attributes are ID and Location related, covered under other JIRA issues. Keep in mind that Resource locations are always point locations, and must be associable to a meter.

The following Resource attributes are identified in EMIX, but may be applicable to EI usage.

Response Time  
 Power Ramp Rate  
 Required Notice Time  
 Shutdown Cost  
 Offer Segment  
 Minimum Resource Cost  
 Minimum Time Between Load Reductions  
 Minimum Load Reduction Cost  
 Maximum Operating Power  
 Minimum Load  
 Power Ramp Rate  
 Is Controllable  
 Min Load  
 Min Load Reduction  
 Min Load Reduction Cost  
 Min Load Reduction Interval  
 Min Time Bet Load Red  
 Shutdown Cost  
 Maximum Operating Power  
 Minimum Operating Power  
 Spin Reserve Ramp

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Feb/11 12:06 AM ]

This is [EMIX-293](#) also.

Separate work is ongoing on constraints and resources.

When that work is complete in EMIX, re-evaluate whether the necessary enrollment information can be conveyed.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-320] Clarify and make consistent the use of Resource and Asset across Energy interoperation and EMIX** Created: 15/Feb/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Critical
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox based on EnergyInterop-289		

**Resolution:** This is addressed in [EMIX-295](#) and [ENERGYINTEROP-289](#), both of which have been resolved and applied.

Description

The terminology around "resource" and "asset" is confusing and should be consistent across EMIX and Energy Interop. This may require a rewrite of lines 736-751 in EnergyInterop which may include a reference rather than a quotation of a rewrite of EMIX PR01 Lines 183-197 and section 7.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 15/Feb/11 11:56 PM ]

Wording to consider:

"Resource is a logical set of attributes that you put into a program. Maybe you only enroll "turn off lights" - meaning the resource itself is not controlling the asset. Can be controlled by things that the Resource defines as "controllable"

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:35 PM ]

Significantly updated by wd24. Resources are offered to a market. Assets are out of scope for Energy Interoperation 1.0. Resolved and applied.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-321] Align EI Event with EMIX Transactive States** Created: 20/Feb/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>

<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Proposal:</b>	An EiEvent that uses EMIX TERMS to communicate price quantity and other information for a DR event could use the Exercise Transactive State.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Align the terminology, model, and EMIX Transactive State (requires EMIX issue - reference )

**Description**

EMIX has updated the list of transactive states. Transactive states control the conformance and situation for communications, including events. The current EMIX Transactive States are:

Indication of Interest Indication of Interest is a non-binding offer or request for offer for a transaction that may or may not indicate price and quantity and other terms..

Tender A Tender is a binding offer or bid for a Transaction by a party that when accepted by a counter party will resulting in a binding Transaction. ISOs use the term Bids to describe offers and bids into their markets.

Transaction A Transaction between two parties is a binding agreement

Exercise Exercise applies to two-part Transactions such as Ancillary Services Dispatch by ISOs, Call and Put Options and DR event dispatch that have an initial agreement that includes a second step to that results in another Transaction.

Transport Commitment Transport Commitment is what the ISOs call "Transmission Scheduling" which is a Transport product and not an energy product transaction. Since the distribution grid may require such transactions or schedules in the future we use the term "Transport"

Delivery Delivery, which includes both Production and Usage, is the act of actually generating and consuming power that is measured by meters and reported for settlement to the parties. Delivery also names the enumeration of the Delivery.

Price Publication Price Publication is the act of general announcement or posting of appropriate prices and other information concerning products. Price Publications are not Tenders or Indications of Interest.

**Comments**

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 23/Feb/11 10:55 AM ]  
 In line with the renaming of Usage as Delivery in EI and EMIX, the set of Usage services need to be renamed. Ie. RequestDeliveries ?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Mar/11 12:36 PM ]  
 From the EMIX.XSD, 3-16

```
< xs:simpleType name="TransactiveStateType">
<xs:restriction base="xs:string">
<xs:enumeration value="Indication of Interest"/>
<xs:enumeration value="Tender"/>
<xs:enumeration value="Transaction"/>
<xs:enumeration value="Exercise"/>
<xs:enumeration value="Transport Commitment"/>
<xs:enumeration value="Delivery"/>
<xs:enumeration value="Price Publication"/>
</xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

Ed C- not sure if there is a interaction. Proposal that "IFF" we use transactive state, that we use the type inherited from EMIX

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-323] Consider using EMIX Constraints (new) in place of OpenADR constraints</b> Created: 21/Feb/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Description**

This request includes submitting back any Constraints missing back to EMIX

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 23/Feb/11 12:21 AM ]  
 Constraint definitions are pending in EMIX; when defined we will compare and contrast the EI Constraints (slow moving) and Opt-In/Out (faster moving), and normalize.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 01:28 PM ]  
 Use the WS-Calendar vavailability for constraints and optout. This narrowly focused solution consistently uses the same information model for constraints in and out, opt in and out.

Should it be used directly, or as defined in EMIX::BusinessSchedule?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-324] UML Model and Diagrams Collector</b> Created: 21/Feb/11 Updated: 29/Jun/11
---

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-212</a>	<a href="#">UML Class Diagrams for EiEvent and As...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-226</a>	<a href="#">Add descriptions of UML attributes to...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-297</a>	<a href="#">Need better grid coordinate specifica...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-319</a>	<a href="#">EMIX Resource definitions does not inc...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-321</a>	<a href="#">Align Ei Event with EMIX Transactive...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Edward Cazalet

**Resolution:** Collector for UML issues closed as all UML diagrams have been re-drawn - repeatedly -- and all sub-issues have been closed

**[ENERGYINTEROP-325] Service Defintion Improvements collector** Created: 21/Feb/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-195</a>	<a href="#">Lines 598_604 where is the interacti...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Girish Ghatikar
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-201</a>	<a href="#">Line 706: OptOut equivalent in IRC mo...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-205</a>	<a href="#">Line 721: testEvent should be expande...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-214</a>	<a href="#">Add a mechanism for VEN to send statu...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Girish Ghatikar
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-215</a>	<a href="#">Remove 0-* as optional requirements/s...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-216</a>	<a href="#">Critical: Provide a mechanism for loa...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-232</a>	<a href="#">Need more detailed specification of t...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-237</a>	<a href="#">Incorporate use of emix price models ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-295</a>	<a href="#">247: Missing Interactions and Data E...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Edgardo Luzcando
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-296</a>	<a href="#">EiOptout contract name scope</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-298</a>	<a href="#">Should add a test indicator to the Ei...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-300</a>	<a href="#">May need to define the enumerated val...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-301</a>	<a href="#">Section 7: Register Services should i...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Bruce Bartell
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-302</a>	<a href="#">Multiple Elements Defined in Service ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Bruce Bartell
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-316</a>	<a href="#">CLONE -Line 706: OptOut equivalent in...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-326] Please add standard language for Transaction and Agreement** Created: 23/Feb/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd18</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd19</a>

<b>Type:</b>	New Feature	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Description  
 Please provide boilerplate paragraph on Trans / Agreement / Contract for inclusion in both EMIX and EI

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 23/Feb/11 05:17 PM ]

The necessary language changes also are addressed in Issue 318 where I was asked to review the Glossary.

Currently the Glossary states the following:

Agreement is broad context that incorporates market context and programs. Agreement definitions are out of scope in Energy Interoperation. See Contract.

Contracts are individual transactions entered into under an Agreement.

I suggested that we rewrite the second sentence as follows:

A transaction binds two parties in the context of an Agreement.

There is no need to introduce the word Contract any where in our documents.

We can include a footnote to the effect that the term transaction used herein refers to an energy or business transaction and not to an information technology transaction.

I suggest that there be a global replace of Contract by Transaction in both EMIX and EI. However each place we do a replace there may be cases where contract meant Agreement.

Both EMIX and EI will also have a table of transactive states that includes definitions of transactions and tenders. I don't think we need more than this. In the explanation of these transactive states we can also indicate that bid and offer are other words for tender and an ISO auction Award is a transaction. However, for clarity we should use only the terms Tender and Transaction in our normative language and rest of the definitions of these terms we provide therein.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Feb/11 05:13 PM ]

Sounds good. The "global replace" isn't quite, and I'm concerned about the overuse of "transaction".

Are you concerned about the "contract" as in NYMEX futures?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Mar/11 11:14 AM ]

Recommended resolving using Ed's language per meeting

**UML Class Diagrams for EiEvent and Associated Classes, Operation Payloads (WD15, In. 643-649) (ENERGYINTEROP-210)**

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-327\] Add mechanism for VEN to query the VTN to find what signals to expect for a specific program](#) Created: 05/Mar/11

Updated: 18/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd15</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 643-649; wd16 lines 643-649		

Description

Add mechanism for VEN to query the VTN to find what signals to expect for a specific program (e.g. pg 76 of OpenADR 1.0 has name of the type from EventInfoType).

NOTE need specific operations and payloads suggested. Stated in updated Issue 210 that the query information is described in 214.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 02:04 PM ]

The citation of [ENERGYINTEROP-214](#) does not clearly address this issue. Please update as needed.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 10:23 PM ]

Collecting and copy comments from [ENERGYINTEROP-210](#), the parent task.

Rish:

This query information is described in #214.

Bill:

[ENERGYINTEROP-214](#) doesn't seem to address the topic of this item (327). Please update comments with an explanation. Does this tie in to EiProgram?

**UML Class Diagrams for EiEvent and Associated Classes, Operation Payloads (WD15, In. 643-649) (ENERGYINTEROP-210)**

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-328\] Clarify relationship between figures 9 and 10](#) Created: 05/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 643-649; wd16 lines 643-649		

**Resolution:** Figure 9 is a full class diagram for the EiEvent class and its associated classes. In Figure 10, the "associated classes" are not shown for clarity. The document should make that clear for all of the "Operation Payload" sections.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

<a href="#">UML Class Diagrams for EiEvent and Associated Classes, Operation Payloads (WD15, In. 643-649) (ENERGYINTEROP-210)</a> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-329] Describe the difference between EISendEventPayload and EISentEventPayload</a> Created: 05/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 643-649; wd16 lines 643-649		

**Resolution:** Correct typographic error.The SEND version should not be in the figure. There is no such operation in the table on line 623.

**Description**  
Describe the difference between EISendEventPayload and EISentEventPayload

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 16/Mar/11 05:24 PM ]  
 Correct. Rather than EISendEventPayload the name should be EiRequestEventPayload as the operation name is EiRequestEvent.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

<a href="#">UML Class Diagrams for EiEvent and Associated Classes, Operation Payloads (WD15, In. 643-649) (ENERGYINTEROP-210)</a> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-330] Allow mechanism for interactions between VEN andVTN for transactions.</a> Created: 05/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 643-649; wd16 lines 643-649		

**Proposal:** EventInfoTypeID is a class, eventStateID seems to be what you're suggesting but it's not clear how you suggest applying it  
**Resolution:** Corrected with applied solutions to [ENERGYINTEROP-342](#) and 343 correcting EiEvent payloads.

**Description**  
Allow mechanism for interactions between VEN and VTN for transactions/ For example, the eventStateID in OpenADR 1.0 is intended to handle transactions by avoiding data payload issues. Other option (may be better) is to create a framework that allow creation of multiple XSDs for each of the types.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 10:18 PM ]  
 Comments from base task ([ENERGYINTEROP-210](#)) Copied here:  
**Bill:**  
 \*Don't understand the comment/suggestion. Please create a new item including only (d). EventInfoTypeID is a class, eventStateID seems to be what you're suggesting but it's not clear how you suggest applying it.  
**Rish:**  
 d. This reflects interactions between VEN and VTN for different types of DR events/programs (e.g., VEN participation in both CPP and DBP programs). in OpenADR 1.0, the eventStateID was intended to show different types of programs/events as part of one payload - in EI we should at least consider the OpenADR style, or even better allow multiple XSDs (one for CPP and one for DBP) that a VEN can poll. The architecture needs discussion.  
**Bill:**  
 Not clear what meaning of "transaction" you're using here. The approved consistent terminology uses that for agreements. In the transaction processing sense, which seems to be close to what you're talking about, a transaction ID is maintained by the transaction manager, not among (say) a set of nodes.  
 Multiple XSDs adds to my confusion. Need a clear statement of the desired effect, and the implied architecture.  
 Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 16/Mar/11 05:09 PM ]  
 The new issue has been created by Bill Cox (reference #342 and #343). This issue is closed.  
 Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 16/Mar/11 05:09 PM ]  
 Resolved in issues for #342 and #343.

<a href="#">UML Class Diagrams for EiEvent and Associated Classes, Operation Payloads (WD15, In. 643-649) (ENERGYINTEROP-210)</a> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-331] Add attribute for schema versions (schemaVersion in OpenADR 1.0)</a> Created: 05/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 643-649; wd16 lines 643-649		

**Resolution:** Add schemaVersion attribute to message payloads and artifacts as needed.

**Description**  
Add mechanism to handle Schema versions? (schemaVersion in OpenADR 1.0)

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 02:06 PM ]  
Should schemaVersion be mandatory or optional? Should it be called "eiSchemaVersion"?

[UML Class Diagrams for EiEvent and Associated Classes, Operation Payloads \(WD15, In. 643-649\)](#) ([ENERGYINTEROP-210](#))  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-332\] Add mechanism to identify test events](#) Created: 05/Mar/11 Updated: 05/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar wd15 lines 643-649; wd16 lines 643-649		

**Resolution:** Resolved per issue [ENERGYINTEROP-208](#), 212, and 205

**Description**  
Add mechanism to identify test event (testEvent in OpenADR 1.0)

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 09:50 PM ]  
As per [ENERGYINTEROP-205](#)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-333\] Patterns for strings and extension needs to be applied to EI](#) Created: 05/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Address all "standardized" strings in this manner, consistent with 201.

**Description**  
The pattern of defined strings for a particular status attribute should be consistently described.  
See [ENERGYINTEROP-204](#) for application to optInOut reason string.  
This is consistent with the approach agreed by the TC, and used in EMIX and WS-Calendar.

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Mar/11 11:28 PM ]  
This is in part editorial and in part schema and model related. Please comment.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Mar/11 11:59 AM ]  
How we solved this in EMIX:  

```
<xs:element name="contractType" type="power:ContractTypeType"/>
<xs:simpleType name="ContractTypeType">
<xs:union memberTypes="power:ContractTypeEnumeratedType emix:EmixExtensionType"/>
</xs:simpleType>
<xs:simpleType name="ContractTypeEnumeratedType">
<xs:restriction base="xs:string">
<xs:enumeration value="FullRequirementsPower"/>
<xs:enumeration value="FullRequirementsPowerWithDemandCharge"/>
<xs:enumeration value="FullRequirementsPowerWithMaximumAndMinimum"/>
</xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

```
<xs:enumeration value="HourlyDayAheadEx-AnteRealTimePrice"/>
<xs:enumeration value="TimeOfUsePricing"/>
<xs:enumeration value="TransportService"/>
<xs:enumeration value="CongestionRevenueRights"/>
</xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>

<xs:simpleType name="EmixExtensionType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>Pattern used for extending string enumeration, where allowed</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:restriction base="xs:string">
<xs:pattern value="x-\.S.*"/>
</xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

This defines a general extension pattern (x-.\*), and a known list, and defines the valid enumerations as the union of the two. It also restricts the extensions to strings only, and not a rational for tunnelling.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 04:55 PM ]

Following NIEM Naming and Design rules for extensibility. Make reference to NIEM document. Include section on how this works (viz. EMIX section with similar goals).

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-334] KML or GML? GML Standard Profile would be consistent with CIM grid locations and Emergency Management**

Created: 05/Mar/11 Updated: 28/Mar/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd20</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Proposal:** Evaluate carefully, consult with OGC, and make the selection and apply to EMIX and EI. May have implications for ws-calendar as well. Given that the GML profile is not yet published, this may have to be deferred for a while.

Description

See also [EMIX 340](#). Comments may be here or in [EMIX 340](#). Should be consistent.

Emergency Management is using an approved but not yet published profile of GML; EMIX and Energy Interop are using KML, both from Open GeoSpatial Consortium,

CIM appears to use GML for grid locations.

For consistency, it would be better to go with the flow provided the GML profile does what we need.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 06/Mar/11 05:12 PM ]

Clarified the issue to reflect that it's a simplified and standardize PROFILE of GML, not GML itself.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 07/Mar/11 02:33 PM ]

There is an EMIX JIRA thread on this. It seems from Carl's comments that he is recommending GML. It would seem that if he is willing to make a specific recommendation, he would be the SME involved.

From: Carl Reed [mailto:[creed@opengeospatial.org](mailto:creed@opengeospatial.org)]  
 Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 12:22 PM  
 To: Bartell, Bruce; Considine, Toby (Campus Services IT); [emix@lists.oasis-open.org](mailto:emix@lists.oasis-open.org); [energyinterop@lists.oasis-open.org](mailto:energyinterop@lists.oasis-open.org)  
 Subject: Re: [emix] RE: [energyinterop] Energy Delivery, Space and EMIX

Bruce -

GML (Geography Markup Language) is an OGC standard that is also an ISO standard. GML is an XML grammar based for the modeling and interchange of geospatial content (or content with a geospatial property). KML, also an OGC standard, is designed for visualization of geospatial content in earth browser systems. KML was not designed as an content interchange mechanism - although folks do so. One issue to be aware of is that KML has no concept of "feature". GML does.

A good summary is here: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geography\\_Markup\\_Language](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geography_Markup_Language)

Regards

Carl Reed, PhD

CTO

OGC

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 16/Mar/11 11:40 AM ]

Now uses GML

**[ENERGYINTEROP-335] Sections 6 and 7 of WD21 have essentially the same Section Title - suggest title changes,** Created: 06/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
----------------	--------

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Change Section 6 title from "Message Composition & Services" to "Message Composition" Change Section 7 title from "Message and Composition Services " to "Message Services"
--------------------	--

**[ENERGYINTEROP-336] EiProgramCall service name is confusing especially with EiProgram class, ProgramName and ProgramID not directly related** Created: 06/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd20</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	New Feature	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-341</a>	<a href="#">Remove Program Service from 1.0 Release</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change the name of this service. Consider relationship to EiQuote and whether this functionality could fit into EiQuote.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Service deleted. Functionality subsumed by the SignalLevel class related to EiEventType and by including the range (0..max value) and "normal" value in MarketContextType for factoring from EiEvent.

**Description**  
 The EiProgram service is not named well. Overloading the term "program" is confusing.  
 This is a quantized way to send levels for price to adapt to the variety of multilevel systems (3, 4, 9, 11, ... levels).  
 It is also not clear who or what would use this. Simplified levels (H/M/L) LOAD\_LEVEL are included in EiEvent

**Re-factoring and Normalization Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-472)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-337] Payloads for Feedback Service should list programName as well as vtnID and venID** Created: 06/Mar/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd20</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Make consistent. programName is really marketContext with specific market rules. Change as appropriate.
--------------------	---

**Description**  
 The payloads across Feedback and other services should consistently include programName and programID where appropriate. vtnID and venID should also be examined.  
 Likewise, the EiQuote service does not uniformly have requestor: EiParty in the payloads; EiDistributeQuote should have sender but several others should have requestor.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 04:00 PM ]  
 closing to re-open to defer  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 08/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
 Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:08 PM ]  
 Please inspect WD32 and verify applied  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:38 PM ]  
 Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-338] WS-Calendar and EMIX terminology and models have changed since PR01.** Created: 07/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">csd01 - Public Review Draft</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Scrub model and document to ensure that all WS-Calendar references are correct. Do the same for EMIX references.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Scrub model and document to ensure that all WS-Calendar references are correct. Do the same for EMIX references. Use the respective PR02 versions.

**Description**  
 The WS-Calendar terminology that was current when PR01 was created is out of date, and some techniques used (e.g. gluonReference) no longer appear to be needed.  
 The entire document and model needs scrubbing for consistency when WS-Calendar enters its next public review  
 Likewise portions of EMIX have evolved, e.g. Resources, which are used in Energy Interop. The same task applies for the next public review version of EMIX.  
 It is not clear whether wscal:TimeStamp is appropriate in all cases, or whether dateTime may be more appropriate.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-339] agreementName is out of date** Created: 07/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd20</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Ensure that agreementName is aligned with the rest of the specification, model, and schemas.
--------------------	--

**Description**  
 Depending on the context, agreement has changed to transaction; contract has been eliminated. programName and programID seem more appropriate, but need careful vetting.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-340] Need consistent use of UID, name, program etc ID, and mrid** Created: 07/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd20</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Make it so. Scrub entire document, make consistent with EMIX use, and identify EMIX issues in EMIX PR02.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Make it so. Scrub entire document, make consistent with EMIX use, and identify EMIX issues in comments on EMIX PR02.

**Description**  
 Need consistent use of UID, name, program etc ID, and mrid  
 See also [ENERGYINTEROP-264](#) and subtasks.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 07/Mar/11 02:24 PM ]  
 EI 299 should be a sub-task for this.

[EIProgramCall service name is confusing especially with EIProgram class. ProgramName and ProgramID not directly related](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-336)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-341\] Remove Program Service from 1.0 Release](#) Created: 16/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd20</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** Service deleted. Functionality subsumed by the SignalLevel class related to EiEventType and by including the range (0..max value) and "normal" value in MarketContextType for factoring from EiEvent.

Description

Per deferral to a future version

NOTE: real issue is that the name is confusing. Still needs consideration as part of load levels and price levels in 1.0 (WTC)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-342\] Annotate the fact that not all associations are shown in the Payload diagrams](#) Created: 16/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox and Rish Ghatikar		

**Proposal:** Add text to each payload diagram saying "Not all associations of the EI Classes are shown for simplicity--associations are present as per the detailed class models that precede this diagram."

Description

Diagrams are confusing because the associated items are left out in the payload diagrams.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

[Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-389)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-343\] Payloads for EiEvent Service need additional information](#) Created: 16/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox and Rish Ghatikar		

**Proposal:** Changes as indicated.

**Resolution:** Changes as indicated.  
Issue on EventID uniqueness is in [ENERGYINTEROP-393](#) so we can complete this.

Description

EventID not included where needed:

In CreatedPayload but not in EiCreateEventPayload. Who is creating the eventID? Must be the VTN, info is in the passed EiEvent object.

EiCanceledEvent must have eventID and doesn't

EiChangeEvent - carries revised EiEvent. It's the Changed versions of the original event, and contains the same eventID.

(in OpenADR two event IDs - this is one. EventIdentifier, second is EventStateID, also EventModNumber. EventIdentifier - when event is first issued.

If nothing in status, no active DR event, field not applicable. If pending/not completed.

EventStateID is transaction ID unique for each instance of event "state" - EiEvent equivalent.

Lifecycle of the EiEvent object.

If only one, issued when EiCreateEvent. When it gets modified and sent to VTN send an ack back saying I received it. Ack which event you're received - every time you send the same ID back no way to tell if to the original or the modified.

Could return Mod number at zero for initial, make mandatory. This allows non-repudiation of event receipt.

VEN uses combo of eventID and modificationNumber.

Require DateTime and Number for mod in all - change cardinality to 1.

EiRequestEvent:  
Needs programName, programID.

Change name to EiRequestEventPayload - not "Requent"

Response is "here are all of the events I have associated with you"

Comments

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 16/Mar/11 05:20 PM ]

Need to address the uniqueness of the Event ID. Obviously Event ID are not globally unique so we need to scope their uniqueness. There are two possibilities - unique across a VTN or unique across a program within the VTN.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 16/Mar/11 05:23 PM ]

BTW in reference to my previous comment, this may not require anything special in the uml or schema and could be handled in the profile with conformance statements. Just need to have all the necessary attributes such as the program ID and some sort of VTN ID.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

[Consolidated list of verbiage adjustments \(ENERGYINTEROP-347\)](#)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-344\] Verbiage change](#) Created: 17/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

**Proposal:** Change to read:  
These changes will create changes that are more granular in terms of energy transactions, temporal price changes, and territory.

Description

lines 18 - 20 currently read:

These changes will create more granular energy transactions, more granular in temporal changes in price, and more granular in territory.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Mar/11 09:58 PM ]

"More granular" is ambiguous. Suggest something like "finer-grained" which is unambiguous.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

[Consolidated list of verbiage adjustments \(ENERGYINTEROP-347\)](#)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-345\] Verbiage change to Contributions paragraph](#) Created: 17/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

**Proposal:** Remove "and time" from line 126

Description

It is implied that unless effort was expended instantaneously, that it took time to do, as such the use of "and time" in this context is redundant.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

[Consolidated list of verbiage adjustments \(ENERGYINTEROP-347\)](#)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-346] Verbiage - plurality doesn't match** Created: 17/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

**Proposal:** change to "markets"

**Description**  
line 257 ... customers, will not interact directly with wholesale market.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-347] Consolidated list of verbiage adjustments** Created: 18/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-344</a>	<a href="#">Verbiage change</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-345</a>	<a href="#">Verbiage change to Contributions para...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-346</a>	<a href="#">Verbiage - plurality doesn't match</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine

**Proposal:** Make corrections as noted in the description.

**Description**  
Line 329 - 300 change to: four types of prices are used:  
Line 353-354 "locked down" colloquialism,  
From: The prices may be fixed tariffs absolutely locked down  
To: The price may be fixed with no changes allowed to the tariffs  
Line 466 should be "mirrors"  
Line 573 paraphrase should be in quotes: "I won't turn on any resource for less than \$100."  
Line 484 should be "actors"  
Line 494 from: "In this section, we clarify terminology for roles..."  
To: In this section terminology for roles is clarified  
Line 498 from: At this level of description, we ignore the presence of application level acknowledgement of invocations  
To: At this level of description the presence of application level acknowledgement is ignored...  
Line 503 change to: The typical push or pull patterns for interactions are also ignored but deferred to later sections.  
Footnote: Strike "we are indebted", Virtual End Note, Source: EPRI, [http://my.epri.com/portal/server.pt?Abstract\\_id=00000000001020432](http://my.epri.com/portal/server.pt?Abstract_id=00000000001020432)  
Line 516 change to: There is no hierarchy implied by these examples, they are used to show how the pairwise  
Line 534 change to: Two structured roles in each interaction have been defined  
Line 547 strike "as we have seen"  
Line 548 change to: the pattern is recursive as shown in Figure 5-45-4  
Line 557 change to: In this section the interaction patterns are described of the services for demand response respectively  
Line 560 change to: By applying the recursive definitions of VTN and VEN, specific services will be described in the next sections.  
Figure 5-6 should the R in DR be capitalized per the camelcase guidance in section 1.6 as DR is an acronym?  
  
Line 608 - 609 change to: The power object in EMIX can include specification of voltage, hertz, quality and other features.  
Line 685 change to: In the following sections services and operations consistent with [SOA-RM] are described.  
Line 687 change to: The roles are indicated by the table headings; Service Consumer for the actor or role that  
Line 690 change to: This terminology is used through all the service definitions that are described in this standard.  
Line 705 change to: The services are divided into four broad categories

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 03:42 PM ]  
Assigned to Editor.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 13/Apr/11 10:28 AM ]  
Clear suggestions for improving verbiage - moving to resolved  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
As voted in meeting

<b>Collector for Interaction Patterns</b> (ENERGYINTEROP-397)			
<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-348] Use of "Ack" as a string</b> Created: 18/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		
<b>Proposal:</b>	The proposal will reflect the intent of the use of Ack, simply changing the data type to Boolean may satisfy the need. If there is a more robust need for an acknowledgement the class should be abstracted out, with consideration given to the CIM Status class.		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Overtaken by events (and with Gerry Gray's help). EiResponseType addresses the functional need, and is in wd24.		

**Description**

Throughout the model there are various uses of "ack" type attributes which have been set to the data type of string. An ack type action is probably best reflected as a Boolean. However, the repeated uses of "ack" attributes throughout the model suggest this attribute may be abstracted out. In addition if more information about an acknowledgement is needed there may be an opportunity to leverage the Status class from CIM.

IEC61968.Common.Status (compounded class)  
This class contains dateTime, reason, remark, value that may be leveraged for this purpose.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Mar/11 02:55 PM ]  
My favorite issue that I had not yet entered.

Do we need a Bool and the 61698, or one, or....

dateTime  
reason - not enumerated, do we need to?  
remark free form  
status, recommend app specific enum...

Note that for types of documents, the status is regarding the subject matter (e.g., TroubleTicket, SwitchingSchedule, Work, WorkTask, Specification, TypeAsset, AssetModel, etc.) of this particular type of document. It is not the status of the document, which is found in 'docStatus'.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 03:47 PM ]  
See email exchange e.g. <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop/201104/msg00002.html> (subject line "Ack Ack - a way forward")

"Ack" was introduced as a shorthand; Application Response is probably a better term. Need to get differentiated information in some exchanges.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 15/Jun/11 05:41 PM ]  
I "think" that we have concensus that the various Ack strings can be removed from the message payloads as the returns (both normal and errors) along with message header information serve to address this need. Once the Ack string are removed this issue may be closed.

<b>Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas</b> (ENERGYINTEROP-389)			
<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-349] EiEvent is overly complex; simplify per current EMIX and WS-Calendar</b> Created: 19/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Remove some of the associations in EiEvent to make the diagram more clear. (the working UML toward WD23 shows these changes)  Make the attributes BusinessSchedules where possible.  Re-examine after refactoring of EiEvent family.		

**Description**

In cleaning up the UML to generate first draft schemas, it became clear that there are several schedules in EiEvent.

One is schedule (associated with Emix:wscal:Sequence) which should be replaced with a simple gluon OR a link (contained in the gluon). This is a carryover from a more complex way of expressing schedules. A gluon is the standard way of referencing a sequence, which is no longer an object in wscal.

By removing the associations the diagram is also more clear. (the working UML toward WD23 shows these changes)

Make the attributes BusinessSchedules where possible.

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 22/Mar/11 10:00 PM ]  
This has been changed in the work in progress in a slightly different way, trying to make all schedule references consistent.

The next step to consider (there's currently a wsCalendarGluonType but that may cause inheritance issues) is perhaps LinkPropType from WS-Calendar's link extension.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-350] enumeration attribute names are not consistent; should all be UpperCamelCase** Created: 20/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Correct the attributes (values) of all Enumerated Values in Energy Interoperation to be UpperCamelCase with no embedded spaces.

**Description**  
 The naming convention for the attributes (values) of an enum need to be typographically consistent across EMIX and EI (at least).  
 Most of these are UpperCamelCase.  
 For example, EiConstraintBehavior is all caps and should be UpperCamelCase - and EiConstraintBehavior is all upper case. In wd22, EiEventInfoTypeId is of the form LOAD\_LEVEL.  
 This mirrors issue [EMIX-314](#)

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 12/Apr/11 06:09 PM ]  
 If we are talking about Enumeration Values of foo, then they should be all UpperCamel, and we can follow Token rules  
 If we are talking about fooEnumeration, the element name in an event message is lowerCamel  
 If we are talking about the type that contains enumeration, its name is FooEnumerationType, UpperCamel  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-351] In EiConstraint the association for notificationInterval and maxEventDuration should be duration, not Sequence; the schedule should be emix::BusinessSchedule** Created: 20/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Change EiConstraint::notificationInterval and maxEventDuration to type duration.  
 Change all schedules in Figures 11-1 and 11-3 to emix::BusinessScheduleType  
 It's all Terms, and should come from emix:standardTerms

**Description**  
 EiConstraint has two associations to WS-Calendar::Sequence which no longer exists.  
 The appropriate reference would be to the type duration (XSDsimpleType) and rather than an association these should be attributes in EiConstraint.  
 For the EiConstraintSchedule the actual schedule should be emix::BusinessScheduleType which is consistent with the EMIX wd19b schemas (thought the type is now EMIX::BusinessScheduleType).

**[ENERGYINTEROP-352] Add a constraint to the model that maxConsecutiveDays in EiConstraint is present only if schedule is not and vice versa** Created: 20/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add a constraint to the model to indicated that consecutiveDays is mutually exclusive with schedule.
<b>Resolution:</b>	These constraints are now in EMIX wd22 - maxConsecutiveDurations, availability schedule. Use that rather than this version.

Description

The class EiConstraint has three associations to EiConstraintSchedule:

- (a) acceptSchedule
- (b) maxConsecutiveDays
- (c) notAcceptSchedule

All need filter:EiConstraintBehavior, but consecutiveDays is mutually exclusive with schedule.

The alternative would require that EiConstraint have two classes rather than one.

(Simpler solution in Resolution)

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 06:00 PM ]

"Constraint" is confusing us -- emix:Constraint is NOT the same as EiConstraint.

These constraints are now in EMIX wd22 - maxConsecutiveDurations, availability schedule. Use that rather than this version.

This solution is overly complex.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-353] Consider use of EiConstraintBehavior for EiOpt; add text to spec to indicate Constraint behavior** Created: 20/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	This is available through the EiMarketRuleSetType associated through the marketContext. Close as fixed.
--------------------	--

Description

Constraints have detailed behavioral descriptions (that need to be in the text) defined in class EiConstraintBehavior.

Consider whether a similar set for EiOpt (out) is appropriate.

There are race conditions (and incorrect logic) that could deliver an EiEvent when a VTN is opted out. What should the VTN do? Apply its own opt out schedule and ignore? Or consider whether to execute the event?

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 05:55 PM ]

Are constraints for a simple device? Or at least EiConstraintBehavior? In the case of a smarter device the VEN can respond.

This is a configuration at the VTN for simple devices. Smarter devices can respond; in effect this seems a VEN classification.

Is this part of the configuration database of the VTN and not sent over the wire?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:22 AM ]

EiConstraintBehavior is used in EiMarketRuleSetType to determine how market rules are applied. These are reachable through the linked marketcontext for EiOptType and EiAvailType.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:23 AM ]

Closed with rewrite of EiOptType and EiAvailType.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-354] Consider types for model, e.g. unsignedInt or unsignedLong (e.g. EiConstraintSchedule)** Created: 20/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change all unsignedLong types to unsignedInt
<b>Resolution:</b>	Change all unsignedLong and unlimitedNatural types to unsignedInt

Description

The model uses unsignedInt and unsignedLong. A choice should be made for consistency.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-355] Payloads in the model need care as to expected results** Created: 20/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Make decisions on the detailed semantics for all services including the EiConstraint service.  
 Make names consistent across the spec and schema.  
 Note that programName should be marketContextName or something similar (see [ENERGYINTEROP-356](#) and [ENERGYINTEROP-305](#)  
 RequestConstraint should send marketContextName, and not a list as the constraints are specific to the program.  
 EiSentConstraint returns 0..3 constrains, as an error would return none, and there are (in wd22) three kinds of constraints.  
 Document that there are up to three constraints per "program"/marketcontext (the relationship is not clear) and modify the model and spec and schema as required.

Description

Consider EiConstraint payloads.  
 When RequestConstraint is called it sends agreementName - should that be programName? Could it be a list? (probably not because the VTN for each program may be different).  
 When EiSentConstraint returns does the payload consist of 0..\* constraints or only one?

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

**Re-factoring and Normalization Collector** ([ENERGYINTEROP-472](#))

**[ENERGYINTEROP-356] agreementName or transactionName or programName, agreementID or transactionID or programID - should be consistent** Created: 20/Mar/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Proposal:** Make it so.  
**Resolution:** Make consistent per other issues. programName is really a marketContext and should be the same and applied across EI. MarketContext does not have a string name. Consider whether marketContext should be a UID or a URI, and whether a string name.

Description

The terms used must be consistent across the spec and model and schema --  
 agreementName or transactionName or programName?  
 agreementID or transactionID or programID?  
 The use of IDs (intent to hold an mRID or other unique ID) needs to be validated as consistent.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 06:16 PM ]  
 Open new issue for marketContext. What's the name of the marketContext.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
 Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:09 PM ]  
 Done in WD31  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:37 PM ]  
 Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-357\] UID in EiProgram is an unsignedInt, not a string](#) Created: 20/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	All IDs must be strings.
--------------------	--------------------------

Description  
 The uid attribute of EiProgram is an unsignedInt. Other IDs/UIIDs are string.  
 This should be consistent across the model.

[Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-389)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-358\] deploymentLevelType needs to be corrected in EiEventInfo](#) Created: 21/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Get correct type from original wd22 model and insert.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Refactored in work in progress. Close with no change.

Description  
 The type for deploymentLevel is deploymentLevelType; this is from the IRC and the correct type needs to be included in the model definitions.  
 EA defaults to "string".

[Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-389)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-359\] In EiEventInfo the ID should be of type string, not eiEventInfoType.](#) Created: 21/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change to string
<b>Resolution:</b>	Overtaken by events. EiEvent family refactored; close with no change and reopen as needed.

Description  
 As in the summary.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-360\] In EiRegisterParty the attributes for payloads should not be EiParty \(in general\) but a partyID which is a string](#)

Created: 21/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox
<b>Proposal:</b>	Change to type string as appropriate.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Uid is of type string All IDs are now of type UID

Description  
As in the summary.

Comments  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 06:22 PM ]  
All IDs should be strings throughout.

**Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas** (ENERGYINTEROP-389)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-361\] In EiEventInfo the value for deploymentLevel should be string not DeploymentLevelType \(which doesn't exist\).](#)

Created: 21/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change type for deploymentLevel to string and add standardized values if needed.
<b>Resolution:</b>	EiEvent family refactored - see <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-349</a> . Close without change; reopen if necessary after refactor completed.

Description  
In EiEventInfo the value for deploymentLevel should be string not DeploymentLevelType (which doesn't exist).  
The original IRC type was GenericEnum which is a proto string; we're using the NIEM rules for strings with "x-" prefixes for extensions, so the type should be string.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-362] Schemas appear to use an eMIX power structure not based on IEC 61970** Created: 23/Mar/11 Updated: 12/Apr/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Use CIM, IEC 61970 ActivePower class (attributes multiplier, unit, value), with the UnitSymbol enumeration (also from IEC CIM 61970_
<b>Resolution:</b>	This is an issue on EMIX and has been raised there. No change to Energy Interoperation.

Description  
Throughout the EiEnroll various complex structures for the measurement of different types of power are used that appear to come from eMix. It is not clear what eMix references here.

Comments  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 03:51 PM ]  
Not affecting Energy Interoperation.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-363] Pnode differences in EiEnrollment** Created: 23/Mar/11 Updated: 12/Apr/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">service</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Leverage use IEC CIM 61970 pNode class where possible.
------------------	--

**Resolution:** This is an EMIX issue where the Pnode is defined. No fix except where used.

**Description**  
Not clear the source of pnode in the EiEnroll schema, there appears to be differences from the power pnode versus CIM pnode

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 03:53 PM ]  
 This came from the IRC work and contributions. This is an EMIX issue, please raise in that Jira project.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 03:54 PM ]  
 EMIX issue - please raise there.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 03:55 PM ]  
 Details needed. This reads as an EMIX issue, not Energy interop.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-364] Use of full GML may be overkill for location information related to EiEnroll** Created: 23/Mar/11 Updated: 12/Apr/11

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [model](#), [schema](#), [service](#), [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd22](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** None

**Type:** Bug **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Gerald Gray](#) **Assignee:** [William Cox](#)  
**Resolution:** Won't Fix  
**Environment:** Gerald Gray

**Proposal:** Limit the gml position to the x,y,z coordinate if this matches the gml location requirement.  
**Resolution:** GML is not mentioned in the specification. This is an EMIX issue; there a profile of "full GML" is used, not the whole thing.

**Description**  
Currently the EiEnroll schema uses a very verbose GML-based structure for location , but this may be overkill if the requirement is only for x, y, z coordinate.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 04:02 PM ]  
 Raise the issue in EMIX, please.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-365] EiResource use of power:meterID** Created: 23/Mar/11 Updated: 12/Apr/11

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [model](#), [schema](#), [service](#), [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd22](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** None

**Type:** Bug **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Gerald Gray](#) **Assignee:** [William Cox](#)  
**Resolution:** Won't Fix  
**Environment:** Gerald Gray

**Proposal:** Use IEC CIM 61968 Metering EndDeviceAsset which allows for the fact that while devices may be a meter, they may be other types of devices/assets. In this instance it should be EndDeviceAsset.mRID.  
**Resolution:** EiResource is not in Energy Interoperation. This reads as an issue on EMIX resources. Please raise in that Jira project.

**Description**  
Resource has a construct that assumes that there are devices under it's control. The use of power:meterID assumes that the asset is a meter. There are other types of devices/assets that may be part of a Resource.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-366] No need for acceptTender and related payloads.** Created: 23/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [schema](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd22](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd23](#)

**Type:** Bug **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Edward Cazalet](#) **Assignee:** [William Cox](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** Ed Cazalet

**Proposal:** Delete acceptTender and related Payloads.  
**Resolution:** Delete acceptTender and related Payloads.

Description

A tender is accepted by a createTransaction that links back to a Tender, hence no need for acceptTender.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 04:06 PM ]

Correct; the transactive state moves forward in createTransaction.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 13/Apr/11 11:51 AM ]

Bill and I agree that acceptTender is unnecessary as createTransaction can move forward the Transactive State. However, acceptTender will do the same thing, but in some contexts may help understanding.

Therefore I recommend we keep acceptTender in the model at least for now.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-367] Consistency and completeness suggestions for Transactive Payloads for Tender and Transactions.** Created: 23/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

**Proposal:**

1. ElCreateTender : refers to offerorPartyID. I believe this should just be PartyID, which is the creator of the Tender. An offerer of a Tender when a Tender can be a buy or sell tender and the general financial use of offer is as an offer to sell is confusing. An ISO Tenders are called bids,
2. CreatedTender : introduces offereePartyID - I prefer CounterPartyID. Note we need to allow for offers to a set of potential counterparties. Also CreateTender should return a TenderID.
3. requestTender should use TenderID, I think.
4. cancelTender -Note this does use TenderID. The references to party are not necessary. ( I would prefer the name withdrawTender, but can live with cancel.
5. requestTransaction -- uses Party and CounterPartyID which is good.
6. createTransaction refers to PartyID (ok), offerID (should be TenderID),acceptanceID (should be counterPartyID).
7. createdTransaction needs to return a TransactionID.

Description

Consistency and completeness suggestions for Transactive Payloads for Tender and Transactions.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 04:09 PM ]

needs discussion.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**Collector for Ws-Calendar or EMIX Constraints (ENERGYINTEROP-396)**  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-368] Use EMIX:BusinessScheduleType in OptOut & OptIn Schedule creates some ambiguity** Created: 23/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Proposal:** Create (or find? tried to but couldn't find) an element or datatype that has only start, end, duration. This is used in multiple places beside opt schedule.  
**Resolution:** EMIX:BusinessScheduleType is no longer present.  
 ElOpt service has been rewritten to directly use xcal:VavailabilityType.

Description

Re: Use of EMIX:BusinessScheduleType

This type contains xcal:properties (contains dtStart, dtEnd, duration; each optional - needs rule on which to use end or duration

xcal:components - BaseComponentType also has start,end,duration. Why do we need both properties and components to convey a schedule? Which one is the actual schedule?  
 wsCal Extensions:interval contains start,end,duration and a bunch of other stuff we don't need. Why can't we just use the element that contains only what we need?

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 25/Mar/11 03:10 PM ]

The main point in the Proposed resolution is to find or create the closest element/datatype defined in ws-calendar and use it directly.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 04:14 PM ]

The WS-Calendar (xcal-based) types require a place for properties and other things. Conformance needs to address the question of what MUST be there, but it's harder to address the question of what must NOT be there.

This should be raised as an issue in the Public Review of WS-Calendar and EMIX.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 09:01 PM ]

Reassigned for comment.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 13/Apr/11 08:58 AM ]  
 EMIX:BusinessScheduleType is :xcal:VavailabilityType with a duration extension. Duration is already in xcal:VavailabilityType. The elements optinschedule and optoutschedule could have a type of xcal:VavailabilityType with the same result.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 13/Apr/11 10:26 AM ]  
 Business Schedule in EMIX is exactly the wscalendar vavailability

```
<xs:element name="businessSchedule" type="emix:BusinessScheduleType"/>
<xs:complexType name="BusinessScheduleType" mixed="false">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>iCalendar-derived business schedule, more variant than allowed in sequences</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:complexContent mixed="false">
<xs:extension base="xcal:VavailabilityType"/>
</xs:complexContent>
</xs:complexType>
```

Duration is, however, the next element named.

There has been a recurring issue of those who want one-time wrapping of ws-calendar into EMIX, and those who want native ws-calendar types. I have waffled myself. Guidance and comments to possible EMIX PR are appropriate.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 27/May/11 01:44 PM ]  
 Guidance is not an EMIX issue. This is an EI issue. The schedule elements should be directly from WS-Calendar, not from EMIX.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 30/May/11 12:01 PM ]  
 If Business Schedule in EMIX is exactly the wscalendar vavailability, let's use the WS-Cal Vaavailability directly. This is an ongoing issue and needs resolution at high level (of using WS-Cal directly as opposed to use through other mechanisms). We should use the elements needed directly from WS-Cal. It may also need simplification.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/May/11 07:57 PM ]  
 I agree

<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/ork/workgroup/energyinterop/email/archives/201105/msg00124.html>

Comment by [Anne Hendry](#) [ 30/May/11 08:29 PM ]  
 Also see <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/EMIX-389>. (use of Schedule and BusinessSchedule in EMIX)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-369] Opt contains additional elements that are not in the submitted models - need explanation on why they are there**

Created: 23/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Resolution:** EIOpt and EiAvail services completely rewritten. The remaining issue (VenID in two places) should be opened as a new issue.  
 Close as fixed.

Description

EIOptout:contractName - what is this for?  
 venID is in twice once at root and again in EIOpt as 1->\*. The definitions do nto match. The definition in the recurring element reads like a customer account ID ("If this ProgramConstraint is associated with a specific ParticipantAccount then this is the identifier of the ParticipantAccount that it is associated with.)  
 validDateTimes "These are the date/times during which a DR Event may be issued. If undefined then it is assumed that the DR Event may be issued at any time except as specified by the other constraints such as the black out dates and times." This looks like a program attribute.  
 maxConsecutiveDaysFilter No definition. Enumerator of Accept or Reject. Accept or reject what?  
 blackOutDateTimes Redundant with optOutSchedule. I thought we were going to use this as Resource Constraint?

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 04:18 PM ]  
 What is this issue referring to? The EAP files contributed are not normative, but help the progress of the work. Is that what was meant as "submitted model"?  
 Needs discussion and clarification.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 09:00 PM ]  
 Reassign for comment.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 03/May/11 05:16 PM ]  
 The definitions in the original issue are from the xsd file. Comments are for EI Schemas 20110503-1236edt. I do not see contractName, so that's a non-issue.

venID is in twice once at root (in payloads:eiCreatedOptPayload) and again in eiClasses:EIOpt as 1->\*. The definitions have been removed. So, what is venID for? The opt should apply to a Resource. Are we intending to use unique identifiers for each VEN? Also, if we need it why would it apply to the entire message and be repeated as part of an opt schedule? Suggest we remove both references.

No longer see validDateTimes or blackOutDateTimes.

But I do see some new ones:  
 < xs:element ref="emix:availabilitySchedule" minOccurs="0"/> --> This seem redundant with opt-in Schedule.  
 < xs:element ref="emix:maximumConsecutiveDurations" minOccurs="0"/> --> This seems like a Resource Constraint and should be part of Enroll/Register Resource  
 < xs:element ref="emix:unavailabilitySchedule" minOccurs="0"/> --> Seems redundant with opt-out schedule.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 03/May/11 05:28 PM ]

This is the language from NAESB PAP09 regarding opt in/out.

Opt in/out

This is used to temporarily opt in/out of DR Events and to override the normal operational constraints. The opt-in/out can be specified using the following criteria:

- All events in a program indefinitely
- Specific DR Event
- All events in a specific time period.

In addition, there may be a schedule associated with the opt in/out state.

If we have to support opt-in because of this we will need a statement on how to handle or avoid contradictory values.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 04/May/11 04:40 PM ]

Comments based on files in energyinterop-1-0-schema-wd23-draft1.

Assuming that the opt in/out has replaced 2 schedules with optType. This seems OK if we can define opt type.

Looks like the venIDs are stil in. Need a defintion/use or remove.

The interim solution pending a better availability schedule from ws-calendar was to use xcal:interval. The schema has emix:businessSchedule. There is no need to skip through emix to pick up a ws-calendar element or datatype. This should be either ref to wsCalendar:interval or optSchedule with type of xcal:wsCalendarIntervalType.

OK with interim solution to avoid "one more thing" for next PR. But, the interim solution with cal interval still has issues with a lot of optional ways to create the same schedule dependant on conformance rules that cannot be enforced by a schema. The multiplicity in xcal:properties is near the leaf level. i.e. To represent a series of start/end date times it would be a series of starts followed by a series of ends. Conformance for matching sets, etc. would be in the application.

The front door option would be:

```
< xs:complexType name="OptPeriodProperties"> (with 1.* for the element)
  < xs:complexContent>
    < xs:extension base="eical:ArrayOfProperties">
      < xs:sequence>
        < xs:element ref="xcal:duration"/> (there seems to be some preferences for dtend instead)
        < xs:element ref="xcal:dtstart"/>
        < xs:element ref="xcal:uid" minOccurs="0"/>
      </xs:sequence>
    </xs:extension>
  </xs:complexContent>
</xs:complexType>
```

Use of recurrence properties and grammer rules from ws-cal (or iCal or xCal, whichever) would be great, but it seems like the timelines will not agree with EI.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/May/11 05:26 PM ]

Good catch, Bruce.

Per our conversation last night, all should have been using the eic:BusinessScheduleType instead of the emix:BusinessScheduleType. The eic:BusinessScheduleType was created as you and I discussed (an array of intervals and an availability).

```
<!-- 2.2 Market Context Definition -->
< xs:element name="businessSchedule" type="eic:BusinessScheduleType"/>
< xs:complexType name="BusinessScheduleType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="xcal:vavailability" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>Regular periods of time when a resource is either available to be scheduled or always unavailable</xs:documentation>
<xs:appinfo>As of this draft, the vavailability object in WS-Calendar is not fully usable. Comments have been submitted to the groups working on that standard. The Intervals below can be used instead</xs:appinfo>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
<xs:element ref="xcal:interval" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>Unique Intervals</xs:documentation>
<xs:appinfo>As of this draft, the vavailability object in WS-Calendar is defective and not usable. The vavailability artifact expresses regular periods of time when a resource is either available to be scheduled or always unavailable. Comments have been submitted to the groups woring on that standard</xs:appinfo>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
```

When I look at that, I wonder i we should be using the constrained eic:interval we also discussed last night.

The secret wip7 (on my hard drive) now has changed to the two occurrences (in RuleSet as well as in Opt) to use the eic version.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/May/11 05:27 PM ]

And to fix the spelling of eic:businessSchedule to businessSchedule as well.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 18/May/11 04:41 PM ]

For wd23 still see emix:businessSchedule in multiple places (eiMarketRuleSet, unavailabilitySchedule)

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 27/May/11 01:58 PM ]

The last comments address <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-369> Not this issue.

This issue is about multiple occurrences of VEN ID in the opt message and no Resource ID. The VTN needs to know which resource is opting out in order to adjust the forecast. The VEN ID is the party that originated the opt message; and may not be needed. Additionally, use of the VEN ID could be misleading. The same part could act as VTN or VEN depending on the context. If we decide we need this element it should be the same party ID that is used during enrollment/registration.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 30/May/11 12:10 PM ]

Let's first, replace (as per Toby's comment on 04/05): "fix the spelling of eic:businessSchedule to businessSchedule." It doesn't seem to be the case in the latest WD23.

Second, how does the VEN ID and Resource ID resolve when the signals cascade through different VENS (e.g., Service provider to aggregator to a building)? I would think that the VEN ID is receiver of the signal and the resource ID is the "end or culminating" point of the signal at the ESI level. I would think that if there is a direct VTN to resource communication, the VEN ID is same as resource ID. We need to also account how the telemetry requirements for A/S markets are handled in return. This is an important requirement for markets that offer incentives to enable automation for DR for customers and also for the purposes of certification and testing.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:32 PM ]

The entire EiOpt service and data structures have been rewritten. Please look again at wd24.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:17 AM ]

Please examine and create new issue for VenID duplication and others as needed against WD24.

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-370] Use EMIX semantic elements in EiConstraint and EiConstraintSchedule</a> Created: 24/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>

<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Change as described in the Description and comments, aligning with EMIX PR02 and WS-Calendar PR02. Use the emix:Constraint for consistency.
--------------------	---

#### Description

eiConstraintType overlaps Emix:constraints.

From EMIX: "Constraints are extrinsic to the product delivery but effect how a partner may request performance of a service. Performance constraints may be tied to the basic mechanical needs of the resource or to the business needs of the source. These constraints can affect the market value of the resource or the repeated invocation of a resource. It is possible for a given underlying resource to be offered to the market with different constraints and therefor different values. It is possible for a given underlying resource to be offered to the market with different constraints and therefor different values."

The Constraints are defined as follows: (starred elements map directly to existing constraints)

Minimum Response Duration The shortest Duration for which the resource will accept a request to maintain a response before returning to pre-request levels.

Maximum Response Duration The longest Duration for which the resource will accept a request.

Minimum Recovery Duration The minimum Duration that the Resource requires after the end of a response the resource has is ready to respond to a new request.

Minimum Duration Between Invocations The minimum Duration that the Resource requires after receiving a request before the resource has is ready to respond to a new request.

\*Minimum Notification Time The minimum Duration that the Resource requires for Notification before initiating a response to a request.

Response Time Duration required from receipt of a request to supplying the requested level of response by the resource

Maximum Invocations Per Duration Maximum number of invocations of service during a given duration

\*\*Maximum Consecutive Durations Maximum consecutive durations in which service can be invoked, e.g., it will not accept requests on more than 3 consecutive days.

Minimum Starts Per Duration The fewest Requests that the resource will accept during any duration. This constraint is typically used in market rather than in resource descriptions

\*Maximum Run Duration The Maximum duration for which a resource will accept a request

Minimum Run Duration The Minimum duration for which a resource will accept a request

Minimum Load Constraint on Minimum Load that a Resource can maintain

Maximum Power Constraint on Maximum Power available from a resource

Maximum Energy Constraint on Maximum Energy available from a resource

Minimum Load Reduction Constraint on Minimum Load Reduction resource can make

Constraint Schedule A schedule of time during which a resource will accept requests. The schedule may include multiple availability windows, i.e., an availability in May, can include weekday mornings and Thursday afternoons. The scheduled duration must be entirely within a single instance of an availability window.

Market Requirements are the market portion of Constraints, i.e., they are used to state the offeror's expectations about a tender. It is possible for a given underlying resource to be offered to the market with different Requirements and therefor different values.

Market Requirements are defined as follows:

Minimum Economic Requirement Minimum net remuneration this resource requires from a total response

Required Startup Cost Minimum remuneration required from start-up of this service.

Minimum Resource Cost Resource requires this amount per period, i.e., a minimum requirement for \$100 / hour at whatever rate

There are a couple missing pieces, i.e., BackoutSchedule and optIn Schedule, OptOut Schedule. These could be submitted back to EMIX or subclassed from Constraints w/ EI.

```
< xs:element name="eiConstraint" type="eitc:eiConstraintProposedType"/>
<xs:complexType name="eiConstraintType">
  <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element ref="eitc:constraintID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:element name="maxEventDuration" type="xs:duration" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <!-- Maximum Run Duration -->
    < xs:element name="notificationInterval" type="xs:duration" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <!-- Minimum Notification Time -->
    < xs:element ref="eitc:resourceID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
    <xs:element ref="eitc:transactionName" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:element ref="eitc:venID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:element ref="eitc.notificationWindow" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:element ref="eitc.eventWindow" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:element name="acceptSchedule" type="eitc:eiConstraintScheduleType" nillable="true" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:element name="notAcceptSchedule" type="eitc:eiConstraintScheduleType" nillable="true" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:element name="maxConsecutiveDays" type="eitc:eiConstraintScheduleType" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:element name="validDateTimes" nillable="true"/>
  </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:annotation>
  <xs:documentation>These are the date/times during which a DR Event may be issued. If undefined then it is assumed that the DR Event may be issued at any time except as specified by the other constraints such as the black out dates and times.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
</xs:element>
<xs:element ref="eitc:maxConsecutiveDaysFilter"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:blackOutDateTimes" minOccurs="0"/>
</xs:sequence>
<xs:attribute ref="eitc:schemaVersion" use="optional"/>
</xs:attribute>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="eiConstraintSchedule" type="eitc:eiConstraintScheduleType"/>
<xs:complexType name="eiConstraintScheduleType">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>[w3c]For now a class with a wscal::Schedule and the associated behavior</xs:documentation>
    <xs:appinfo>[tc]Look to Constraints class from EMIX</xs:appinfo>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="consecutiveDays" type="xs:unsignedInt" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:annotation>
      <xs:documentation>Changed from days:unsignedLong in PR01</xs:documentation>
    </xs:annotation>
    </xs:element>
    <xs:element name="filter" type="eitc:eiConstraintBehavior" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
    <xs:element name="schedule" type="emix:BusinessScheduleType" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
  </xs:sequence>
  <xs:attribute ref="eitc:schemaVersion" use="optional"/>
</xs:complexType>
</xs:schema>
```

#### Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Mar/11 09:58 AM ]

Two approaches ccould be followed.

- (1) Substitute the existing elements for EMIX constraints on a one for one basis.
- (2) Replace the most of the constraint set with the Emix Constraint object

```
<xs:complexType name="ConstraintsType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:element name="constraints" type="emix:ArrayOfConstraints"/>
<xs:element name="requirements" type="emix:ArrayOfRequirements"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
```

1) looks more like the pre-existing OpenADR 1.0

2) Allows more flexibility because:

- EMIX Constraints have greater abstraction. For example, one could have a MaxConsecutiveHors and MaxConsecutiveWeeks as well Max Consecutive Days (MaxConsecutive 4 hour periods) of the market made sense by having multiple occurrences of the MaxConsecutiveDurations constraint
- One could take advantage of the other constraints not yet used
- EMIX COnstraints are based on an extension class, and so could be extended w/i particular markets

I recommend approach 2. Approach 2 might require significant attention to inheritance and overrides as BlackOuts, OptIns, OptOuts, etc are overlaid.

Is there a way to set "non-overridable constraints" into agrmments? Is this desirable?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Mar/11 10:25 AM ]

EI Constraint simplifies to:

```
< xs:complexType name="EiConstraintProposedType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc.constraintID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>This is the identifier that may used by other entities to refer to this instance of an EiConstraint.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
<xs:element ref="emix:constraints"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc.resourceID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>[w/TC] optional Asset indicator. Needs discussion. If this EiConstraint is associated with a specific Asset then this is the identifier of that Asset. TC = then shouldn't it be the assetID?
</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
<xs:element ref="eitc.transactionName" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc.venID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>If this ProgramConstraint is associated with a specific ParticipantAccount then this is the identifier of the ParticipantAccount that it is associated with.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
<xs:element name="acceptSchedule" type="eitc:EiConstraintScheduleType" nillable="true" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element name="notAcceptSchedule" type="eitc:EiConstraintScheduleType" nillable="true" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
</xs:sequence>
<xs:attribute ref="eitc.schemaVersion" use="optional"/>
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>The version of the schema representing this entity.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:attribute>
</xs:complexType>
```

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Mar/11 10:28 AM ]

Do we still need the EiConstraintSchedule if we do this? It is different in that it contains the constraintBehavior as well as the schedule. This might be an argument fo defining the OptIn and OptOut schedules w/i EI as extension to the EMIX elements rather than w/i Emix

Here are the new constraints:

```
<!-- ===== -->
<!-- These new constraint types should be pitched to EMIX or included in EI by extension -->
<!-- Constraint Schedule already replaces need for validDateTimes, -->
<!-- ===== -->
<!-- the property formerly known as blackoutdates. I dont thing we need both blackout and OptOut dates -->
< xs:complexType name="OptOutScheduleType" mixed="false">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>ScheduleType of the schedule of time for which which a resource will not accept requests. The schedule may include multiple availability windows. No scheduled duration may be within an Interval specified in an OptOutSchedule.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:complexContent mixed="false">
<xs:extension base="emix:BaseConstraintType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="emix:businessSchedule" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:extension>
</xs:complexContent>
</xs:complexType>
<!-- we may not need this one - need to watch the effect on the overall schema -->
< xs:complexType name="OptInScheduleType" mixed="false">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>ScheduleType of the temporary schedule of time for which a resource will accept requests. The schedule may include multiple availability windows. The scheduled duration must be entirely within an Interval specified in an OptInSchedule.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:complexContent mixed="false">
<xs:extension base="emix:BaseConstraintType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="emix:businessSchedule" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:extension>
</xs:complexContent>
</xs:complexType>
<!-- Requires deleting existing NotificationWindowType in EiClasses-->
< xs:complexType name="NotificationWindowTypeProposed" mixed="false">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>ScheduleType for the periods during which a resource is willing to receive requests. For example, a Resource may be available during any period of the day, but can only make decisions during a 8-9 and 1:30 schedule each day when the foreman is in the office. All requests must be sent within the Notification Window, but this element does not constrain any performance windows.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:complexContent mixed="false">
<xs:extension base="emix:BaseConstraintType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="emix:businessSchedule" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:extension>
</xs:complexContent>
</xs:complexType>
```

[Collector EIEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-389)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-371\] What is purpose of new EILocation element](#) Created: 24/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">schema</a>
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	Toby Considine		

Proposal:	Recommend that we reference emix::interface directly and remove this element
Resolution:	Use emix:EmixInterfaceType to describe this range. All of the items mentioned in the Description and more are included as subtypes.

Description

Location: Is location meant to be just the GML Service Area or the residential specific Service location?

Is it alternately an alias for the mass of terms for thing geographic, metered, collected, and virtual that we finally opted to call the interface in Emix?

In other words, how much is this a direct carry-over from OpenADR, and should its scope be better defined/named?

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 07:06 PM ]

Not clear which version of schema is addressed; the resolution applies generally.

[Collector EIEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-389)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-372\] Do we have an enum for the Event ModificationReason](#) Created: 24/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">schema</a>
Affects Version/s:	None
Fix Version/s:	None

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
Resolution:	Won't Fix		
Environment:	Toby Considine		

Resolution:	No change. String, not an enumeration.
-------------	--

Description

Do we have an enum for the Event ModificationReason

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 06:44 PM ]

The modification reason is a string, not an enum. It comes from the IRC business information requirements.

[Collector for Ws-Calendar or EMIX Constraints](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-386)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-373\] How is event::schedule different from event::OperatingDay](#) Created: 24/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">schema</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd22</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd24</a>

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Major
Reporter:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	No Action		
Environment:	Toby Considine		

Resolution:	Overtaken by events. EIAvail and EiOpt use xcal:VavailabilityType; emix:BusinessSchedule is no longer relevant. Close no change.
-------------	--

Description

Is it possible to use a single emix::BusinessSchedule for both?

See WIP1 Schemas for status quo ante

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 07:08 PM ]

Not clear what version(s) of schema this applies to.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 09:00 PM ]

After entering info please assign to Edgardo or Bruce.

**Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas** (ENERGYINTEROP-389)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-374] Event::vtnComment looks like an invitation to non-interoperability** Created: 24/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		

**Resolution:** EiEvent refactoring in progress. Please refile against the completed refactoring.

Description

I have an innate suspicion of communications with barely defined functions, as they are frequently a means to carry proprietary info that breaks interoperability....

Discussion, please.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 07:11 PM ]

This refers to EiEvent.vtnComment. This came from (I believe) IRC business information exchange but needs to be better defined.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**Re-factoring and Normalization Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-472)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-375] Replace event::DeploymentMW with something else** Created: 24/Mar/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** Change to DeploymentRealPower. Make type emix:RealPower...  
THat was done, but I annot find anywhere this type is used. Recommend deleting type.

Description

If DeploymentMW is the name, should it be emix:RealPowerUnits rather than emixPowerUnits?

Alternately, should MW be dropped from the name.

What if the denomination of the Units (intrinsic to each units object) were K? If it is a fixed immutable scale/units, then a simple number would make more sense.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 07:26 PM ]

This should be applied in the EiEvent refactoring work in progress.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 01:10 PM ]

Closing to Reopen to Defer to put into the Factoring collector post PR02

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]

Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Oct/11 05:25 PM ]

We must use SI units for global reach and eventual IEC acceptance.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Oct/11 08:55 PM ]

Apply - may already have been.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Oct/11 09:47 AM ]

It appears that Deployment is no longer used in any other type or or payload. Recomend we delete.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:37 PM ]

Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

<a href="#">Collector EIEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-389) <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-376] EventInfoType needs clarification</a> Created: 24/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>Use this instead - replace all event-Ids. Note the extensibility as well.</p> <pre>&lt; xs:element name="eiEventInfoType" type="eitc:EiEventInfoTypeType"/&gt; &lt; xs:simpleType name="EiEventInfoTypeType"&gt; &lt;xs:union memberTypes="eitc:EiEventInfoTypeEnumeratedType eitc:EiExtensionType"/&gt; &lt; /xs:simpleType&gt; &lt; xs:simpleType name="EiEventInfoTypeEnumeratedType"&gt; &lt;xs:annotation&gt; &lt;xs:documentation&gt;each event type should have an ID[tc - what does this mean? Should this be more complex than an enum?] Price responsive Reliability responsive / Instead of deployment - say price/rel level Reliab level, percent, event / Price response - multiple, relative / Add reliability? on hierarchy side. Receive RTP comm - want to send RTP info. DR should fall under that. Next layer is grid reliab or emerg signals. First RTP Then DR (rel and pric) Emergency?&lt;/xs:documentation&gt; &lt;/xs:annotation&gt; &lt;xs:restriction base="xs:string"&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="LoadLevel"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="LoadAmount"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="LoadPercentage"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="GridReliability"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="PriceRelative"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="PriceMultiple"/&gt; &lt;/xs:restriction&gt; &lt; /xs:simpleType&gt;</pre>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Overtaken by events; changed title to indicate EiEventInfo relationship.

**Description**  
 Reading all the schemas, it appears to be more of a type than an ID. Either we are using the same name for two things, or we shonged what the "thing" is.  
 NOTE original title was "EventID needs some clarification"

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 07:52 PM ]  
 Should be considered in refactoring of the EIEvent family.

<a href="#">Re-factoring and Normalization Collector</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-472) <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-377] Now that we have the Energy / Power matrix</a> Created: 24/Mar/11 Updated: 22/Oct/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Aaron Snyder</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** Evaluate use of Power and Energy terminology to be consistent with the matrix as applied in EMIX.

**Description**  
 Please update power description glossary to match how we are discussing power

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Aaron Snyder](#) [ 25/Mar/11 08:20 AM ]  
 i'm confused. i thought i was doing this for EMIX, not EI.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 07:31 PM ]  
 EI uses (or should use) the Energy | Power X Real|Apparent|Reactive terminology where appropriate. See for example issue [ENERGYINTEROP-375](#) for use of "DeploymentMW" that needs units and RealPower used.  
 All TC members should look at the uses with that taxonomy in mind IMO.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 03:17 PM ]  
 <closing to defer  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
 Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

**[ENERGYINTEROP-378] Glossary/Vocabulary section to be included in spec for terms and acronyms/abbreviations** Created: 25/Mar/11 Updated: 12/Apr/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Anne Hendry</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	Anne Hendry		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>Create glossary/terms section. This could be merged with appendix C (semantics from ws-calendar) or precede or follow that section.</p> <p>Possible entries in the vocabulary list could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>gluon</li> <li>transactive</li> <li>extrinsic/intrinsic (as used in the spec)</li> <li>resource</li> <li>asset</li> <li>etc.</li> </ul> <p>Many, many abbreviations could be moved into an abbreviation table and then only need to be described/spelled out once.</p>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Opened in EMIX; this was inadvertently entered in Energy Interoperation.

Description

Especially when working deep within a specific domain with the hopes of generating interest in other domains, industry and cross-industry terms used in a spec need to be defined for the business reader and readers from other domains who may not be aware of specific industry definitions.

To support broad, thorough, and actionable review of the spec we should provide a glossary/vocabulary containing definitions for the industry terms, acronyms, and abbreviations used. Everyone has their own interpretation of words. This spec brings in vocabulary from several domains. It is critical that the vocabulary used in the spec be interpreted consistently to provide the basic underpinning for consensus and successful future use.

For examples on ways in which this is provided, see OASIS specs listed below, the NIST IKB (PAP 09 Deliverable 1), the NAESB documents, openADR spec, etc.

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/kmip/spec/v1.0/os/kmip-spec-1.0-os.pdf> (Sec 1.1 and Appendix D)

[http://docs.oasis-open.org/xacml/2.0/access\\_control-xacml-2.0-core-spec-os.pdf](http://docs.oasis-open.org/xacml/2.0/access_control-xacml-2.0-core-spec-os.pdf) (Sec 1)

Comments

Comment by [Anne Hendry](#) [ 01/Apr/11 05:28 PM ]  
 This was mistakenly filed against EI when should have been for EMIX.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 08:47 PM ]  
 Reopening to follow workflow and apply/close.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-379] Use of "Type" in the naming convention** Created: 28/Mar/11 Updated: 02/Sep/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Remove the word "type" unless it is being used to distinguish amongst a class.
<b>Resolution:</b>	The specification and schema follow the NIEM Naming and Design Rules. The resolution is to add a non-normative reference to the NIEM rules and a section that describes their application to Energy Interoperation.

Description

EI Enroll - In some places the "Type" suffix appears to make sense, e.g. ResourceGenerationType where perhaps a distinction is being made among different types of resources, however, in some places it is somewhat confusing e.g. ResourceTypeType. (Would this indicate where an enum would be used?)

Is there a naming convention here to distinguish complex types in the schema with the "type" suffix?

Comments

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 05/May/11 04:11 AM ]  
 The issue was not clearly reported. While "typing" is appropriate per the NIEM NDR, what is of interest is where we see "TypeType" in the schema, where a "Type" is "Typed".

What may be useful is to use the work "Kind" when indicating a category of a particular thing.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 01:07 PM ]  
 Happy to consider whether Kind should Replace Type in enumerated values, but not when UML for PR02 is mostly baked....

Will defer, which means have to close to open to defer....

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
 Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 02/Sep/11 03:06 PM ]

I kept waiting for this to be discussed or covered as an agenda item when we went through issues. Somehow it never made the cut.  
 Clever use of delaydelay to ignoreignore something that is dumbdumb.  
 I have filed this under "Harmless but stupid". Closing.

[Collector for Ws-Calendar or EMIX Constraints](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-396)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-380\] Resolve issues of Use of EMIX vs use of WS-Calendar](#) Created: 28/Mar/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** Close; fixed by evolution of specification.

**Description**  
 The information in EventWindow can be handled using MinimumNotificationDuration and MaximumNotificationDuration, constraints from EMIX

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 07:49 PM ]  
 Not sure what the exact reference is. Schemas? WIP Schemas? Something else?  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 13/Apr/11 10:31 AM ]  
 Actually, this was a Jira issue made to track changes made in WIP2  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 13/Apr/11 11:55 AM ]  
 Have to Apply to re-open <sigh />  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:12 AM ]  
 Can this be closed - overtaken by events, close as fixed?

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-381\] Replace eventWindow with BusinessSchedule from EMIX](#) Created: 28/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Description**  
 Event Window is a list of those period[s] of time during which an Event might be called. Business Schedule is a Constraint based upon vailability, during which a business entity is able to accept scheduling.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 07:51 PM ]  
 Needs clarification of affected version and where/which component.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 13/Apr/11 10:20 AM ]  
 Moving to resolved, because it has been in the last several schema versions, but still needs review in TC  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 01:05 PM ]  
 Moving along because no dispute that is has been resolved...

[Collector EIEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-389)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-382\] Review defintions of EventStatusEnumeratedType](#) Created: 28/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine - split part to <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-388</a>		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Please evaluate - if in WIP5, then used in later work. The final comment - clarify "near" and "far" - create separate issue. See <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-398</a>
--------------------	--

Description

<p>The EventStatus includes a number of undefined terms, or rather "Terms dependent on the DR program"</p> <pre>&lt;xs:simpleType name="EventStatusEnumeratedType"&gt; &lt;xs:restriction base="xs:token"&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="none"&gt; &lt;xs:annotation&gt; &lt;xs:documentation&gt;No event pending&lt;/xs:documentation&gt; &lt;/xs:annotation&gt; &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="far"&gt; &lt;xs:annotation&gt; &lt;xs:documentation&gt;event pending in the far future. The exact definition of how far in the future this refers is dependent upon the DR program, but typically means the next day.&lt;/xs:documentation&gt; &lt;/xs:annotation&gt; &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="near"&gt; &lt;xs:annotation&gt; &lt;xs:documentation&gt;event pending in the near future. The exact definition of how near in the future the pending event is active is dependent on the DR program&lt;/xs:documentation&gt; &lt;/xs:annotation&gt; &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="active"&gt; &lt;xs:annotation&gt; &lt;xs:documentation&gt;The event has been initiated and is currently active.&lt;/xs:documentation&gt; &lt;/xs:annotation&gt; &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="completed"&gt; &lt;xs:annotation&gt; &lt;xs:documentation&gt;The event has completed.&lt;/xs:documentation&gt; &lt;/xs:annotation&gt; &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="cancelled"&gt; &lt;xs:annotation&gt; &lt;xs:documentation&gt;The event has been canceled.&lt;/xs:documentation&gt; &lt;/xs:annotation&gt; &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt; &lt;/xs:restriction&gt; &lt;/xs:simpleType&gt;</pre> <p>Can somewhere, perhaps in the program definition, can we define "near" and "Far" in terms of durations?</p>
--

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 12/Apr/11 08:55 PM ]
Relates to EiEvent family refactoring.
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 18/Apr/11 11:33 AM ]
Please evaluate - if in WIP5, then used in later work.

<a href="#">Collector for Ws-Calendar or EMIX Constraints</a> ( <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-396</a> ) <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-383] Constraints and Constraints Behavior re-factoring</a> Created: 30/Mar/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Resolution:</b>	The EiConstraint service has been completely rewritten as the EiAvail service, using PR03 ws-calendar and emix structures. This comment has been overtaken by events. Close, no action.
--------------------	---

Description

<p>We have the Schedules from EMIX Constraints:</p> <pre>availabilitySchedule unavailabilitySchedule</pre> <p>We also have the Ei ConstraintBehavior, which is hints at how to deal with times when there is an incompatibility between the temporal constraints of the schedule and the requirements of the event.</p> <p>Currently, the availability schedules are in the array of constraints. Should they instead be paired in some other object with the eiConstraintBehavior? This appears to be what the eiConstraintSchedule does. In refactoring [eiEvents] several constraints were eliminated, a couple new ones were added to EMIX constraints, and the event now has an array of constraints, unspecified. Should it be an Array of eiConstraintSchedule(s) with any single constraint modifiable by the eiConstraintBehavior? Should only some constraints be expressable in eiConstraintSchedule(s)?</p>
---

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 13/Apr/11 10:16 AM ]
I would like a discussion of the ConstraintsBehavior object, as it is not a Constraint, as defined in EMIX, but some responses to some specific constraints when encountered.
It almost sounds as "How to configure the VTN for this customer [VEN]". Can the VEN Change it? Is it a report about that configuration to the VEN, but its actual setting is out of scope?

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-384] wd22 Line 743 RegistrationInfoType needs definition</b> Created: 30/Mar/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema, spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** Note that RegistrationInfoType is an abstract Type and to be used to attach relevant registration information for the particular market context.

**Description**  
RegistrationInfoType is currently a Type with no elements

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:10 AM ]  
RegistrationInfoType was intended as an abstract class to which additional market-relevant registration information might be added. If it were listed as abstract then an implementation would have to define something that extends that type.

EiEnrollment takes a similar approach; enrollment information varies widely across markets.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 03/Jul/11 10:03 PM ]  
It seems like this can wait to do it right after PR02.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 08/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Aug/11 11:46 AM ]  
Make sure noted in both spec and schema

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 19/Sep/11 08:36 PM ]  
Add note to spec and schema as stated

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>Collector for Ws-Calendar or EMIX Constraints</b> (ENERGYINTEROP-396)	
<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-385] MaxConsecutiveDaysFilterType purpose and application un-clear</b> Created: 30/Mar/11 Updated: 29/Jun/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model, schema, spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** MaxConsecutiveDays is now MaxConsecutiveDurations, of of the Terms in EMIX. The MaxConsecutiveDurations Term can be applied repeatedly, i.e., 6 consecutive hours, 3 consecutive days, and 2 consecutive weeks.

**Description**

```
<xs:simpleType name="MaxConsecutiveDaysFilterType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>tc: emix constraint?</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:restriction base="xs:string">
<xs:enumeration value="ACCEPT"/>
<xs:enumeration value="REJECT"/>
</xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Mar/11 05:10 PM ]  
Is the answer part of / the same as [ENERGYINTEROP-383?](#)

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 30/Mar/11 05:34 PM ]  
Also part of <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-369>

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-386] Need to Add Block/Tier Tariff Message as part a Price Distribution Profile</b> Created: 30/Mar/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema, spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>

<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Resolution:** EiQuote delivers EMIX artifacts. The price distribution profile includes EiQuote, so the appropriate price+product distribution includes block and tier prices. Close - no change as this is already addressed. A TC note or white paper is planned that will include extended examples on this topic post PR02. The Note on Emix will include Emix examples for this information.

**Description**

There is an example of the Consumption Block - Time of Use Tier message in EMIX. This needs to be defined as part of a profile in EI.

As already discussed extensively, it is not a transactive message - a notice of current retail price structure. Not sure if that means it needs to be separate from EiQuote. I am happy with any solution that keeps the intended TEMIX profile intact. Comments on the "example" payload are being submitted to EMIX.

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 04:29 PM ]  
 Not sure what's being requested here. A profile for delivery of block/tier information would seem to reduce flexibility but might improve delivery to SEP environment. Will SEP commit to specifying a profile, including long term management and stability? The functions of price delivery and DR are addressed;.

Intriguing idea - let's discuss after PR02 is out.  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 11/May/11 03:50 PM ]  
 This "intriguing idea" is the result of the request of the PAP03 Tiger Team to insure that pricing messages are compatible.

A detail list of mapped and missing elements is uploaded to: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/42107/PriceMsgMapping%2020110510.xls>

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 11/May/11 08:10 PM ]  
 Worth discussing.

While the block tariffs are not TeMIX profile compliant they are nonetheless a Tender. I don't see a reason that all tenders in EMIX/EI need to be TeMIX compliant. In my view the tender services should do the job. As to another profiles for delivery to the SEP environment that is another issue.

I fully expect that the SEP environment will have users who will want to be able to consume TeMIX services, block tariffs and OpenADR, as examples.

I guess a question is, does the name of the service need to imply the profile or does the payload define the Ei profile? I would expect the later.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 12/May/11 12:17 PM ]  
 I used Ei Quote for the mapping because this is where the editors told me to expect it. I would have no expectation of that based on what I see in the spec. It can be its own message. It doesn't matter to me. It seems that in order to determine which message type it is you have to first look at which element of the choice / substitution group is being used in the payload.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 22/Jun/11 12:30 PM ]  
 Resolution is deferred to post or during PR02.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:03 AM ]  
 See resolutions to [EMIX-472](#) and [EMIX-304](#).

This issue seems to now call for an example. EiQuote distributes EMIX artifacts; the same artifacts that express the blocks and tiers as validated in EMIX, so I think this is resolved. Examples are planned or produced for EMIX, and the Note on Emix will include this example.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-387] Add Glossary/Vocabulary section in spec for terms and acronyms/abbreviations</b> Created: 01/Apr/11 Updated: 12/Apr/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Anne Hendry</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Won't Fix		
<b>Environment:</b>	Anne Hendry		

**Proposal:** Create glossary/terms section similar to EI spec. This could be merged with appendix C (semantics from ws-calendar) or precede or follow that section.

Possible entries in the vocabulary list could be:  
 gluon  
 transactive  
 extrinsic/intrinsic (as used in the spec)  
 resource  
 asset  
 etc.

Many, many abbreviations could be moved into an abbreviation table and then only need to be described/spelled out once.

Will take glossary definition suggestions to the list.

**Resolution:** Opened in EMIX; this was inadvertently entered in Energy Interoperation.

**Description**

Especially when working deep within a specific domain with the hopes of generating interest in other domains, industry and cross-industry terms used in a spec need to be defined for the business reader and readers from other domains who may not be aware of specific industry definitions.

To support broad, thorough, and actionable review of the spec we should provide a glossary/vocabulary containing definitions for the industry terms, acronyms, and abbreviations used. Everyone has their own interpretation of words. This spec brings in vocabulary from several domains. It is critical that the vocabulary used in the spec be interpreted consistently to provide the basic underpinning for consensus and

successful future use.

For examples on ways in which this is provided, see OASIS specs listed below, the NIST IKB (PAP 09 Deliverable 1), the NAESB documents, openADR spec, etc.

<http://docs.oasis-open.org/kmip/spec/v1.0/os/kmip-spec-1.0-os.pdf> (Sec 1.1 and Appendix D)  
[http://docs.oasis-open.org/xacml/2.0/access\\_control-xacml-2.0-core-spec-os.pdf](http://docs.oasis-open.org/xacml/2.0/access_control-xacml-2.0-core-spec-os.pdf) (Sec 1)

Comments

Comment by [Anne Hendry](#) [ 01/Apr/11 05:28 PM ]

This was mistakenly filed against EI when should have been for EMIX.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 08:44 PM ]

Reopening to resolve and apply no fix. Opened in EMIX project.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-388] Issues with Normative References (Sections 1.3) and Non-Normative References (Section 1.4)** Created: 02/Apr/11 Updated: 28/Sep/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Anne Hendry</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Proposal:** All proposals are inline with each issue description above.

Description

Normative References Section 1.3 (lines 219 through 249)

Line 222 [RFC 5545]  
Delete if this is not the one we will use in final draft.

Lines 224 - 227 [CEFACT]  
Delete lines 224 - 227 and replace with:  
UN/CEFACT  
5ISO 4217 3A - Code List Schema Module  
[http://www.unece.org/unecefact/codelist/standard/ISO\\_ISO3AlphaCurrencyCode\\_20100407\\_xsd](http://www.unece.org/unecefact/codelist/standard/ISO_ISO3AlphaCurrencyCode_20100407_xsd)

Line 231 [GML]  
GML reference (link) takes you to a click-through license.  
Delete or replace with valid link to spec.  
I don't think we can publish with a click-through license.

Lines 232 - 234 [SOA-RA reference]  
Delete  
I understand there is a relationship,  
but believe the normative reference is appropriate to EI more than EMIX.

Lines 235 through 238: Delete (no references)

Line 240 [UML]  
Replace link with  
<http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/2.2/>

Line 241 [URI]  
Fix formatting and link.

Line 243 [WS-Calendar]  
Refers to WS Calendar TC page.  
Think we need the real link to the spec or artifacts for going public.

Line 248 [XML Schema]  
This refers to XML Schema Part 2, but do we also use Part 1?  
If so should add that reference too.

Non-normative References Section 1.4 (lines 250 - 271)

Line 251 [EISA]  
Remove words ", online. Link retrieved 06/23/2010".

Line 253 [FIX] (financial information exchange messaging)  
This link takes you to the front page of the  
"FIX Protocol Industry-Driven Messaging Standard" web site.  
Are we using this messaging standard concept in EMIX, or is this more appropriately EI?  
If it is used in EMIX then we should update the URL to point to the actual standard and make it a hot link.  
Otherwise delete.

Lines 254 - 255 [IEC TC57]  
Link takes you to front page of TC 57 working group. This is a very broad body of work.  
3 of 4 links at the top 'help' section took me to a 404-not-found.  
No way to search for "Power and Load Management" as per our reference.  
Need more specific link or strike reference until one is found.

Lines 256 - 257 [ISO 2022] (another financial industry messaging scheme)

Takes you to a web page with powerpoints and other links.  
 One link goes to the standard which is 5 parts.  
 Are we actually using this standard?  
 It is very specific and is basically a messaging scheme.  
 If we are using it, we would be best to identify which of the 5 parts  
 and put the link to here [http://www.iso20022.org/UNIFI\\_ISO20022\\_standard.page](http://www.iso20022.org/UNIFI_ISO20022_standard.page)  
 or whichever of the parts we used and make it a hot link.

Line 266 [NIST Roadmap]  
 Remove words ", online. Link retrieved 06/23/1010".

Lines 271 - 272 [White Paper on WS-Calendar]  
 This link is broken (not hot, double 'ws-calendar', has spaces) and so takes you to a google search.  
 Should either fix or delete.

Comments

Comment by [Anne Hendry](#) [ 02/Apr/11 10:28 PM ]

Wrong TC. :|

**[ENERGYINTEROP-389] Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas** Created: 05/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-254</a>	<a href="#">Need to add name attribute to EventTy...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-263</a>	<a href="#">Additional types needed in EventInfoT...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-264</a>	<a href="#">update line 897 per issue 263</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-343</a>	<a href="#">Payloads for EiEvent Service need add...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-349</a>	<a href="#">EiEvent is overly complex: simplify p...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-358</a>	<a href="#">deploymentLevelType needs to be corre...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-359</a>	<a href="#">In EiEventInfo the ID should be of tv...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-361</a>	<a href="#">In EiEventInfo the value for deployme...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-371</a>	<a href="#">What is purpose of new EiLocation el...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-372</a>	<a href="#">Do we have an enum for the Event Modi...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-374</a>	<a href="#">Event.vtnComment looks like an invit...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-376</a>	<a href="#">EventInfoType needs clarification</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-382</a>	<a href="#">Review definitions of EventStatusEnum...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-393</a>	<a href="#">Scope of uniqueness of Event ID</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-398</a>	<a href="#">Near versus Far - What's needed?</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
<b>Proposal:</b>	Review and accept changes.				
<b>Resolution:</b>	All sub-issues in resolved state; move to resolved.				

Description

The following JIRA is related to our sub-group's (Jerry, Rish, Bruce, Ed) latest version of our refactoring. All the files we have been modifying are included in an uploaded zip file entitled:

ei-schemas-wip5-ed-Apr-05.zip

Also included in the zip is a note that describes our changes since the release of the wip 5 set of schema files. With respect to the EiEvent class I think we are nearly finished. We still need to derive and restrict the WS-calendar stuff to generate the type of schedules we care about using in the EiEvent, but once we get over that hurdle we should be able to generate example XML instances of all the OpenADR 1.0 DR signals in current use today to verify that we can support the existing DR programs that use OpenADR 1.0.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 08:35 PM ]

Fix version changed to wd23.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 12:54 AM ]

Verify that all subtasks have been applied, not just resolved, and then close.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 08/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-390] Addition to section 1.8 Architectural Background** Created: 12/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">sDec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

**Proposal:** Add the following suggested verbiage at line #174:

While loosely coupled it is important to understand some typical message exchange patterns to understand how business processes are tied together through an SOA. [SOA-RA] section 4.3.2.1 describes how message exchange patterns (MEP) are leveraged for this purpose. While [SOA-RA] describes two types of MEPs, event notification and request response it also notes that, "This is by no means a complete list of all possible MEPs used for inter- or intra-enterprise messaging". Three types of MEPs can inform the discussion on energy-interop integration; a one way MEP, which differs somewhat from an event notification MEP in that no response is required from the service provider, although the service consumer may receive appropriate http messages, e.g. 404 error.

Figure 1 : One-way MEP where no response is expected from the other party  
 Additional a two-way MEP and a callback MEP are specific types of request/request MEPs described in [SOA-RA] that are used in energy-interop. A two way MEP exchange pattern assumes that after a service is consumed an acknowledgement is sent. This acknowledgement is made up of the message header of the returning service, and may include a standardized acknowledgement payload, ie, for capturing errors, (or no errors if the service was called successfully).

Figure 2 : Two-way MEP where after a service is consumed an acknowledgment is provided to the service consumer  
 The callback MEP is similar to the request/response pattern described in [SOA-RA] except that it is more specific. In a callback MEP the service provider will send an acknowledgement upon receiving a request, however, once the service provider completes the corresponding business process, it will become a service consumer, by calling a service of the previous consumer, where it turn it will receive its own acknowledgement.

Figure 3 : Callback MEP where a service provider sends an acknowledgement to the service consumer, performs a corresponding activity to act on the service request, then in turn makes a service request to the original initiating service consumer and receiving an acknowledgement in return

**Description**  
 A discussion on message exchange patterns (MEP) would inform the narrative in the Architectural Background section as MEPs provide context on the expected use of a service.  
 A word document will be uploaded as a contribution that includes the images used in the narrative contained in the proposal.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 12/Apr/11 04:37 PM ]  
 Work through this. Looks good at first read.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 13/Apr/11 10:12 AM ]  
 I like this and move we incorporate this language. Moving to resolved.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 13/Apr/11 10:19 AM ]  
 I support this as well and this should apply to both the Event and Transactive Services.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-391] TC57 noted as input to PAP09 requirements, but informative/normative references to this work** Created: 12/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

**Proposal:** Add:  
 IEC 61968 Application integration at electric utilities - System interfaces for distribution management - Part 9: Interfaces for meter reading and control  
 IEC 61970-301, Energy management system application program interface (EMS-API) - Part 301: Common information model (CIM) base

**Resolution:** Assigned to Editor to address with other reference issues. Include as appropriate.

**Description**  
 PAP09 requirements note the inclusion of TC57 as input into this work but the current version of the document does not include any informative or normative references.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 12:35 PM ]  
 Thanks, Gerry!

**[ENERGYINTEROP-392] Figure 4-1 Caption and Figure should have the word 'Offer' replaced with the word 'Tender' to match the text.** Created: 12/Apr/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Table 3-1 in WD25 updated
Description	
Figure 4-1 Caption and Figure should have the word 'Offer' replaced with the word 'Tender' to match the text.	
Comments	
Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 29/Jun/11 11:18 PM ]	
This correction is still pending. Requires a fix to Figure	
New figure provided to editor on June 29 ,2010	
Change "Offer" In caption to "Tender"	

<a href="#">Collector EIEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-389)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-393] Scope of uniqueness of Event ID</a> <small>Created: 12/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11</small>			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch
<b>Resolution:</b> Describe the scope of uniqueness of an EventID - to a MarketContext (program) Note that the VTN can always create a new MarketContext using its ID, so the power is the same			

Description	
See <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-343</a> , the relevant comment quoted here:	
Ed Koch added a comment - 16/Mar/11 05:20 PM Need to address the uniqueness of the Event ID. Obviously Event ID are not globally unique so we need to scope their uniqueness. There are two possibilities - unique across a VTN or unique across a program within the VTN.	
Ed Koch added a comment - 16/Mar/11 05:23 PM BTW in reference to my previous comment, this may not require anything special in the uml or schema and could be handled in the profile with conformance statements. Just need to have all the necessary attributes such as the program ID and some sort of VTN ID.	
Comments	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]	
As voted in meeting	

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-394] Scrub model, UML and text to replace the use of the term offer with the term tender in most all cases.</a> <small>Created: 12/Apr/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11</small>			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet
<b>Resolution:</b> Follow recommendation.			
Comments			
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 12/Apr/11 08:50 PM ]			
Assigned first to editor.			

<a href="#">Re-factoring and Normalization Collector</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-472)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-395] Market Context should replace Program; add marketName to Market Context for cases where ProgramName is used.</a> <small>Created: 12/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11</small>			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	attach a marketName to Market Context. Replace uses of program, programName, etc, with references to Market Context.
------------------	---

**Description**  
 A program acts like a market, in that it determines market rules and more.  
 Demand bidding can more easily be done in a market, and programs (OpenADR1) determine their own rules, many of which are out of scope for Energy Interoperation.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 13/Apr/11 10:11 AM ]  
 This makes the work consistent with the use of Market Context in EMIX, is broader and unambiguous. I like it.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 22/Apr/11 06:25 PM ]  
 Following up on the discussion of this topic at the April 20 TC meeting I have the following suggestions:  
 At the TC meeting an idea was floated that we would define a MarketType that could carry specific information about a Program for example. The Market Concept would remain as a URL to descriptive text information about the market context.  
 In the case of a DR Program it seems that some of the descriptors of a program fall into our definitions of a Product. We already have gluons and intervals to hold Product descriptors. Some of them may not vary over intervals and would be in top level gluons for the product. Thus they take the place of a Market Type.  
 If a utility has a block tar riff then that also is a product, An ISO will have a set of products.  
 What is not clear yet is where/how the party and or VTN/VEN ids are communicated in EI. They are not in the EMIX schemas. With the Parity identifier combined with the product descriptors we should have all of what we need to describe a program, tariff, wholesale market, etc. without the need to introduce a Market Type or change the definition of Market Context.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 12:21 PM ]  
 Another issue discussion in the Refactoring conversation.  
 There are a number of things that are known about an event or quote before it is received. in EMIX, these are defined in Standard Terms. They include Terms (response time, etc), Schedule (this market./tariff only applied to SUMmer afternoons), and product description (MW or Joules?)  
 The current Events ignore this by making a marketcontext optional.  
 We have not defined Resource enough to make them a usefull slution to "this" problem. Is a Resource enrolled in a particular market context? Can a Resource be enrolled in two contexts? Is it the same resource if it is?  
 Closing so I can re-open so I can defer

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-396] Collector for Ws-Calendar or EMIX Constraints</b> Created: 13/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Sub-Tasks:</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Key</th> <th>Summary</th> <th>Type</th> <th>Status</th> <th>Assignee</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-368</a></td> <td><a href="#">Use EMIX:BusinessScheduleType in OptO...</a></td> <td>Sub-task</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>William Cox</td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-373</a></td> <td><a href="#">How is event:schedule different from...</a></td> <td>Sub-task</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>Toby Considine</td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-380</a></td> <td><a href="#">Resolve issues of Use of EMIX vs use...</a></td> <td>Sub-task</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>Toby Considine</td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-383</a></td> <td><a href="#">Constraints and Constraints Behavior ...</a></td> <td>Sub-task</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>William Cox</td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-385</a></td> <td><a href="#">MaxConsecutiveDaysFilterType purpose ...</a></td> <td>Sub-task</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>William Cox</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-368</a>	<a href="#">Use EMIX:BusinessScheduleType in OptO...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-373</a>	<a href="#">How is event:schedule different from...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-380</a>	<a href="#">Resolve issues of Use of EMIX vs use...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-383</a>	<a href="#">Constraints and Constraints Behavior ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-385</a>	<a href="#">MaxConsecutiveDaysFilterType purpose ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee																											
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-368</a>	<a href="#">Use EMIX:BusinessScheduleType in OptO...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox																											
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-373</a>	<a href="#">How is event:schedule different from...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine																											
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-380</a>	<a href="#">Resolve issues of Use of EMIX vs use...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine																											
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-383</a>	<a href="#">Constraints and Constraints Behavior ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox																											
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-385</a>	<a href="#">MaxConsecutiveDaysFilterType purpose ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox																											
<b>Resolution:</b>	All sub-issues resolved. Move to applied.																														

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-397] Collector for Interaction Patterns</b> Created: 13/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Sub-Tasks:</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Key</th> <th>Summary</th> <th>Type</th> <th>Status</th> <th>Assignee</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-348</a></td> <td><a href="#">Use of "Ack" as a string</a></td> <td>Sub-task</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>William Cox</td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-390</a></td> <td><a href="#">Addition to section 1.8 Architectural...</a></td> <td>Sub-task</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>William Cox</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-348</a>	<a href="#">Use of "Ack" as a string</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-390</a>	<a href="#">Addition to section 1.8 Architectural...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee												
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-348</a>	<a href="#">Use of "Ack" as a string</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox												
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-390</a>	<a href="#">Addition to section 1.8 Architectural...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox												

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 12:47 AM ]

All subitems closed.

[Collector EiEvent Family refactoring against WIP 5 of the schemas](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-389)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-398\] Near versus Far - What's needed?](#) Created: 18/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Fully supported in existing schemas</p> <pre> &lt;xs:simpleType name="EventStatusType"&gt;   &lt;xs:union memberTypes="eitc:EventStatusEnumeratedType eitc:EiExtensionType"/&gt; &lt;/xs:simpleType&gt; &lt;xs:simpleType name="EventStatusEnumeratedType"&gt;   &lt;xs:restriction base="xs:token"&gt;     &lt;xs:enumeration value="none"&gt;       &lt;xs:annotation&gt;         &lt;xs:documentation&gt;No event pending&lt;/xs:documentation&gt;       &lt;/xs:annotation&gt;     &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt;     &lt;xs:enumeration value="far"&gt;       &lt;xs:annotation&gt;         &lt;xs:documentation&gt;event pending in the far future. The exact definition of how far in the future this refers is dependent upon the DR program, but typically means the next day.&lt;/xs:documentation&gt;       &lt;/xs:annotation&gt;     &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt;     &lt;xs:enumeration value="near"&gt;       &lt;xs:annotation&gt;         &lt;xs:documentation&gt;event pending in the near future. The exact definition of how near in the future the pending event is active is dependent on the DR program&lt;/xs:documentation&gt;       &lt;/xs:annotation&gt;     &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt;     &lt;xs:enumeration value="active"&gt;       &lt;xs:annotation&gt;         &lt;xs:documentation&gt;The event has been initiated and is currently active.&lt;/xs:documentation&gt;       &lt;/xs:annotation&gt;     &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt;     &lt;xs:enumeration value="completed"&gt;       &lt;xs:annotation&gt;         &lt;xs:documentation&gt;The event has completed.&lt;/xs:documentation&gt;       &lt;/xs:annotation&gt;     &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt;     &lt;xs:enumeration value="cancelled"&gt;       &lt;xs:annotation&gt;         &lt;xs:documentation&gt;The event has been canceled.&lt;/xs:documentation&gt;       &lt;/xs:annotation&gt;     &lt;/xs:enumeration&gt;   &lt;/xs:restriction&gt; &lt;/xs:simpleType&gt;                 </pre>
--------------------	---

Description

[ENERGYINTEROP-382](#) - splitting the near/far question

Per Ed Koch to address simple clients (OpenADR1). Typically have only an "in the future" and "now".

Is this even needed in EI? Concept may not be needed.

"<xs:documentation>event pending in the far future. The exact definition of how far in the future this refers is dependent upon the DR program, but typically means the next day.</xs:documentation> "

EK: Need pending if not this; different strategies for things you have to do far in advance like pre-cooling. Difference in the strategy you'd apply - "far" means you can do something.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 18/Apr/11 11:44 AM ]

Seems OK - both are Pending, "far" is a hint that you could or should do something to anticipate.

Include as an optional hint.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-399\] Use of eiQuote to represent Time-of-Use and Consumption Block rates](#) Created: 18/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Proposal:</b>	Need to have working session to resolved how the actual payload would look, and supporting structures and compliance rules enforced by schema.
<b>Resolution:</b>	EMIX addresses block and tier price information, and EiQuote delivers an EMIX artifact.  (See e.g. resolutions to <a href="#">EMIX-428</a> , <a href="#">EMIX-400</a> , <a href="#">EMIX-472</a> , <a href="#">EMIX-304</a> .)  Ensure that EiQuote indicates in text (it's already in payloads) that the payload is any emix artifact.

**Description**  
 Structure to support Time-of-Use in conjunction with Consumption Block Rates is not apparent. The Consumption Block is represented by type blockPowerFullRequirementsProductDescription which is a type of productDescription referenced by the wsCalendar-attach. The interval and gluon structures are parallel in emixBase to the productDescription. I think the interval and gluon can represent the same structures as part of a recursive structure. If these contain the date/time ranges that would have the productDescription embedded in the the list, then I think this could represent the TOU with each occurrence containing the block rates.

**Comments**

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 22/Apr/11 05:23 PM ]  
 Need to have a working session with other TC members who are familiar with EMIX and WS-Calendar elements as used by the EiQuote to represent the tariff message in eiQuote (Toby?). There must be a single path defined to represent the two tiers that I can use to prepare the detail mapping to the tariff message as requested by the PAP03 Tiger Team. (Recent discussions in WS-Cal on multiple ways to represent the same structures may come to mind.) This analysis must be completed prior to the next public review. That does not mean that any and all issues that come out of that must be addressed, but at least identified to some degree.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Jun/11 01:27 PM ]  
 In the current schema

```
<xs:element name="eiDistributeQuote" type="payloads:EiDistributeQuoteType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiDistributeQuoteType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>For price distribution through broadcast, the VTN-VEN links, or otherwise (e.g. passive placing on a web site for REST-style access). A quote is delivered as an EMIX Product. This is a push, not a pull. EiRequestQuote is a pull, to which EiSentQuote is a response.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element name="applicableLocation" type="emix:EmixInterfaceType" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>EmixInterfaceType is an abstract type with specific locations including geospatial as subclasses.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
<xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
```

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-400] Sequence diagrams to support message exchange pattern narrative** Created: 19/Apr/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add sequence diagrams as figures to the EI specification.
------------------	---

**Description**  
 EI services have been reviewed for the appropriate message exchange pattern (MEP). Sequence diagrams have been created in Enterprise Architect (available at <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/41870/EI-sequence-diagrams-export.xml>) which reflects this review.  
 Adding these sequence diagrams to the specification will add some clarity to the expected interaction between actors.

**Comments**

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 15/Jun/11 05:20 PM ]  
 Sequence diagrams have been added. Although individual diagrams may require updates as the requirements are refined the core need for the sequence diagrams has been resolved.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 12:12 PM ]  
 Gerry,  
  
 Where do you propose the Diagram be inserted...  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 01:03 PM ]  
 Are these the MEP diagrams uploaded by you as JPEGs?  
  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-401] Update EiEnroll service interaction table** Created: 27/Apr/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Joshua Phillips</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Eliminate all enroll service operations except EiCreateEnroll, EiCreatedEnroll, EiUpdateEnroll, EiUpdatedEnroll  This would reflect a request for enrollment (Create), an acceptance, rejection, or qualification of an enrollment (Created). An attempt to rectify a disqualification (Update) and the response to a success enrollment update request (Updated).  Request and Send operation may remain unchanged
<b>Resolution:</b>	EiEnroll Service Operations are (as of wd34):  Create/Created Request/Reply Cancel/Canceled  This follows the alternative in the description.

Description

The matching service operation for EiCreateEnroll should be one of three alternatives:  
 EiRejectedEnroll - rejecting the enrollment request  
 EiRejectedEnrollQualify - rejecting the qualification of the enrollee  
 EiCreatedEnroll - (the appropriate response of a successful enrollment).  
  
 Alternatively:  
 The status of an enrollment should not be reflected in an operation name, but rather in a status in the message payload.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 02:01 AM ]  
 Awaiting IRC comment on this functionality.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 09:51 PM ]  
 For wd24 and beyond, why wouldn't the varying responses be conveyed in EiResponseType for EiCreatedEnrollment? (EiResponseType didn't exist prior and when this item was entered).  
  
 IRC comments would be welcome, particularly on the EiModifyEnrollment issues raised.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 09:52 PM ]  
 Deferring past PR02; awaiting IRC input as this functionality comes from their requirements contributions.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
 Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:07 PM ]  
 The pattern with specific responses matches that in the IRC swim lane diagrams for enroll. We should use that pattern (subject to naming changes as listed in Proposal) rather than bundle a status "flag" in the response.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Nov/11 03:02 PM ]  
 Updates after much discussion. Information on the enrollment is EnrollmentStatusType, an extensible enumeration, as these status results depend on the specific business interactions (out of scope for Energy Interoperation).  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-402] Baseline as part of Event message may not be needed</b> Created: 02/May/11 Updated: 28/Sep/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR Alliance		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Minimally, the baseline should be an optional element for eiEvent WD23.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Baseline is optional element.

Description

The baseline info does not apply to all DR Programs and may include information already know by the VEN.  
 Therefore the OpenADR Alliance has requested that this part of the Event message be:  
 1. Removed and made available as part of a general usage message that can be obtained on request.  
 or  
 2. Only sent as part of the Event if requested. (I think that that this approach would only work as part of the pull model)

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:56 AM ]  
 The ArrayOfEventBases type is a confusing way to associate multiple schedules - how does one tell what's in the eventbases? There may be multiple signal streams, baseline(s), and more.  
  
 I think this area is rather weak, but is acceptable for PR02. An urgent work item post PR02.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 09:49 PM ]  
 Deferred to post PR02. Issue is well-stated; the multiplicities seem to not be effectively addressed with an Array but better individual attributes.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
 Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 24/Aug/11 11:46 AM ]  
 Why is this assigned to me? Is there further definition needed? I think this is a simple schema change.  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 31/Aug/11 05:30 PM ]

Baseline is now optional, so if that is the solution then close it.  
Looking at the original request, it seems that some would prefer that it be a separate message, but the baseline rules I have looked at seem to be tied to the timing of the event. i.e. Like days, day of, etc.

<a href="#">Re-factoring and Normalization Collector</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-472)	
↳ <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-403] Power attributes are required</a> Created: 05/May/11 Updated: 28/Sep/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Set minOccurs to 0 for any powerAttributes.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Address in factoring work for wd24 and later.

**Description**

Power attributes (hertz, voltage, ac) used by EnergyInterop in the ramp schedule are required, however, these attributes would be known (or assumed) in any specific grid. The only instance where this information might be required, is those few locations where grid equipment from the two major vendors exist, e.g. Japan, where there is both the 50 hz grid and the 60 hz grid.

Recommend making these attributes optional.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]

Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 28/Jul/11 09:50 AM ]

If known for any grid, they can be specified in the market context for trading within that grid - and inherited within the information model.

Trading between grids could then be a market context in which they are not specified, and so must be specified per transaction.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 29/Jul/11 02:50 PM ]

Are you agreement then that the power attributes should be optional?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Aug/11 09:52 PM ]

In any market, it will be "fixed"

If we allow it in the market context, then it can be assumed / inherited in any Event within that context.

If it can be inherited, then it need not be specified in the event.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 03/Aug/11 09:51 AM ]

It appears in the schema that if you specify a PowerQuantityType that the power attributes are not inherited, they are specified. If inheritance is set that would be fine (I don't see where this is - perhaps you could point it out to me). Or you could simply set minOccurs to 0 and maxOccurs to 1 for the power attributes.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 20/Sep/11 12:48 PM ]

This issue should have been moved to EMIX as it refers to the powerAttributes that is part of the powerQuantity structure. However, the EMIX bird has flown. We shall henceforth always include power attributes, assumed or not, applicable or not, needed or not.

Closing.

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-404] Inconsistencies in Binding and Anchored semantics</a> Created: 05/May/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Description**

There is an inconsistency at the heart of the core semantics of WS-Calendar

From line 369:

An Interval specifies how long an activity lasts. An Unanchored Interval is not bound to a specific date and time. The example below shows the components section of a WS-Calendar message containing a single Interval

From table 1-6:

Anchored An Interval is Anchored [in time] if it is Bound to a full date and time. A Sequence or Partition is Anchored if it contains an Anchored Interval, and when Fully Bound, the specific date, time, and duration of all Intervals can be determined unambiguously. Specific performance of a Service Contract always occurs in an Anchored Sequence.,

Partially Anchored An Interval is Partially Anchored if EITHER its Date OR its Time is Bound. A Sequence or Partition is Partially Anchored if its Designated Interval is Partially Anchored.

Unanchored An Interval is Unanchored if NEITHER its Begin Date nor its Begin Time are known.

**Issue:**

For a long time, there was an idea that there was a "date" and a "time" and that these were bound separately. Drafts of the specification described binding a day, and letting the invoker name any time during the day, or naming time, and letting the invoker pick the day....This was found to be in conflict of many core semantics of iCalendar, and caused multiple issues in handling time zones.

The specification now consistently using a date-time for all bindings. The specification is also now using Availability for the "time portion" of patially bound.

We need to review the core semantics as they cascade down throughout the document.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:59 AM ]

This is an old (early May) issue and I believe has been overtaken by events, including the updated conformance sections of Energy Interoperation and WS-Calendar PR03.

Please update as needed, and close.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-405] Deal with Fig 6-6 per earlier notes** Created: 05/May/11 Updated: 05/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Figure removed
--------------------	----------------

Description

I has sent specific issues with the figure earlier, as comment in an edited draft (197, 217), don't have those comments on this machine. Talk later. Don't want to forget.

Comments

Comment by [David Holmberg](#) [ 05/Jul/11 09:20 AM ]

The figure has been removed.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-406] Usage Services should be called Delivery Services** Created: 05/May/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	EiUsage service has been deleted. EiFeedback gives similar information.
--------------------	--

Description

The TC earlier voted to apply the name Delivery rather than Usage so that such services would apply to both generation and end customers.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 05/Jul/11 12:19 PM ]

Ei Feedback may return some measured delivery (usage) for an Event but the purpose of EiDelivery is to communicate the relevant reported energy deliveries for all intervals consistent with the NAESB

EiUsage should be renamed EiDelivery and with the payload specified in the EMIX Spec now in PRO# see EMIX wd35 line 636 Section 4.5 EMIX Delivery

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-407] The term offer is still used in a few places in the latest Ei Schemas** Created: 06/May/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Make change as suggested above.
------------------	---------------------------------

**Resolution:** Ensure that "offer" is not used in the document or schemas where "tender" is appropriate.

#### Description

In the following schema the Tender Payloads should replace offerorParty with tenderParty and offereeParty with tenderCounterParty. Bids and offers are both Tenders. Throughout emix and ei have been attempting to standardize on "Tender"

FROM EiPayloads:

```
<xs:element name="eiCreateTender" type="payloads:EiCreateTenderType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiCreateTenderType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:offerorPartyID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="eiCreatedTender" type="payloads:EiCreatedTenderType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiCreatedTenderType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element name="createdTenderAck" type="xs:string" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:offereePartyID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="eiRequestTender" type="payloads:EiRequestTenderType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiRequestTenderType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:offerorPartyID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="eiSentTender" type="payloads:EiSentTenderType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiSentTenderType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element name="sentTenderAck" type="xs:string" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="eiAcceptTender" type="payloads:EiAcceptTenderType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiAcceptTenderType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:offerID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:offerorPartyID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="eiAcceptedTender" type="payloads:EiAcceptedTenderType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiAcceptedTenderType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element name="acceptedTenderAck" type="xs:string" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="eiCancelTender" type="payloads:EiCancelTenderType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiCancelTenderType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:offereePartyID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:offerorPartyID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:tenderID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
<xs:element name="eiCanceledTender" type="payloads:EiCanceledTenderType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiCanceledTenderType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element name="cancelTenderAck" type="xs:string" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:offereePartyID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:offerorPartyID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
```

FROM EiEvent:

```
<xs:element name="eventID" type="xs:string">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>Identifier assigned to the Event. An Event consists of the time periods, deadlines, and transitions during which Demand Resources perform. The System Operator shall specify the duration and applicability of a Demand Response Event. Some deadlines, time periods, and transitions may not be not applicable to all products or services.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
<xs:element name="eventModificationNumber"/>
<xs:element name="eventStateID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="deployment" type="power:EnergyItemType"/>
<xs:element name="marketName" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="modificationNumber" type="xs:unsignedInt"/>
<xs:element name="offerID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="offerorPartyID" type="eitc:PartyIDType"/>
<xs:element name="offereePartyID" type="eitc:PartyIDType"/>
<xs:element name="offline" type="xs:boolean"/>
<xs:element name="optID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="partyID" type="eitc:PartyIDType"/>
<xs:simpleType name="PartyIDType">
<xs:restriction base="xs:string"/>
</xs:simpleType>
<xs:element name="partyName" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="partyRole" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="quoteID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="resourceID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="programCallID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="registeredPartyID" type="eitc:PartyIDType"/>
<xs:element name="registrarPartyID" type="eitc:PartyIDType"/>
<xs:element name="registrationID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="requestorPartyID" type="eitc:PartyIDType"/>
<xs:element name="responseSchedID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="signalName" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="tenderID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="testEvent" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="transactionID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="transactionName" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="venID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:element name="vtnID" type="xs:string"/>
<xs:attribute name="schemaVersion" type="xs:string">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>The version of the schema representing this entity.</xs:documentation>
```

</xs:annotation>  
</xs:attribute>

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Jun/11 01:29 PM ]

In the schemas:

OfferId is now TenederId  
OfferorParty is not TendererParty  
Offeree is not Tenderee

**[ENERGYINTEROP-408] Recommended changes to energvinterop-1-0-schema-wd23-wip7 version of schema** Created: 06/May/11 Updated: 08/Jun/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Have uploaded a new version of the EIClasses changes to energvinterop-1-0-schema-wd23-wip7-edkoch.zip in the contributions folder. Recommend we integrate into future versions of schema.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Mostly accepted, and we are now several schema releases later. Closing

Description

Found some issues in the energvinterop-1-0-schema-wd23-wip7 version of the schemas. Specifically the following:

Modifications to wip7 schemas

Ed Koch

May 5, 2011

- Changed the substitution group of responseDescription from signalInformationBase to eventDescriptionBase
- Changed the substitution group of eventBaselineDescription from signalInformationBase to eventDescriptionBase
- Changed cardinality of EventDescriptorType:emixMarketContext to make it optional.
- Moved eitc:eiEventSchedule from EiMarketContext and put it back in EiEventType
- changed signalAmount back to signalAmountMW to fix the units. See below for explanation:

Some of the typing information that we were using in the signal definitons has disappeared in wip7. We may not need it if you consider the following:

price - requires currency, but that can be part of the market context of the overall event and does not need to be defined in the signal definition.

priceRelative - unitless number

priceMultiplier - unitless number

signalAmount - this needs units, but if we change it back to signalAmountMW then we can fix the units. We can express all valid numbers using this unit and do not need to have variable units.

signalLevel - unitless number

signalPercent - unitless number

Since Toby removed the typing information then I suggest we leave it out.

**Resources - Define Resouce and explore its use Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-473)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-409] Need to add some attributes to Feedback** Created: 10/May/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Evaluate the next version of the schema against the above requirements and adjust as necessary.
------------------	---

<b>Resolution:</b>	Reports now have two instances of Target, one to indicate "what is being reported on", one to indicate "sources of information" Both are now part of reportDescription
--------------------	---

**Description**  
There are a number of attributes associated with the feedback which may require a bit of refactoring and refinement. Based upon our experience with telemetry feeds for DR programs the following are the necessary attributes for a particular dataset that might appear in a feedback payload.

- = Source of the data which is described with the following attribute hierarchy:
  - DR Resource, i.e. "VEN ID"
  - Data source name, i.e. "meter1"
  - Data set name, i.e. "power"
- = Units for the data
- = A collection (i.e. sequence) of data values. We should support a sequence of values, i.e. meter values from 1:00 to 2:00 at 5 minute intervals. Note that in this example each data value may be associated with an interval (i.e. 5 minute), but in general data values may also be at specific time instances (i.e. timestamps)

I see most of these attributes in the existing schema, but it is not clear to me how they are organized in a fashion that satisfies the above requirements.

**Comments**

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 12/May/11 05:35 PM ]  
I see an element of VEN ID in the Feedback message as well as Resource ID. Do we intend to have 2 identifiers? I thought VEN was a role definition. Is it also going to be a party identified in the transactions? VEN ID is also in the Opt message.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 27/Jun/11 11:48 AM ]  
The source of the message is a VEN; the referenced information is with respect to (one or more) resources in wd23 terminology. So we need both.

The VEN has a relationship with a particular VTN with respect to a Market Context.

This all needs to be more clear in the specification.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
Needs more discussion than we will get to this week as part of the larger "What is a Resource conversation"

Closing to reopen to defer

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:13 PM ]  
Please review and indicate of Report Description now meets this concern

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-410] Need to add current value to signals** Created: 10/May/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

**Proposal:**

(1) Confirm that the EIEventCreatedType.createdTime can be used for representing the creation time of the payload.  
NOTE: I believe what's requested is that EiCreatedEventPayload include createdTime [for that payload].

(2) Add creation time attribute to the EIRequestEventPayloadType  
NOTE: I believe this is a request to add creationTime: xcal:DateTimeType to EiRequestEventPayloadType. Semantics need to be clear (see comments below).

(3) Make the following change to the wip7 schema:

```
<xs:complexType name="EiEventSignalType">
<xs:complexContent>
<xs:extension base="eitc:EventBaseType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:signalName"/>
<xs:element ref="emix:marketContext" minOccurs="0"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:uid"/>
>>> NEW element
<xs:element name="currentValue">
<xs:complexType>
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:signalInformationBase"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
</xs:element>
>>> END of new element
</xs:sequence>
<xs:attribute ref="eitc:schemaVersion"/>
</xs:extension>
</xs:complexContent>
</xs:complexType>
```

**Resolution:** PresentValue in in EventInfoType and can contain any SignalInformationType

**Description**  
Need to add a currentValue attribute to the EIEventSignalType.

This information reflects the current value of the signal. It is redundant information to the signal value schedule and was used in OpenADR 1.0 to reflect the value of the signal at the time that the payload was created. Even though this is redundant information it makes it much easier for simple devices to determine the current signal value without needed to parse the entire signal schedule.

Note that I believe the payload created time is reflected in the EiEventCreated.createdTime attribute. With respect to the RequestEventPayload payload type we may be missing this attribute.

SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS WTC

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 12:45 AM ]

(1) Confirm that the EiEventCreatedType.createdTime can be used for representing the creation time of the payload.

COMMENT: not sure whether this is in the wd24 schemas; is a createdTime: xcal:DateTimeType in EiEvent sufficient? Should it be in EiEventContextType instead?

(2) Add creation time attribute to the EiRequestEventPayloadType

COMMENT: What is the intended meaning? The creation time of the request, the event? The semantics are "send me all events relevant to me and transactionName (should this be marketName aka programName?) that are active or in the future.

Please describe the purpose.

(3) Make the following change to the wip7 schema:

COMMENT the schema refactoring and conformance post wd22 makes this hard for me to understand. Please revisit in the context of the wd24 schemas.

```
<xs:complexType name="EiEventSignalType">
<xs:complexContent>
<xs:extension base="eitc:EventBaseType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:signalName"/>
<xs:element ref="emix:marketContext" minOccurs="0"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:uid"/>
<>>> NEW element
<xs:element name="currentValue">
<xs:complexType>
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:signalInformationBase"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
</xs:element>
<>> END of new element
</xs:sequence>
<xs:attribute ref="eitc:schemaVersion"/>
</xs:extension>
</xs:complexContent>
</xs:complexType>
```

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Jul/11 04:37 PM ]

As a cached value, I have no problem with this.

As time stamps that one tries to use to connect event components together, there are problems.

The core proposal would seem to be to add a currentValue to the header (EiEventBase) for the list, in conjunction with the SignalType element it allows the use of that cached value.

Time stamps are fine, but shouldn't be used beyond the limits of reliability. They are NOT an event ID.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-412] Section 5.4 Naming of Services and Operations and Section 5.5 Push and Pull Patterns Needs Editing** Created: 11/May/11

Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	WIP 1 Ed Cazalet WD23-wip1 apparently.		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change specification to so reflect. WD24 - sections 5.5 and 5.6.
<b>Resolution:</b>	The editor will consider whether this is an appropriate change to the specification and (if so) whether it can be accomplished for PR02. WTC: I suggest Defer.

Description

Apparently refers to WD23-WIP1 <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/42101/energyinterop-1-0-spec-wd23-wip1.pdf>

Sections 5.4 and 5.5 refer to VEN and VTN that are interchangeable in their service interactions. If instead the references are to Parties then the discussion would apply to both VEN/VTN interactions and the transactive interactions.

NOTE SECTIONS 5.5 and 5.6 in wd24.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-413] Line 188 OSG Citations** Created: 11/May/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
----------------	--------

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Resolution:** Include links as supplied in Description; non-normative references.

**Description**  
 Line 188 UCAlug OpenSG OpenADR Task Force:  
 Need definitive and permanent links here.  
 Here are the docs and links:  
 OpenADR 1.0 System Requirements Specification v1.0  
<http://osqug.ucauiug.org/sqsystems/OpenADR/Shared%20Documents/SRS/OpenSG%20OpenADR%201.0%20SRS%20v1.0.pdf>  
 OPENADR 1.0 SERVICE DEFINITION - COMMON VERSION :R0.91  
<http://osqug.ucauiug.org/sqsystems/OpenADR/Shared%20Documents/Services/OpenSG%20OpenADR%20SD%20-%20Common%20r0.91.doc>  
 OPENADR 1.0 SERVICE DEFINITION - WEB SERVICES IMPLEMENTATION PROFILE Version: v0.91  
<http://osqug.ucauiug.org/sqsystems/OpenADR/Shared%20Documents/Services/OpenSG%20OpenADR%20SD%20-%20WS%20r0.91.doc>

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 15/Jun/11 05:37 PM ]  
 I have recently created an OpenSG "store" which will be a permanent library for deliverables that have been approved by OpenSG task forces.  
 My expectation is that this new construct will be approved at the upcoming OpenSG face to face meeting in Vancouver, July 18-21.  
 As an alternative to the three links provided by Bruce, a single link may suffice (to the new "store" location): <http://osqug.ucauiug.org/sqstore/default.aspx>  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 12:04 PM ]  
 We can re-visit post PR02, but using the links for now. OASIS references should not be to catch-all libraries.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-414] Table 3-1; what does wrt stand for?** Created: 12/May/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Resolution:** "wrt" in the cited table means "With Respect To". The editor may address.  
 Added note defining abbreviation in vicinity of each table that uses wrt.

**Description**  
 What does wrt stand for? List of possible acronyms:  
 Acronym Definition  
 WRT With Regard To  
 WRT With Respect To  
 WRT World Rally Team  
 WRT With Reference To  
 WRT Web Runtime (cell phone application)  
 WRT Wrought  
 WRT Walter Reade Theater  
 WRT Westchester Reform Temple  
 WRT Wallace Roberts & Todd  
 WRT Workforce Review Team (National Health Service body responsible for workforce planning in England)  
 WRT Water Restoration Technician (Institute of Inspection, Cleaning and Restoration Certification)  
 WRT Wealth Replacement Trust  
 WRT Workshop on Refactoring Tools  
 WRT Water Round Torpedo  
 WRT Wildlife Rehabilitation Today (magazine)  
 WRT Welcome Real Time (Aix-en-Provence, France)  
 WRT Windowed Radon Transform  
 WRT Wireless Receiver/Transmitter  
 WRT World Roofing Technologies (South Africa)  
 WRT Writer's Round Table  
 WRT Warrior River Terminal Company  
 WRT Wastewater Retention Tank

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 12/May/11 02:46 PM ]  
 I would say clearly the first two.  
 Although I must confess, I had no idea off the top of my head.  
 Comment by [Anne Hendry](#) [ 12/May/11 04:31 PM ]  
 I'd go for "Windowed Radon Transform" myself.  
 Fits right in:  
[http://idlastro.gsfc.nasa.gov/idl.html/help/Transforming to and from the Hough and Radon Domains.html](http://idlastro.gsfc.nasa.gov/idl.html/help/Transforming%20to%20and%20from%20the%20Hough%20and%20Radon%20Domains.html)

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:58 PM ]

I rather liked World Rally Team...

**[ENERGYINTEROP-415] Lines 719,722, 725 Figure 3-7 Reference to DR Standing Bid and Acceptance; these interactions are not defined elsewhere in the document.** Created: 12/May/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Resolution:** These functions are not in PR02; delete references as necessary.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-416] Improved References to UCAlug work** Created: 16/May/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** This issue is already documented in #413 so this instance can be closed.

Description

In the current draft, there is a placeholder for the critical UCAlug documents and controbutions. The Editor needs references and links

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 17/May/11 08:00 AM ]

<http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-413>

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 15/Jun/11 05:51 PM ]

This issue is already documented in #413 so this instance can be closed.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Jul/11 06:15 PM ]

Monving through series because it was closed without applying.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-417] Proposed changes to the wd24 wip 1 EiClasses.xsd schemas** Created: 17/May/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

**Proposal:** Accept propoesed changes.

Description

Propose minor changes to the EiClasses.xsd schemas as follows. Note that these changes are reflected in the wip8\_ed\_mods.zip file that was uploaded. Also note that some of these changes are reflected in previous JIRA submissions,

- Changed EiEventSignalType.emix:marketContext to be optional
- Added elementFormDefault="qualified" to the schema attributes
- Added currentValue attribute to the EiEventSignalType

```
<xs:element name="currentValue">
<xs:complexType>
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eit:signalInformationBase"/>
</xs:sequence>
```

</xs:complexType>  
</xs:element>

- changed the EventDescriptorType.emix:marketContext to EventDescriptorType.eitc:eiMarketContext and made it mandatory.
- changed EiMarketContext.emix:marketContext to be optional

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 17/May/11 08:55 PM ]
Existing WD23 is so close to publication that these requests are forestalled until WD24 and TC discussion. These are WD24 for WIP1.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 04/Jul/11 05:00 PM ]
Mostly done, dsome done differently in WD24.
Review after PR02
Comment by <a href="#">Ed Koch</a> [ 19/Sep/11 12:17 PM ]
These changes have already been applied
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Editorial Collector for wd24** (ENERGYINTEROP-466)  
 **[ENERGYINTEROP-418] Insert reference to OpenADR 1 and use as appropriate** Created: 17/May/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox wd22		

<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Non-normative reference in wd24 and perhaps wd23.</p> <p>Citation: Piette, Mary Ann, Girish Ghatkar, Sila Kiliccote, Ed Koch, Dan Hennage, Peter Palinsky, and Charles McParland. Open Automated Demand Response Communications Specification (Version 1.0)., 2009. LBNL-1779E.</p> <p>URI for specification (direct): <a href="http://drrc.lbl.gov/sites/drrc.lbl.gov/files/cec-500-2009-063.pdf">http://drrc.lbl.gov/sites/drrc.lbl.gov/files/cec-500-2009-063.pdf</a></p> <p>Apply as needed editorially. Other uses - Rish please enter comments on PR02.</p>
--------------------	--

Description

There should be a non-normative reference to OpenADR 1.  
References should be made where appropriate, e.g. in the first discussion of price relative and multiple.

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 17/May/11 08:12 PM ]
Ridsh, will you please provide me the appropriate link(s) and titles?
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 08/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]
As voted in meeting

**Re-factoring and Normalization Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-472)  
 **[ENERGYINTEROP-420] Refactoring - was Proposed changes to the wip 8 EiEvent.xsd schemas (and other dependencies)** Created: 17/May/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatkar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatkar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatkar		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>1. Add the current DR program implementation of PRICE_RELATIVE and PRICE_MULTIPLE (and potentially, PRICE_ABSOLUTE) through eitc as "event-based signals" for signalInformationBase attribute and align them similar to signalAmountMW, signalLevel, and signalPercent. The proposal is as follows:</p> <p>a. change/add the priceMultiplier.emix:multipier to signalPriceMultiplier.eitc:signalPriceMultiplierType.                  b. change/add priceRelative.emix:value to signalPriceRelative.eitc:signalPriceRelativeType</p> <p>Both the above be of type xs:float.</p> <p>Potentially, consider the following as they're part of current OpenADR DR event-based signals to communicate prices and allows backward compatibility:</p> <p>c. add signalPriceAbsolute.eitc:signalPriceAbsoluteType</p>
------------------	---

<b>Resolution:</b>	Addressed in part in wd24. Use the price structure as defined. The proposal extends the scope of EITC which is not permitted. Add description suggested by Bruce Bartell to the document if still needed.
--------------------	--

**Description**  
Proposed changes to the EiEvent.xsd schemas as per wip8\_ed\_mods.zip file.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 17/May/11 10:02 PM ]

Adding to the comment list so it shows in the e-mail.

1. Add the current DR program implementation of PRICE\_RELATIVE and PRICE\_MULTIPLE (and potentially, PRICE\_ABSOLUTE) through eitc as "event-based signals" for signalInformationBase attribute and align them similar to signalAmountMW, signalLevel, and signalPercent. The proposal is as follows:

a. change/add the priceMultiplier.emix:multiplier to signalPriceMultiplier.eitc:signalPriceMultiplierType.  
b. change/add priceRelative.emix:value to signalPriceRelative.eitc:signalPriceRelativeType

Both the above be of type xs:float.

Potentially, consider the following as they're part of current OpenADR DR event-based signals to communicate prices and allows backward compatibility:

c. add signalPriceAbsolute.eitc:signalPriceAbsoluteType

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 18/May/11 09:06 AM ]  
Where did the signal data go? I do not see the (formerly) dispatch level value either. I was expecting to see it as part of eiEventSignal.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 18/May/11 09:33 AM ]  
I see these things as extension to signalInformationBase, but do not see where it is used in eiEvent.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 18/May/11 10:35 AM ]  
In the previous schemas they were explicit attributes of the signals, but at that time we had not yet worked out how we would attach them to the interval schedules. They are now part of a separate substitution group that becomes an attachment to the signal schedule. This is pretty much what I expected would happen when we finally worked out the interval attachment mechanism. I've generated xml from the new wip8 schemas and while I would prefer a more explicit coupling in the schema I don't see any way around what we are doing in wip8 given the ws-calendar mechanisms for attaching values to intervals. Baring any changes to ws-calendar I think this is fine.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 18/May/11 10:55 AM ]  
What points where? Does properties.interval.attach url point to the signalInformationBase substitution group extension? I think we need to have a detailed explanation of how to navigate to any expected attachments and include as part of the document.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 25/May/11 12:55 PM ]  
Continuing with our discussion at workshop meeting today, the following is a simple and straightforward addition to the EiEvent schemas:

It is intended to not create any conflicting and redundant ways of using price responsive DR for even-based communications.

```
< xs:element name="signalPriceRelative" type="eitc: SignalPriceRelativeType " substitutionGroup="eitc:signalInformationBase"/>
< xs:annotation>
  < xs:documentation>
    Represents communication of relative price information for DR-event-based signal dispatch.
  < /xs:documentation>
< /xs:annotation>
  < xs:complexType name="SignalPriceRelativeType">
    < xs:complexContent>
      < xs:extension base="eitc:SignalInformationBaseType">
        < xs:sequence>
          < xs:element name="value" type="xs:string"/>
        < /xs:sequence>
      < /xs:extension>
    < /xs:complexContent>
  < /xs:complexType>

< xs:element name="signalPriceMultiple" type="eitc: SignalPriceMultipleType " substitutionGroup="eitc:signalInformationBase"/>
< xs:annotation>
  < xs:documentation>
    Represents communication of multiple price information for DR-event-based signal dispatch.
  < /xs:documentation>
< /xs:annotation>
  < xs:complexType name="SignalPriceMultipleType">
    < xs:complexContent>
      < xs:extension base="eitc:SignalInformationBaseType">
        < xs:sequence>
          < xs:element name="value" type="xs:string"/>
        < /xs:sequence>
      < /xs:extension>
    < /xs:complexContent>
  < /xs:complexType>

< xs:element name="signalPriceAbsolute" type="eitc: SignalPriceAbsoluteType " substitutionGroup="eitc:signalInformationBase"/>
< xs:annotation>
  < xs:documentation>
    Represents communication of absolute price information for DR-event-based signal dispatch.
  < /xs:documentation>
< /xs:annotation>
  < xs:complexType name="SignalPriceAbsoluteType">
    < xs:complexContent>
      < xs:extension base="eitc:SignalInformationBaseType">
        < xs:sequence>
          < xs:element name="value" type="xs:string"/>
        < /xs:sequence>
      < /xs:extension>
    < /xs:complexContent>
  < /xs:complexType>
```

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:56 PM ]  
The functionality requested is present in the schemas wd24-wip3; the references are to several generations back. Please update to wd24 when issued.

The information factoring for wd24 has also affected this issue.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 12:22 AM ]  
using only MW as units does not function in international markets, and does not address use cases for e.g. microgrids and devices. The application should be able to select the relevant units.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 11:52 AM ]  
Have to Close to re-open and Defer

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:15 PM ]  
Are you now content with this resolution as in Signals expressed in Streams?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:38 AM ]  
 Applied in wd24 and following.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:37 PM ]  
 Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-421] No Resource ID in OptOut</b> Created: 18/May/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Resolution:** ResourceID is in EiOptType, the key payload for the EiOpt service, as of wd24.

Description  
 Cannot find Resource ID in OptOut payload.  
 NOTE: Affected Version is not supplied.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-422] OptOut using emix:marketContext; need access to a name or identifier</b> Created: 18/May/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Resolution:** marketName is an element of eitc:EiMarketContext as least as of wd24. Already applied.

Description  
 Opt Out recipient need to know the DR Program involved. I think that the ei version of market context supplies this.

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 08/Jun/11 12:29 PM ]  
 Market Context uid?  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 13/Jun/11 09:56 AM ]  
 Not sure if there is an ID or Name used. The rest of the group needs to chime in on this. It may be difficult to implement a unique id assignment for this.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:50 PM ]  
 EiOpt has a MarketContext included. A reference (to an emix:MarketContextType, which is a URI, could be assigned uniquely. That MarketContext defines the "DR program" involved.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-423] Opt Out for individual event; not in opt out message; is it in feedback?</b> Created: 18/May/11 Updated: 28/Sep/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Proposal:** Defer. Post PR02 pending business case justification; post 1.0 list if not.  
**Resolution:** Added ot event reply.

Description  
 Need the ability to opt out for an individual event. The event does not seem to be in the opt out message. Are we handling this through feedback message?

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:38 PM ]

If a VEN does not want to respond to an individual event, it will invoke the EiCreatedEvent operation with a failure message. That message might use the string "OptOut" but does not involve the EiOpt service. It would be a burden on VTNs to try to manage Opt changes during events; direct communication from the VEN as suggested seems much cleaner and less computationally intensive.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 29/Jun/11 02:00 PM ]

Bill,  
This seems like a solution to opt-out of an event AFTER it's issued and BEFORE it's active. I am OK with the proposed change if the message is standardized (seems obscure at this point of time). I still have a question on how this might work for opt-out AFTER the event is active? We need to address that use case.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 12:09 AM ]

I think that we need validation of this use case. The posting of this item is the first that we've heard of this (so far as I can recall). The behavior in a contractual arrangement is "failure to perform" with all the implications and potential penalties. Why is this any different, other than delivering a hint to the VTN to not expect any additional generation/response?

It seems an odd case, as all the behaviors except that notification can take place already.

So we need several steps:

FIRST step is justification of need - to understand real business requirements and/or regulatory requirements for this behavior. Is this discussed in the Phase 2 NAESB requirements?

SECOND step if there is justification is for the TC to decide whether to support this behavior

THIRD step is to determine the solution. See below for my thoughts.

FOURTH step is to determine the release. Given the timing of steps 1..3, I think this is post PR02. And if it's not picked up by the TC it's on the list of possible items post 1.0

FIFTH step is to do the work.

Here are my thoughts on how to accomplish the stated objective; I haven't seen the detailed use cases and business case for this behavior, so I'm presuming that steps one and two are completed and we're working on step three.

I'd see using either

(a) EiCancelEvent sent by the VEN, rather than the VTN. This has the defect that the event is not canceled, only that particular VTN's participation.

(b) EiCreatedEvent could be called up to twice; if first called by the VEN with accept, then it could be called once more with Failure. This seems odd, and pushes the behavior into a re-used operation that confuses the flow.

(c) Create a new function, VEN is service consumer, VTN is service provider, say EiStopEvent, that would indicate the VEN's decision to no longer abide by its commitment in accepting the event in the first place.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]

Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 13/Jul/11 04:14 PM ]

This is a link to one of the DR Programs in place that require an opt in/out for a specific event. The recommendation is to add the opt type to the eiCreated message. Ed K. will be sending out the details. <http://www.pge.com/mybusiness/energysavingsrebates/demandresponse/peakchoice/programdetailsandeligibility/bestefortplandetails/>

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 24/Jul/11 12:27 PM ]

I submitted document wd26\_ed\_wip1.zip which is a simple change to the schemas to add a single attribute to the eiEventCreated payload. May need to also add this same attribute to the modified payload as well.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 24/Jul/11 02:18 PM ]

Note that the original zip file I uploaded was blank so I deleted it and have uploaded wd26\_ed\_wip2.zip in its place. Note that this zip file also contains the changes necessary for issue 473 as well.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 27/Jul/11 10:42 AM ]

URI for WIP2 is [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/42983/wd26\\_ed\\_wip2.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/42983/wd26_ed_wip2.zip). WIP 1 was deleted, so there's no note on the proposed change.

Trying to extract only information with respect to this issue, it seems that the proposed additional element for the EiCreatedEventPayloadType, is a mandatory ei:EiOptType - values OptIn and OptOut - so you have to send one or the other. This is confusing with respect to the EiOpt service, as this does not affect the Availability or Opt system except for this one event, and requires that a value be sent.

Quoting from WIP2 EiPayloads.xsd:

```
<xs:complexType name="EiCreatedEventPayloadType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>This is the payload for the EiEvent Service CreatedEvent response..</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element name="eventCreatedResponse" type="eitc:EiResponseType" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>This is an acknowledgement of the receipt of a DR notification or dispatch. It should be accompanied by any necessary provisions for non-repudiation</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
<xs:element ref="eitc:eventID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:modificationNumber" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:optType"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
```

The approach makes a lot of sense, but requiring that either OptIn or OptOut be sent with each message is an issue. I suggest that the element be an optional boolean called something like "NoPerformance". I think that this does exactly what's requested and is more clear.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 27/Jul/11 02:40 PM ]

I used the OptTypeType because it was already defined and seemed to fit the bill. If you would prefer to make it a boolean then make it so. If you want to make it optional then that is fine too.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 24/Aug/11 11:45 AM ]

Why is this assigned to me? I thought we had a resolution.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 31/Aug/11 05:47 PM ]

Handing back to Bill. I don't see the resolution in the latest schema, but I think we have an agreed upon resolution. So I guess that means someone can close it, but we will have to check the next set of schemas before moving to resolved.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-424] eiConstraint - Can't find Resource ID** Created: 18/May/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Bug
<b>Priority:</b>	Major

<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

**Resolution:** EiAvail (wd24, successor to EiConstraint) has Resource ID included (cardinality 1).

**Description**  
Did we replace Resource ID with VEN ID and someone forgot to tell me?

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:46 PM ]  
 Please look at wd24 and comment.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

<b>Feedback Collector PR02</b> (ENERGYINTEROP-529) <b>[ENERGYINTEROP-425] Continuing thoughts for a feedback service.</b> Created: 22/May/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">service</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>To be discussed with the TC.</p> <p>Post 1.0. This is a significant proposed extension to functionality.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>wd24 EiFeedback services provides means for periodically or one-time measure of demand and energy use. This is historical for the period designated in the EiCreateFeedback service operation.</li> <li>Feedback is response, not prediction. Others (e.g. ASHRAE SPC201P) are working on projected use and demand.</li> <li>Projected demand, curtailment, generation availability is post-1.0; collaboration with the ASHRAE technical committee and soliciting comments from their members seems a good way forward.</li> <li>EiDelivery addresses this in part.</li> </ol>
<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Historical functions are meet (and satisfy the feedback requirements) as part of the EiReport Service (EiReport, allow periodic send and historical responses, EiHistorian to "start recording" at some time in the past.)</p> <p>Projected demand, curtailment, generation availability is available through the Projection operations in EiReport, requesting projections with confidence. This is the model accepted by ASHRAE SPC201P as of mid-2011. They are building an information model; these operations allow access to the information.</p> <p>EiDelivery addresses delivery at an emixInterface.</p> <p>Define the full EiReport Service including Historian, Report, and Projection operations, in wd32.</p>

**Description**  
Feedback Service:

The feedback service is intended to meet the Smart Grid's need from resources (think VEN) to address the DR program requirements across different markets (think VTN). The following are some of the services to get started. These can potentially vary depending on the DR signal traversal from VEN to the final designated VTN. It is not intended to be exclusive requirement under one service of EI and can be supported by different standards/PAP activities such as PAP 10/OpenADE, PAP 17/ASHRAE, etc.:

- Measured demand.
  - Current (for load shed verification/settlement)
  - Historical (for baseline, forecast, etc.)
  - Optionally, can include peak values (although it can be extrapolated from above).
- Predicted demand (this parameter can be a calculated data point or estimated by a VEN to VTN)
- DR Availability (also includes any DER availability for DR)
  - How much is available in next hour?
  - How much is available in next 24-hours?
  - Optionally, how much is available next week?
- Resource location identifier
  - Meter (s).
  - Locational information (e.g., address, grid location indicator, sub-station, etc.)
  - Optionally, assets.
- Schedule information to above as appropriate.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 01/Jun/11 12:17 AM ]  
 Clearly feedback needs to include "present measured demand" as a minimum.

We've also discussion (and I think it's useful) to bundle responses in some way so that you don't have a message from each VEN for each measurement. (The measurement interval is in the EiFeedback service, as well as a way of making the feedback stop - adding an optional element for the bundling quantity is clear).

Once we have bundling, each feedback item needs a timestamp, and there would be the information structures in place to do Rish's 1b (which bundling does to some extent anyway).

Per discussions in the ASHRAE SPC201P group, it would seem that the demand measures are actually averaged over some interval anyway, so I'm not sure what 1c would do - love a discussion on the topic.

- Predicted demand. The way SPC201P does this is a confidence level; others have suggest a confidence interval. We've tried this with the EiUsage service, but for curtailment demand makes much more sense.
- This is addressed in the SPC201 sheddable load descriptions, and if we go this way (I'd suggest post 1.0) we should be careful to coordinate. SPC201 is using EMIX Resources BTW.

As I've suggested elsewhere, the resource gives the envelope of performance; the Feedback needs to give the "position of the needle" on the gauge. 1 does that function.

4. This is simply resource ID; the Interface defines other things. This is all associated with the Resource IMO.

Assets are out of scope for 1.0, so 4c is post 1.0 at the earliest.

There's no 5.

Not sure about 6 - is this the interval for feedback?

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 01/Jun/11 08:08 AM ]

Also see: <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-409>

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 01/Jun/11 04:12 PM ]

I. Let's start with an elemental feedback as a response from VEN to VTN with no intermediaries. In this case the VEN is also a resource:

1. Measured demand in real-time from a resource

a. Specified interval period (1, 5, 15-minute?)

b. Associated schedule.

2. Predicted demand - important for A/S markets.

a. Associated schedule.

3. DR Availability (hour, 24-hour, etc.) - important for A/S markets.

b. Associated schedule.

4. Resource identifiers

a. VEN ID [1..1]

b. Resource ID [1..1]

c. [Asset ID?]

II. If we want to extend this to a campus scenario, #4 would additionally have

4. Resource ID

a. VEN ID [1..\*]

b. VTN ID [1..\*] -- assumes that the signals come from multiple resources/meters (VEN) and then gets distributed to centralized location (VTN), which will send it to the service provider (originating VTN)

III. If we want to extend this to an intermediary/ies (aggregator w/ I or II above), #4 would additionally have:

4. Resource ID

a. VEN ID [1..\*]

b. VTN ID [1..\*]

In either of the scenarios, we need to differentiate the trail of VTN IDs to the final destination VTN, which issued the signals in the first place.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 11:39 AM ]

Have to Close to Re-open to defer.

< sigh />

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]

Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:16 PM ]

Does the current report service meet your concerns?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 08:45 PM ]

Round trip back to Resolved to change to Fixed.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-426] Interaction pattern diagrams for EIQuote and EIEvent services are missing interactions** Created: 30/May/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">service</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd26</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd26</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Modify the specification, diagrams, schema, and model appropriately.  Recommend post-PR02 if not addressed already.  Update from submitted diagrams: <a href="http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/42739/Proposed%20image%20updates%20to%20resolve%20issue%20426.doc">http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/42739/Proposed%20image%20updates%20to%20resolve%20issue%20426.doc</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	All interactions derived from schemas, published in wd34.

**Description**

The interaction patterns for the PUSH and PULL are not equivalent. Specifically the interaction pattern diagrams for the EIQuote (861) and EIEvent (974) are missing an interaction for the EIRequestXXX services. Once the VTN responds to a request from the VEN (or Party) with the EISentXXX service then the VEN should respond with a EICreateXXX interaction when appropriate. This will insure that the PULL and PUSH mechanisms are semantically equivalent and contain the same set of payload exchanges between the VEN and VTN.

Update: WD26 has not been updated from the diagrams submitted to resolve: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/42739/Proposed%20image%20updates%20to%20resolve%20issue%20426.doc>

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:43 PM ]

Diagrams have been updated. Please re-examine.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Jul/11 11:48 PM ]

Consider along with Rish's refuse-event-in-progress issue, where the best solution seems to be the VEN sending EICancelEvent or a failure response EICreatedEvent after event initiation if that behavior is required.

Recommend post PR02.

Ed - still assigned to you. Please comment.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Jul/11 11:50 PM ]

Pending re-review by Ed Koch.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 02/Aug/11 04:57 PM ]

Notice this issue was closed, however the latest working draft had not been updated with the diagrams intended to address this issue. A link to the submitted diagrams has been provided.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 10:33 AM ]

Are you content now?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-427] Missing attributes in the payloads for the EIQuote and EIEvent service that are used to support non-repudiation.**

Created: 30/May/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd22</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Should add the following optional attribute to the EIQuote and EIEvent payload schema for EICreatedXXX and EICanceledXXX payloads:  < xs:element name="signature" type="xs:string"/>
<b>Resolution:</b>	This is a function of header content (or extension) for a particular transport protocol. The EI payloads are the information needed to make decisions. The ability to compose needed security is maintained by doing the various extensions in the headers (SOAP Headers in the wsdl examples). No action in the schemas and model.  The section on message headers (non-normative) was deleted from wd32. A paragraph on how composition is needed should be included in section 4 line 657

Description

Need to add an attribute to the EICreatedXXX and EICanceledXXX payloads for the EIQuote and EIEvent services that can be used for non-repudiation. This attribute can contain a unique signature that can be used to validate that the VEN received the Quote or Event information. Note that this is also required for compatibility to OpenADR 1.0.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:41 PM ]

Does this apply more generally? Non-repudiation may be important elsewhere. May be post-PR02; I support adding this to wd25.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 29/Jun/11 09:56 AM ]

We may want to consider this attribute as part of a message header construct that would (optionally) apply to any service that may require non-repudiation.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Jul/11 11:44 PM ]

This is generally addressed with composition of appropriate security, rather than doing a specific version in Energy Interoperation. This decoupling allows messages to contain what is needed, and to evolve separately from the specification.

Recommend no change for PR02.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 03/Jul/11 12:45 PM ]

I recommend we leave this open for the time being and discuss. My feeling is the mechanisms described by Bill require additional layering of services to the protocol stack that are difficult to implement in small devices. The addition is a simple signature attribute does not preclude using the methodologies that Bill suggests, BUT it does open the possibility of using a very simple technique that is easy to implement by simple devices.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 08:21 PM ]

I've deferred this issue to post PR02.

Typical signatures are with respect to a part or an entire message; this is a signature alone with no referent.

This should be on our action list after PR02 is voted out.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]

Opening all Deferred Items following vote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 11/Sep/11 02:55 PM ]

I think we need to discuss this in the larger group.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 11/Sep/11 06:03 PM ]

This is an important requirement and a discussion with the rest of the group should lead to a solution.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:18 AM ]

See meeting minutes October 2011 and email discussions on headers and their use.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-428] wd31: schema block header -> spec no longer related** Created: 20/Jun/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Anne Hendry</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Anne Hendry		

**Proposal:** For final release match schema section numbers/names in block comments to spec or remove comments, or numbers, or names, whichever are least useful.

**Description**  
 The block header comments in the schema while at one time may have referred to the sections of the spec, no longer relate (have different titles than the spec sections they refer to, are sometimes unpopulated, just block comment heads with no content below). These should be cleaned up (or removed) before final release as they are confusing as is.  
 For instance, in resource.xsd there is a block comment header "<!-- 3.6 Voltage Regulation -->", but there is no section 3.6 in the spec and Voltage Regulation is described in section 13. In power.xsd there is a block comment header "<!-- 9.9 Enumerations -->" and "<!-- 9.9.1 Voltage -->" but there is no spec section 9.9. Other headers suggest content for spec sections that do exist but have different content. These are just examples. It seems most of them are no longer related.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 08:17 PM ]  
 Not sure if this is necessary, but it may be desirable for PR02; good idea for PR03.  
 I'd defer to Toby - if time, consider for PR02. If not, defer.  
 Perhaps add a statement in the specification section about the schemas indicating that the comments/documentation are numbered but do not relate to the sections of the specification.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 05:02 PM ]  
 They have never referred to sections of the spec, and, like a table of contents, refer only to themselves, and aid the reader in wandering around.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]  
 As voted in meeting

[Resources - Define Resource and explore its use Collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP.473)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-429\] wd23: incorrect glossary entry reference to EMIX](#) Created: 20/Jun/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">sPEC</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Anne Hendry</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Anne Hendry		

**Proposal:** Delete lines 1454 - 1456 or use another term (don't define 'resource' twice in a differing ways).  
**Resolution:** Rationalize the definitions of Resource. Make the Glossary consistent with the one selected.  
 This is in non-normative Appendix B.

**Description**  
 Line 1454 - 1456 states:  
 "Resource (as defined in EMIX): A Resource is something that can describe its capabilities in a Tender 1455 into a market. How those Capabilities vary over time is defined by application of the Capability 1456 Description to a WS-Calendar Sequence. See [EMIX]."  
 EMIX has no such definition for 'Resource'. Rather it has many mentions of various characteristics under various circumstances in many different places in the specification, but no definition.  
 Resource is already defined for Energy Interop. It doesn't make sense to have two definitions in one spec for the same term, one from the spec itself and then another differing one from different spec. Otherwise you'd need to specify each time you used the term which one you were using.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:57 AM ]  
 May be post PR02.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 11:36 AM ]  
 This is one of the more critical issues in the current Spec. Different parties want to define Resources for "Radically" different purposes w/o taking the trouble to define a consensus view. Accordingly, we have a muddle here that could substantially limit interoperation between implementations,  
 Deferring this for discussion during the PR and at the F2F in Montreal  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 11:38 AM ]  
 You have to Close to Re-open to Defer  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]  
 Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:18 PM ]  
 Current resolution uses new EMIX Glossary, makes stronger references of EMIX spec.  
 Ann, does this now answer your concerns?  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-430\] wd23: normative references link to ws-calendar spec gets '404 not found' error](#) Created: 22/Jun/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Bug
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Anne Hendry</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Anne Hendry

<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Tobv Considine</a>
<b>Proposal:</b>	Make link valid.
<b>Resolution:</b>	This is a very old reference. Add normative reference to WS-Calendar PR03 in its place.

**Description**  
 wd33 pdf:  
 66 [WS-Calendar] OASIS Committee Specification Draft, WS-Calendar 1.0, September 2010.  
 67 <http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-calendar/ws-calendar/v1.0/CD01/ws-calendar-1.0-spec-cd-01.pdf>  
 gives 'not found on this server' error.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-431] [wd34 schema: ws-calendar shcema w/ multiple additional zips](#)** Created: 22/Jun/11 Updated: 28/Sep/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Anne Hendry</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Anne Hendry

<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Proposal:</b>	Clarify ws-calendar schema existence / maintainability for wd34, prd03, and beyond.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Wrong TC.

**Description**  
 The evolutionary path for (and the impact of) the ws-calendar schema in EMIX wd34 remains unclear. They were not in wd31 (2 days ago) but are in wd34.  
 Also in wd34 are additional zips wscalendar-wd26-actual.zip and wscalendar-wd26-gamed.zip.  
 See <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/emix/201106/msg00419.html>  
 and <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/emix/201106/msg00454.html>  
 for prior discussion.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-432] [Ei Response Type Proposal: WD23 - WIP7](#)** Created: 27/Jun/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	New Feature
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Girish Ghatikar

<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Proposal:</b>	See above description.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Add response values per description.

**Description**  
 This is the result of discussions between Gerald and Rish with respect to EiEvent

- Response Types = ERRORS (between a VEN and VTN)
- Models considered = PULL and PUSH
- The ERRORS for payloads NOT communications.
- Focus on Mandatory elements within eiEventPayload

- generic ERROR: mandatory filed/string is empty

eiCreateEventPayload  
 (some of it applies to eiCreatedPayload)

- createTime:
- xcal:dstamp: event past current time + invalid time stamp.

- ts:accuracy: accuracy is out of tolerance
- rest ignored as they seemed to be informational.
- vtnGluon:
  - xcal:uri: uri is malformed.
  - cal:uid: no such uid
- eitc:eiEvent:
  - eitc:eventID: event already exists
- eitc:eventSchedules:
  - itemUnits: no such units
  - scale: no such scale
- resourceTarget + others generic
  - powerNode: No such node
  - powerMRID: No such MRID
- serviceArea
  - emix:geographicArea: not in the Geographic area

NOTE:  
 - Why emix:marketContext is mandatory and NOT optional?  
 - Why modificationNumber in createEventPayload (should not).

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Jul/11 11:42 PM ]

Gerry and Rish may add or suggest changes to table. This can be for PR02 if it's in the Jira lists now, or a review comment.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-433] Request not Requent** Created: 27/Jun/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Repent and change "Requent" in all cases to "Request" in payload names
<b>Resolution:</b>	Correct "...Requent..." to "...Request...". This occurs only in EiPayloads.xsd.

Description

Although it may also be a "repent payload we suspect it is a request payload. Please update the name.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:03 PM ]

Corrected in Model; next update of the Payload schemas will pick up the correction.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 11:29 AM ]

Requent, for the end (of the edit cycle) is nigh!

**[ENERGYINTEROP-434] Modification in CreateEvent** Created: 27/Jun/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Remove the modificationNumber from CreateEiEvent payload.
<b>Resolution:</b>	modificationNumber is not present as of WD24-WIP3 schemas.

Description

The modificationNumber exists as an attribute in a CreateEiEvent payload, however, by definition if we are creating an event it is a new one. If we are modifying an existing event the ChangeEvent payload is to be used.

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 27/Jun/11 02:49 PM ]

SEP does not support a modification number. The paradigm there is to cancel and create a new event if there is a change. The work around that was discussed at OSG was that SEP would concatenate the event and modification number for the event id sent to the SEP devices. I don't know if this affects the request in this issue.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 27/Jun/11 04:52 PM ]

Nominally the resolution is the same; removing modificationNumber from this payload. The implications of the SEP approach is that we would not have an UpdateEvent at all.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:10 PM ]

Actually, an SEP edge server would process the off-the-web UpdateEvent (actually EiChangeEvent) and turn it into an internal event.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Jun/11 08:12 PM ]

No affected version listed. modificationNumber is not the EiCreateEventPayload as of wd24-wip3 schemas.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 29/Jun/11 09:48 AM ]

Thanks Bill, the affected version that I "thought" I had stipulated was, at the time, unreleased wd23-wip7. If this has been removed from wd24 I consider this closed.

<a href="#">Editorial Collector for wd24</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-466)			
<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-435] I242: Correction to language on Transactive Energy</a> Created: 29/Jun/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		
<b>Proposal:</b>	change texts as proposed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	In wd27 change the bullet list on line 289 to start with "Transactive Energy" (rather than "...markets") Eliminate parenthetical remark on Demand response approaches Add "Projected price, demand, and energy"		

**Description**  
243 refers to Transactive Energy Market  
Should read Transactive Energy Bilateral Interactions, Tarrifs and Markets

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 06:37 PM ]  
That makes this bullet read at an entirely different level of complexity than the rest of the bullets.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Sep/11 09:52 AM ]  
Entire list can be reworked as needed.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-436] 323 : minor improvement in expression</a> Created: 29/Jun/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd23</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section was rewritten for wd25. Close with no action. Re-raise in PR02 if necessary.		
<b>Description</b>	Change "to be the" "the"		

<a href="#">Editorial Collector for wd24</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-466)			
<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-437] 353 corre meaning of "Execution"</a> Created: 29/Jun/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		
<b>Resolution:</b>	In wd27 line 407 change "execution of a transaction" to "transaction" and ..."generally FROM the acceptance of a tender" Line 409 change to something like "For some transaction such as an option or a Demand Response program, there is an execution (bold) for delivery at ...."		
<b>Description</b>	353 3. should read There is a transacion(bold) to 4. For some transaction such as an option or a Demand Response program, there is an execution (bold) for delivery at ....		

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 20/Sep/11 07:47 PM ]
Please verify that this is correct in wd27.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-438] 380 : Grid pricing service is a vague concept - grid pricing is not in scope for EI.** Created: 29/Jun/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>The text proposed for line 380 is too technical and in advance of the definitions; it would be more suitable later in the specification:</p> <p>Several types of price communications are of interest.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the price of a buy or sell tender for the next delivery interval.</li> <li>2. Change What is the price of a tender for power a delivery interval 5 minutes from now?</li> <li>3. What is the price currently tendered to buy or sell power for each delivery hour of the day tomorrow?</li> <li>4. What is the price tendered for other delivery intervals in the future?</li> </ol> <p>389 - change "wild guesses" "estimates or predictions" [NOTE: it is common to use wholesale prices in a region to estimate, predict, or set retail prices - wild guesses is a bit extreme]</p> <p>390: Change With a standardize price service " to "With a standardized way of exchanging price and product information for dynamic price, energy tenders, or market closing prices"</p> <p>394: change "call for performance" to "exercise an option for the specific desired performance"</p>
--------------------	--

Description

<p>Change 380 to read.</p> <p>Several types of price communications are of interest.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the price of a buy or sell tender for the next delivery interval.</li> <li>2. Change What is the price of a tender for power a delivery interval 5 minutes from now?</li> <li>3. What is the price currently tendered to buy or sell power for each delivery hour of the day tomorrow?</li> <li>4. What is the price tendered for other delivery intervals in the future?</li> </ol> <p>389 - remove sentence containing "wild guesses"</p> <p>390: Change With a standardize price service " to with a "standardized way of communicating prices for energy tenders"</p> <p>394: change "call for performance: to exercise an option"</p> <p>399: add add "generation: after "resources"</p>
--

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 03/Jul/11 02:52 PM ]
Rewrote with notes in the Proposal.
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 03/Jul/11 08:12 PM ]
Editor please examine the text to provide a second opinion.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 04/Jul/11 11:12 AM ]
Line 389 is meant to be transgressive. EI makes no representation about which price services can issue price estimates, nor that only those forward price services that have been "engineered" and "proven" and perhaps "certified" may make prices estimates. If someone predicts prices by hepatoscopy, they can communicate those prices predictions. If they can find willing sellers, and turn a profit, others will try hepatoscopy as well.
Limiting it as suggested, to approved ways in approved markets seems profoundly inimical to the commenter's approaches to energy markets.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]
As voted in meeting

**Editorial Collector for wd24 (ENERGYINTEROP-466)**  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-439] Section 3 Minor Edits** Created: 29/Jun/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet
<b>Resolution:</b>	Use the term "Collaborative Energy" rather than "Smart Energy" (yes, we used Collaborative and changed to Smart a while ago). Extra blank lines on 326 and 329. Delete. Editor consider the rest of the wording in the Description.

**Description**  
Change paragraph beginning on 323 to read  
Transactive energy describes the established process of parties buying and selling energy based on tenders (buy or sell offers) that may lead to transactions among parties. In open wholesale forward energy markets, a generator may tender a quantity of energy at a price over a future delivery interval of time to a customer. Acceptance of a tender results in a binding transaction. In some cases the transaction requires physical delivery of energy. In other cases the transaction is settled for cash at a price determined by a prescribed price index. The use of Energy Interoperation to enable present and future wholesale and retail energy markets and retail tariffs, including dynamic and multi-part tariffs is described in [TEMIX]. This section reviews the generic roles and interactions of parties involved in energy transactions.

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 02:42 PM ]  
We have been using the term "Collaborative Energy" in this regard due to others' use of "Smart Energy" Suggest changing this back as part of this item.  
Extra blank lines on 326 and 329.  
No recommendation on the main proposal at this point, except that the description focuses on HOW (via transactive energy) not WHAT EFFECT (collaboration, collaborative energy).  
Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 03/Jul/11 02:48 PM ]  
I am fine with the use of term Collaborative Energy -- it's more specific than the term "Smart Energy." Even Managed Energy could be Smart.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Jul/11 10:32 PM ]  
Changed Smart Energy to Collaboroative Energy.  
Added Paragraph in Description as second paragraph in section.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-440] 461 conform language regarding option parties to that of EMIX.** Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change paragraph beginning on 461 to Two parties MAY also engage in an option transaction. An option is a promise granted by one Party (the Promissor, or informally, the option writer) to a second Party (the Promisee, or informally, the option holder) usually for a premium payment. The Promisee is granted a right to invoke specific transactions for energy that the Promissor promises to deliver. Demand response, ancillary services, and price cap transactions are forms of options. Any Party may take the role of a Buyer or Seller of a tender for an option transaction.
------------------	--

**Description**  
Change paragraph beginning on 461 to  
Two parties can also engage in an option transaction. An option is a promise granted by one Party (Option Writer) to a second Party (Option Holder) usually for a premium payment. The Option Holder is granted a right to invoke specific transactions for energy that the Option Writer promises to deliver. Demand response, ancillary services, and price cap transactions are forms of options. Any Party may take the role of a Buyer or Seller of a tender for an option transaction.

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 02:38 PM ]  
Description (now in proposal) has a lot of capitalized terms that are not defined in Energy Interoperation - Option Holder, Option Writer. These should not be capitalized.  
Are Holder and Writer roles? Can you register for them? I think not.  
We've defined and used "Promissor" and "Promisee" used on line 965 wd24 and defined on 464; I've kept that text in the proposal.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-441] 472 change "communication of pricing" to "communication of price"** Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Change to "communication of price information"
--------------------	--

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 11:00 AM ]

Reviewed all instances of the word "Pricing" in the spec and adjusted several others as well

[Editorial Collector for wd24](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-466)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-442\] 550 : 3.2.3 VTN and VEN invoking services on each other and 3.2.4 DR interactions are not consistent with interactions in 3.3.2.](#) Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Correct "Table 10" to current names. Add clarifying text as per COMMENTs embedded in the desription.
------------------	---

Description

Lines 510 and 550 and 572

In 3.2.2 Parties take on roles of VTN or VEN which is correct

In 3.2.3 VTNs and VENs can invoke services on each other. Thus VTNs and VENs change roles rather than Parties changing roles to VEN or VTN.

COMMENT WTC A Party in the role of VEN and with respect to a VTN and an EiMarketContext invokes service operations on that VTN. I don't see this in conflict.

3.2.4 needs to be deleted or updated to current terminology

COMMENT WTC needs to be updated. Figure/"Table" 10 has old names. Rest of the text seems fine.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 02:27 PM ]

Please review proposed resolution.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-443\] 745: Section 5.4 is VEN/VTN centric](#) Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>From Ed Cazalet, edited by Bill Cox: I went back to Resource with its possible confusions, because "Account" would take a significant amount of reword to be usable for PR02. Those aspects should be considered post PR02.</p> <p>Suggest revising the part of 5.4 that refers to both transactive and VEN/VTN as follows:</p> <p>5.4 Narrative Framework for EI Services (Non-Normative)</p> <p>The summary that follows provides a narrative guide to aid in understanding key potential uses of the services. It does not define a normative market or application framework. Markets and applications may use some or all of the services defined in this specification.</p> <p>A Party first establishes a unique Party ID.</p> <p>A Party may also Enroll (using EiEnroll) various Resources with respect to its Party ID and in a specific EiMarketContext. A Resource can be enrolled in one or more Market Contexts. A Market Context may include specific Terms. . Market and application rules concerning multiple enrollments are out of scope for this specification.</p> <p>A Party registers with another Party and exchanges Party IDs. Registration establishes an identity and basic contact information. [does it do the latter? That's EiEnroll I think]</p> <p>A Party may create one or more Market Contexts (out of the scope of this specification) or refer to Market Contexts defined by others.</p> <p>A Party may request information from another Party about about the Market Contexts that either may support or use.</p> <p>Parties may then register Resources with each other for transactions in mutually agreed Market Contexts.</p> <p>Parties may also register with a Market Context to expose their interests to other parties. [??]</p> <p>For transactive services Parties may interact with service operations expressing indications of interest, tenders, transactions, deliveries, and publication of information to each other and to others.</p> <p>[NOTE FROM ED] The material below would extend the framework to cover VTN/VEN. However, the material below still needs substantial rework to make sense.</p> <p>[NOTE FROM BILL]</p>
------------------	--

This might be a good place for the Transactive State transition diagrams and text if not placed in section 3 or 4.

To act as a VEN, a Party may locate one or more potential VTNs by any means, by search in a Market Context or by polling a potential VTN for the Market Contexts that it offers.

One or more parties may offer to serve as a VTN or as a VEN. Some market MAY have only one potential VTN. Some Parties MAY be constrained to acting solely in the VEN role. Any such market rule and set of roles is outside the scope for this specification.

A Party which wishes to act as a VEN enrolls one or more Accounts with a VTN. During enrollment, an Account is associated a particular market context. An Account may be enrolled as a Resource, and exchange detailed capability information, or it may be enrolled solely as a transactive participant. A VEN can choose to enroll a single Account in multiple market contexts, or with multiple VTNs. An Account enrolled in a Market Context accepts the rules of that Market Context, which may include specific Terms including non-performance penalties. Market and Application rules concerning multiple enrollments a out of scope for this specification.

A VEN identifies its Accounts by Party ID (its own) and Account Name. It is possible to enroll an Account and associate it with no Market Context. The meaning of such an enrollment is determined by market rules which are outside the scope of this specification.

During Enrollment, each Account is associated with one or more schedules. A Market Context may have a schedule for when it is active. An Account may have a schedule when it can respond to requests. A market may offer different terms for day-time and night-time performance. A VEN may require different Terms for work-time and after-hours performance. Enrollment makes no statement about how suc Terms are agreed to, but only how the agreement is expressed.

A VEN may Opt to change its availability for performance. It can make permanent, i.e., non-expiring changes to its schedule by re-enrollment. It can Opt-In to add a specific availability schedule to the existing schedule for a discrete time. It may Opt-Out, replacing the current schedule with another for a discrete time.

[ Show » ]

Edward Cazalet added a comment - 01/Jul/11 10:31 AM Suggeste revising the part of 5.4 that refers to both transactive and VEN/VTN as follows: 5.4 Narrative Framework for EI Services (Non-Normative) The summary that follows provides a narrative guide to aid in understanding key potential uses of the services. It does not define a normative market or application framework. Markets and applications may use some or all of the services defined herein. A Party first establishes a unique Party ID. A Party may also establish one or more Accounts under its Party ID. An Account can be enrolled in one or more Market Contexts. A Market Context may include specific Terms. . Market and application rules concerning multiple enrollments are out of scope for this specification. A Party registers with another party and exchanges Party ID. Registration establishes an identity and basic contact information. A Party may create one or more Market Contexts or refer to Market Contexts defined by others. A Party may request information from a Party with which it has registered about about the Market Contexts that it supports. Parties may then register Accounts with each other for transactions in mutually agreed Market Contexts. Parties may also register with a Market Context to expose their interests to other parties. For transactive services Parties may then interact with indications of interest, tenders, transactions, deliveries, and publication of information to each other and to others. The material below would extend the framework to cover VTN/VEN. However, the material below still needs substantial rework to make sense. To act as a VEN, a Party may locate one or more potential VTNs by any means, by search in a Market Context or by polling a potential VTN for the Market Contexts that it offers. One or more parties may offer to serve as a VTN or as a VEN. Some market MAY have only one potential VTN. Some Parties MAY be constrained to acting solely in the VEN role. Any such market rule and set of roles is outside the scope for this specification. A Party which wishes to act as a VEN enrolls one or more Accounts with a VTN. During enrollment, an Account is associated a particular market context. An Account may be enrolled as a Resource, and exchange detailed capability information, or it may be enrolled solely as a transactive participant. A VEN can choose to enroll a single Account in multiple market contexts, or with multiple VTNs. An Account enrolled in a Market Context accepts the rules of that Market Context, which may include specific Terms including non-performance penalties. Market and Application rules concerning multiple enrollments a out of scope for this specification. A VEN identifies its Accounts by Party ID (its own) and Account Name. It is possible to enroll an Account and associate it with no Market Context. The meaning of such an enrollment is determined by market rules which are outside the scope of this specification. During Enrollment, each Account is associated with one or more schedules. A Market Context may have a schedule for when it is active. An Account may have a schedule when it can respond to requests. A market may offer different terms for day-time and night-time performance. A VEN may require different Terms for work-time and after-hours performance. Enrollment makes no statement about how suc Terms are agreed to, but only how the agreement is expressed. A VEN may Opt to change its availability for performance. It can make permanent, i.e., non-expiring changes to its schedule by re-enrollment. It can Opt-In to add a specific availability schedule to the existing schedule for a discrete time. It may Opt-Out, replacing the current schedule with another for a discrete time.

#### Description

A Party engaged in only Transactive interactions should also be able to Register Accounts. Each Partiy should have one to many Accounts. For example Walmart might have an Account for Each store or building.

This section needs a lot of work to clearly express the use of market context and accounts for both transactive and VTN/VEN interactions. As it stands it is confusing and needs a very careful rewrite.

#### Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 01/Jul/11 10:31 AM ]

Suggeste revising the part of 5.4 that refers to both transactive and VEN/VTN as follows:

##### 5.4 Narrative Framework for EI Services (Non-Normative)

The summary that follows provides a narrative guide to aid in understanding key potential uses of the services. It does not define a normative market or application framework. Markets and applications may use some or all of the services defined herein.

A Party first establishes a unique Party ID.

A Party may also establish one or more Accounts under its Party ID. An Account can be enrolled in one or more Market Contexts. A Market Context may include specific Terms. . Market and application rules concerning multiple enrollments are out of scope for this specification.

A Party registers with another party and exchanges Party ID. Registration establishes an identity and basic contact information.

A Party may create one or more Market Contexts or refer to Market Contexts defined by others.

A Party may request information from a Party with which it has registered about about the Market Contexts that it supports.

Parties may then register Accounts with each other for transactions in mutually agreed Market Contexts.

Parties may also register with a Market Context to expose their interests to other parties.

For transactive services Parties may then interact with indications of interest, tenders, transactions, deliveries, and publication of information to each other and to others.

The material below would extend the framework to cover VTN/VEN. However, the material below still needs substantial rework to make sense.

To act as a VEN, a Party may locate one or more potential VTNs by any means, by search in a Market Context or by polling a potential VTN for the Market Contexts that it offers.

One or more parties may offer to serve as a VTN or as a VEN. Some market MAY have only one potential VTN. Some Parties MAY be constrained to acting solely in the VEN role. Any such market rule and set of roles is outside the scope for this specification.

A Party which wishes to act as a VEN enrolls one or more Accounts with a VTN. During enrollment, an Account is associated a particular market context. An Account may be enrolled as a Resource, and exchange detailed capability information, or it may be enrolled solely as a transactive participant. A VEN can choose to enroll a single Account in multiple market contexts, or with multiple VTNs. An Account enrolled in a Market Context accepts the rules of that Market Context, which may include specific Terms including non-performance penalties. Market and Application rules concerning multiple enrollments a out of scope for this specification.

A VEN identifies its Accounts by Party ID (its own) and Account Name. It is possible to enroll an Account and associate it with no Market Context. The meaning of such an enrollment is determined by market rules which are outside the scope of this specification.

During Enrollment, each Account is associated with one or more schedules. A Market Context may have a schedule for when it is active. An Account may have a schedule when it can respond to requests. A market may offer different terms for day-time and night-time performance. A VEN may require different Terms for work-time and after-hours performance. Enrollment makes no statement about how suc Terms are agreed to, but only how the agreement is expressed.

A VEN may Opt to change its availability for performance. It can make permanent, i.e., non-expiring changes to its schedule by re-enrollment. It can Opt-In to add a specific availability schedule to the existing schedule for a discrete time. It may Opt-Out, replacing the current schedule with another for a discrete time.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 02:12 PM ]

With respect to "Accounts" handle per issue 448.

The narrative seems useful; next step will be working a proposal.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Jul/11 10:56 AM ]

Proposal is a mass of conflicting statemetns, conflicting text, unedited cut-and-paste including edit histories, and is unactionable

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 08/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**Editorial Collector for wd24** (ENERGYINTEROP-466)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-444\] 785 - generalize to transactive and VEN/VTN](#) Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Request—Sent A request is made for all objects of the specified type previously created and relevant to this VTN-VEN relationship
<b>Resolution:</b>	Request—Sent A request is made for all objects of the specified type previously created and relevant to this VTN-VEN relationship

Description

785 change to "A request is made for objects previously created:

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 02:08 PM ]

Added "previously created" to text in proposed resolution.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 20/Sep/11 07:46 PM ]

Not sure whether this has been fixed - please verify.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Editorial Collector for wd24** (ENERGYINTEROP-466)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-445\] W24 Misc Editorial](#) Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Modified from Description; all evaluated by WTC. Propose applying all but those with negative instructions in ALL CAPS.</p> <p>476 add "a" before "seller"</p> <p>476 change "the" to "a"</p> <p>477 change "on retailer" to "on a retailer"</p> <p>501 move "is" from before parenthetical remark to just before "called"</p> <p>525 :insert space after "Table" separating from "5" -- NOTE THIS MAY BE CORRECTED BY THE GENERAL FIX CAPTIONS ITEM</p> <p>562 What does "transacted resources" mean: just say "resource" AGREE. TRANSACTIONED SEEMS TO SUGGEST "a resource that is subject to transactive or event interaction"?</p> <p>590 change "transactional" to "transactive"</p> <p>519: change "transactional power" to "for transactive power" which is an amount of power delivered over an interval of time at a constant rate of delivery"</p> <p>617 : change : "request for a single interval" to "request for power delivered over a single interval of time".</p> <p>619 change "transactional" to "transactive" and "power"</p> <p>649 change "replication" to "repetition"</p> <p>651. delete "specific response rates" NOT SURE ABOUT THIS ONE. "SPECIFIED RATES" as for 652?</p> <p>652 change "transactive purchase of fixed blocks of energy" to "transactions of energy delivered at specified rates over an interval"</p> <p>716: change "the customer" to "both customers and suppliers" SHOULD BE "SUPPLIERS AND CONSUMERS" rather than CUSTOMERS AND SUPPLIERS IN MY OPINION</p> <p>719: generally a VEN and not a VTN would participate in in DR program where the VTN is the controller. THIS WAS LOOKING UP FROM THE VTN AND THE VEN; COULD BE REWORDED BUT "CONTROLLER" IS NOT THE RIGHT WORD.</p> <p>719. Delete: "distributed energy program" unless it can be defined clearly. ...OR PROVIDES DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCES...</p> <p>739"load and usage projection: is nowhere defined or provided for. CORRECT. SUGGEST DELETING. This is likely an application supporting ASHRAE SPC201P</p> <p>&gt;&gt; to excpet as noted in comments</p>
--------------------	--

Description

Miscellaneous Editorial on WD24  
 476 add "a" before "seller"  
 476 change "the" to "a":  
 477 change "on retailer" to "on a retailer"  
 501 add "is" before "called"  
 525 :insert space after "Table"  
 562 What does "transacted resources" mean: just say "resource"  
 590 change "transactional" to "transactive"  
 519: change "transactional power" to "for transactive power" which is an amount of power delivered over an interval of time at a constant rate of delivery"  
 617 : change : "request for a single interval" to "request for power delivered over a single interval of time".  
 619 change "transactional" to "transactive" and "power"  
 649 change "replication" to "repetition"  
 651. delete "specific response rates"  
 652 change "transactive purchase of fixed blocks of energy" to "transactions of energy delivered at specified rates over an interval"  
 716: change "the customer" to "both customers and suppliers"  
 719: generally a VEN and not a VTN would participate in in DR program where the VTN is the controller.  
 719. Delete: "distributed energy program" unless it can be defined clearly.  
 739"load and usage projection: is nowhere defined or provided for.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 07:16 PM ]

Fixed in part.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Jul/11 10:17 PM ]

Modified from Description; all evaluated by WTC. Propose applying all but those with negative instructions in ALL CAPS.

476 add "a" before "seller"  
 tc>> done

476 change "the" to "a"  
 tc>> done

477 change "on retailer" to "on a retailer"  
 tc>> done

501 move "is" from before parenthetical remark to just before "called"  
 tc>> done

525 :insert space after "Table" separating from "5" -- NOTE THIS MAY BE CORRECTED BY THE GENERAL FIX CAPTIONS ITEM  
 tc>> done

562 What does "transacted resources" mean: just say "resource" AGREE. TRANSACTIONED SEEMS TO SUGGEST "a resource that is subject to transactive or event interaction?"  
 tc>> pending further conversation

590 change "transactional" to "transactive"  
 tc>> done

519: change "transactional power" to "for transactive power" which is an amount of power delivered over an interval of time at a constant rate of delivery"  
 tc>> done (assuming this was 619)

617 : change : "request for a single interval" to "request for power delivered over a single interval of time".  
 tc>> done

619 change "transactional" to "transactive" and "power"  
 tc>> done

649 change "replication" to "repetition"  
 tc>> done

651. delete "specific response rates" NOT SURE ABOUT THIS ONE. "SPECIFIED RATES" as for 652?  
 tc>> done >> specific Rates

652 change "transactive purchase of fixed blocks of energy" to "transactions of energy delivered at specified rates over an interval"  
 tc>> done >> TeMIX defines communications for transactions of energy delivered at specified rates over an specific intervals.

716: change "the customer" to "both customers and suppliers" SHOULD BE "SUPPLIERS AND CONSUMERS" rather than CUSTOMERS AND SUPPLIERS IN MY OPINION  
 tc >> We've hashed this out before. We have Buyers and Sellers. THE paragraph before has a call-out to customers because it only makes sense with premioses equipment.

719: generally a VEN and not a VTN would participate in in DR program where the VTN is the controller. THIS WAS LOOKING UP FROM THE VTN AND THE VEN; COULD BE REWORDED BUT "CONTROLLER" IS NOT THE RIGHT WORD.

719. Delete: "distributed energy program" unless it can be defined clearly. ...OR PROVIDES DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCES...

to discussion on 719:

If the VEN participates in a demand response program or provides distributed energy resources, its ESI is the interface to at least one dispatchable resource (Resource), that is, to a single logical entity. A Resource may or may not expose any fine structure. The Resource terminology and the duality of generation and curtailment are from [EMIX].

Under a demand response program, a Resource is capable of shedding load in response to Demand Response Events, Electricity Price Signals or other system events (e.g. detection of under-frequency). The VTN can query the actual state of a Resource with the EIFeedback service and request ongoing information. The VEN can query the status of the VTN-VEN relationship using the EiStatus service.

Alternatively, a Resource may provide generation in response to similar information. The net effect is the same.

739"load and usage projection: is nowhere defined or provided for. CORRECT. SUGGEST DELETING. This is likely an application supporting ASHRAE SPC201P

[Editorial Collector for wd24 \(ENERGYINTEROP-466\)](#)

 [\[ENERGYINTEROP-446\] Front matter editorial issues wd24](#) Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">SPEC</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray
<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Proposal:</b>	Make changes as noted Renumbr the tabe index
<b>Resolution:</b>	Make changes as noted Renumbr the table index; correct Table and Figure captions.

Description

Editorial issues:

Opening line of abstract should read, "Energy interoperation describes an information and communication model ..."

Remove comma from "This work facilitates enterprise interaction with energy markets, which:"

Index to Tables: table names should consistently have a space between the word "Table" and the number; tables are also inconsistently numbered

**Editorial Collector for wd24** (ENERGYINTEROP-466)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-447\] Clarity regarding description of granularity](#) Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change as proposed
<b>Resolution:</b>	Rewrite to make it clear using terms such as "finer" and "courser" grained interaction or granularity.

Description

line 20 - 21 change to: changes will create more granular energy transactions, require more granularity in temporal price changes , and more granularity in service territory.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:49 AM ]  
 More or less granularity is ambiguous; use the suggested wording.

**Resources - Define Resource and explore its use Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-473)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-448\] 660 : Account concept in WD24 is under developed.](#) Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change Paragraph 660 to read  Energy Interoperation provides for the registration of Parties. Each Party must register one or more Accounts which can be used for further identification within a Party. Parties may enter into enabling Agreements with Counter Parties. Such Agreements may characterize a tariff by a retailer to a customer or enrollment in a Program such as a DR program. The Agreements would specify the Accounts that a Party and a Counter Party may agree to use. Accounts participate directly in energy transactions, using the Semantics from TeMIX. Accounts may enroll Resources with certain capabilities. Some of these Resources may share detailed capability and response information with their counter-party using the EMIX Resource semantics.  The above will require some schema improvements. For example does a tender refer just to a Party or to a Party and an Account? It could refer to an Account if the Account was uniquely identified with a party. Or we define a PartyAccount that is both the PartyName and the AccountName or number. Energy Interoperation provides for the registration of Parties. Each Party must register one or more Accounts which can be used for further identification within a Party. Parties may enter into enabling Agreements with Counter Parties. Such Agreements may characterize a tariff by a retailer to a customer or enrollment in a Program such as a DR program. The Agreements would specify the Accounts that a Party and a Counter Party may agree to use. Accounts participate directly in energy transactions, using the Semantics from TeMIX. Accounts may enroll Resources with certain capabilities. Some of these Resources may share detailed capability and response information with their counter-party using the EMIX Resource semantics.  The above will require some schema improvements. For example does a tender refer just to a Party or to a Party and an Account? It could refer to an Account if the Account was uniquely identified with a party. Or we define a PartyAccount that is both the PartyName and the AccountName or number.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Defer post PR02; delete wording related to Accounts for PR02.

Description

660: Currently reads --  
 Energy Interoperation defines Parties which enroll Accounts with counter-Parties. Some of those Accounts participate directly in energy transactions, using the Semantics from TEMIX. Others enroll as Resources with certain capabilities. Some of these Resources may share detailed capability and response information with their counter-party using the EMIX Resource semantics.

I can find no specification of Account in the WD24 schema.

I can find no place where a VTN or VEN is registered or enrolled or otherwise determined by an interaction among Accounts.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:37 PM ]

"Accounts" are similar to "Roles" as described elsewhere in the specification.

I agree that the concept of "Accounts" is under developed; I suggest deleting it for PR02.

Change the text to indicate roles, not Accounts, for parties.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 08/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]

Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Sep/11 04:49 PM ]

Accounts are part of enrollemtn, as a sper-odinate above Party.

For example:

A VEN enrolls with a VTN and get an Account #

A VEN in a chain store enerolls with a VTN and get the same account as other members of the chain.

As we have decided that Enrollment is largely out of scope, so, too, is Account.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 14/Oct/11 09:23 AM ]

No further change needed

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

[Editorial Collector for wd24 \(ENERGYINTEROP-466\)](#)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-449\] 686 Improper Figure Title](#) Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change Figure title to "A Demand Response Event Signal" Remove yellow highlighting. Add text to tie "ActiveInterval" terminology to the figure (the "Active Event Period" in the diagram).
<b>Resolution:</b>	Changed to Figure 4 5 A Demand Response Event and associated Signals

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-450\] 717 Clarification of the Roles of Resources, Curtailment and Generation](#) Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Close no change. See <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-453</a> and its proposal as it addresses the same issues and same lines.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Addresses as noted in <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-453</a>

Description

Original proposal:

At 717 add the flowing sentence.

Any party using transactive service may own generation or distributed generation or reduce or increase energy from previously transacted energy amounts. These activities are not identified in transactive services. The dispatch of these resources and the use of energy by a party are influenced by tenders between the parties that may result in new transactions and changes in operations behind the ESI.

The VEN/VTN services provide a characterization of the aggregate resources behind the ESI that may be communicated to the VTN and the VTN. The next section describes the role of Resources, Curtailment and Generation for the VTN/VEN approach only.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:43 PM ]

See notes and reference to [ENERGYINTEROP-453](#).

<a href="#">Editorial Collector for wd24</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-466)	
[ENERGYINTEROP-451] <b>Editorial issues Part deux</b> Created: 30/Jun/11 Updated: 05/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change as noted above.
<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Slightly modified from Description. Apply all but those otherwise marked in ALL CAPS.</p> <p>Line 286 change "market" to "markets"</p> <p>line 305 remove comma at end of line</p> <p>line 320 - 321 change to read: However, interaction patterns in this specification are defined to provide additional information for markets in which tariffs or market rules are required.</p> <p>Line 323 Change from "We consider Smart Energy to be the transactions ..." to "Smart Energy, in this specification, refers to the ..."</p> <p>Line 327 change to: In this specification the information exchanged and the services needed to implement smart energy are defined.</p> <p>Line 326 and 329 are extra blank lines - delete.</p> <p>Line 364 - 365 change to: Communication of price in transactions is at the core of the Energy Interoperation services. Four types of prices are identified in this specification:</p> <p>CONSIDER THIS CHANGE IN LIGHT OF OTHERS FOR THIS SECTION: Line 388 change to: The prices may be fixed by contracts or tariffs that change infrequently if at all.</p> <p>OTHER RESOLVED ISSUES ADDRESS THIS SENTENCE AND INCLUDE THIS CHANGE, SO DON'T APPLY 423-424 Line 423 -424 change to: Transactive energy refers to market-based energy transactions. Today it is used for wholesale energy interoperations; buying and selling of energy and trading options. (remove the (and what else), when we get a "what else" we can add it. (thinking in terms of preparing this spec for the next PR)</p> <p>Line 711 change to: This terminology is used through all service definitions presented in this specification.</p> <p>Line 732 change to: The services presented in this specification are divided into four broad categories:</p> <p>Line 788 - 789 change to: To construct an operation name for the EiEvent service, "Ei" is concatenated tp name fragment (verb) as listed. For example, an operation to cancel an outstanding operation or event is called EiCancelEvent</p> <p>Line 795 change to: In this section, without loss of generality, it is assumed that the invoker is the VTN and the responder is the VEN, except for where the PULL pattern is used wherein the roles would be reversed.</p>

<b>Description</b>	
<p>Line 286 change "market" to "markets"</p> <p>line 305 remove comma at end of line</p> <p>line 320 - 321 change to read: However, interactions patterns were developed to provide additional information for markets in which they are required.</p> <p>Line 323 Change from "We consider Smart Energy to be the transactions ..." to "Smart Energy, in the context of this specification, refers to the ..."</p> <p>Line 327 change to: In this specification the information exchanged and the services needed to implement smart energy are defined.</p> <p>Line 364 - 365 change to: Communication of price in transactions is at the core of the Energy Interoperation services and four types of prices are identified in this specification:</p> <p>Line 388 change to: The prices may be fixed tariffs that change infrequently if at all.</p> <p>Line 423 -424 change to: Transactive energy refers to market-based energy transactions. Today it is used for wholesale energy interoperations; buying and selling of energy and trading options. (remove the (and what else), when we get a "what else" we can add it. (thinking in terms of preparing this spec for the next PR)</p> <p>Line 711 change to: This terminology is used through all service definitions presented in this standard.</p> <p>Line 732 change to: The services presented in this specification are divided into four broad categories:</p> <p>Line 788 - 789 change to: To construct an operation name for the EiEvent service, "Ei" is concatenated tp name fragment (verb) as listed. For example, an operation to cancel an outstanding operation or event is called EiCancelEvent</p> <p>Line 795 change to: In this section, without loss of generality, it is assumed that the invoker is the VTN and the responder is the VEN, except for where the PULL pattern is used wherein the roles would be reversed.</p>	

<b>Comments</b>	
<p>Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 03/Jul/11 10:55 PM ]</p> <p>Line 286 change "market" to "markets" tc&gt;&gt;done</p> <p>line 305 remove comma at end of line tc&gt;&gt;done</p> <p>line 320 - 321 change to read: However, interaction patterns in this specification are defined to provide additional information for markets in which tariffs or market rules are required. tc&gt;&gt;done</p> <p>Line 323 Change from "We consider Smart Energy to be the transactions ..." to "Smart Energy, in this specification, refers to the ..." tc&gt;&gt;done</p>	

Line 327 change to: In this specification the information exchanged and the services needed to implement smart energy are defined.  
tc>>done

Line 326 and 329 are extra blank lines - delete.  
tc>>done

Line 364 - 365 change to: Communication of price in transactions is at the core of the Energy Interoperation services. Four types of prices are identified in this specification:  
tc>>done

CONSIDER THIS CHANGE IN LIGHT OF OTHERS FOR THIS SECTION:  
Line 388 change to: The prices may be fixed by contracts or tariffs that change infrequently if at all.  
tc>>done

OTHER RESOLVED ISSUES ADDRESS THIS SENTENCE AND INCLUDE THIS CHANGE, SO DON'T APPLY 423-424  
Line 423 -424 change to: Transactive energy refers to market-based energy transactions. Today it is used for wholesale energy interoperations; buying and selling of energy and trading options. (remove the (and what else), when we get a "what else" we can add it. (thinking in terms of preparing this spec for the next PR)  
tc>>Used complete re-write of this paragraph suggested by Ed Cazalet instead... (it was quite similar and I got to his first).

Line 711 change to: This terminology is used through all service definitions presented in this specification.  
tc>>done

Line 732 change to: The services presented in this specification are divided into four broad categories:  
tc>>done

Line 788 - 789 change to: To construct an operation name for the EiEvent service, "Ei" is concatenated to name fragment (verb) as listed. For example, an operation to cancel an outstanding operation or event is called EiCancelEvent  
tc>>done

Line 795 change to: In this section, without loss of generality, it is assumed that the invoker is the VTN and the responder is the VEN, except for where the PULL pattern is used wherein the roles would be reversed.  
tc>>done

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 05/Jul/11 04:38 PM ]  
WD25 Line 1254 - "then then".

[Editorial Collector for wd24 \(ENERGYINTEROP-466\)](#)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-452\] 423: Rewording needed to make clear that Transactive Energy is about both Market Based and Non-Market Based Energy Interactions](#) Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Reworded from original proposal Replace section lines 423-426 with the following.  Transactive Energy is a term used to describe the communication of prospective and completed transactions of energy whether market-based, bilateral or, contract-, agreement-, or tariff-based, and whether of energy or options on energy. The terminology used by Transactive Energy is most evident today in the buying and selling of wholesale energy in bilateral and exchange transactions. The use of Energy Interoperation to enable present transactive energy interoperation and future markets and dynamic agreements is addressed in the TEMIX Profile (and further described in [TEMIX]). This section reviews the roles and interactions of Parties involved in energy transactions.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Reworded from original proposal Replace section lines 423-426 with the following.  Transactive Energy is a term used to describe the communication of prospective and completed transactions of energy whether market-based, bilateral or, contract-, agreement-, or tariff-based, and whether of energy or options on energy. The terminology used by Transactive Energy is most evident today in the buying and selling of wholesale energy in bilateral and exchange transactions. The use of Energy Interoperation to enable present transactive energy interoperation and future markets and dynamic agreements is addressed in the TEMIX Profile (and further described in [TEMIX]). This section reviews the roles and interactions of Parties involved in energy transactions.

Description

423: states "Transactive energy is market-based energy transactions. It is used today for wholesale energy interoperations—buying and selling of energy, trading options, (and what else?)." Suggest reword below.

Note also the "(and what else?)" that should be deleted. (WTC)

Original proposal:

423: Transactive Energy is a term used to communicate prospective and completed transactions of energy whether market-based, bilateral or, tariff-based. The terminology used by Transactive Energy is most evident today in the buying and selling of wholesale energy in bilateral and exchange transactions. The use of Energy Interoperation to enable present transactive energy interoperation and future markets and dynamic tariffs is described in [TEMIX]. This section reviews the generic roles and interactions of parties involved in energy transactions.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:18 PM ]

What do you think?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 06:38 PM ]

Moved to resolved, expecting editor to adjust as necessary in applying the resolution.

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-453\] 717: Clarify the role of resouces in transactive services.](#) Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet

<b>Proposal:</b>	At 717 add the following:  Any party using Transactive Energy services may own generation or distributed generation or reduce or increase energy from previously transacted energy amounts. These activities are not identified in transactive services. The dispatch of these resources and the use of energy by a party are influenced by tenders between the parties that may result in new transactions and changes in operations behind the ESI. The VEN/VTN services provide a characterization of the aggregate resources of a VEN that may be communicated to the VTN. The next section describes the role of Resources, Curtailment and Generation for the VTN/VEN approach. In the transactive approach tendering and prices are used by parties to discover and negotiate transactions that respect the preferences of each party and energy usage, generation, storage and controllability directly available to each party. There is no formal communication of resource characteristics in the transactive approach.
<b>Resolution:</b>	modified from proposal. At 717 add the following:  Any party using Transactive Energy services may own generation or distributed generation or reduce or increase energy from previously transacted energy amounts. These activities are not identified in transactive services. The dispatch of these resources and the use of energy by a party are influenced by tenders between Parties that may result in new Transactions and changes in operations.  The VEN/VTN services provide a characterization of the aggregate resources of a VEN that may be communicated to the VTN; that relationship depends also on the EiMarketContext in which the interactions take place.  The next section describes the role of Resources, Curtailment and Generation. In a transactive approach tendering and prices are used by parties to discover and negotiate transactions that respect the preferences of each party and energy usage, generation, storage and controllability directly available to each party. There is no formal communication of resource characteristics in the transactive approach.

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 03/Jul/11 01:13 PM ] I've reworked the text; I'm not quite happy with it yet.  While TEMIX provides a profile, we do not want to restrict any transactive "approach" from using what it needs; a specific restricted profile would be the TEMIX profile.
--

[Editorial Collector for wd24 \(ENERGYINTEROP-466\)](#)

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-454] 741: editorial</a> Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Change Transactional to Transactive		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Change Transactional to Transactive		

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 03/Jul/11 09:20 PM ] Except two locations where transactional was expected as a term of art...
---

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-455\] 6.2.4 Question and request to clarify the operation of Distribute and Create \(line 882 wd24\)](#) Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	See responses in line in the Description.
<b>Resolution:</b>	The payload for EiCreateTender has no counterparty so the assumption must be that it is only sent to those counterparties that the invoker selects and that only those that receive it can respond. Correct?  YES  Distribute Quote and Distribute Tender would be sent to all parties in a location. Correct?  MAYBE. Distribution within a site is dependent on the implementation and how the parties have been identified/Registered. They would go to a web services (WS-Addressing style) endpoint or other locations, e.g. geospatial (all entities in a geospatial polygon that defines Marin county, for example). There is no assumption that there's one Party in a relationship at a particular endpoint/area.

	<p>Distribute has no expectation of a response or acknowledgment. Do all other messages require acknowledgment?</p> <p>YES</p> <p>It also would seem that Create Tender would have no expectation of a response other than perhaps acknowledge</p> <p>NO. The response (corrected to use ResponseType in wd25wip1 model and schemas) returns the offeree (to be corrected to Tenderee per another item), the ResponseType, and the EmixBaseType that's created (basically the full Tender; EmixBaseType allows any derived type to be that payload).</p> <p>It seems that the Distribute operation has the distinguishing feature that the set of parties the payload to send to is based on a geographic area or location whereas the create operation is sent to specific parties with no geographic limitation expressed. Both have no expectation of a response. Correct?</p> <p>NO. Distribute operations have no expectation of a response, although one can be made (this is more a fan-out/server load issue, though Distribute* is there for broadcast with other specifics such as geospatial area. CreateTender expects a response (EiCreateTenderPayloadType) as described above.</p>
--	---

**Description**

<p>The payload for EiCreateTender has no counterparty so the assumption must be that it is only sent to those counterparties that the invoker selects and that only those that receive it can respond. Correct?</p> <p>YES</p> <p>Distribute Quote and Distribute Tender would be sent to all parties in a location. Correct?</p> <p>MAYBE. Distribution within a site is dependent on the implementation and how the parties have been identified/Registered. They would go to a web services (WS-Addressing style) endpoint or other locations, e.g. geospatial (all entities in a geospatial polygon that defines Marin county, for example). There is no assumption that there's one Party in a relationship at a particular endpoint/area.</p> <p>Distribute has no expectation of a response or acknowledgment. Do all other messages require acknowledgment?</p> <p>YES</p> <p>It also would seem that Create Tender would have no expectation of a response other than perhaps acknowledge</p> <p>NO. The response (corrected to use ResponseType in wd25wip1 model and schemas) returns the offeree (to be corrected to Tenderee per another item), the ResponseType, and the EmixBaseType that's created (basically the full Tender; EmixBaseType allows any derived type to be that payload).</p> <p>It seems that the Distribute operation has the distinguishing feature that the set of parties the payload to send to is based on a geographic area or location whereas the create operation is sent to specific parties with no geographic limitation expressed. Both have no expectation of a response. Correct?</p> <p>NO. Distribute operations have no expectation of a response, although one can be made (this is more a fan-out/server load issue, though Distribute* is there for broadcast with other specifics such as geospatial area. CreateTender expects a response (EiCreateTenderPayloadType) as described above.</p>
---

**Comments**

<p>Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 03/Jul/11 01:04 PM ]</p> <p>Responses inline in the Description above. If any related issues need to be created, please reference this issue (and preferably make the newly raised issues subtasks of this one).</p> <p>Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 19/Sep/11 08:33 PM ]</p> <p>Apply the recommended changes</p> <p>Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 21/Sep/11 04:54 PM ]</p> <p>This resolution is not actionable. Please revise. Discussion is fine in the comments, but the resolution should state what needs to be done.</p> <p>Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]</p> <p>Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.</p>
--

**[ENERGYINTEROP-456] 878 - Table 9 offer, offoror and offeree should be tender, tenderor and tenderee.** Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Change as requested in model, schemas, and specification.
--------------------	---

**Editorial Collector for wd24** ([ENERGYINTEROP-466](#))  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-457] 900 Table 9 L createdContractAck should be createdTransactionAck** Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Corrected in most recent (wd25wip) model and schema.
--------------------	--

**Comments**

<p>Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 03/Jul/11 12:47 PM ]</p>
--

Note that the payload types do not have "Payload" in the names; this should be corrected post-PR02.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Jul/11 08:47 PM ]

payloads have been added (WD25)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-458] 792 : Section 5.6 Push and Pull Patterns needs to be generalized to all EI Operations** Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>5.6 Push and Pull Patterns</p> <p>The Service Operation naming includes application-level acknowledgements, which in nearly every case carry application-level information, and allow for both push and pull of messages. This description applies to both transactive and VTN/VEN interactions as both are performed by Parties taking on various roles.</p> <p>Push and Pull are with respect to the invoker of the operation. So if a Party produces information that describes a price quote, it can (in the case of Push) invoke an operation to send it to one or more other Parties. In the alternative, each Party (in the case of Pull) can invoke a request for information by polling, or pulling it, another Party respect to a particular relationship or Market Context.</p> <p>The Pull operation is performed by the Party invoking the Request service operation pattern and fulfilled with a Sent service operation pattern invoked by the receiving Party.</p> <p>So a series of Push operations from one Party to a counterParty is analogous to a series of Pull operations from the counterParty to the Party.</p>
<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>5.6 Push and Pull Patterns</p> <p>Replace lines 793-803 with the following:</p> <p>"The Service Operation naming includes application-level acknowledgements, which in nearly every case carry application-level information, and allow for both push and pull of messages. This description applies to both transactive and VTN/VEN interactions as both are performed by Parties taking on various roles.</p> <p>Push and Pull are with respect to the invoker of the operation. So if a Party produces information that describes a price quote, it can (in the case of Push) invoke an operation to send it to one or more other Parties. In the alternative, each Party (in the case of Pull) can invoke a request for information by polling, or pulling it, another Party respect to a particular relationship or Market Context.</p> <p>The Pull operation is performed by the Party invoking the Request service operation pattern and fulfilled with a Sent service operation pattern invoked by the receiving Party.</p> <p>So a series of Push operations from one Party to a counterParty is analogous to a series of Pull operations from the counterParty to the Party."</p> <p>CHANGE the entire paragraph lines 803-806 with</p> <p>"In the VTN-VEN context, a series of Push operations from a VTN to its VENs is analogous to a series of Pull operations from the VEN to its VTN; by examining (e.g.) the absence of an Event that was visible on a previous Pull the VEN can infer that that Event was canceled. The VEN could then send a Canceled service operation as if it had received a Cancel service operation."</p>

Description

Recommend replacing Section 5.6 text as in the Proposal below.

The following is not in the new Section 5.6 and should be clarified: or put elsewhere:  
 And by examining (e.g.) the absence of an Event that was visible on a previous Pull the VEN can infer that that Event was canceled. The VEN could then send a Canceled service operation as if it had received a Cancel service operation.

[Editorial Collector for wd24 \(ENERGYINTEROP-466\)](#)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-459] 834 Section Heading 6.1 Registration Services is missing.** Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Section 6.1 editorial:                  (1)No introductory text before table. Insert</p> <p>"The EiRegisterParty service operations create a registration for potential Parties in interactions. This is necessary in advance of an actor interacting with other parties</p>
--------------------	---

	in various roles such as VEN, VTN, offeror, and so forth."
	(2) Heading says EiRegisterParty Service but table says EiRegister.
	Change title to match Service column to read EiRegister

**[ENERGYINTEROP-460] 834 Need a Register Account Service?** Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	No RegisterAccount service is needed; Account text is backed out of PR02. Close no action.
--------------------	---

Comments  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 01:47 AM ]  
 What's an account? Where is it defined?  
 Test on line 660 is wrong, as is 661, 757, and other uses. Registration does not imply "enrolling" anything; that's the province of the EiEnrollment service.,  
 I believe this comes from partial application of a proposal; this whole area needs to be revisited quickly to avoid confusion in PR02.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-461] 960 Replace Text describing EiEventService.** Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Replace text in 962 to 970 for EiEvent Service with Text describing its use in VTN/VEN services. NOTE: Suggest not changing. The description is one way of addressing the issue, but straightforward options should not be prohibited. No action.
<b>Resolution:</b>	No change. The support services are still support services. Use in profiles is listed in the Profiles section.

Description  
 Option Transactions provide standing Tenders at strike prices that are invoked by the CreateTransaction Service to create new energy transactions, for example. Event services are not used to invoke Options.

Comments  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 10:08 PM ]  
 Events act as options, as described in the introductory sections.  
 The clarification of what sections and services are relevant to a particular profile belongs in the profile section, not in each section of the services.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 10:10 PM ]  
 Separate item posted to update Profiles section.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-462] 1091 Change Title to VTN/VEN Support Services as these services are not used by Transactive Interactions.**

Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Suggest changing section title and introduction.
<b>Resolution:</b>	The title should not change -- they're still support services.  The Editor should consider changes to text.  >> t>> intro changed, t eliminate Contrain language, try to adjust required pluripotence.  See comments.

Comments

<p>Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 03/Jul/11 10:04 PM ]</p> <p>We need to be very particular in our terminology. These functions may not be used in the TEMIX profile but they may well be used in transactive implementations.</p> <p>I suggest not making the proposed change but instead clarifying that TEMIX describes the included transactive profile, and that these services are not part of that profile.</p> <p>As such, the title should not change -- they're still support services.</p> <p>Resolution: no change to title; editor consider changes to text.</p>
<p>Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 03/Jul/11 10:06 PM ]</p> <p>Fixed in part - Editor will determine what if anything to change in the text.</p>
<p>Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 03/Jul/11 10:47 PM ]</p> <p>Every item in Support Servies is DR Event or VTN/Related. We only confuse the reader by not being clear about what is transactive and what is not.</p>
<p>Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 04/Jul/11 10:26 AM ]</p> <p>It is likely that there will be a continuum w/ Energy Interoperation defined specifications. Many feel (including the commenter) that the DR/event approach will fade as Transactive approaches become prominent. Any plausible transition scenario imagines not a direct cut-off, wherein the entities that reside behind an ESI, and expose the roles of a VTN or VEN, change the sorts of business interactions they enter into.</p> <p>We need to carefully balance clarity of vision and any number of potentially messy practices.</p> <p>Will see what I can do with the specific paragraph.</p>
<p>Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 04/Jul/11 10:37 AM ]</p> <p>Users of [OpenADR] found that they needed to be able to constrain the application of remote DR services. For The DR Operator, advanced knowledge of these constraints improved the ability to predict results. The services in this schedule are based on the services used to tailor expectations in [OpenADR].</p> <p>Availability and Opt are similar in that they communicate when a Party will receive an Event or participate in a transactive market. Availability is a long term schedule for when a Party will consider a response. Availability is are set at registration or transaction negotiation. Opt (as in opt in or opt out) encompasses short-term additions to or replacement of the schedule in Availability.</p> <p>The combination of Availability and Opt states together (a logical or) define the committed response from the VEN.</p> <p>Availability and Opt apply to curtailment and DER interactions, and only indirectly to price distribution interactions.</p>

<p><a href="#">Editorial Collector for wd24 (ENERGYINTEROP-466)</a>  <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-463] 1284 add and dynamic tarrifs to end of sentence.</a> Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11</p>			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet
<p><b>Resolution:</b> Add text as suggested, with slight change: "...and dynamic price communication"</p>			
<p>Description Editorial</p>			

<p><a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-464] EI Quote description should simply be "for communicating prices."</a> Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11</p>			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet
<p>Description since several of the services can use push pull and distribute the EiQuote description needs less detail here.</p>			

<p>Comments</p> <p>Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 03/Jul/11 06:21 PM ]</p> <p>Not sure which text is referenced. If this needs to be considered pre-PR02 please update with line numbers.</p> <p>Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 06/Jul/11 12:08 PM ]</p> <p>Opening all Deferred Items following fote out of WD25 as a CSD for PR</p> <p>Comment by <a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a> [ 19/Sep/11 08:40 PM ]</p> <p>Fully define the payload and transactive state of EiQuote as price only or ?</p> <p>Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]</p>
--

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-465] 1339 - new section TeMIX Conformance Rules** Created: 01/Jul/11 Updated: 04/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet

<b>Proposal:</b>	Make indicated update.
<b>Resolution:</b>	12.2 TEMIX Conformance The TeMIX Profile MUST apply the conformance rules for TeMIX described in [EMIX].

Description

TeMIX Conformance Rules  
The TeMIX Profile MUST apply the conformance rules for TeMIX described in EMIX.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Jul/11 06:12 PM ]  
Conformance must be consistent, per EMIX rules for specifications claiming conformance.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-466] Editorial Collector for wd24** Created: 03/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Bug
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-418</a>	<a href="#">Insert reference to OpenADR 1 and use...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-435</a>	<a href="#">1242: Correction to language on Trans...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-437</a>	<a href="#">353 corre meaning of "Execution"</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-439</a>	<a href="#">Section 3 Minor Edits</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-442</a>	<a href="#">550 : 3.2.3 VTN and VEN invoking ser...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-444</a>	<a href="#">785 - generalize to transactive and ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-445</a>	<a href="#">W24 Misc Editorial</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-446</a>	<a href="#">Front matter editorial issues wd24</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-447</a>	<a href="#">Clarity regarding description of gran...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-449</a>	<a href="#">686 Improper Figure Title</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-451</a>	<a href="#">Editorial issues Part deux</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-452</a>	<a href="#">423: Rewording needed to make clear ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-454</a>	<a href="#">741: editorial</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-457</a>	<a href="#">900 Table 9 L createdContractAck shou...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-459</a>	<a href="#">834 Section Heading 6.1 Registration...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-463</a>	<a href="#">1284 add and dynamic tariffs to end o...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-467</a>	<a href="#">Table and Figure captions are confuse...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-469</a>	<a href="#">Line 863 EITender Operation Names are...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-471</a>	<a href="#">EiFeedback Section 8.1.5 line 1020 is...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine

Description

Collector for editorial issues based on wd24

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 28/Sep/11 12:42 PM ]  
Moving to Applied because all sub-issues are applied  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Sep/11 10:30 PM ]  
Assign old editorial issues to Toby Considine.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">Editorial Collector for wd24</a> ( <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-466</a> ) <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-467] Table and Figure captions are confused and confusing</a> Created: 03/Jul/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">SPEC</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Correct figure and table captions throughout the specification.

**Description**  
 The table and figure captions are confused.  
 For example, Line 900 is a figure, and has an appropriate figure caption. BUT the indicator is "Table 13"

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-468] Add new signal type</a> Created: 03/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	ed koch		

**Proposal:** I recommend that we split the existing EI signal type signalAmount into two different types:  
 signalDelta - Amount of power to change from the current usage.  
 signalSetpoint - Target amount of usage.

**Description**  
 One of the issues that we have been dealing with in the application of OpenADR 1.0 to ancillary services is the use of the signalAmount type. Currently it is simply a specific amount of usage. The problem is that it can be applied in two different contexts. In one case it can represent a change in the amount of usage and in the second use case it may represent an actual target amount of usage. I will post a JIRA about this.

**Comments**

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 11/Sep/11 02:54 PM ]  
 This was incorporated in my proposed schema change, but still not sure it has made it into the current working draft of the schemas. Keep it open until confirmed.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 11/Sep/11 04:02 PM ]  
 From the current schema...

```
<xs:simpleType name="SignalTypeType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>SignalType is used in EventSignal to determine which type of Signal Artifacts are used in Signal Schedule</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:restriction base="xs:token">
<xs:enumeration value="signalDelta"/>
<xs:enumeration value="signalPercent"/>
<xs:enumeration value="signalLevel"/>
<xs:enumeration value="signalPrice"/>
<xs:enumeration value="signalSetpoint"/>
<xs:enumeration value="eventBaseline"/>
</xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 11/Sep/11 07:27 PM ]  
 These comments summarize considerable off-line back and forth that resulted in two statements:

- 1) There will never be a single signal that (relative)1.5, (relative)4.0, (absolute)25, (relative)24.0. Accordingly, we are adding two enumerations to specify which price type is communicated in each signal.
- 2) In an idealized world, market context would have all units, and they would be expressed as derivatives of emix:itemBaseType. There would be no need to express it during an individual event. If a VEN had "forgotten" the units for the context, it could ask again, and it would contain the units. It is useful for certain interactions with certain [simple] devices to be able to express that again in the event. Therefore the event MAY include an optional itemBase derived unit expression.

(A similar argument covers currency, FWIW).

Some difficulties. It is now possible for an event to express units different than that of the market context. While this should be illegal as an "application" rule, forcing conformance appears to be outside the scope of energyinterop.

One potential issue is that with this price change, while we are still semantically mappable to EMIX, we are no longer using the common price communication we defined therein—this may leave us open to some criticism there.

```
< xs:element name="factoredInfo" type="emix:ProductDescriptionType" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
< xs:element ref="emix:itemBase" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1">
  < xs:annotation>
    < xs:documentation>This is the units of the signal. </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
```

I have also added itemBase (optional) to the EventSignalInfoType. This was previously factored into a derivative of productDescription (optional) which is already minimally expressed in itemBase. We, as a committee, should probably pick one. Now we have both, and they are each optional.

See Artifact at <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energinterop/download.php/43501/energinterop-1-0-schema-wd28-wip1.zip>

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 16/Sep/11 07:15 PM ]

Proposal applied

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Editorial Collector for wd24** (ENERGYINTEROP-466)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-469\] Line 863 EiTender Operation Names are wrong in the table](#) Created: 03/Jul/11 Updated: 06/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Change Table 6-5 as follows:  
 Note for EiCreateTender: add "And sends the Tender"  
 Note for EiRequestTender: add "Request outstanding Tenders from the Service Provider that have been sent to the ServiceConsumer"  
 Delete line 3 (EiSendTender) completely  
 Change EiWithdrawTender to EiCancelTender  
 Change EiWithdrewTender to EiCanceledTenderr  
 This brings the patterns in line with the rest of the specification.

**Description**

On researching another Jira item I noticed that the names in the EiTender table are out of date.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 06/Jul/11 11:32 AM ]

As voted in meeting

**[ENERGYINTEROP-470] Line 1268 Profile section needs corrected Service names and section numbers** Created: 03/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Proposal:** Update service names and section numbers. This may not be able to happen until post wd25, but is important for PR02.  
**Resolution:** Update to conform to current/being updated service names as per Gerry Gray

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Editorial Collector for wd24** (ENERGYINTEROP-466)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-471\] EiFeedback Section 8.1.5 line 1020 is too high a level heading](#) Created: 03/Jul/11 Updated: 03/Jul/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd24</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox

<b>Resolution:</b>	Make it so.
--------------------	-------------

Description  
 EiFeedback main section should be H2 not H3 - should be parallel to EiEvent.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-472] Re-factoring and Normalization Collector</b> Created: 04/Jul/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-337</a>	<a href="#">Payloads for Feedback Service should ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-356</a>	<a href="#">agreementName or transactionName or P...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-375</a>	<a href="#">Replace event::DeploymentMW with some...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-377</a>	<a href="#">Now that we have the Energy / Power m...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Aaron Snyder
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-395</a>	<a href="#">Market Context should replace Program...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-403</a>	<a href="#">Power attributes are required</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Gerald Gray
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-420</a>	<a href="#">Refactoring - was Proposed changes to...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Garish Ghatikar

Description  
 Now that the Information is stable, need to review how factoring and normalization can be applied. Common thread in many issues.

Comments  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 24/Jul/11 02:16 PM ]

Uploaded file wd26\_ed\_wip2.zip which contains the following single changes to address the remainder of the refactors to address the interval squeezing and the units issue.

The following changes were made to this version of the schema to complete the refactoring of the signals to squeeze intervals and add unit information to the signals

- Added SignalValue of type SignalValueType to the signalInformationBase in order to support a generic signal value. The type of the value is contained in EiEventSignalType:signalType and the units of the signal are contained in EiEventSignalType:signalUnits.
- Added signalUnits to EiEventSignalType to contain the units of the signal. It is a string and should use the proper units designator for the signal in question.
- Added the missing signalPriceRelative and signalPriceMultiple to the enumerations in SignalTypeType

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 25/Jul/11 04:39 PM ]  
 These changes look good. Three questions.

- 1) I notice that this revision adds the OptType to the eventCreatedResponse. The optType is optIn or optOut.  
 What is the meaning of OptType in the eventCreatedResponse?
- 2) In the EventType, the eventDescriptor is changed from a reference to an in-line definition. Is this change something we should preserve?
- 3) I would like to propose that the new SignalUnits be an emix:item. The reason is because there are some markets that are no 1MW markets, but 10MW (or even 100 MW) markets. This should be a simple change. The Emix:item consists of a Number/Units/Scale

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 27/Jul/11 02:54 PM ]  
 Toby. See my responses below:

- 1) I notice that this revision adds the OptType to the eventCreatedResponse. The optType is optIn or optOut.  
 What is the meaning of OptType in the eventCreatedResponse?  
 > See item 423. This change was for that issue. I added a comment to 423 for this change.
- 2) In the EventType, the eventDescriptor is changed from a reference to an in-line definition. Is this change something we should preserve?  
 > If this was something I did to the schema then it was unintentional.
- 3) I would like to propose that the new SignalUnits be an emix:item. The reason is because there are some markets that are no 1MW markets, but 10MW (or even 100 MW) markets. This should be a simple change. The Emix:item consists of a Number/Units/Scale  
 > The reason I made it a string was because only a couple of the signal types require units and those that do only require currency in the case of price and power units in the case for the setpoints. When I dove

down into how we current define units in other parts of the spec I found that in the power.xsd schema the units attribute was simply a string amd when I dove down into how we represent currency in EMIX it was also only a string that uses the well defined ISO currency designators. Thus I used a mechanism that is consistent with the way it is currently being done in EMIX and other parts of the EI spec. If you want to make it an EMIX artifact I won't object as long as we don't have too much baggage that goes along with that because that would defeat the purpose of the refactoring.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 28/Jul/11 09:46 AM ]

Understand - hadn't though that sometimes it is currecny, sometimes MV.

In either case, would there be a time when each was not established by the Market Context already? Market Context as defined in EMIX contains the currency (so it need not be repeated), and optionally contains not the units (MW)

Would we ever have KW in a MW market?

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 28/Jul/11 12:00 PM ]

I'm going to re-post a previous diatribe on the power units issue. Personally I think it is overkill to add a units designator to differentiate between kW and mW. Having something that differentiates between kWh and kW makes sense, but not kW and MW. We would be better off and make the programmers lives much simpler if we simply fixed the power units and let them decide how to move the decimal place. The alternative is to add a units field that the programmer potetially has to dig out of some far away market context artifact that may not even be part of the same message and then based upon that information decide if he has to move the decimal place or not. Really?

Specifying units in the market context has a couple of potential issues:

- I doubt we want to send the market context with every signal. I see no harm in sending a simple currency or power units indicator with every signal since that is all we really need. I do see issues of having to try and parse this information out of some other transaction and/or part of the schema when it should be a very simple piece of information.

- Right now in the Alliance we are not requiring the simple VEN devices to deal with the market context schemas. I would really hate to have to force them to do that simply to get a units designator for their signals.

Toby- Can you send me an example of a "market context" that contains the currency specification.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Sep/11 10:33 PM ]

Many of these are applied; others are overtaken by events.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:23 PM ]

Ed,

Are you ready for us to close this?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:39 AM ]

All subtasks are applied or closed.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:38 PM ]

All subtasks are closed. Move to closed.

Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-473] Resources - Define Resouce and explore its use Collector** Created: 04/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-409</a>	<a href="#">Need to add some attributes to Feedback</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-429</a>	<a href="#">wd23: incorrect glossary entry refere...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-448</a>	<a href="#">660 : Account concept in WD24 is unde...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:21 PM ]

Moving to resolved becausze all sub-issues moved to resolved

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-474] eiEnroll Resource Not in WD25** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd36</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

**Resolution:**

	The required functionality is available, including ramp descriptions, in the Enrollee type for Resources, as it leverages the EMIX Resource Description. This is now a specification issue.
	The issue raised in the comments (substitution group and xml references), solution 3 is adopted as it minimally affects the specification and schemas by keeping what's been there in terms of thypes.
	Also change the cardinality of the emix:ResourceDescriptionType to 1..*, and the cardinality of the emixInterface in Resource Enrollee to [0..1] (optional).

**Description**

The enrollment services are not in wd25 in spec or schema payloads.

Is this going to be in CD02? or later?

I am assuming that this is where the resource "capabilities and constraints" will be defined.

Capabilities as what can be shed/generate over time (ramps) and constraints as min/max per # items that were already defined for resources.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Jul/11 10:36 AM ]

This is because there is no real definition of Enrollment yet

There has been mention on the calls (and side conversations) that the IRC was going to weigh in with specific enrollment requirements during the review period. Understanding enrollment is also critical to understanding the VEN/Resource issue that is one of the weakest areas of the current specification.

During Enrollment, a VEN registers (itself as a Resource [EPRI]) (multiple Resources [others]) to participate in Market Contexts....What does that mean?

What does it mean to enroll a resource, and what information should be exchanged? Is it the EMIX Resource "exactly"? Is it something else? We know that some RUCs have specified a social component to DR, i.e., demographics rather than systems. For an aggregator, is 500 water heaters under contract a Resource? How about 500 homes of a special Demographic? There is an unresolved notion that a VTN can ask all its VENs for the nameplates of all their resources. Doing so obliterates the "E" in VEN. These issues are all tied into the Enrollment Issue.

See the collector issue <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-473> and all the Deferred issues in this space for soem more.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 05/Jul/11 11:41 AM ]

The replacement for Register Resource obviously will not make it in CD02.

This is not a new topic. We had several TC workshops on this. There was a mapping document for Resource contributed on 2/14/2011 [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energvinterop/download.php/41128/Service%20Inventory%20Mapping%20OADR%20to%20EI%2020110210\\_bb.xls](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energvinterop/download.php/41128/Service%20Inventory%20Mapping%20OADR%20to%20EI%2020110210_bb.xls)  
We discussed the contents in several TC workshops. (Look at the DR Resource tab, it may jog your memory.)

It is based on the Register Resource service defined in the contribution on 12/8/2010 <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energvinterop/download.php/40522/OpenSG%20OpenADR%20SD%20-%20WS%20r0.91.doc>. The Service Definitions are based on the requirements and data objects defined on the System Requirements Specification contributed 9/29/2010 <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energvinterop/download.php/40522/OpenSG%20OpenADR%20SD%20-%20WS%20r0.91.doc>

At some point the Virtual End Node becomes a real end node. We must be able to associate the Resource with a meter (Service Delivery Point) at the end, otherwise none of this works. The Resource also has capabilities and constraints that are needed to do planning by the aggregators or utilities.

As far as I can tell, most or all of the elements are already defined. Ramp rates can represent capabilities (although IRC contributed additional classes here), and there are resource constraints already defined in EMIX. Nobody asked for a nameplate.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 05/Jul/11 02:51 PM ]

I see a lot of the "constraint" types in eic:ResponseTermType. It makes sense to provide overrides for an event, but they should be overrides to some base that is registered.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 02/Aug/11 10:46 AM ]

The definition for Resource Enrollment or Registration is certainly defined and was defined some time ago. The requirements for Resource Registration were submitted in Nov. 2010 and summarized again in Feb. 2011. See links above.

The requirements were clearly defined in the OpenADR System Requirements Specification submitted in August of 2010. After a year I think everyone should have had a chance to review them.

A DR Resource is used during the enrollment process. A DR Resource as a logical entity is a group of Assets that represents a dispatchable entity.

The purpose of the registration or enrollment of a DR Resource is to advertise the capabilities, constraints, and location of the resource. Much, if not all, of this has been defined in EMIX.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 08/Aug/11 03:30 PM ]

The schemas for eiEnrollment for eiResource in WD23 has a resource enrollment element that contains most of what is needed here for retail. It looks like it is based on the IRC approach of a Offer Segment for capabilities. Some parts of it disappeared in a later draft.

I think the retail DR version for capabilities is simpler - just a simple ramp rate. The capabilities should match or be very similar to the structure used for feedback.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 21/Oct/11 11:37 AM ]

Based on wd32-wip1:

Capabilities need to be associated with ramps up/recovery. Same as in Figure 4-7.

There are mandatory IDs for AdminPartyID, PartyID, enrolleePartyID (in the message twice), enrollee.entityID. I only see definitions for some in the schema and no mention in the spec.

Assuming AdminPartyID is if the resource is managed by a third part. Mandatory might be tough if there is no third party, would it be the same ID as enrollee? If we have enrollee.entityID then why do we need the generic PartyID? Which of these would correlate (or hopefully be the same value as) to then VENID?

The definitions for both applicationDate and endDate are the same and refer to termination. applicationDate is probably the date that the enrollment was submitted to the VTN/Enroller.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 28/Oct/11 10:03 AM ]

To clarify the previous comment: Capabilities need to be associated with ramps same as figure 4-7.

This would be the same as what is being asked of a Resource in eiEventSignal. It looks like in the latest iteration the ramp is associated with a strm:interval.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:15 PM ]

Assigning to Toby for spec mention if needed.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 07/Nov/11 09:13 AM ]

For createEnroll:  
enrolleeId is still in the payload twice, maybe three times.  
in createEnrollType & eiEnrollmentType. There is also enr:enrollee that has a partID. What is the difference?

I still don't know where to find the ramps. I don't see any clarification in the Enrollment section of the spec.

power:mrid is in resource type and in each of the substitution group items for emixInterface. What is the first mrid intended for? It seems to be an identifier for many things.

Found another partyID in enr:resource. Which ID is this? how is it different from the other PartyIDs mentioned above?

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 07/Nov/11 09:52 AM ]

element "location" has no type. I assume the default is string. What is this for?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 07/Nov/11 08:45 PM ]

Location is an EMix Interface...

```
< xs:element name="location" type="emix:EmixInterfaceType" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
```

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 08/Nov/11 09:29 AM ]

Ok, Bruce has zoomed in on an unexpected feature of XML. This feature breaks the Resource location. See below for thread.

The abstract type is inherited properly. It breaks the substitution group rules, though. To recap:

```
< type name="fooType" abstract="true">
```

```
< element name="foo" type="fooType" >
< type name ="fooType" abstract="true">
< element name="notFoo" type="fooType" >

< xs:element name="fooFighter" type="emix:fooFighterType" substitutionGroup="foo"/>
< type name ="fooFighterType" >
<xs:extension base="fooType"/>
</type>
< xs:element name="fooLover" type=" fooLoverType " substitutionGroup="foo"/>
< type name ="fooLoverType" >
<xs:extension base="fooType"/>
</type>
```

fooFighter and fooLover are substitutes for foo  
 fooFighter and fooLover are NOT substitutes for notFoo

We have three routes we can go.

- (1) WE can make location a name (or reference) to an existing concrete type,
- (2) we can make location a container for an EMIX interface
- (3) We can simply stick an EMIX Interface in there can get rid of the word Location.
- (4) We can lose the entire EMIX stuff and refer to the GML directly

Discussion:

1) Location is all that matters, we don't care about any of the other possible meaning of interface, we want a geographic location only. The counter-argument is that what matters may well be "what substation is this resource attaching to" which is covered by the interface but not by the location

```
< element name="location" type="emix:ServiceAreaType"/>
```

2) If we just put an Emix Interface there, no one will understand it. The word and concept Location is important, especially since a Resource, could, in concept, be a collection of [devices] each with its own EMIX Interface.

```
< element name="location" type="locationType">
< type="locationType">
< element ref="emix:emixInterface"/>
</type>
```

3) Emix defined it. Add an annotation and be done with it. The other interfaces (see 2) will be embedded inside emix:resources anyway, so why worry about it.

```
< element name="emixInterface" type="emix:EmixInterfaceType"/>
```

4) We can lose the entire EMIX stuff and refer to the GML directly. It is just confusing to reference that EMIX stuff. There would be no issue if we went directly to the GML. Well, we would have to include the gml profile definitions stuff, and it could, in concept, diverge from the normalization of GML performed in EMIX. The down-side is that if a future version of emix defines standard gml profiles for, say "within 50 feet of a Transmission line" or "distribution zone associated with a sub-station" we will not inherit them.

```
< element name="location" type="gml:AbstractFeature"/>
```

Please discuss and vote

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 08/Nov/11 10:05 PM ]

Applied in wd36.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-475] Miscellaneous Editorial Changes to WD 25** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Changes made or over-taken by other changes

Description

Don't see the diagrams for Transactive State yet.  
 515 Substitute the word "Promisor" to "Writer" and "Promisee" to "Holder" per rest of section.  
 848 - change "VTN-VEN" to "Party-Counter Party" or to "Party-Counter Party or VTN-VEN"  
 930 (Table6-2), 937 Figure 6-4, and 947 Figure 6-6 Need consistent, current set of Tender Services:  
 createTender, requestTender, cancelTender, acceptTender and distibuteTender - get rid of send and withdraw.

961 : UML Diagram for EiTransaction is missing EiRequestTransaction  
 990: Change EiUsage to EiDelivery with Delivery Payload from EMIX and we should be done with this.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Sep/11 12:44 PM ]

EiDelivery is a Stream that uses the EMIX Delivery Information model.

Accept change (990) and define EiDelivery Service Operations.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-476] Line 1055 - Refers to Program Name** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>

<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add further explanation to line 1055 indicating that a Program or Demand Response Program are type of Market Context.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Change line from "The program or agreement under which the event was issued—program" to "The program or agreement or Market Context under which the event was issued—marketContext"  Also review all instances of word "Program" in spec to find other psoble mis-communication

Description

Line says: "The program or agreement under which the event was issued—program"  
I think this has been replaced by eiMarket Context name.  
Need some type of connector in the text to the schema element used since few readers will expect DR Program to be Market Context Name.  
  
In wd28 this is at line 1140.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 10:02 PM ]  
Yes, it's the name (not the UID/URI) - EiMarketContextType.marketName  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

[Market Context Collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-540)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-477] Line 1066 and others- using emix:marketContext instead of eitic:marketContext; Resource ID has multiplicity of**

-1 Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change to match the schema.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Correct cardinality in diagrams (based on wd28).  Evaluate places where emix:MarketContext is used for correctness; see Theory 1 and <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-522</a> . Change as necessary to ensure that EiMarketContext or emix:MarketContext is properly used.

Description

Same problem in Figures 8-2, 8-3, 8-8, 8-10  
  
This reflects a bug in Enterprise Architect 8, where touching an element in XSD mode changes 0..unbounded to 0..-1. Bug reported, not addressed.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 11:34 PM ]  
This is part of the broad issue on Market Contexts - see e.g. [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document\\_id=43740&wg\\_abbrev=energyinterop](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=43740&wg_abbrev=energyinterop) and other issues on Market Context especially [ENERGYINTEROP-522](#).  
  
With the operations suggested elsewhere, and if Theory 1 is the choice, these should be emix:marketContext.  
  
ResourceID 1..-1 is an Enterprise Architect bug, corrected in later diagrams in process.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 01:14 AM ]  
Updates in model Payloads/etc pending 20111003. Needs spec and schema changes.  
  
Not in figures 8-8 and 8-10. Other uses are correct.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:31 PM ]  
Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

[Ei error return is unduly obfuscated](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-499)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-478] Line 1085 Figures 8-5, 8-6, 8-9 attribute names ext ref 73, ref element72, ext ref 16** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell
<b>Proposal:</b>	Change to match the schema.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Correct model to match the schema. Associations are shown differently than Figure 8-6 PR02. Note also that other issues are pending with respect to EiResponseType (e.g. <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-499</a> )

**Description**  
Element names look generated. Do not match schema.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 09:29 PM ]  
 Changed this to a subtask of [ENERGYINTEROP-499](#)  
 Applied in UML model, not yet in specification as of 20111002  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]  
 Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-479] Line 1132 - referst to work after PR02** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 26/Sep/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

**Resolution:** No change - thanks for the warning.

**Description**  
Language that referred to known deficiencies in the spec were removed by the TC Admin an placed on the cover letter for PR01. I'm fine with the language, but we should be prepared for the possibility it will get removed.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-480] Line 254 - Figures 1-2, 1-3 refer to acks that are not in the diagram** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

**Proposal:** No change.  
The text on lines 259-261 describes the MEP of Energy Interoperation; "acknowledgement" is lower case and is sufficiently general.

**Resolution:** No change.  
The text on lines 259-261 describes the MEP of Energy Interoperation; "acknowledgement" is lower case and is sufficiently general.

**Description**  
The diagram captions and supporting verbiage refer to acknowledgments. I don't know if this is intended. Should ack references all be changed to response?  
 Note: line 258 and 263 of wd28

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 01:27 AM ]  
 Reassigned for comment on resolution.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]  
 Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-481] 1039 eiRequestEvent - consumer/provider is either; which event is requested, how to handle event cancel** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd26</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell
<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add EiRequestEvent/EiReplyEvent to Figure 81- line 1127 wd28. Add text as in Cox comment on the expected response time range.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Add EiRequestEvent/EiReplyEvent to Figure 81- line 1127 wd28. Add text as in Cox comment on the expected response time range. A new section on special semantics of Event Requests has been added to the section on the Evetn Service

**Description**

Table 8-1 says consumer/provider for eiRequestEvent is either. Does this mean that either the VEN or VTN can initiate the request? This case is not covered in the sequence diagram provided in Figure 8-1. I think this is covered in Figure 1-2 w/o the either scenario.

Which event is being requested? Is it "assumed" to be current or next if there is no current? If this is how it is done, what happens if an event is cancelled? When the VEN requests another event message and a new event shows up it is assumed the event is over? I thought 9.3.1 Interaction Patterns for the EiStatus Service would clear this up, but there is event id there either.

**Comments**

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 05/Jul/11 05:48 PM ]

I never quite understood the notion that the request can be initiated by either the VTN or the VEN. I'm pretty sure that when we profile this in the OADR Alliance that we won't support VTN requesting the events from the VEN.

The request is suppose to return ALL events. It is suppose to be a snap shot in time of all the events that exist and are in process. If in subsequent requests an event has disappeared from the list then it no longer exists and the implication is that it has been cancelled. I've seen this explicitly stated somewhere.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Oct/11 11:37 PM ]

A black start on a VEN or VTN can query its partners (assuming it knows them) and get the list of outstanding events. These are ones that are pending, not past, and may extend indefinitely in the future.

The implication that an event has been canceled if it's missing is used in the PULL patterns for the EiEvent services; it's what makes detection of canceled events possible via PULL.

Figure 811 line 1128 in wd28 omits this pair from the interaction diagram; they should be added.

The number of events to be returned include at least those that are current and near-term pending, where the definition of that is implementation defined.

This should be clarified in the text.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Oct/11 11:39 PM ]

Assigned to Gerald Gray, then to Toby Considine to apply.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 10:26 AM ]

Other jira issues

- <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-635>
- <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-634>
- <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-625>
- <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-626>

have addressed the issues of defining active and pending, or filtering events, of limiting events to an interval of concern. Filters and requests for completed and cancelled events are legal, but there is no expectation or requirement to return them as smaller devices are unlikely to maintain extensive histories.

A new section on special semantics of Event Requests has been added to the section on the Evetn Service

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 07/Nov/11 08:47 PM ]

Closing because no comment from submitter after several days

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-482] Line 1096 - PowerFeedbackType / EnergyFeedbackTypes references; not sure where they are defined in the schema.** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 28/Sep/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell
<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Feedback and other streams-based parts of the specification and schema are being revised. The PowerFeedbackType and EnergyFeedbackType will go away in a near-future working draft. Close no action.
--------------------	---

**Description**

PowerFeedbackType and EnergyFeedbackType are referenced on line 1096. Are these complex datatypes that should be in the schema? I can't seem to find them. Are they examples of the extensions mentioned in the second half of that sentence?

**[ENERGYINTEROP-483] Line 1094 - Change measurementDuration to measurementDuration** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 28/Sep/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd25</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd28</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Minor
Reporter:	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	Bartell		

Resolution:	Correct spelling.
-------------	-------------------

**Feedback Collector PR02** (ENERGYINTEROP-529)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-484] Line 1098/1102 - eiCreateFeedback says "periodic response" - who / where defined?** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">spec</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd25</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd32</a>

Type:	Sub-task	Priority:	Minor
Reporter:	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	Bartell		

Resolution:	The structuring of the EiReport service addresses these issues.  Delete EiRequestResponseSchedule (not needed) See section 9.2ff wd32.  Closing as addressed in wd32. Please review the new wd32 version for clarity.
-------------	--

Description

Table 8-3 says that create feedback is one time or periodic response. Looking at the sequence diagram create is from VTN to VEN and created comes back VEN to VTN. The Create message has no period, the Created does. So does this mean the VEN defines the feedback period, measurementDuration and reportDuration?  
I thought EiRequestResponseSched might clear this up, but I can't find a payload for this.  
Feedback period and measurementDuration have the same definition for the first sentence ("The duration of the period for feedback"). Are they the same thing? Ed K submitted definitions for these (can't find them, they may be in an email thread).  
I can't find an actual measurement value being sent in the CreatedFeedbackPayload. Is it in the response value?

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-485] Change element in schema from ChangedrAvailResponse to ChangedAvailResponse. I don't think the extra r is intentional.** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
Component/s:	<a href="#">schema</a>
Affects Version/s:	<a href="#">wd25</a>
Fix Version/s:	<a href="#">wd29</a>

Type:	Improvement	Priority:	Minor
Reporter:	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	Assignee:	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
Resolution:	Fixed		
Environment:	Bartell		

Resolution:	Correct spelling as indicated in Description (which has line number for wd28)
-------------	---

Description

Section 2.0 line 127 wd28 EiPayloads.xsd - Change element in schema from ChangedrAvailResponse to ChangedAvailResponse.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-486] Line 1159 - EiDeleteAvail - only place we use delete.** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 30/Sep/11

Status:	Closed
Project:	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>

<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

**Resolution:** DELETE is an acceptable operation if that is indeed the intent.

**Description**  
We use Cancel throughout except for this one. Is this intentional? Is there a difference between cancel Availability schedule vs. delete Avail schedule?

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 30/Sep/11 03:35 PM ]  
 Reopening to resolve to close.  
 Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 30/Sep/11 03:35 PM ]  
 Resolving so that it is resolved.  
 Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 30/Sep/11 03:35 PM ]  
 Applying...  
 Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 30/Sep/11 03:36 PM ]  
 Closing... for reals...

**[ENERGYINTEROP-487] Line 1389 - EiRegisterParty is in the OpenADR Profile - Alliance Profile refers to Registqer DR Resource** Created: 05/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

**Resolution:** Resources are Enrolled, Parties are Registered. Correct the OpenADR profile if it indicates otherwise.

**Description**  
Suggest we change the OpenADR Profile to something other than Register Party when we find out where the Register Resource happens.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Aug/11 12:07 PM ]  
 Review entire Profile naming list for consistency  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 11:03 PM ]  
 EiEnroll is for resources, EiRegisterParty is for Parties -- so EiEnroll is probably what you want.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 11:03 PM ]  
 For comment.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 02/Oct/11 11:23 PM ]  
 My summary of registration vs. enrollment  
 Registration establishes a unique identity  
 Enrollment establishes participation in a market, program, enabling agreement, etc.  
 Parties register using EiRegister Party  
 A Resource such as a Generator must register using EiRegisterResource  
 A Party owning a registered Generation Resource may enroll in a VEN/VTN relationship with an ISO and enroll each of its generators in the relationship.  
 A Party that has registered a DR Resource may enroll itself and any registered resources in a VEN/VTN relationship with a DR Aggregator acting as a VTN.  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 04/Oct/11 08:51 AM ]  
 Ed's descriptions are good. I'm not personally stuck on Enroll or Register whatever, but the discussions in the Alliance still use Register and only apply to a Resource. I do not see any Enroll payloads and do not see a RegisterResource in eiPayloads. So what is the equivalent to Register Resource to look at? What name do we use in the profile section?  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 11:04 PM ]  
 There is no "register resource" -- it's "enroll resource" per IRC contributions. I'm working as of this writing on getting the payloads correct and consistent, then finishing the EiEnroll description. Sorry for the delay.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 11:05 PM ]  
 Where in the specification does it indicate resource registration?  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Nov/11 02:48 PM ]  
 No further comments from October 4-November 4. Close no action.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-488] Line 504 has "Error! Reference source not found", probably a reference to Figure 3-1** Created: 06/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

**Resolution:** Fixed reference erros in Specification

Comments  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-489] Editing: The Interaction Diagrams need to be updated to match the service operation tables for Figures 6.4, 6.8, 7.1 and 8.7.** Created: 25/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Psoter, Eugene of PG&E		

**Resolution:** Verify that diagrams and tables are correct.

Description  
 Editing: The Interaction Diagrams need to be updated to match the service operation tables for Figures  
 Figure 6-4: Interaction Diagram for the EiTender Service  
 Figure 6-8: Interaction Diagram for the EiTransaction Service  
 Figure 7-1: Interaction Diagram for the EiEnroll Service  
 and  
 Figure 8-8-7: UML Interaction Diagram for the EiFeedback Service Operations (typo in figure title fixed by wd28)

Comments  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Sep/11 10:43 PM ]  
 Fix while updating service tables.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]  
 Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-490] Do not support eiChangeEvent - Use cancel and create to do changes to existing event.** Created: 25/Jul/11 Updated: 21/Sep/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Psoter, Eugene of PG&E		

**Resolution:** Change Event functionality is required per IRC, other requirements, . No Action.

Description  
 Technical: Regarding the EventServices, if an EiChangeEvent operation is performed, the consumers may have a significant amount of work to do to understand what is changed and then to update all the downstream parties regarding a change. My suggestion would be to not support this operation and if a change to an event was required, that the event be cancelled and a new event created which would trigger a new set of transactions regarding that event.

Comments  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 25/Jul/11 09:09 AM ]  
 SE2 also does not support an event change message. The process is to cancel and re-issue.  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 11/Sep/11 02:53 PM ]

We have actually debated this a few times over the years. There are uses cases where a change event is preferred over the two transactions required to first cancel and then re-issue an event. There are dispatch type programs where a dispatch level is given and is designed to stay in effect until told otherwise. It is much more efficient to simply change the existing event to the new dispatch level than to cancel it and re-issue a new one. Beyond the communications efficiency issue there is also potentially an issue with the automation equipment itself. Cancelling an event may put the control equipment into it's normal operating mode when in fact all you wanted to do is change the dispatch level. This could cause severe problems with the automation equipment if it were to be continuously brought in and out of events just because you wanted to change the dispatch level.

I strongly recommend we keep the change event message.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 11/Sep/11 06:02 PM ]

I agree with Ed K -- the change event is preferred over cancel and re-issue of event. If the building controls are programmed to respond automatically to any event issues, it must be able to accommodate the change event. If the building can't participate with the change, it can always opt out.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 11/Sep/11 06:35 PM ]

BTW one other thing I forgot to mention is that if a device manufacturer thinks it is too burdensome to figure out how an event has changed when they get a changed event they can always "pretend" the previous event was cancelled and treat the changed event as a new one.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Sep/11 01:13 PM ]

Round trip to correct to No Action (from Fixed).

**[ENERGYINTEROP-491] How to treat overlapping events.** Created: 25/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Psoter, Eugene of PG&E		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add a relative priority to the event description type
<b>Resolution:</b>	Add a relative priority to the event description type

Description

Question: Who is responsible for handling overlapping events? Is this completely up to the parties in the Market to take this into account when they construct transactions? If not, perhaps there should be some discussion in the specification regarding how to treat overlapping events if they occur?

Comments

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 11/Sep/11 02:45 PM ]

Should add a relative priority to the event description type. I'll propose something in the next round of schema changes.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-492] Remove venID from eiCancelEvent** Created: 26/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Remove venID from EiCancelEventPayloadType and from EiCanceledEventPayloadType.
--------------------	---

Description

Remove VendID from the cancel event. The message is sent to the VEN that needs to know.

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 31/Aug/11 05:19 PM ]

Rather than remove, it should be optional. Currently mandatory. For broadcast message it could be applicable to all VENs or just one or a few. So maybe it need to be unbounded? Going this route would mean that there would probably have to be a rule that if there is no VEN and you got this cancel message it means you. This probably simplifies the case of the whole event being cancelled.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Oct/11 11:44 PM ]

An event sent to a group of VENs should use the same description to cancel (e.g. the "Blue Group", or a geospatial polygon).

The argument that if you got it it means you doesn't work in the broadcast case as observed in earlier comments.

I'm not sure when you would need even one in a VTN-VEN relationship, so I support removing.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Oct/11 11:46 PM ]

Applied in wd28+ payload update pending 201111003

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-493] EiTender issues including spelling</b> Created: 27/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-539</a>	<a href="#">EiCreateTenderPayLoadType tendereePar...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Edward Cazalet

<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Changes as described.</p> <p>Add EiDistributeTender and EiDistributeEvent (parallel to EiDistributeQuote) [done wd29 in model] Include EiTargetType (with emix:interfaceType, geospatial, and group names).</p> <p>936 EiSend - should be EiRequestTender. Diagram has problems. Add EiDistributeTender. Withdraw should instead be Cancel/Canceled.</p> <p>Part of diagram duplicated, title "opt Check for Open Tenders" is confusing - change to "opt Check for Tenders"</p> <p>Indicate the the emixBase:uid is for that tender.</p> <p>Indicate that the CreatedTender sends back what was received; change to send IDs rather than artifacts.</p> <p>EC: if a UID for a tender could receive -- suggest change to returning uidType for the response?</p> <p>Consider the multiple response pattern from EiEvent and EiQuote. Quote and Tender should look the same.</p> <p>Document in the specification that If you don't want a response, use DistributeTender</p> <p>Consider Market Rules market rulesa pplying to the values returned to restrict what's returned. Could use the "boolean" approach in EiEvent:TestEvent.</p> <p>Document in the specification that EiRequestTender can be from either Party. The return values are those for which I am also a party. Request Tender is not historical, it is only the outstanding tenders and might be implementation limited. Exception: when tenderIDs are passed, if the tender is available it will be returned even if expired or withdrawn.</p> <p>Consider POST 1.0 including a query string [0..1]" - but default to return all active (not withdrawn, have not expired) for the relevant party pair .</p> <p>Cancel - a list of UIDs (here TenderIDType) and delete the association with emixBase. This leaves only tenderID as the key. Same pattern for Canceled, 0..* tenderIDs.</p> <p>Note in the spec that Cancel and Canceled apply to the entire tender. Note in the spec that if the tender to be canceled was created with DistributeTender or CreateTender I already have the ID and the geolocation in my hand, so I don't need to have the full tender.</p> <p>partyRole - roles like ISO, LSE, MA, ... that list of things. ... at a high level in the architecture. Annotate the EiEnroll section with that fact.</p>
--------------------	--

Description

<p>Cancellation or cancel? 931</p> <p>936 EiSend - should be EiRequestTender. Diagram has problems. Add EiDistributeTender. Withdraw should be Cancel/Canceled.</p> <p>Part of diagram duplicated</p> <p>Distribute Tender - to geo area</p> <p>UID for that tender?</p> <p>Send back what I received.</p> <p>EC: if a UID for a tender could receive -- suggest change to returning UuidTypes for the response?</p> <p>Return all tenders that I've created - response for "not all" but success?</p> <p>Should I have partial success if only a; few can be done. Creation of a tender may or may not require a response, but just an ack that I received the payloads.</p> <p>T: two cases - comm are good enough, don't care if you accepted one - each of the five rejected should have an error message? Or "I got your message and may or may not do anything with it"</p> <p>Independent - respond with a list of UIDs of created - but sometimes you don't want (all of N California). If don't want a response, use DistributeTender (TB)</p> <p>EC: On create - ack of receipt of the message - list of IDs of created things. Make it optional - market rules? T: should define all three patterns. one is (a) Tell me about rans you've created; (b) these are the ones I've successfully created in my memory (c) I don't know what's going on - tell me everything about what you accept/reject (create)</p> <p>B: Apply same "boolean" as EiEvent TestEvent to this.</p> <p>EiRequestTender should be from either pParty - either. party. NOTE only those to which I was a Party.</p> <p>Is it only tenders made? Only ones that are ative? limit set of tenders that come back? T: Date? Value? Date range?</p> <p>ADD string - "query: string [0..1]" - but default to return all active (not withdrawn, have not expired) for the relevant party pair .</p> <p>Cancel - a list of UIDs (here TenderIDType) - as shown.</p> <p>Cancel and Canceled - - the entire tender. If it was created with DistributeTender or CreateTender I already have the ID and the geolocation in my hand, so I don't need to have the full tender.</p> <p>Same pattern for Canceled, 0..* tenderIDs.</p> <p>partyRole - roles like ISO, LSE, MA, ... that list of things. ... at a high level in the architecture.</p> <p>Event - does the UID change? UID and revision have to send back more than the UID.</p>
--

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 04/Oct/11 09:38 PM ]
---

Portions are addressed in the pending Payloads 20111003.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Oct/11 09:00 AM ]

Ed

Does the current draft meet your concerns?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 07/Nov/11 08:48 PM ]

Applying because no further comment from submitter on WD34

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-494] EiQuote Service issues and errors** Created: 27/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd26</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox and Ed Cazalet		

**Proposal:**

RequestQuote and SentQuote in Fig 6-5 line 939 are going the wrong direction - reverse.

Add to specification something along the lines of: "EiQuote is to distribute (say) index prices out of ISO market day ahead; could be part of a service that a residential customer sees, tied to that quote with modification for retail. That information, a quote, becomes a tender."

Terminology could be better aligned. Transactive state is "IndicationOfInterest" (quote) -945 TransactiveState True for all quotes. BITEL Tender should also be Tender TransactiveState

TransactiveState must be documented. For example, in quote typically TransState is IndicationOfInterest. For Tenders, should be "Tender". Clearing and other prices should be "Publication"

CreatedQuote should have the same semantics as for EiTender (see other item). Same except for Transactive State - services and payloads should be identical. With a tender have a quantity, quote I don't.

Quantity in a publication SHALL be ignored.

The requestor is responsible for setting transactive state appropriately as above.

State that the quoteID has the same value as the returned emixBase:uid (e.g. in EiCreatedQuote).

CanceledQuotePayloadType is used except for cancel of DistributedQuote

RequestQuote - must be quantity, think forward usage purchase.

ADD requestor party to RequestQuote.

Change cardinality of quoteID in Created to 0..\*, in Cancel to 1..\*.

Adapt EiEvent multi-response pattern.

**Resolution:**

RequestQuote and SentQuote in Fig 6-5 line 939 are going the wrong direction - reverse.

Add to specification something along the lines of: "EiQuote is to distribute (say) index prices out of ISO market day ahead; could be part of a service that a residential customer sees, tied to that quote with modification for retail. That information, a quote, becomes a tender."

Transactive state is "IndicationOfInterest" (quote) -945 TransactiveState True for all quotes. BITEL Tender should also be Tender TransactiveState

TransactiveState must be documented. For example, in quote typically TransState is IndicationOfInterest. For Tenders, should be "Tender". Clearing and other prices should be "Publication"

CreatedQuote should have the same semantics as for EiTender (see [ENERGYINTEROP-493](#)) except for Transactive State - services and payloads should be identical. With a tender have a quantity, quote does not.

Quantity in a publication SHALL be ignored. Add to conformance and spec.

The requestor is responsible for setting transactive state appropriately as above. Add to spec.

State that the quoteID has the same value as the returned emixBase:uid (e.g. in EiCreatedQuote). Add to spec.

CanceledQuotePayloadType is used except for cancel of DistributedQuote. Indicate in the spec.

RequestQuote - must be quantity, think forward usage purchase.

ADD requestor party to RequestQuote.

Change cardinality of quoteID in Created to 0..\*, in Cancel to 1..\*.

Adapt EiEvent multi-response pattern.

**Description**

WD26

DistributeQuote - where do I send the operation? No response required - so is this a specialized Party? (the broadcast party). Say distribute to N Calif, only certain sizes of consumer. Also send as internet message to a list of registered IP addresses. Possibly multicast. Distinguish by Geolocation, or other means. (Say received a multicast).

Require a response from each "Broadcast/Distribute Agent", NOT from each Party that gets the broadcast.

RequestQuote and SentQuote in Fig 6-5 line 939 are going the wrong direction.

Distribute in that diagram should show a lightning

bolt and broadcast

EiQuote is to distribute (say) index prices out of ISO market day ahead; could be part of a service that a residential customer sees, tied to that quote with modification for retail. That information, a quote,

becomes a tender.

Ter, inology could be better aligned. Transactive state is an IndicationOfInterest (quote) -945 TransactiveState True for all quotes. BITEL Tender should also be Tender TransactiveState

NOTE: Clearing price at a node - not closing price. That use of quote is not an indication of interest but more like a publication. Use that transactive state. Intercontinental Exchange, NYMEX create an index (computations) use for MTM for portfolios. Could use to supp...for that hour as def in day ahead clearing.

CreatedQuote should have the same semantics as for EiTender (see other item). Same except for Transactive State - services and payloads should be identical. With a tender have a quantity, quote I don't.

Quantity in a publication SHALL be ignored.

requestOr or reequestEr? Is responsible for setting transactive state appropriately as above.

Should the quoteID be the uid?

Keep CanceledQuotePayloadType (except for cancel of DistributedQuote)

RequestQuote - must be quantity, think forward usage purchase. TransState - IndicationOfInterest.

ADD requestor party

NOTE that request/sent is different from other services.

DistributedQuotePayloadType with a response (from the distribution agent) Distribution agent is in our space, the distribution itself is not.

Change cardinality of quoteID in Created to 0..\*, in Cancel to 1..\*. Adapt EiEvent multi-response pattern.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 05:34 PM ]

For comment on "Broadcast party".

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 09:07 PM ]

Model (pending Payloads 20111003) has changes to EiQuote payloads and EiTender payloads.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-495] EiTransaction Service issues and errors** Created: 27/Jul/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd26</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox and Ed Cazalet		

**Resolution:** Changes incorporated in payloads for WD33

Description

Fig 6-8 line 961: missing request/sent

Line 967

CreateTransaction - thge TransactiveState must be Tender. CreatedTransaction The copy returned in CreatedTransaction must have TState Transaction.

Same issue as CreatedTender

AcceptanceID: should be deleted. party should be me (tendereeID?). - Send emix:UidType - look like should have 1..\* tendID, and send no EMIX bases? Send a tender if and only if you are accepting only part. MUST send a new tender - should send a counter offer. Tender says all or nothing or a portion. if IntegralOnly NOT SET, then can accept by sending a new tender with my values included.

Stock market analogy - a lot of tenders/orders on my screen, say I'll do a market order for 10mw of that - don't get a back tender.

If accept as-is, only use tenderID.0..\* simpleAcceptTenderID 0..\*

If quantities differ ONLY then do I sent an EmixBase. Need a list of pairs: (TenderIDType, EmixBaseType) if values are not IntegralOnly

THOUGHT: Delete acceptanceID

CreatedTransactionPayloadType:

If your quantity-differs emixBase is not acceptable (e.g. violates \*10 market rule) then that part fails THEN send list of failed emixBase IDs and responseType for each.

Overall response - success if anything succeeded.

If accepted (acceptance, or counter with acceptable quantities) then return the transactionID

CONTINUE WITH Request/Sent Transaction

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 07/Oct/11 04:13 PM ]

We should only not build into this work any assumptions about how a market will clear including how an bid/ask exchange like a stock market might work.

Acceptance of a Tender should result in a single Transaction.

If a tender is only partially accepted by the tenderee, then the tenderor should withdraw the remaining quantity. Whether the tenderor creates a new tender for the remaining quantity should be out of scope.

Partial acceptance of a single interval tender is clear. Partial acceptance of multi-interval tender with ramps etc is not well defined. I suggest a conformance rule that multi-interval tenders be integral only.

A market order to multiple counter parties or an exchange should out of scope.

I think the above simplifies things considerably.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 10:30 AM ]

Please review and see if you agree this issue is done

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-496] Baseline units must support both W and Wh** Created: 01/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

<b>Proposal:</b>	PowerReal (which should really be RealPower) is hanging off of EventBaseLineType and not contributing much. Move it to be a choice or in a substitution group with energyReal (which should be RealEnergy) in eventBaselineDescription.
<b>Resolution:</b>	In WD29 WIP2, Baselines moved to be based on ItemBase, which is the parent type for both Real Power, Real Energy, and a number of other things that might warrant baselining and measuring.  This supports (when baselines are finished) W, Wh, as well as SI J/s and J.  Check units and type names for correctness.

Description

Baseline calculations use either Power (W) or Energy (Wh) depending on whose program it is.

PJM uses an average kW at one-minute intervals. California Edison uses KWh per hour. NYISO uses MWh per hour.

See also [ENERGYINTEROP-497](#) and [ENERGYINTEROP-498](#)

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 10/Aug/11 03:50 PM ]

Sources are: <http://asset.sce.com/Documents/Business%20-%20Energy%20Management%20Solutions/10DayAvgBaselineFS.pdf>

for SCE.

<http://www.enemoc.com/resources/files/wp-baseline2-web.pdf>

for Enemoc (which cites PJM as using the kW measurements).

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 31/Aug/11 05:04 PM ]

To clarify what is in the proposal: The first level within EventBaseline is a choice of xcal:vcalendar or eitc:vcalendar, and power:powerReal. So presumably this means that powerReal is applicable to the entire EventBaseline.

But, eitc:vcalendar contains eitc:ArrayOfElements which contains a choice of one, which is eitc:interval  
eitc:interval contains eventBaselineDescription which is an extension of the eitc:eventDescriptionBase substitution group.  
eventBaselineDescription contains power:EnergyReal and a quantity. eitc:interval has a duration.

So it looks like we can have the default be PowerReal, which is probably what the aggregators are going want. And can override at the interval level to be Energy for what is may the settlement view of a baseline. Assuming this meets the override rules.

This introduces 2 different problems:

eitc:interval only has a duration. The start is in the other choice at that level. The schema comment for eventBaseline says "xs:appinfo>eventBaseline should be paired with eventBaselineDescription types in the gluons and intervals</xs:appinfo>". What does "paired" refer to? Is there a missing element? I see a dtstart in xcal:properties of xcal:vcalendar, but this is in a choice so I can't get to both places.

Extending eventBaseLineDescription makes signalInformationBase available in this element. I'm not sure what I would with a value for signalDelta if I got one in a baseline.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 01/Oct/11 05:35 PM ]

Of course, it may be Joules as well. That is why ItemBase is used for baselines.

Bruce: See if post-streams work on Baseline has made this clearer...If not, comment and I will look at it again.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 11:46 PM ]

No action required--capability is included.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Baseline needs to have specific date/time intervals associated** (ENERGYINTEROP-498)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-497] Baseline Quantity May need to be optional** Created: 01/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">sDEC</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change text to indicate that a later defined baseline SHOULD be sent with an EiChangeEvent.  Other alternatives are complex (how do you point to day(s) to use as a baseline?) or out of scope.
------------------	---

<b>Resolution:</b>	This was originally against the schema; changed to spec as no schema changes seem to be required. 1) Made payload Baseline optional 2) Spec now says that payloads are optional
--------------------	---

**Description**

Baseline Quantity may need to be optional.

Some baseline calculations use a "day of" adjustment using the demand rate leading up to the event compared to "like days" . Those quantities may not be know to the VTN at the time of the event notification.

Also, the model contributed by the IRC does not contain any quantities, just time intervals to be included and time intervals to be excluded.

See also [ENERGYINTEROP-496](#) and [ENERGYINTEROP-498](#)

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Sep/11 10:03 AM ]  
Made this a subtask of [ENERGYINTEROP-498](#) because they are intimately related.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 11:39 PM ]  
What are the implications for the information model for baseline? Is it that one should be able to send a baseline for an event separate from the event notification? Or send a baseline schedule with no values?

In the first case, I think this is post 1.0. In the second case, a revision of the event with the as-computed baseline numbers seems to address the point.

In any event, please expand on the ideas in the Description in a followup comment.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 03/Oct/11 08:26 AM ]  
The quantity associated with a specific interval may not be know when the event message is sent. For example, the baseline may have a "day of" for "like day" baseline. In the case of a day ahead message the usage value would not be known. I don't have have a specific preference on the resolution. The VTN could not include that interval at all, or maybe they want to be able to specify the date/time interval without a quantity.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Oct/11 11:54 PM ]  
Editorial - Spec only.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Oct/11 09:25 AM ]  
Not sure what to do.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 27/Oct/11 11:35 AM ]  
An optional value with the note in the spec is sufficient.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 27/Oct/11 11:36 AM ]  
That means there is nothing else to do. It is resolved.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-498] Baseline needs to have specific date/time intervals associated** Created: 01/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-497</a>	<a href="#">Baseline Quantity May need to be opti...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine

**Resolution:** Baseline stream in wd29-wip3 and later has date and time intervals with the earlier drafts' optimizations applied.  
No action required.

**Description**

Baseline calculations use a series of specific date/time intervals of "like days" to compute the baseline. The EventBaseLineType has xcal:vcalendar and eic:vcalendar. The eic:vcalendar contains duration and the evenBaselineDescription with the units, quantity. It is unclear on how to associate the duration with a start datetime.

See also [ENERGYINTEROP-496](#) and references:

Sources are: <http://asset.sce.com/Documents/Business%20-%20Energy%20Management%20Solutions/10DayAvgBaselineFS.pdf> for SCE.  
<http://www.enemroc.com/resources/files/wp-baseline2-web.pdf> for Enemroc (which cites PJM as using the kW measurements).

See also [ENERGYINTEROP-496](#) and [ENERGYINTEROP-497](#)

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Sep/11 10:02 AM ]  
Please provide references.

Streams address the specific intervals; [ENERGYINTEROP-497](#) which suggests no quantities renders the baseline description rather odd.

If what is communicated is not actionable information (in this case, quantities from [ENERGYINTEROP-497](#) seem to be determined offline) I suspect that it shouldn't be in the model or payloads.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 24/Sep/11 11:01 AM ]  
This is should be bundled with 496 as well. That is where the references are. The example is simple: The baseline includes "day of" the event. The event is issued "day ahead". The usage quantity is not known at the time of the initial event notice. What do we do for day of? Not include it? or include the date with no quantity. If powerReal becomes optional it is the implementor's option on how to handle. If it is mandatory then they will have to exclude that date or use some bogus value to mean "dunno".

The use of both W and WH is also in 496. If you look at the references you see that one of the ISOs and 2 of the utilities use kWh per hour for the baseline. PJM per the Enemroc paper uses W. Yes, it makes more sense to have a baseline that is for Power. It seems (and I am surmising) that the use of kWh per hour is to facilitate settlement. So it seems the choices are to add Energy units as optional as well as

make Power units optional - or leave as is and state that the baseline that is conveyed has nothing to do with settlement. And what if they want to convey both? I have no idea how to do that.

This issue (496) has to do with how to express specific days as in the case of "like" days. Looking at the schema again, I think we can express that using dtStart within eiActivePeriod(?). dtstart also exists in xcal:properties. There may be other ways, but it would be nice there was only one that was acceptable.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-499] Ei error return is unduly obfuscated** Created: 03/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd26</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-478</a>	<a href="#">Line 1085 Figures 8-5, 8-6, 8-9 attri...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
<b>Proposal:</b>	Put the ResponseType in Ei rather than EMIX Remove enumerations, "Yes", "No", "Maybe"				
<b>Resolution:</b>	See WD27 Section 5 update use of EiErrorObject - move text earlier into patterns.  wd29: Make the following changes.  Delete the present EiResponseType, ResponseTermType, ResponseDescriptionType, and ResponseType.  Change name of EiErrorObjectType to EiResponseType  Change all payload elements to "eiResponse" and make it mandatory if there is a response.  EiResponse will now have the following elements:  errorNumber [1] errorID [1] - the ID (from UidType) of the thing that the error is related to - an EiEvent, a Tender, ... errorDescription [0..1] - the string, needs to be internationalizable but this is now server/client side errorTime [0..1] timestamp, optional delete "response"  Describe errorNumber format following (Toby) HTTP style, where leading digit is the major code.  For example, 2.. is success. 1... info 2... success 3... 4... 5.. server error  Note that a numeric string starting with '2' indicates success.				

**Description**

Beginning at line 1081 the description of ResponseType is described. There are a couple of challenges here. First it is probably inappropriate to define the unique Ei response types in EMIX. Second, the enumerations are not needed. The "Yes", "No", and "Maybe" is self-defining. If a single response is sent and the error number is 0 then it is successful. If a single response is sent and the error number is anything other than 0 it is not successful.

"Maybe" comes into play when > 1 response type is returned. For example, if two response types are returned one with a 0 and one with some other number, this represents a "Maybe", but the "Maybe" does not need to be literally returned as an enumeration, the package itself, with its mixed results defines "Maybe". The system that receives these returns will still need to determine from the interaction identifiers, which return failed.

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Aug/11 10:27 AM ]

ResponseType needs to be earlier, rather than inserted just before EiEvent responses are defined. Figure 8-6 is mis-titled as well.

I suggest moving the ResponseType description and figures to Section 5, Introduction to Services and Operations, in section 5.6, Description of the Services and Operations.

I don't understand the reference to EMIX in the description.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 16/Aug/11 04:49 PM ]

Regarding EMIX reference question: In WD26 figure 8-6 the XSDComplexType ResponseTermType has an element ext\_ref\_73: emixBaseTerm.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:08 AM ]

The emix Base Term Type is used for market terms; I think that's been cleaned up in wd29-wip1 or so. The intent there was to say "you asked with one hour notice and the program requires 3 hours, AND you asked for 30 minutes of energy and I won't provide it for less than an hour AND..."

The overall issues on responsees need to be addressed under this issue and made uniform across EI for wd29.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 03:52 PM ]

send 20 events, get 20 responses...looks at the responses and ORs them itself...The semantics are complex because of the complexity of what's sent. This applies to CreateEvent, ChangeEvent, response Payloads.

Other changes in Resolution

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 04:02 PM ]

Payload updates in pending file 20111003

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-500] Update response names from Send to Reply** Created: 04/Aug/11 Updated: 28/Sep/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">service</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd26</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change "Send" in the service naming pattern to "Reply" in all cases to align with IEC 61968-100
<b>Resolution:</b>	Corrected in WD27 tables and interactions patterns use the correct verb.

**Description**  
 The service naming pattern used by EI follows the verb-object pattern from IEC 61968-100 CD fairly closely i.e., Create/Created Cancel/Canceled, except for one common pattern. EI uses Request/Send when the suggested pattern is Request/Reply

**Feedback Collector PR02** (ENERGYINTEROP-529)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-501] Con Edison use case (Patricia Robison)-- need feedback every 5 min: what can you shed now, for how long? (and what ramp rate?)** Created: 12/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	David Holmberg Con-Ed PR02		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Discussed with Bill the solution of adding the ability to pass a sequence of intervals in Feedback (not attached to an event), or perhaps in EIDelivery. The same format that would be used for reporting historical usage, here used for estimated forward load shed ability (or power gen). We also discussed that this could be accomplished with EQuote and EITender, but that Con Edison wants to use OpenADR for event communication and this would be a useful feature in OpenADR. Dave Hardin also requested this kind of functionality.
<b>Resolution:</b>	This pattern is now supported by Historian Service

**Description**  
 Email discussion with Patricia 8/6-12

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 12/Aug/11 11:15 AM ]  
 Is it "set and forget"?  
 From now until 3:00, tell me every 5 minutes...  
 Is it a seasonal commitment?  
 From now until Labor Day, from 11:00 until 6:00, tell me every 5 minutes... (availability with request).  
 Would a request such as this come with/during enrollment?  
 Does it have response parameters  
 - How much could you shed in 5 minutes? 20 Minutes?  
 - How much could you shed for 5 minutes, for an hour?  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Market Context Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-540)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-502] Remove eventSchedules from eiMarketContext** Created: 18/Aug/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd25</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Description

eventSchedules is already in the event message, so this is redundant. We need to be able to use eiMarketContext without an event schedule.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 18/Aug/11 06:41 PM ]

Boy am I happy to see this comment. I have been trying to figure out what purpose they serve in the Market Context...

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:29 PM ]

Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-503] Incorrect verb use in service operation names** Created: 22/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Gerald Gray		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Update tables and figures with correct verbs.
------------------	---

Description

Incorrect verb use in the service naming, ie Send should be Request, Sent should be Reply, Register should be Create

Comments

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 02/Sep/11 12:15 PM ]

Updates have been sent to the technical editor for applicaiton to the next working draft.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Sep/11 04:45 PM ]

Specification done.

Schemas alignment coming later

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-504] Add Reading Type as optional element in ei:Market Context for use in eiQuote** Created: 27/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bruce Bartell		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add an optional element readingType: string to ei:MarketContext
<b>Resolution:</b>	Necessary items are in wd34. Close Fixed. Application Specific Data addresses the same issue.

Description

Add Reading Type as part of ei:MarketContext for optional use in eiQuote.

The xsd with the suggested structures is contributed at: [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/document.php?document\\_id=43357](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/document.php?document_id=43357)

Reading Type is a necessary component for a tariff price message in order to provide proper context of the price and to express both the nature of a product and its pricing characteristics. This is the structure that provides for interoperability for pricing message between and among the domains defined for NAESB PAP10, EUI, ESPI, SE2 and others.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Sep/11 10:14 AM ]

Not sure what this means. ReadingType expresses information already expressed in EMIX and EI, and is not duplicated elsewhere.

A precise and identical representation of ReadingType is not required for conformance to NAESB PAP10; the information is already there.

is the proposal to add an optional element readingType: string ?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 21/Sep/11 10:23 AM ]

Some of the Reading type (as expressed in the linked artifact) adds valuable new information.

Some of it introduces incompatible expresses of information conveyed in EMIX differently. We should not intermittently replace ItemBase. We should intermittently introduce new and incompatible ways to express

That said, this artifact is a good start.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 23/Sep/11 03:30 PM ]

The answer Bill's question, yes, the proposal is to add an optional string element. This will facilitate ease of mapping to those efforts that also use a ReadingType string attribute.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 24/Sep/11 10:14 AM ]

The element/type structure is included in the document contributed (with the link included: [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/document.php?document\\_id=43357](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/energyinterop/document.php?document_id=43357) ) in the original descri What is in Reading Type has nothing to do with EMIX. It is parameters for how the energy usage is measured. How something is sold vs. how it is measured are not necessarily the same thing.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 04:47 AM ]

The original document implies a reading type considerable more complicated than a string.

Is the proposal to URL encode a long XML artifact and pretend it is a string? Per the proposed annotation:

Detailed description for a type of a reading value. Values in attributes allow for creation of recommended codes to be used for identifying reading value types as follows:

&lt;macroPeriod&gt;. &lt;aggregate&gt;. &lt;measuringPeriod&gt;. &lt;accumulation&gt;. &lt;flowDirection&gt;. &lt;commodity&gt;. &lt;measurementKind

- 1) I don't think we should be encoding and ignoring large artifacts to tunnel them. Doing so is a barrier to interoperation.
- 2) The proposal seems to indicate that it occurs in the Market Context, in the Signal, and in each Interval. Is this required?
- 3) Several of the annotations are obscure.

Or perhaps I am misunderstanding the proposal and/or the artifact.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 05:09 AM ]

The Reading type as proposed seems to include duplicated information from elsewhere, creating an issue if the duplicated alternate encodings are not consistent.

The specific duplicated items are:

Commodity (in ItemBase)  
Currency (in Market Context)  
Unit (in ItemBase)  
measurementKind (in ItemBase)

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 05:10 AM ]

measuringPeriod should be expressed as a Duration, not as a String

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 05:13 AM ]

The proposal suggests the distortionVoltAmperes be a reading type. It appears that we should be using the EMIX Quantity attributes in the envelope if we want to communicate this type of information. We should

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 05:15 AM ]

MacroPeriod requires further definition. It appears, though, that it should be expressed as a WS-Calendar Duration rather than as a string.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 05:17 AM ]

The proposed artifact includes "Time of use (TOU) bucket the reading value is attributed to. Value 0 means not applicable"

Is this information not a dependency on the underlying Interval/quantity communication?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 05:21 AM ]

Consumption Tier seems to be an alternate encoding of EMIC Block Tier information. Please communicate using EMIX Block information, perhaps with Tiers expressed at the Market Context level, and indicating s

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 05:24 AM ]

The proposed artifact includes the following definition:

```
<xs:element name="argument" type="s:RationalNumber" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>Argument used to introduce numbers into the unit of measure description where they are needed (e.g., 4 where the measure needs an argument such as CEMI(n=4)). Most arguments used in
    Value 0 in 'numerator' and 'denominator' means not applicable.</xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
```

CEMI?

Possible Meanings Rank

Centre of Excellence in Mining Innovation \*\*  
China Europe Management Institute \*\*  
Computer Enhanced Musical Instruments \*\*  
Chesapeake Energy Marketing Inc \*\*  
Cato Education Market Index \*\*  
Continuous Emissions Monitoring Incorporated \*\*  
Center for Environmental Management Information \*\*  
Central Economics Mathematics Institute \*\*  
Complexo Esportivo Maria Imaculada \*\*  
Centre of Mining Innovation \*\*  
Customers Experiencing Multiple Interruptions \*\*  
Central Economic Mathematical Institute \*\*  
Centre for Entrepreneurial Management and Innovation \*\*  
Central Economics and Mathematical Institute \*\*  
Centre for Excellence in Mining Innovation \*\*  
China EC Management Institute \*\*  
Church Equipping Ministries International \*\*  
Catholic Education and Ministry Institute \*\*  
Central Economical Mathematical Institute \*\*  
Canadian Environmental and Metallurgical Inc \*\*  
Charismatic Ecumenical Ministries International \*\*  
Centre for Management Innovation \*\*  
Center for Molecular Imaging \*  
Canadian Environmental Metallurgical Inc \*  
Crawford Edgewood Managers Inc \*  
Center for Music and Intermedia \*  
Center of Economics and Mathematics Institute \*  
Center for Maternal Infant \*  
Centre of Excellence for Mining Innovation \*  
Center for Electronic Music and Intermedia \*  
Communications Electronics Maintenance Instructions \*

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 05:26 AM ]

Current proposal has accumulation and aggregate as two undefined strings. Are these perhaps two choices in an enumeration?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 26/Sep/11 05:26 AM ]

element MacroPeriod requires further definition.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 29/Sep/11 11:16 AM ]

We can't be chained at the hip to a 3rd party standard not developed in an SDO. On the other hand, we need to support application-specific communications.

A continuing concern is that we cannot have communications that merely duplicate the EI Payloads, because that would require that we create processes to validate the overlapping semantics. If a VEN approves

I propose that we

- 1) Create an optional abstract applicationInfo element in the event.
- 2) Develop strong conformance language that the applicationInfo MUST NOT restate information already in the event
- 3) Develop strong conformance language that when information is adjacent to Energy Interoperation information, that the semantics must be the same as EI uses (which encompasses WS-Calendar conformance)

I would not mind having a better name for the applicationInfo element.

I also recommend that we (Bruce) prepare a brief tech note using, perhaps, the artifact that Bruce has already prepared (as modified to meet the conformance) as an theoretical example...

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 29/Sep/11 11:27 AM ]

The Reading Type is an optional element to be used in conjunction with an eiQuote to a know meter asset.

i was asked to add as an optional element in eiMarketContext.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 29/Sep/11 12:11 PM ]

I saw that, Bruce, and I was unclear why the "live" information would be included in the market context.

Why did you chose that?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Feedback Collector PR02** (ENERGYINTEROP-529)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-505\] Suggested supplementary optional data classes with additional \(optional\) data types, detailed below](#) Created:

31/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Steffes		

**Resolution:** EiReports now have additional types, and allow multiple payloads ot be passed in each interval

**Description**

In order to provide optimum value and control and to meet the requirements of the ISO/utility, our units are required to send the following power data to the ISO/utility:

- 1) Regulation Set Point Feedback - a repeat of the control value sent from the ISO/utility,
- 2) Up Regulation Capacity Available - the up regulation capacity available to the ISO/utility,
- 3) Down Regulation Capacity Available - the down regulation capacity available to the ISO/utility,
- 4) Current Regulation Set Point - the regulation service that is currently being provided to the ISO/utility,
- 5) Baseline Power - the system load that would exist were the system not providing regulation services,
- 6) Instantaneous Power Flow, and
- 7) 15-Minute Rolling Average of Power Flow

One embodiment of the use of these parameters is outlined in Appendix I: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/201108/bin00000.bin>. Additionally, new control strategies would allow the ability to provide several energy parameters important to energy storage applications, including:

- 8) Stored Energy - amount of energy currently stored
- 9) Target Energy Storage - desired energy storage level
- 10) Available Energy Storage - capacity available for further energy storage

The Energy Interoperation v1.0 specification currently supports two data classes: PowerFeedbackType and EnergyFeedbackType (from Figure 8-8, line 1110 of working draft). Steffes requests that consideration be given to supplement these two data classes with the above-listed 10 parameters as optional data classes within the standard. These data types are necessary to facilitate frequency regulation and other Smart Grid Control for ISO/Utilities.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 01/Oct/11 06:07 PM ]

Anything that you can get feedback on, you might set a baseline for. In WD29 Wlp1, the schemas for both BaseLine and Feedback include ItemBase (instead of PowerReal) as their core "thing". ItemBase already covers many of the above, and could be extended to cover the rest.

There is another aspect of each, Instantaneous vs Rolling Average vs Peak ... that could be defined in another attribute. If we go down that road, we should make Feeback and Baselines to be similar in how we specify and report.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:35 PM ]

Now accomplished by updated EiReports

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for OpenADR Alliance Comments EI PR02** (ENERGYINTEROP-515)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-506\] Section 4.4 - "These durations are expressed in the Emix Resource Description" - Emix Resource Description not included](#) Created: 31/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR		

**Resolution:** Added reference to resouce.xsd to EiPayloads.xsd

**Description**

Second to last paragraph - This is referring to the ramp up, recovery time, etc. The "Emix Resource Description" is defined in the Resources.xsd file which is not included as part of the EI schema or any of its downstream imports. The Resources.xsd files should be included in the specification

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 07/Sep/11 11:32 AM ]

Look to see if inclusions are correct for resource.xsd as well as clarify language.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for OpenADR Alliance Comments EI PR02** (ENERGYINTEROP-515)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-507\]](#) **Section 10 - There is confusion about how to get a VTN Market Context outside the framework of a specific event** Created: 31/Aug/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR - Cloned in <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-542</a> for Market Context Collector		

**Resolution:** Fixed in [ENERGYINTEROP-543](#) (q.v. for changes).

Description

: Section 10 of the EI specification describes Market Context indicating that both parties in a transaction can have a "market context". Furthermore, the narrative framework (section 5.3) describes VEN's querying VTNs for their market context. However, when looking at the schema, the only two places where market context appears in the payload is as follows:  
 1) Various eiOpt payloads, in both the requests and responses. We assume that the responses are just a mirror of the requests marketContext. If not, this needs to be described.  
 2) In eiRequestStatusPayload and as part of eiSentStatusPayload eiEventDescriptor.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 01:28 AM ]

Extensive comments in [ENERGYINTEROP-543](#) of which this appears to be a duplicate.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:52 PM ]

All closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

**Collector for OpenADR Alliance Comments EI PR02** (ENERGYINTEROP-515)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-508\]](#) **Section 10 - Why would the requestStatus operation contain market context in the payload? Perhaps having an ID of some sort might make sense to filter the request response, but why the entire marketContext?** Created: 31/Aug/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR - Cloned in <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-544</a> for Market Context Collector		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Recommend making the emix:marketContext mandatory in the event (EIEventType), and have another means/service to request an entire eiMarketContext when needed.
<b>Resolution:</b>	emix:marketContext is 1..1 in EventDescriptorType.  New service EiMarketContext has operations Request and Reply. A Request passes at least one emix:marketContext (which acts as an ID for the EiMarketContext) and returns the relevant EiMarketContexts.  payloads:EiRequestEventType should include elements marketContext: emix:MarketContextType [0..*]  Note that this does not associate the requested URIs with the returned EiMarketContext, but the requested URI is a key and is in each EiMarketContext returned.

Description

: Section 10 of the EI specification describes Market Context indicating that both parties in a transaction can have a "market context". Furthermore, the narrative framework (section 5.3) describes VEN's querying VTNs for their market context. However, when looking at the schema, the only two places where market context appears in the payload is as follows:  
 1) Various eiOpt payloads, in both the requests and responses. We assume that the responses are just a mirror of the requests marketContext. If not, this needs to be described.  
 2) In eiRequestStatusPayload and as part of eiSentStatusPayload eiEventDescriptor.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 07/Sep/11 11:39 AM ]

See if overtaken / handled by Payload adjustments already underway

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 01/Oct/11 05:47 PM ]

This is correct. The relationship between Market Context and Standard terms in EMIX could be clearer.

Still, Market Context is presumably largely invariant, and prices and offers (and events) vary within that. The variable MarketContext as in some sense the ID for the standard terms. There should be a way to request the StandardTerms using a marketContext.

As for the expanded information in the EiMarketContext, its all optional.

Recommend making the emix:marketContext mandatory in the event, and have another means/service to request an entire eiMarketContext when needed.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 08:34 PM ]

Suggestion here is to partially follow the proposal, and use the emix:marketContext's URI as the UID for the EiMarketContext.

An issue that remains is how to get the related EiMarketContext to get the other information in that Type. The October 2 payloads model does not add an operation but instead passes the emix:marketContext and gets back 0 or more EiMarketContexts.

The alternative is to define (e.g.)  
 EiRequestMarketContext which includes 1..\* emix:marketContexts and  
 EiReplyMarketContext which includes 0..\* eitc:EiMarketContexts.

One could also return anything else associated with the emix:marketContext - such as StandardTerms.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 11:14 PM ]

Please comment before this is applied - there are choices of service operations in the comments.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 01:51 PM ]

Clarified Resolution with current (wd32) model.

See other issues for payload items for wd32.

[Collector for OpenADR Alliance Comments EI PR02 \(ENERGYINTEROP-515\)](#)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-509\] Section 10 - How does one know whether the marketContext returned in a Status response is just a confirmation of the request or something different?](#) Created: 31/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR - Cloned to <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-543</a> for Market Context Collector		

<b>Resolution:</b>	See <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-543</a> . "Change EiMarketContext uses to emix:MarketContextType as needed; see comments and linked items for details. "
--------------------	---

Description

Section 10 of the EI specification describes Market Context indicating that both parties in a transaction can have a "market context". Furthermore, the narrative framework (section 5.3) describes VEN's querying VTNs for their market context. However, when looking at the schema, the only two places where market context appears in the payload is as follows:  
 1) Various eiOpt payloads, in both the requests and responses. We assume that the responses are just a mirror of the requests marketContext. If not, this needs to be described.  
 2) In eiRequestStatusPayload and as part of eiSentStatusPayload eiEventDescriptor.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

[Collector for OpenADR Alliance Comments EI PR02 \(ENERGYINTEROP-515\)](#)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-510\] The schema payload for eiRegisteredParty contains multiple undefined IDs](#) Created: 31/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add text describing the payload. See comments below for clarification.  strings for ID types should be replaced with EiPartyType which includes a partyID which in turn is derived from/extends UidType.  Rename the payload types correctly in the diagram to include "PayloadType" at the end.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Add text describing the payload. See comments below for clarification.  ID Types have been changed so partyID and counterPartyID are in the actorID substitution group.  EiCreatedPartyRegistration (the wd32 name analogous to EiRegisteredParty) consists of 0..1 registree partyIDs and one EiRegistrationInfoType. The set of IDs is no longer used.

Description

: The schema payload for eiRegisteredParty contains the following ID's...  
 -eitc:registrationID  
 -eitc:PartyID (below registrarParty)  
 -eitc:registeredPartyID (below eiRegistrations - Can be multiple ID's here - Why?)

-eit:registrarPartyID (below eiRegistration)  
The meaning of all these different IDs is not described and will need additional definition.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 07/Sep/11 11:55 AM ]  
Part of broader issues of schema quality and of synchronization of schema and spec

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 10:57 PM ]  
registrationID - a UID, shown as string. Should inherit from UidType.

regitrarParty is the Party that performed the registration. EiPartyType has optional ID, name, and that party's registrar, allowing moving up the graph.

Inside EiPartyType:  
partyID - a UID, shown as string. Should inherit from UidType.

Not sure where the multiple ID question applies? The wd28 version has problems with EiClasses::RegistrationType which duplicates the EiRegisteredPartyPayloadType attributes and is an optional associated class.

Referring to GGray for comment

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 11:51 AM ]  
Changes are in pending Payloads update as of 20111003

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 02:04 PM ]  
Fixed in wd29, further changes in wd32.

Proposal is original resolution; Resolution updated to reflect wd32.

Moving to Applied then Closed.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-511] Registration cancellation parameters ill-defined** Created: 31/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd35</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR		

<b>Proposal:</b>	No change with respect to firewall issue. Clarify that Parties register, and compare and contrast with enrollment. Need description of how to establish the VTN/VEN relationship.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section 3.3 discusses establishing the roles; establishing the relationship is not in scope for 1.0. (configuration issues). Cancellation can be initiated by either party to the registration process, and is clear from the spec.

Description

There is confusion about who is allowed to initiate a registration cancellation. If a VEN registers with a VTN, who exactly can cancel the VEN to VTN registration relationship? Just the VEN, just the VTN, or either? If the VTN can cancel the relationship, how would that work in a pull model with the VEN behind a firewall? More description is needed.

Comments

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 23/Sep/11 05:41 PM ]  
I think that nominally either a VEN or VTN could cancel their relationship although there may need to be a check to ensure that it is a valid cancellation, e.g. the VEN/VTN is not attempting to cancel a relationship that invalidates a contract, although this sort of cancelation request could be rejected via the proposed EiErrorObject.

Being behind a firewall should not be an issue as WSDLs had part of their genesis in the integration challenges posed by firewalls. If there was a firewall issue that would be an implementation/filtering question that I think would be out of scope for the specification.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 10:25 PM ]  
I agree with Jerry on the firewall question.

Registration is of a Party; the new name (EiCancelPartyRegistration) makes that clear.. A Party MAY implement/take on the role of a VEN, VTN, or both, in any MarketContext in which it participates.

With the cancellation, a relationship is established, and the intent was that either party could break that relationship. Whether there are agreements/contracts affecting the relationship is out of scope for Energy Interoperation -- the parties must be presumed to follow their own rules. The check is internal to the party, and the description of agreements is also out of scope.

So clarity is needed in the Registration and Enrollment sections on who is registering/enrolling and what that means.

Clarity is also needed to with respect to the entire registration paradigm, and what it means to cancel a registration.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 10:25 PM ]  
For comment.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 03/Oct/11 12:07 AM ]  
I think that the relationship depends on the type of program that the VTN/VEN pair is part of. If it's a contractual program, the registration can be canceled by either party (think credit card -- where a consumer or a credit card company can terminate the contract) by mutual arrangements (left to individual implementation). If it's a voluntary program (price quote or broadcast information), it's up to the VEN to determine if it would like to receive the information or not. When there is a reliance by either VTN/VEN to provide information (as it relates to grid reliability/security), a mutual arrangements makes more sense.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 07/Oct/11 04:46 PM ]  
This is an OPNADR issue and should not have been assigned to Ed Cazalet

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 07/Nov/11 07:12 PM ]  
Recommend close no action.

Cancellation invalidates the party credentials and ID for the actor whose party registration is canceled. In a pull relationship you would discover that the Registrar (not necessarily a VTN) has canceled your registration when you try to use your Party ID and an operation fails.

The cancel operations (I expect) would be infrequently used, and their use requires care.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]  
Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-512] It is unclear exactly how the EiAvail force filter works.** Created: 31/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Eliminate Force
<b>Resolution:</b>	Eliminate Force

**Description**

What would happen if a DR event intersects with more than one availability period when Force in in effect? What if the VEN is always available? Is the intersect between the availability and the DR event time frame that triggers a "FORCE" the start of the event, then end of the event, or any point during the event time frame? More description is needed

**Comments**

- Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 11/Sep/11 02:21 PM ]  
 I can see where this can get a little complicated I think we have the following options:
- (1) The force constraints is applied to any availability period that intersects with the active event period and if there is more than one of them then the event start time is the beginning of the fist availability period that the event intersects with and the end of the event period is the end of the last availability period that it interacts with.
  - (2) We eliminate the force altogether. I think I like this option the most.
- Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 11:58 PM ]  
 See [ENERGYINTEROP-513](#) :
- Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for OpenADR Alliance Comments EI PR02 (ENERGYINTEROP-515)**  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-513] The eiCreateAvailPayload has one confusing issue: It is our understanding that the VEN would specify the behavior characteristic (Force, etc) but behavior does not appear in the create payload.** Created: 31/Aug/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR		

<b>Proposal:</b>	No action required.
------------------	---------------------

**Description**

The eiCreateAvailPayload has one confusing issue: It is our understanding that the VEN would specify the behavior characteristic (Force, etc) but behavior does not appear in the create payload. Oddly it does get returned in eiCreatedAvailPayload. It doesn't seem to make sense that the OpenADR Alliance Comments on EI v1.0, July 8, 2011 Page | 3 VTN would dictate how events get mapped to the VENs availability schedule. More description is needed.

NOTE 20111002: Per [ENERGYINTEROP-512](#) "Force" has been removed from the enumeration.

NOTE 20111025: The EiAvailBehaviorType is in EiAvailType, and is sent by the VEN to the VTN. This appears to address the issue. The response (EiCreatedAvail) returns an AvailID.

**Comments**

- Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 11:55 PM ]  
[ENERGYINTEROP-512](#) as applied eliminates Force from the enumeration.
- This behavior may be defined in the program, which would suggest in the StandardTerms for the marketContext, or it may be done by the VEN as needed. The behavior needs to be unambiguous.
- Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 05/Oct/11 08:54 PM ]  
 The need for the action for "FORCE" or others such as "ACCEPT, REJECT, or RESTRICT" came from OpenADR 1.0 program constraints, which as mapped into others in EI as Avail, etc. The idea behind force is to make sure the VEN makes the intention clear that it would force the set of restrictions that are pre-configured (that's part of EI) are respected and it can only participate only outside of those conditions. From my perspective, I think it's an important requirements for the VEN, unless I am missing something.
- I think the question originated more from the fact that such VEN behavior characteristic exist only in the EiCreatedAvailPayload and not the the EiCreateAvailPayload and not if this or a set of actions are needed or not. The resolution would be to simply add it.
- Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:50 PM ]  
 Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.
- Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:50 PM ]  
 Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-514] Muddled use of vavailability</b> Created: 31/Aug/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd30</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Conforming Avail, Opt to a single vavailability substantially addresses issue		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Conforming Avail, Opt to a single vavailability substantially addresses issue		
<b>Description</b>			
Opt types use vavailability. Discussion should bring in proper use of bus-type within that specification, and how this changes semantics in Opts.			
Recommend conforming busy-type to mandatory.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]			
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-515] Collector for OpenADR Alliance Comments EI PR02</b> Created: 06/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11					
<b>Status:</b>	Closed				
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>				
<b>Component/s:</b>	None				
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>				
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>				
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major		
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed				
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR				
<b>Sub-Tasks:</b>	<b>Key</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Assignee</b>
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-506</a>	<a href="#">Section 4.4 - "These durations are ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-507</a>	<a href="#">Section 10 - There is confusion about...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-508</a>	<a href="#">Section 10 - Why would the requestSta...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-509</a>	<a href="#">Section 10 - How does one know whethe...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-510</a>	<a href="#">The schema payload for eiRegisteredPa...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Gerald Gray
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-513</a>	<a href="#">The eiCreateAvailPayload has one conf...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
<b>Resolution:</b>	Closing because all sub-issues are closed or applied				
<b>Comments</b>					
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 27/Oct/11 09:12 PM ]					
Closing because all sub-issues are closed or applied					
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]					
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09					

<b>Feedback Collector PR02 (ENERGYINTEROP-520)</b>			
<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-516] CLONE -Con Edison use case (Patricia Robison)-- need feedback every 5 min: what can you shed now, for how long? (and what ramp rate?)</b> Created: 07/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Phil Davis</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	David Holmberg/ConEd		
<b>Proposal:</b>	The same format that would be used for reporting historical usage, here used for estimated forward load shed ability (or power gen). We also discussed that this could be accomplished with EiQuote and EITender, but that Con Edison wants to use OpenADR for event communication and this would be a useful feature in OpenADR. Dave Hardin also requested this kind of functionality.		

**Resolution:** This pattern is now supported by Historian Service

**Description**  
Email discussion with Patricia 8/6-12

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Sep/11 10:34 AM ]  
 Assigned to Phil to update with suggestions.  
 Also making this CLONE a subtask of the Feedback collector.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-517] Use of ApplicableLocation in eiDistributeQuote** Created: 09/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [schema](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [CSD02/PR02](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** [wd29](#)

**Type:** Improvement **Priority:** Minor  
**Reporter:** [Bruce Bartell](#) **Assignee:** [William Cox](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** Bartell

**Resolution:** Change name of EiDistribueQuotePayload::applicableLocation to emixInterface: emix:EmisInterfaceType.

**Description**  
 The way it is structured now I only seem to be able to access gml:AbstractFeature via the ServiceAreaType (datatype extends EmixInterfaceType)  
 I noticed that serviceArea is part of the emixInterface substitution group. That group has ServiceDeliveryPoint, PNode, and other locations applicable to a price.  
 It seems that we should use the same structure to define and extend a price location as used for event and resource locations.i.e probably make the ApplicableLocation part of the same substitution group as ServiceDeliveryPoint, Pnode, etc. And include ServiceArea (or whatever it takes to pull in the gml stuff) as part of that.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 09/Sep/11 10:12 AM ]  
 We also have a case where extensions are handled as an extension of a an abstract data type in one case, and as elements in a substitution group that overlap. A more consistent style would make it easier on the extenders to extend without breaking something else.  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 09/Sep/11 11:36 AM ]  
 Just noticed that the stuff I was asking for is elsewhere in the quote message as part of emixInterface. So we have a related issue on the use of a broadcast message with something like ServiceDeliveyPoint in it.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Sep/11 10:43 AM ]  
 Assigned to Toby for GML and location issues.  
 Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 24/Sep/11 10:21 AM ]  
 I think t he bigger issue here is that what is in ApplicableLocation is redundant with a portion of what is available in emixinterface.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 01/Oct/11 05:30 PM ]  
 Bruce has it exactly right.  
 Quotes are delivered to one or many Emix Interfaces.  
 An EMix Interface "may" be a Service Area  
 If a Service Area is used as the EMIX Interface in this the Quote, this functionality is fully supported with the existing schemas.  
 I recommend that we remove the applicable location from DistributeQuote and am assigning to Bill who has the Payloads Schema at thisis time.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 12:49 PM ]  
 Changed version to wd28 (the Payloads.xsd has changed in various ways since PR02, but not in this area).  
 In wd28+ (with payload updates) the type for applicableLocation is emix:EmixInterfaceType which allows what is requested - geospatial, ServiceDeliveryPoint, etc.  
 So applicableLocation refers to the substitution group. the name should be emixInterface: emix:EmixInterfaceType.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 12:50 PM ]  
 In wtc wd28+ eap, which will be applied in the schema and spec.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-518] Mismatch in cardinality between the EICreateEvent and the EICreatedEvent response operations** Created: 12/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [schema](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd28](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** None

**Type:** Bug **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [Ed Koch](#) **Assignee:** [Ed Koch](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed

<b>Proposal:</b>	Put a wrapper on the EIEventCreated payload to allow a seperate acknowledgement for each event that may have been sent with the EICreateEvent or EISentEvent payloads. Ed K will create a proposed change to the schema and submit it.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Proposed change was uploaded and is in energyinterop-1-0-schema-wd28-wip2-ed-payload_changes.zip

**Description**  
 The EICreateEvent operation allows multiple events to be created, but the EICreatedEvent response only allows one event to be acknowledged. This is also a problem with the EIRequestEvent which may return multiple events.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 19/Sep/11 12:16 PM ]  
 Payload changes to address this were uploaded in energyinterop-1-0-schema-wd28-wip2-ed-payload\_changes.zip  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-519] Need way of correlating instances of objects in the EICreateEvent and the EIChangeEvent operations with the responses in the EICreated and Elchangfed payloads.** Created: 12/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add uid to the EICreatedEvent and EIChangedEvent payloads. Ed K will submit a new payload schema with thees changes.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Add uid to the EICreatedEvent and EIChangedEvent payloads. Payload changes submitted in energyinterop-1-0-schema-wd28-wip2-ed-payload_changes.zip

**Description**  
 Need way of correlating instances of objects in the EICreateEvent and the EIChangeEvent operations with the responses in the EICreated and Elchangfed payloads.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 05:20 PM ]  
 in wd29-wip5 or so the UID is in the EIResponseType. The payloads for Created and Changed remain the same.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-520] Customer is now defined as an Enrollment Entity in the Specification but is not yet in the corresponding schema.** Created: 13/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet - Related to <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-566</a>		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Enter Customer in the Enrollment Entity Schema
<b>Resolution:</b>	New types added to the EnrolleeType (no longer "EnrollingEntityType") include ConsumerType, which addresses this request. See <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-602</a> for details on this and other issues related to Enroll.

**Description**  
 Customer is now defined and is Enrollment Entity in the Specification but is not yet in the corresponding schema.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Sep/11 10:46 AM ]  
 Of whom is the suggested entity a "customer"? Generally we've tried to stick with terms like producer/consumer.  
 Hold pending enrollment completion.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 29/Sep/11 10:37 PM ]  
 "Customer" is the customer of the Retail Service Provider" which could be a utility or a competitive retailer. Customer is a standard term used by NAESB etc.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-521] Enrolling Entity should include Market Partiiicipant and System Operator ( see Table 7.1)** Created: 13/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Incomplete		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add Market Participant and System Operator as Enrolling Entities
<b>Resolution:</b>	The following are added (as of wd32): SystemOperator Generator  The following are NOT included in wd32: Marketer (perhaps "Aggregator" or as the IRC seems to use it, ServiceProvider?) Storage (consider it as separate Generator and Consumer? )

Description

Market Participants such as Generating, Storage, Marketer, and related entities are participants in Transactive Markets and should be in the list of Enrolling Entities (Table 7.1).  
Also System Operator should be an Enrolling Entity.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 21/Sep/11 10:47 AM ]  
Hold pending enrollment completion.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Sep/11 10:55 PM ]  
Should only Market Participant and System Operator be added? Not clear from the description.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 08:35 PM ]  
Please review the resolution.  
Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 27/Oct/11 06:24 PM ]  
Storage is a very different business and technology from Generator and Consumer. Storage requires negative and positive quantity transactions. Stored energy is a key attribute of Storage that is not an attribute of either a Generator or Consumer.  
  
Retail Energy Provider (REP, also called LSE ), Aggregator and Marketer often perform different functions. An Aggregator and REP have a retail and wholesale face, whereas a Marketer may have a primarily wholesale face.  
  
Recommend adding Storage and Marketer.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">Market Context Collector</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-540)	
 <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-522] Clarify the purpose of Ei Market Context vs. EMIX Market Context</a> Created: 14/Sep/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Ei Market Context extends (by including) Emix Market Context. Editor may consider textual changes as he sees fit to reflect this.  emix.MarketContextType acts as a UID for Market Contexts, assuming that the URIs are consistently applied. Re-examine all payloads to ensure that the correct one is used.  Add text to specification that an application may choose to cache EiMarketContexts, but they not generally needed in operation payloads.
--------------------	---

Description

It is not yet stated what the different purposes of EI vs. EMIX market context might be.  
How does the user know which to employ?  
See <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43740/EventWithMultipleSignals%2020110902.zip> document, Theory 1.

Comments

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 15/Sep/11 02:37 PM ]  
I don't think it is a matter of deciding which to use. Ei Market context is a simple extension of the EMIX market context and contains attributes not defined in EMIX. By default it also contains references to the EMIX Market context.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 02/Oct/11 09:42 PM ]  
Reopening to address market context issues in the large.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:13 AM ]  
Theory 1 in the document in <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43740/EventWithMultipleSignals%2020110902.zip> applies here. Resolution reflects that approach.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:13 AM ]  
Will be assigned to Toby Considine and Bill Cox for changes.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:14 AM ]  
Round trip to address pilot error.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:28 PM ]

Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-523] Distinguish the EI Classes for VTN/VEN and Transactive Services** Created: 14/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** At this stage, the purpose can be achieved with an application schema using only the relevant schema pieces.  
No change. May consider as an example for an application schema note for Energy Interoperation. Cloned to [ENERGYINTEROP-530](#) for that purpose.

Description

VTN / VEN and Transactive Service use a very few common EI Classes.  
For clarity and ease of defining profile conformance statements I suggest that EI Classes contain only Common Classes and EI Transactive and EI VTN/VEN Classes have their own .XSD.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Market Context Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-540)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-524] Continuity of Transaction** Created: 14/Sep/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Resolution:** Full definition and use of refID types addresses this issue

Description

There are three sorts of interactions  
A) One time tender-bid-execution  
B) I get a discount all the time because I can get called for n events per year  
C) I have a specific option for specific availability for a specific time  
In B and C there is a continuity of contract and transaction that does not appear to be adequately represented in the current payloads.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 14/Sep/11 03:05 PM ]  
Toby I am not certain of the context of this issue.  
Is the comment focused on VEN/VTN Services or Transactive Services?  
For Transactive Services we have the following cases:  
A) Tender, Transaction, and Delivery  
B) This is an EMIX Option with the Option Price providing the discount for standing by to be called N times per Year  
c) This is an EMIX Option  
In the case of VTN/VEN I don't understand the comment.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Sep/11 11:00 PM ]  
Actors presenting the VEN or VTN interface may/are also present the Party role and interfaces. So I think that the answer is the same for VTN/VEN - actors may participate in transactions..  
Reassign to Toby for comment.  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:29 PM ]  
Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-525] Missing uid in the EiCanceledEventPayloadType** Created: 19/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>		

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>Add uid in the EiCanceledEventPayloadType as shown below:</p> <pre>&lt;xs:element name="eiCanceledEventPayload" type="payloads:EiCanceledEventPayloadType"&gt; &lt;xs:complexType name="EiCanceledEventPayloadType"&gt; &lt;xs:sequence&gt; &lt;xs:element name="eventCanceledResponse" type="eitc:EiResponseType" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/&gt; &lt;xs:element ref="eitc:eventID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/&gt; &lt;xs:element ref="eitc:modificationNumber" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/&gt; &lt;xs:element ref="eitc:venID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/&gt; &lt;xs:element ref="eitc:uid"/&gt; &lt;/xs:sequence&gt; &lt;/xs:complexType&gt;</pre>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Simple schema change as proposed.

**Description**  
Missing uid in the EiCanceledEventPayloadType. Should add it like we are proposing to do with the EiCreatedEventPayloadType so that it is consistent.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-526] Make eitc:eventDescriptor:operatingDay optional</b> Created: 19/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Make eitc:eventDescriptor:operatingDay optional
<b>Resolution:</b>	Make eitc:eventDescriptor:operatingDay optional

**Description**  
Make eitc:eventDescriptor:operatingDay optional. It is not always needed.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-527] Add priority attribute to the EiEvent description</b> Created: 19/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	New Feature	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>Add the following element to &lt;xs:complexType name="EventDescriptorType"&gt; in the schema</p> <pre>&lt; xs:element name="priority" type="xs:unsignedInt" minOccurs="0"&gt; &lt;xs:annotation&gt; &lt;xs:documentation&gt;This is the priority of this event relative to other events. The lower the number higher the priority. A value of zero (0) indicates NO priority and in essence is the lowest priority by default&lt;/xs:documentation&gt; &lt;/xs:annotation&gt; &lt; /xs:element&gt;</pre>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Add the proposed element

**Description**  
Need to add a relative priority attribute to the EiEvent data structure that can be used to indicate the relative priority among a list of events.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">Market Context Collector</a> (ENERGYINTEROP-540)	
↳ <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-528] Attributes in EiMarketContext not in the right context for events</a> Created: 19/Sep/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Move EiMarketContext:createdDateTime to EventDescriptorType:createdDateTime Move EiMarketContext:uid to EventDescriptorType:uid Eliminate them both from EiMarketContext
<b>Resolution:</b>	EiMarketContext's createdDateTime is the time of creation for that MarketContext instance; change comment in EiMarketContextType to so reflect (in the payload update pending 20111003)  The UID in the EiMarketContext is not needed; the emix:MarketContext should be mandatory, and then serves as a UID. Delete uid in EiMarketContext.  EventDescriptor has createdDateTime. That is the createdDateTime for the EVENT. Add ac comment on that element saying so.

Description

The EiMarketContext:createdDateTime and the EiMarketContext:uid are currently being used as the uid and the created DateTime for the event as a whole EiEvent. These are event attributes that are very specific to a particular instance of an event and are not market context attributes.

EiMarketContext is not the right place for these attributes and they should be moved one level up to EiEventDescription. Whether they remain as attributes in the EiMarketContext or not is a separate issue.

Comments

- Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:25 AM ]  
Specification changes to Toby; payload annotation and class annotation being done in Payload update pending 20111003 by William Cox.
- Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:28 PM ]  
Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-529] Feedback Collector PR02</a> Created: 21/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">service</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-425</a>	<a href="#">Continuing thoughts for a feedback se...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Girish Ghatikar
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-484</a>	<a href="#">Line 1098/1102 - eiCreateFeedback sav...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Bruce Bartell
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-501</a>	<a href="#">Con Edison use case (Patricia Robison...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-505</a>	<a href="#">Suggested supplementary optional data...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-516</a>	<a href="#">CLONE -Con Edison use case (Patricia ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Phil Davis

Description

Collector for Feedback-related issues

Comments

- Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 08:47 PM ]  
Move to Applied matching all subtasks.
- Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-531] Quality Signals</a> Created: 26/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine

<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>

**Resolution:** Closing no action, can be done by extension of Streams and Report Type

**Description**  
 The submitted notes on including Reading Type suggest non-power, non-energy readings be exchanged: Quality. Energy Interoperation does not currently support Quality feedback as part of Energy Interoperation.  
 There should be a signal type to transmit quality readings Quality is an Emix Type, it can appear per Interval, so mechanically its OK. Quality has a number of measures that are different than the tope level service request. This can consist of sending an "empty" quality warrant down with a reporting expectation. The Feedback is then a completed Q Warrant, with the appropriate Intervals, per request, to segment the response.  
 Does this mean we need to have a service to enable a buyer (or VEN) to say "wait a mniute, you've been giving me lousy power!" and return a Quantity feedback w/o request?

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Sep/11 06:37 PM ]  
 Given the long nature of quality reports, I suspect this would not be frequent.  
 In any event, the stream mechanism would allow doing this. I suggest defer post 1.0 or close no action.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-532] [EiEventType:resourceTarget disappeared and was incorrectly replaced by resourceID](#)** Created: 26/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Proposal:</b>	Put the resourceTarget back the way it was and add resourceID to the resorceTarget
<b>Resolution:</b>	Added resourceTarget back to the event and add resourceID to the resorceTarget

**Description**  
 EiEventType:resourceTarget disappeared and was incorrectly replaced by resourceID. This completely changes the semantics of this attrbiute and eliminates one the major use cases for this attribute which was to allow a DR event to be sent to an intermediary like an aggregator and specify attributes of their resources that should be used without having to know specifics of the resources behind that VEN. resourceID might be an acceptable form of specifying a target for an event, but it should not supplant the existing resourceTarget attribute.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Sep/11 06:29 PM ]  
 Bulk open of issues.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-533] [For the EiEvent service make the interaction patterns for the asynchronous opt out the same for the PUSH and PULL patterns.](#)** Created: 26/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch
<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change the diagram on line 1095 for the PUSH pattern. Change CreateOptState to EICreatedEvent so that it is consistent with the PULL pattern.
<b>Resolution:</b>	New diagrams submitted for PR03. These will be in wd33.

**Description**  
 Please refer to the diagrams on lines 1095 and 1098 of WD27. The operation used by a VEN to do an asynchronous opt out after an event has been created is not the same in both the PUSH and PULL pattern. In the PULL pattern the VEN uses the EICreatedEvent operation and in the PUSH pattern it uses the CreateOptState operation. The same operation should be used for both patterns and it should be EICreatedEvent.  
 See also [ENERGYINTEROP-544](#) and [ENERGYINTEROP-534](#)

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Sep/11 06:29 PM ]

Bulk open of issues.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 28/Sep/11 10:39 PM ]

Agreed; fix the diagram.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 26/Oct/11 03:55 PM ]

New diagrams submitted for inclusion in PR03.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**Response and EIResponse Issues** (ENERGYINTEROP-536)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-534] It is not clear in the spec whether the response operation for both EIEvent and and EIQuote services are mandatory or not.** Created: 26/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Make sure that in the text of the document that the response operations for both the EIEvent and and the EIQuote services are not mandatory and that in some case they will not be required.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Using Event as an example, if an Event is created using CreateEvent I believe that a CreatedEvent should always follow. We have allowed for asynchronous communication to be initiated in the PULL pattern wherein a list of events is queried for and then a CreatedEvent is issued in response; but this implies that the CreateEvent already existed.  A rule of thumb:  Create is always followed by Created Request is always followed by Reply  Cancel and Delete do not necessarily require Canceled and Deleted operations. Normally in implementation an identifier is passed to reflect the object to be canceled or deleted and an optimistic operation is assumed, that is, if you have received an HTTP 200 Status OK you know the other system received the request and if you don't later hear back via an error return that something failed, that the operation completed successfully. The only time a Canceled or Deleted operation would normally be done is if something other than "yep canceled/deleted" is needed to be passed to the calling system.  Distribute never gets a return.  See section 6.5 in WD32

**Description**

There is a requirement that the EIEvent and EIQuote services need to support interaction patterns that allow the messages to be PUSH'ed and/or PULL'ed from the VTN without requiring a response by the VEN, (e.g. broadcast prices or event information). The diagrams seem to imply that a response is always required and it should be made clear in the text that responses are not mandatory in order to support the broadcast use cases.

See also [ENERGYINTEROP-544](#) and [ENERGYINTEROP-533](#)

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Sep/11 06:29 PM ]

Bulk open of issues.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Oct/11 10:57 PM ]

The only place without a response (which can be done in either push or pull) is the Distribute\* operation. There's no explicit response, although it might be better in some cases to have a "Distribute agent" that would respond with errors if the payload is ill-formed.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 03/Oct/11 10:58 PM ]

Reassigned for comment.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 26/Oct/11 04:05 PM ]

Using Event as an example, if an Event is created using CreateEvent I believe that a CreatedEvent should always follow. We have allowed for asynchronous communication to be initiated in the PULL pattern wherein a list of events is queried for and then a CreatedEvent is issued in response; but this implies that the CreateEvent already existed.

A rule of thumb:

Create is always followed by Created  
Request is always followed by Reply

Cancel and Delete do not necessarily require Canceled and Deleted operations. Normally in implementation an identifier is passed to reflect the object to be canceled or deleted and an optimistic operation is assumed, that is, if you have received an HTTP 200 Status OK you know the other system received the request and if you don't later hear back via an error return that something failed, that the operation completed successfully. The only time a Canceled or Deleted operation would normally be done is if something other than "yep canceled/deleted" is needed to be passed to the calling system.

Distribute never gets a return.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 08:27 PM ]

As described in GGray comment. All operations are one-way; there is no requirement to respond to a cancel unless there's an error. Distribute does not have a return. Information is returned from a Create (the Pull operation has a response to the Create).

Transport level semantics could be applied in a particular deployment to ensure delivery, but in the general case an application level acknowledgement is often needed. This could use (as Gray say) an HTTP 200 OK, where you PRESUME that the action took place. But that doesn't work for Create.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-535] "schedule" and "schedules"** Created: 26/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Rename one of them.
<b>Resolution:</b>	We now have ApplicationEvent and EiEventSignals

**Description**  
 Having one thing named "eitc:eventSchedules" and another named "eitc:eiEventSchedule" is very confusing.  
 EiClasses.xsd - rename one of them.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Sep/11 06:29 PM ]  
 Bulk open of issues.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Sep/11 05:08 PM ]  
 Schemas fixed, now have to run through Definitions to match  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Oct/11 06:24 PM ]  
 Applied during WD29 WIP2  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-536] Response and EiResponse issues** Created: 26/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-534</a>	<a href="#">It is not clear in the spec whether t...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch

<b>Proposal:</b>	Update spec and schema as suggested in Description.
<b>Resolution:</b>	CHanges to EiResponse, Responses, EiEventResonese, eventResponses in place and well socialized.

**Description**  
 The use of Response and EiResponse is not clear.  
 What is the meaning of the Terms? It's not clearly stated, but we intended that it be the terms that you have violated with a comment on each (so you don't do multiple round trips to "discover" all the errors). This is not clear in the schema, nor in the spec.  
 The terms are optional, and are meaningful and present only if the result is failure. This also is not clear.  
 ResponseType - success/maybe/failure was a carryover from an earlier version. I suggest removing "maybe" from the enumeration. This could bring it back to a boolean.  
 EK, please comment on what other interpretations you've seen.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Sep/11 06:29 PM ]  
 Bulk open of issues.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-537] Comments on Proposed New Chapter 4** Created: 28/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Resolution:</b>	Section placed in Specification
Comments	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]	
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09	

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-538] Comments on "Big Bag of Definitions"</b> Created: 28/Sep/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Chapter placed in Specification		
Comments			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]			
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09			

<b>EITender issues including spelling (ENERGYINTEROP-493)</b>			
 <b>[ENERGYINTEROP-539] EiCreateTenderPayloadType tendereeParty: EiPartyType[1..*]</b> Created: 01/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model, schema, spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Change spec and schema as suggested.		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Change spec and schema as suggested.		
Description			
Create Tender needs to specify one or more parties to whom the tender is made. Generally a tender is to a single tenderee, but there can be cases where the same tender is made to a list of tenderees.			
Distribute Tender ( not yet in spec and schema) would be to a set of tenderess specified by an area or other criteria.			
Comments			
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 02/Oct/11 11:17 PM ]			
The change is in Bill Cox's model for payloads, which will be uploaded soon. Sending updated diagram to Ed Cazalet after other EITender service issues are addressed.			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]			
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-540] Market Context Collector</b> Created: 02/Oct/11 Updated: 28/Oct/11					
<b>Status:</b>	Closed				
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>				
<b>Component/s:</b>	None				
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02, wd27, wd28</a>				
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>				
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major		
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed				
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox				
<b>Sub-Tasks:</b>	<b>Key</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Assignee</b>
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-477</a>	<a href="#">Line 1066 and others- using emix:mark...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-502</a>	<a href="#">Remove eventSchedules from eiMarketCo...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox

<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-522</a>	<a href="#">Clarify the purpose of Ei Market Cont...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-524</a>	<a href="#">Continuity of Transaction</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-528</a>	<a href="#">Attributes in EiMarketContext not in ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-541</a>	<a href="#">Clone of 508 - Section 10 - Why would...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-542</a>	<a href="#">Cloned of 507 - Section 10 - There is ...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-543</a>	<a href="#">Cloned from 509 - Section 10 - How do...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-548</a>	<a href="#">EiOpt and EiAvail Pavloads use EiMark...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine

Description

Market Context is used in various ways, and not always consistently. Possible assumptions (which need to be expressed) about Market Contexts are in [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document\\_id=43740&wg\\_abbrev=energyinterop](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=43740&wg_abbrev=energyinterop) and [ENERGYINTEROP-608](#) (for example).

This issue is to hold as subtasks the issues related to MarketContext (or in some cases clones of them).

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:44 AM ]

All subtasks are resolved or applied.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:51 AM ]

All subtasks are Applied.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:32 PM ]

Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

All subTasks are Closed.

[Market Context Collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-540)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-541\] Clone of 508 - Section 10 - Why would the requestStatus operation contain market context in the payload? Perhaps having an ID of some sort might make sense to filter the request response, but why the entire marketContext?](#) Created: 02/Oct/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR - Cloned from <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-508</a> for Market Context Collector		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Recommend making the emix:marketContext mandatory in the event, and have another means/service to request an entire eiMarketContext when needed.
<b>Resolution:</b>	emix:marketContext is 1..1 in EventDescriptorType.  New service EiMarketContext has operations Request and Reply. A Request passes at least one emix:marketContext (which acts as an ID for the EiMarketContext) and returns the relevant EiMarketContexts.  payloads:EiRequestEventType should include elements marketContext: emix:MarketContextType [0..*]  Note that this does not associate the requested URIs with the returned EiMarketContext, but the requested URI is a key and is in each EiMarketContext returned.

Description

: Section 10 of the EI specification describes Market Context indicating that both parties in a transaction can have a "market context". Furthermore, the narrative framework (section 5.3) describes VEN's querying VTNs for their market context. However, when looking at the schema, the only two places where market context appears in the payload is as follows:  
1) Various eiOpt payloads, in both the requests and responses. We assume that the responses are just a mirror of the requests marketContext. If not, this needs to be described.  
2) In eiRequestStatusPayload and as part of eiSentStatusPayload eiEventDescriptor.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:46 AM ]

Applied in Payloads Model pending 20111003. Assigned to Toby for spec and schema changes.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:29 PM ]

Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 01:53 PM ]

Corrected Resolution to match wd32 descriptions.

emix:MarketContextType is of type anyURI, so acts as an ID to the full EiMarketContext which has additional elements. Clarifications applied throughout the document.

[Market Context Collector](#) (ENERGYINTEROP-540)

[\[ENERGYINTEROP-542\] Cloned of 507 - Section 10 - There is confusion about how to get a VTN Market Context outside the framework of a specific event](#) Created: 02/Oct/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR Cloned from <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-502</a> for Market Context Collector		

**Resolution:** Fixed in [ENERGYINTEROP-543](#) (q.v. for changes).

**Description**  
 : Section 10 of the EI specification describes Market Context indicating that both parties in a transaction can have a "market context". Furthermore, the narrative framework (section 5.3) describes VEN's querying VTNs for their market context. However, when looking at the schema, the only two places where market context appears in the payload is as follows:  
 1) Various eiOpt payloads, in both the requests and responses. We assume that the responses are just a mirror of the requests marketContext. If not, this needs to be described.  
 2) In eiRequestStatusPayload and as part of eiSentStatusPayload eiEventDescriptor.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:30 PM ]  
 Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

**Market Context Collector** ([ENERGYINTEROP-540](#))  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-543\] Cloned from 509 - Section 10 - How does one know whether the marketContext returned in a Status response is just a confirmation of the request or something different?](#) Created: 02/Oct/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd27</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	OpenADR - Cloned from <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-500</a> for Market Context Collector		

**Resolution:** Change EiMarketContext uses to emix:MarketContextType as needed; see comments and linked items for details.

**Description**  
 Section 10 of the EI specification describes Market Context indicating that both parties in a transaction can have a "market context". Furthermore, the narrative framework (section 5.3) describes VEN's querying VTNs for their market context. However, when looking at the schema, the only two places where market context appears in the payload is as follows:  
 1) Various eiOpt payloads, in both the requests and responses. We assume that the responses are just a mirror of the requests marketContext. If not, this needs to be described.  
 2) In eiRequestStatusPayload and as part of eiSentStatusPayload eiEventDescriptor.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 01:10 AM ]  
 From the description. Notes are on lines starting with \*\*  
 \*\* This section is being overhauled as the standard terms are treated differently in wd29.  
 Section 10 of the EI specification describes Market Context indicating that both parties in a transaction can have a "market context".  
 \*\* both parties share / reference a market context. The VTN/VEN relationship between two parties is conditioned on a market context that defines and describes that program/etc.  
 Furthermore, the narrative framework (section 5.3) describes VEN's querying VTNs for their market context.  
 \*\* That section is non-normative. The discovery of Market Contexts is subject of ongoing work, but is post 1.0.  
 However, when looking at the schema, the only two places where market context appears in the payload is as follows:  
 1) Various eiOpt payloads, in both the requests and responses. We assume that the responses are just a mirror of the requests marketContext. If not, this needs to be described.  
 \*\* These are changed to reflect the nature of the emix:MarketContext as a key value. Yes, they indicate and confirm the context in which the operations take place. An Opt is present for each VEN in each Market Context. See [ENERGYINTEROP-532](#) and Theory 1. Corrected in [ENERGYINTEROP-545](#)  
 2) In eiRequestStatusPayload and as part of eiSentStatusPayload eiEventDescriptor.  
 \*\* All corrected to emix:MarketContext as part of other issues.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 01:11 AM ]  
 Addressed in model in Payloads pending 20111003. Needs to be appled to schema and specification.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:29 PM ]  
 Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-544] EiEvent Interaction Pattern issues - Push line 1128** Created: 03/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Correct the diagram.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Correct the diagram. New diagrams contributed for PR03, based on wd32.

**Description**  
 Figure 8-1 at line 1128 has two problems:  
 (1) the "I'm not going to respond any more to this event" is properly shown in Figure 8-2: a CreatedEvent messages; Figure 8-1 shows "CreateOptState which is wrong.  
 (2) The response to EiCancelEvent is missing.  
 See also [ENERGYINTEROP-534](#) and [ENERGYINTEROP-533](#)

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 26/Oct/11 03:56 PM ]  
 New diagrams submitted for inclusion in PR03  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]  
 Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-545] use xcal:DateTimeType instead of xs:dateTime in EiEvent classes** Created: 04/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Correct as needed.
--------------------	--------------------

**Description**  
 modificationDateTime is of type dateTime; it should be consistent with others can be xcal:DateTimeType.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 01:19 AM ]  
 Done in model pending 20111003. Needs application to spec and schema.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-546] Cardinality of EiChangeEventPayloadType eiEvent should be 1..\* not 1** Created: 04/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Change the cardinality of the eiEvent attribute of EiChangeEventPayloadType to 1..* Add comment that the changed events must be those already created for the VTN/VEN pair, address the error responses per <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-499</a> resolution(s)
--------------------	--

**Description**  
 Just as an EiCreateEvent can carry 1..\* events, a EiChangeEvent should do the same.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:40 AM ]  
 In payload update pending 20111003  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-547] Market Name in EiMarketContext is not a key and need not be unique. emix:MarketContext is a key.** Created: 04/Oct/11  
 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">CSD02/PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Add text to the table on line 1257 indicating that Market Name does not uniquely define or describe a MarketContext.  
 Add text indicating that Market Context may be used as a key or UID.  
 Changes in the schema comments as well as the specification and model.

**Description**  
 As stated above.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:55 AM ]  
 Consider whether Market Name should be optional - it's cardinality 1.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 12:56 AM ]  
 Addressed in Payloads/Model pending 20111003. Needs resolution and application in schema and spec.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Market Context Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-540)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-548] EiOpt and EiAvail Payloads use EiMarketContext, should be emix:MarketContext as key value.** Created: 04/Oct/11  
 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Change instances in EiOpt and EiAvail to emix:MarketContextType as key value.

**Description**  
 Part of "Theory 1" corrections. See [ENERGYINTEROP-522](#)  
 Applies to use of EiMarketContext in all EiAvail and EiOpt payloads.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 01:05 AM ]  
 Applied in model Payloads pending 20111003. Needs to be in schema and specification.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 01:08 AM ]  
 Should the eiMarketRuleSet be changed? I think that wd29-wips change that structure.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:31 PM ]  
 Closed at EITC meeting 20111026.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-549] EiCancelEvent needs ResourceTargetType cancel broadcast events; likewise for broadcast tenders and quotes**  
 Created: 04/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Per the description.

**Description**  
 See [ENERGYINTEROP-482](#) for background.  
 ResourceTargetType should be renamed EiTargetType; wd29 WIP version includes emixInterfae, groups, resourceIDs, and SHOULD contain optional VenIDs (0..\*) as well.  
 Distribute (Event || Quote || Tender) should have eiTarget included.  
 To cancel such an (Event || Quote || Tender) eiTarget has to be an optional element of the payload.  
 In the case of a VEN given the EiCreateEvent via point-to-point messages, eiTarget is not needed -- and the respective VEN gets the Cancel.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 05:24 PM ]  
 Fix in pending payloads 20111004; reassign for spec and schema.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-550] EiEvent Service Operation Payload issues - transactionName is an antique** Created: 04/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** None  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd28](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** None

**Type:** Bug **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [William Cox](#) **Assignee:** [Toby Considine](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** William Cox

**Resolution:** As in Description.

**Description**  
 EiRequestEventPayloadType - replace transactionName with emix:marketContext (there's no longer a key transaction/program name, moved into EiMarketContext, and emix:marketContext is the key to that artifact)  
 EiCanceledEventPayloadType - change UID to VenID.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 05:22 PM ]  
 Fix is in pending Payloads 20111004  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Oct/11 05:22 PM ]  
 Assigning for spec and schema updates.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**ID and Artifact Collector** ([ENERGYINTEROP-553](#))  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-551] Use of IDs and referenced artifacts** Created: 04/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

**Status:** Closed  
**Project:** [OASIS Energy Interoperation TC](#)  
**Component/s:** [model](#), [schema](#), [spec](#)  
**Affects Version/s:** [wd28](#)  
**Fix Version/s:** None

**Type:** Sub-task **Priority:** Major  
**Reporter:** [William Cox](#) **Assignee:** [Toby Considine](#)  
**Resolution:** Fixed  
**Environment:** William Cox

**Resolution:** Consider for all interactions.  
 In EiQuote service add a paramter to EiRequestQuotePayloadType which is quoteID [0..\*] for response.  
 Change documentation for EiRequestQuote to indicate that if one or more quoteIDs are requested that the response is the quotes with respect to the counterparty with those IDs.  
 In EiTransaction: Created should have 0..\* transactionIDs, not emixBases. And Request should also have 0..\* transactionIDs. Document that if there are zero transaction IDs all transactions related to the listed counterParties are returned; if there are 1..\* transactionIDs, then all the emixBase transactions will be returned.  
 transactionName should be considered carefully in a subtask--it may be a carryover from when marketContexts were called transactions. See ENERGYINTEROP-  
 Conformance: There must be at least one of {counterParty, transactionID, transactionName} in the Request Transaction Payload sent. Or could return an error.

**Description**  
 The use of IDs and of the referenced objects/artifacts is not entirely consistent.  
 For example, EiCreatQuote returns a QuoteIDType as well as 0..\* emixBases. QuoteID is used later in CancelQuotePayloadType.

Presumably the quoteID is the uid in the returned emixBase(s) - but there should be 0..\* not 0..1 of them. (see e.g. [ENERGYINTEROP-494](#) ).

Unspoken is how you get the referenced artifact given the ID. Operations have been added in wd29-WIP(later) to get an EiMarketContext given an emix:MarketContext as a key.

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 04/Oct/11 08:53 PM ]
For comment.
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 04/Oct/11 11:01 PM ]
Mostly in pending Payloads 201111004. Will need spec and schema updates.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**ID and Artifact Collector** (ENERGYINTEROP-553)  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-552] EiQuote and EiTender - should Created return what was sent?** Created: 04/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	As in Description.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Answer to Title: No.  Apply the pattern as follows to each Request operation as needed (in Payloads.xsd):  Request can include 0..* IDs. If there is 1..* IDs then return that artifacts referenced by each ID. If none, respond with all quotes/tenders related to the requesting party.

Description

The message exchange pattern in EiQuote and EiTender has a Create with an emixBase, then a created also with an ID and an emixBase.  
 The emixBase in that return is not needed -- the ID suffices.  
 Apply the pattern as follows:  
 Request can include 0..\* IDs. If there is 1..\* IDs then return that artifacts referenced by each ID. If none, respond with all quotes/tenders related to the requesting party.

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 04/Oct/11 11:00 PM ]
Specification and schema will need to follow. Most of this applied in pending Payloads 201111004
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-553] ID and Artifact Collector** Created: 04/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-551</a>	<a href="#">Use of IDs and referenced artifacts</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-552</a>	<a href="#">EiQuote and EiTender - should Created...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-554</a>	<a href="#">EiTransaction use of transactionName</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine

**Resolution:** Move to resolved as all subtasks are resolved.

Description

Collector for issues related to IDs and the referenced artifacts.

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>ID and Artifact Collector</b> (ENERGYINTEROP-553)			
<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-554] EiTransaction use of transactionName</b> Created: 04/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Change to emix:MarketContext.		
<b>Description</b>			
transactionName in EiRequestTransactionPayloadType is incorrect. It should be emix:MarketContext.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 04/Oct/11 10:49 PM ]			
Resolution done in pending Payloads 20111004			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]			
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-555] EiDelivery Service still required for Transactive Services - Ei Feedback has not yet be shown to provide the same services</b> Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">service</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Added in wd32. Closing this issue; please re-raise issues with respect to wd32 EiDelivery.		
<b>Description</b>			
EMIX has a Delivery artifact. We need an EiDelivery service with that artifact as the payload. EiFeedback has not yet been demonstrated to provide the same service as EiDelivery.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 26/Oct/11 08:20 PM ]			
EiDelivery is structured so a report implementation could be used (but with restricted input and multiplicity of results).			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-556] Collector for Payload issues for PR03</b> Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11					
<b>Status:</b>	Closed				
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>				
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>				
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None				
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>				
<b>Type:</b>	Task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major		
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed				
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox				
<b>Sub-Tasks:</b>	<b>Key</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Assignee</b>
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-557</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiEvent Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-558</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiQuote Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-559</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiRegisterParty Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-560</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiStatus and Market Context Payl...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-561</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiTender Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-562</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiTransaction Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-563</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiFeedback Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-564</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiAvail Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-565</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiOpt Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox

<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-566</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiEnroll Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-567</a>	<a href="#">PR03 EiDelivery Payloads</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-568</a>	<a href="#">In EiEventType eventID is defined twi...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine

Description

This is the task collector for payloads issues for Energy Interoperation Public Review 03.  
 Most recent payload diagrams are in [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload\\_Diagrams\\_For\\_WIP6%2B\\_20111004.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload_Diagrams_For_WIP6%2B_20111004.zip)  
 Please post issues on individual payload diagrams in the respective subtask; issues that affect more than one should be posted as comments in this item.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
 Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-566](#)  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 03:27 PM ]  
 Clarify that the transitive closure of artifacts are sent, e.g. all of the EiEvent information not just the EiEvent class.  
 Make Request parallel - to get the items related to IDs for each service. Common pattern. Note that in EiRegisterParty only one registration is processed at a time. See note there.  
 Consider general text discussion on the Distribute operations.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Nov/11 02:32 PM ]  
 All are in Applied or Resolved state so moving the collector to Resolved.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for Payload issues for PR03** ([ENERGYINTEROP-566](#))  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-557\] PR03 EiEvent Payloads](#) Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

Description

Place for comments on EiEvent Payloads in [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload\\_Diagrams\\_For\\_WIP6%2B\\_20111004.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload_Diagrams_For_WIP6%2B_20111004.zip) .  
 Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
 Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-566](#)  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 08:04 PM ]  
 See also [ENERGYINTEROP-568](#) .  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for Payload issues for PR03** ([ENERGYINTEROP-566](#))  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-558\] PR03 EiQuote Payloads](#) Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	wd33
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Close no action. Unused collector.

Description

Place for comments on EiQuote Payloads in [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload\\_Diagrams\\_For\\_WIP6%2B\\_20111004.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload_Diagrams_For_WIP6%2B_20111004.zip) .  
 Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
 Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-566](#)  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:01 PM ]  
 Unused collector. Close no action.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for Payload issues for PR03** (ENERGYINTEROP-556)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-559] PR03 EiRegisterParty Payloads** Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	wd33
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Make Request parallel - to get the items related to IDs for each service. Common pattern. Note that in EiRegisterParty only one registration is processed at a time. Consider "bulk" registrations (more than one sent, more than one returned). Emphasize in the text that this is for registering PARTIES, not for resource enrollment. Consider bundling with EiEnroll so you can register and enroll with one message sent. Separate an identify for a party and enroll in a program as a VEN/VTN/etc

Description

Place for comments on EiRegisterParty Payloads in [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload\\_Diagrams\\_For\\_WIP6%2B\\_20111004.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload_Diagrams_For_WIP6%2B_20111004.zip).

Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]

Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-556](#)

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 03:22 PM ]

Make Request parallel - to get the items related to IDs for each service. Common pattern. Note that in EiRegisterParty only one registration is processed at a time.

Consider "bulk" registrations (more than one sent, more than one returned).

Emphasize in the text that this is for registering PARTIES, not for resource enrollment.

Consider bundling with EiEnroll so you can register and enroll with one message sent. Separate an identify for a party and enroll in a program as a VEN/VTN/etc

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**Collector for Payload issues for PR03** (ENERGYINTEROP-556)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-560] PR03 EiStatus and Market Context Payloads** Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	wd34

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Proposal:** Make venID and vtnID optional [0..1]  
**Resolution:** Make venID and vtnID optional [0..1] in EiRequestMarketContext.  
 Mandatory venID in EiRequest\*Event payloads.

Description

Place for comments on EiStatus and Market Context Payloads in [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload\\_Diagrams\\_For\\_WIP6%2B\\_20111004.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload_Diagrams_For_WIP6%2B_20111004.zip)

Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]

Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-556](#)

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 03:19 PM ]

If broadcast or multicast, venID and/or vtnID should be optional. (from 20111005 meeting).

Response EiReplyStatus should have optional vtnID in addition to venID.

Comment: there is no Distribute operation; optionality is OK but at least one element must be present.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 10:42 AM ]

There is no Status service in WD33

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">Collector for Payload issues for PR03</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-556)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-561] PR03 EiTender Payloads</a> Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Comment out of date, Please review ans submit new Jira issues if needed.

**Description**  
 Place for comments on EiTender Payloads in [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload\\_Diagrams\\_For\\_WIP6%2B\\_20111004.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload_Diagrams_For_WIP6%2B_20111004.zip).  
 Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
 Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-556](#)  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 03:26 PM ]  
 Bill needs to write text for the spec on RequestTransactionPayload as well as RequestTenderPayload. RequestTender should parallel RequestTransaction.  
 EdC write text on EiDistributeTender and use cases.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 10:43 AM ]  
 This was several versions ag and I beleive this is all complete  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">Collector for Payload issues for PR03</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-556)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-562] PR03 EiTransaction Payloads</a> Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Cannot Reproduce		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Acceptance ID previously deleted. Please review and submit new issues if needed.

**Description**  
 Place for comments on EiTransaction Payloads in [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload\\_Diagrams\\_For\\_WIP6%2B\\_20111004.zip](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43768/Payload_Diagrams_For_WIP6%2B_20111004.zip).  
 Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
 Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-556](#)  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 03:25 PM ]  
 Bill needs to write text for the spec on RequestTransactionPayload as well as RequestTenderPayload. RequestTender should parallel RequestTransaction.  
 EdC needs to write text for the role of market context in EiTransaction.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 06/Oct/11 12:28 AM ]  
 EiCreateTransaction has acceptanceID as an attribute. What does this do? Is it an old UID (represented as UidType = string) or something else?  
 Consider deleting acceptanceID.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#)[ 06/Oct/11 12:33 AM ]  
 I agree that the acceptanceID can be deleted. I don't know its origin.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">Collector for Payload issues for PR03</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-556)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-563] PR03 EiFeedback Payloads</a> Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
--	--

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** EiFeedback became part of a general Reprot Service in WD32. Please review WD33 or later and create new Jira issue if needed.

**Description**  
Place for comments on EiFeedback Payloads in (File not uploaded yet)  
Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-566](#)  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for Payload issues for PR03** ([ENERGYINTEROP-556](#))  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-564] PR03 EiAvail Payloads** Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** EiAvail Service extensively re-written. Please review WD33 or later and create new Jira issue if needed.

**Description**  
Place for comments on EiAvail Payloads in (File not uploaded yet)  
Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-566](#)  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for Payload issues for PR03** ([ENERGYINTEROP-556](#))  
**[ENERGYINTEROP-565] PR03 EiOpt Payloads** Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** EiOpt Service extensively re-written. Please review WD33 or later and create new Jira issue if needed.

**Description**  
Place for comments on EiOpt Payloads in (File not uploaded yet)  
Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-566](#)  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">Collector for Payload issues for PR03</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-556)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-566] PR03 EiEnroll Payloads</a> Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Later		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Defer to broader optimization of payloads and interactions post 1.0.

**Description**  
 Place for comments on EiEnroll Payloads in (File not uploaded yet)  
 Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
 Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-556](#)  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 03:24 PM ]  
 Consider bundling with EiRegister so you can register and enroll with one message sent. Separate an identify for a party and enroll in a program as a VEN/VTN/etc. Parallel note on EiRegister.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:04 PM ]  
 Post 1.0 optimization.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">Collector for Payload issues for PR03</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-556)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-567] PR03 EiDelivery Payloads</a> Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Other Jira issues are addressing the Delivery Service. Please review WD33 or later and create new Jira issue if needed.

**Description**  
 Place for comments on EiDelivery Payloads in (File not uploaded yet)  
 Please state the date of the payload file/image on which you are commenting. Bill will move into the description a consolidation of the comments so we stay current.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Oct/11 01:24 PM ]  
 Bulk open of all payload subtasks of [ENERGYINTEROP-556](#)  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">Collector for Payload issues for PR03</a> <small>(ENERGYINTEROP-556)</small> <a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-568] In EiEventType eventID is defined twice and we are missing the uid.</a> Created: 05/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Blocker
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change EiEventType:eventID to EiEventType:uid and kill two birds with one stone.
<b>Resolution:</b>	uid in EiEvent is now eventMessageID of type refID. eventID is EventDescriptor is now (correctly) different

Description

In wd29 wip6 schemas - EiEventType:eventID and EiEventType:eventDescription:eventID are redundant. Furthermore the EiEventType:eventDescription:uid that was in previous versions of the schema has disappeared and is needed. I suspect that this bug was created when someone tried to move the uid attribute and did an incorrect cut and paste.

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 05/Oct/11 07:56 PM ]
eventID: EventIDType is in EventDescriptorType (not EventDescriptionType) and EiEventType.
Agree with Ed - not needed in both places. Need documentation in schema on what uid represents (the instance of the EiEvent artifact, not the Event itself?).
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 10/Oct/11 12:09 PM ]
To enter the wd29-wip number where addressed and apply/close.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-569] Suffixes should be "or" not "er" for Tenderor, etc** Created: 06/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Technical editor to make consistent style choice.
------------------	---

Description

Editorial issue: TenderOR, not TenderER. Similar to RequestOR (rather than RequestER).

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 22/Oct/11 11:22 PM ]
All Party IDs are now consistent
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-570] Improve Semantics of signalPercent** Created: 06/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Recommend that it be renamed signalMultiplier, normally a number between 0 and 1, and have thereby identical semantics to priceMultiplier.
<b>Resolution:</b>	renamed signalMultiplier, normally a number between 0 and 1, and have thereby identical semantics to priceMultiplier.

Description

One of the signals, signalPercent has very muddy semantics. It is currently a float, but w/o special pleading its meaning and use is unclear. Percent generally is divided by a 100 and then multiplied by its base. For this comment, assume it only makes sense between 0% and 100%, although clearly greater than 100 and even negative numbers could make sense.

Is this number  
 - a number between 0 and 100?  
 - a number between 0 and 1?  
 - something else?

Comments

Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 26/Oct/11 08:19 PM ]
It's still a float in wd32.
Consider adding conformance requirements in application profiles/descriptions.
The multiplier can be a percentage (in which case it's 0 to 1) or a natural number expressed as a float (1, 5, 10 in one example given the TC), or any number for a ratio.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 28/Oct/11 05:44 PM ]
Closing un-changed because no comments after a week
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-571] UidType should be abstract; need transmittle or referencelD</b> Created: 06/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	EventMessageID identifies instance of EiEvent Uid is abstract refID is abstract partyID is abstract
<b>Resolution:</b>	Uid is abstract refID is abstract derivative of Uid all references are concrete derivatives of refID  actorID is abstract derivative of Uid all parties are abstract derivatives of actorID  EventMessageID identifies instance of EiEvent

**Description**  
 The UidType should be abstract. Classes such as EiResponseType then have a uid but it must be a specific type. This will improve documentation and understanding.  
[ENERGYINTEROP-566](#) applied a uid to (apparently) the instance of a description of an Event, which also carries an EventIDType (in EventDescriptor).  
 This also relates to the question of what is identified - the object or the Event/Tender/Quote in all of its manifestations.  
 Consider the use of mRID for the artifact/instance and the abstract uid with concrete eventID, tenderID, quoteID, etc -- because you do NOT cancel an object instance that references the actual tender or event, you cancel the tender or event itself.  
 This affects the information model and the payloads. We want to return IDs (of the event) that allow us to get an event from an instanceID.  
 MessageID, TransmittalID, InstanceID, referencelD are all possible names for this function.  
 I prefer (at this moment) transmittalID or referencelD.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-572] Wip 8 Schema : Why does eiRequestMarketContext refer to venID, Resouce ID and a request for status?</b> Created: 07/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd28</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet WD 29 WIP 8 Schema		

<b>Resolution:</b>	No action required. The venID, vtnID, and resourcelD are optional, so a transactive implementation need not use those at all, providing exactly what's requested. Close no action.
--------------------	---

**Description**  
 Why does eiRequestMarketContext refer to venID, Resouce ID and a request for status? Just seems out of place since Transactive Services may request market context and not convey such information.  

```
<!-- 7.5 Market Context Payloads -->
<xs:element name="eiRequestEiMarketContext" type="payloads:EiRequestEiMarketContextType"/>
<xs:complexType name="EiRequestEiMarketContextType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="emix:marketContext" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:venID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>VEN for which Resource Status is requested.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
<xs:element ref="eitc:resourcelD" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>Resource(s) for which status is requested.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
</xs:element>
<xs:element ref="eitc:vtnID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
```

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 08:15 PM ]

The other elements are optional. For transactive use, they are not required.

The wd32 elements are  
 marketContext [1..\*]  
 venID [0..1]  
 resourceID [0..\*]  
 vtnID [0..1]

The semantics will be more clear in wd33. In short, the market context(s) are required. The others are optional and restrict the information to those that meet those other criteria. If a marketContext is not relevant to (say) vtn XYZ then there is no response on that marketContext.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 08:16 PM ]

Please re-examine.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-573] WD 29 WIP 8 : Possible typo in eiTransactionID for EiReplyTransactionPayloadType** Created: 07/Oct/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

**Resolution:** Correct to eiTransactionID [0..\*] and make related changes to responses.

Description

```
<xs:complexType name="EiReplyTransactionPayloadType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:eiResponse" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:responses" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:eiTransaction" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
```

Shouldn't eiTransaction be eiTransactionID ?

**[ENERGYINTEROP-574] No way to request Feedback in current Schemas** Created: 09/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd30</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Proposal:**

I think we need a Feedback Request Type. It consists of

- A Reference ID
- A Set of Feedback Parameters

An event, then, can contain 0-\* Feedback Requests.  
 An EI Market Context can contain 0-\* Feedback Requests, if the expectations are that all Events in that Context expect a certain kind of Feedback.

Feedback, then, becomes a Simple Stream consisting of:

- Reference ID (from the Request)
- ItemBase
- Amount (per each Interval)

Of Course, it is legal to send an Event that is pure FeedbackRequest (What are you seeing).

There may need to be a request that is simply "What is the level now"

**Resolution:** Feedback become Reports, and we now have request report services

Description

It appears that in the current schemas that there are no Feedback Requests.

Feedback Requests were a way to specify what Feedback was expected from the VEN during an Event. Reporting requirements might extend before and after the period in an Application Event. As it stands now, Feedback includes a set of Feedback Parameters.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-575] Comments on Proposed Chapter 5 for WD29 D4.pdf** Created: 10/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">SPEC</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Transactive State removed in WD33 Transactive Profile defines what is or is not in Transactive Energy
--------------------	--

Description

Comments on Proposed Chapter 5 for WD29 D4.pdf

10: Table would seem to apply only to VTN?VEN - if Group and Target are also to be used for Transactive Services the definition needs to avoid the use of the term Event, VEN and VTN.

31: What use is Transactive State in EiMarketContext? - it is a property of an interaction and not a market.

For transactive energy we only need

- A The artifacts in the first table, with the exception of Resource
- B 5.2.1 Registration
- C 5.3 Some elements of Market Context ( possibly)
- D 5.6 Responses and Error Reporting

And we need a way of designating what is and is not used by transactive energy so those who are implementing transactive energy can focus on what they need and not be burdened by artifacts that do not apply to transactive energy.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 11/Oct/11 12:02 AM ]

VEN, Group, and Target each occur 0-unbounded times, meaning it is quite possible to use Target artifacts without these elements.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-576] SignalType enumeration should be the same for Signal / Report / Baseline** Created: 11/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Unify these Types into a single enumeration used for all Streams
<b>Resolution:</b>	Unify these Types into a single enumeration used for all Streams (applied in wd32)

Description

There is already substantial overlap. Signals are request to Make It So. Reports are What did you make of it. Baselines are expectations about what it is.

With the current structure of ItemBase / Payload, there is no barrier to using the same enumeration for all. I can think of use cases even for Price as a Baseline and as a Report.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 12/Oct/11 12:46 PM ]

Rish:

Please look into these definitions and let me know whether we can pull this off.

thanks

tc

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-577] Improvements to Transactive Services Payloads** Created: 12/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd30</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet - see also <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-580</a>		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Per marked up Description. In addition, document the behavior in #2 with respect to receiving the tenderIDs that are canceled or not. This belongs in the EiResponse section 6.8 wd32
--------------------	--

Description

Comments in { }

With respect to the Transactive Services Payloads

- EiCreateTender needs a tendereeParty ID to identify the counterparty to the Tenderee or each Tender.  
{ Accepted }
- Canceled Tender should return a list of canceledTenderIDs (in wd32 cancel tender takes one party ID and an optional counterPartyID., and 1..\* TenderIDs.  
The responses (ArrayOfResponses) responds with an ID (of which tenderID is substitutable) and a response for each. So there's a value that can be used as a Tender ID for each tenderID submitted.  
So this is in wd32., but is NOT MANDATORY if the cancel is successful. The pattern is to return those that have failed (required) and those that succeeded (optional).  
ACTION improve documentation on this point.  
}
- Why does EiRequestTender us counterPartyID rather than tendereePartyID? As you know I still prefer Party and CounterParty for Tenderor and Tenderee.  
{ Accepted in [ENERGYINTEROP-580](#) }
- Need EiDistributeTender service  
{ Included in wd32 }
- EiCreateTransaction needs multiple transactionIDs if accepting multiple Tenders.  
{ Rejected. For simplicity in 1.0, a single tenderID is used. Note that the multiplicity can be at any level inside the eiTransaction, which contains an EMIX Base. Allowing multiplicity inside and outside the emix base is too complex for 1.0, and the work would delay 1.0.

I'm splitting this as a deferred post 1.0 in a new issue (FILL IN THE NUMBER) ENERGYINTEROP-

- Why does ReplyTenderPayload carry emixBase when it does not appear in any other payload?  
{ Thanks for catching this earlier. Corrected by wd32. }
- EiRequestTransaction also needs multiple transactionIDs.  
{ Accepted. has 0..\* transactionIDs. }

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 11:03 PM ]  
Spec markup (last in Resolution) needs to be applied; balance is applied.  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-578] Comments on Proposed Section 10 from Transactive Point of View.** Created: 12/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	<a href="http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43856/energqinterop-1-0-spec-wd29%2Bwtcd3.docx">http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43856/energqinterop-1-0-spec-wd29%2Bwtcd3.docx</a>		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Suggested Section 10 Title: Event Support Services 6: change Party to VEN and remove "or participate in a transactive market" 8: Change registration to Program Enrollment and remove "or transaction negotiation"
<b>Resolution:</b>	Suggested Section 10 Title: Event Support Services 6: change Party to VEN and remove "or participate in a transactive market" 8: Change registration to Program Enrollment and remove "or transaction negotiation"

Description

The section needs to be retitled to apply only to Event Services and all references to Transactive Services in this section should be deleted.

Transactive Energy uses EMIX Market Context and EMIX Options with Availability artifacts. Applying this section to Transactive Services is duplicative, confusing and a basis for error and unreliability in implementation.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-579] Comments on Section 5** Created: 12/Oct/11 Updated: 26/Oct/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema, spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	bbartell		

**Resolution:** Action no longer required. Close no action (changes accepted and applied in wd32 and before).

Description

Much has changed since wd27, much in response to your comment. I'm responding with respect to wd32.

Editorial

lines 657 & 662 - [WS-Calendar] itself extends the well-known semantics [RFC5545]. Sentence is repeated.  
line 666 - "EMIX does not redefine these terms", maybe EI or "EI and EMIX"?

ABOVE IS CLEANED UP IN wd32.

Comments:

5.3.3 Response Smoothing.  
977- How is tolerance used? I see it in the text and schemas, but what is it telling me? Is it the range of acceptable random start?

ADDRESSED IN NEW SECTION 4.1.4 in wd32, lines 721-757

980- eiSmoothing is derived from EMIX base, but I do not see where/how this would be called out in an Event message.  
Smoothing has 3 enumerations without definitions. How are they used? I am surmising that these indicate the type of pseudorandom number generation algorithm to use. If this is the case, there are probably a lot more than 3 (in both uniform and non-uniform). In the case of poisson it may need the value of lambda as a parameter. Maybe just a string for a name and a way to pass parameters and leave the rest to the implementers.

NOTES:

eiSmoothing (of EiSmoothingType is not (wd32) derived from EMIX base; the enumerated values are defined in section 5.2.3 line 987 wd32.

Poisson has been deleted; additional parameters are not defined.

The text is much more clear thanks to these pointed comments.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 08:05 PM ]

Added in-line description discussing each point, which has been addressed. Closing this as applied. Further issues should be new and reference wd32.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-580] Additional Comments on Services Payloads** Created: 12/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd31</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

**Resolution:** Per marked-up description. Since nearly all of the requests are addressed, resolving, applying and closing this. Further comments must be based on wd32 or later.

Description

NOTES INLINE IN { }

Question: if a service is delivered to an URL ( IP address) then the payload also needs to identify the the parties to the service? Perhaps I don't fully understand how the services will be defined.

For example, EiCreateTender should have both the TenderorPartyID and the TendereePartyIDs. URLs may change but the PartyIDs should not.

{Correct. the URI may resolve to an IP address but need not. PartyIDs have no specified format, only the requirement that they be expressed as strings and be unique.  
}

Registration:

EiRegisterParty is just one example. I suggest that the service be generic. EiRegister where what is registered can be a Party, EMIX Interface, Elements of an EMIX interface, EMIX MarketContext etc. The Registrar normally will be a Party.

The purpose of registration is to assign unique IDs that may be used in different market contexts etc.

```
{ Correct on the purpose of registration. The reason the registration in 1.0 is "PartyRegister" or "RegisterParty" is so the more generic can be done in 1.1, or at least post 1.0. There isn't time to do a good job of generic Registration, so we've done only Party registration.
}
```

Enrollment:

Enrollment is Party in a MarketContext or Program (is this just a Market Context, or a sub Market Contact). Is suggest using the term EnrollAdmin instead of EnrollingParty.

```
{ MarketContext. Program is no longer used, but the functions and information for a "program" are in an EiMarketContext, with id emix:MarketContextType, a URI.
```

Accepted EnrollAdmin. We've tried to eliminate the ambiguity of "enrolling".

Transaction Services:

EiRequest Transaction needs Party in addition to the CounterParty and the Requestor Party. When permitted the requester may be a regulator or another authorized party not a party to the transaction.

```
{ as of wd32, PartyID and RequestorPartyID are mandatory, and CounterParty is optional. The semantics involve restricting the possible responses to those that include all of the stated items, so adding additional counterpartyIDs will restrict to those. Accepted in part. Good description of the intend of requestorPartyID.
}
```

Tender Services

I repeat my recommendation that Party and CounterParty be used instead of Tenderor and Tender.

```
{ Done.
```

The use of Party and CounterParty is clear in the context of a Tender and a Transaction and this usage has been in place for over a year in the TeMIX White Paper and throughout the Ei Specification. Weak argument. A stronger one is "this is common terminology in business interactions involving agreements to buy, sell, option, and delivery.

In recent Ei Specification drafts some UML diagrams proposed Tenderee and Tenderor but no TC consensus was attempted in my recollection. Our terminology should be a simple as possible.

Quote Services

I suggest the term publisherPartyID instead of quoterPartyID.

```
{ Accepted
}
```

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 09:13 PM ]

Thanks for the useful comments and discussions. The simplifications suggested were almost completely accepted and applied.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-581] Suggests for corrections to schema documentation and multiplicity for Tenders, Transactions and Quotes in EIPayloads 7.0** Created: 16/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd30</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	WD30,WD31		

**Proposal:**

```
<!-- 7.1 Tenders -->
< xs:documentation>
Tender Indicates a soecific offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for any number of EmixBase derived types, and the Tender is treated as all-or-none.
Correction: Tender indicates a binding offer to buy or sell. A Tender is for a single EmixBase derived types.
<!-- 7.2 Quotes -->
< xs:documentation>
A non-binding indication of price for a potential Tender. A Quote is for a single EmixBase derived types.

<!-- 7.3 Transactions -->
Correction: <!-- 7.3 Transactions -->

< xs:documentation>
A Transaction is a specific agreement to accept a specific Tender or Tenders

It is my understanding that Ei 1.0 does not deal with compound Tenders with multiple.TenderIDs and emixBases. EiCreateTender communicates multiple TenderIDs and emixBases in its Payload, but each of them can be independently transacted. Post Ei 1.0 we can deal with compound Tenders where a single TenderID is associated with multiple emixBases.

Hence for Tenders:
Currently:
< xs:element ref="eitc:tenderID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
< xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>

Correction:
< xs:element ref="eitc:tenderID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
< xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>

And for Transactions:

Currently:
< xs:element ref="eitc:transactionID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
< xs:element ref="eitc:tenderID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
< xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>

Correction:
```

```

< xs:element ref="eit:transactionID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
< xs:element ref="eit:tenderID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>
< xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>

And for Quotes

< xs:element ref="eit:quoteID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
< xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>

Correction:
< xs:element ref="eit:quoteID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
< xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
    
```

**Description**

Current Schema in EiPayloads WD30  
 <!-- 7.0 Tenders, Quotes, and Transactions -->  
 <!-- 7.1 Tenders -->  
 < xs:element name="eiTender" type="eit:EiTenderType"/>  
 <xs:complexType name="EiTenderType">  
 <xs:annotation>  
 <xs:documentation>Tender Indicates a specific offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for any number of EmixBase derived types, and the Tender is treated as all-or-none.</xs:documentation>  
 </xs:annotation>  
 <xs:sequence>  
 <xs:element ref="eit:tenderID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>  
 <xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>  
 </xs:sequence>  
 </xs:complexType>  
 <!-- 7.2 Quotes -->  
 < xs:element name="eiQuote" type="eit:EiQuoteType"/>  
 <xs:complexType name="EiQuoteType">  
 <xs:annotation>  
 <xs:documentation>A specific offer to sell for a particular price. A Quote can be for any number of EmixBase derived types, and the Quote is treated as all-or-none.</xs:documentation>  
 </xs:annotation>  
 <xs:sequence>  
 <xs:element ref="eit:quoteID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>  
 <xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>  
 </xs:sequence>  
 </xs:complexType>  
 <!-- 7.3 Transactions -->  
 < xs:element name="eiTransaction" type="eit:EiTransactionType"/>  
 <xs:complexType name="EiTransactionType">  
 <xs:annotation>  
 <xs:documentation>A Transaction is a specific agreement to accept a specific Tender or Tenders.</xs:documentation>  
 </xs:annotation>  
 <xs:sequence>  
 <xs:element ref="eit:transactionID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>  
 <xs:element ref="eit:tenderID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>  
 <xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>  
 </xs:sequence>  
 </xs:complexType>

**Comments**

- Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 22/Oct/11 11:02 PM ]  
 Please review in WD32 and verify that we can close this issue
- Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 23/Oct/11 03:48 PM ]  
 Not ready for close: following changes still needed based on WD32:
- EiClasses:815  
 xs:documentation>Tender Indicates a specific offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for any number of EmixBase derived types, and the Tender is treated as all-or-none.</xs:documentation>  
 Delete reference to all-or-none as each of the Tenders in a createTender can be accepted independently  
 xs:documentation>Tender Indicates a specific offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for any number of EmixBase derived types.</xs:documentation>
- EiClasses:819 - an A Tender must have a single emixBase. Change 819 to maxOccurs = "1"  
 < xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
- EiClasses:826 change to  
 < xs:documentation>A non-binding indication of price for a potential Tender. A Quote is for a single EmixBase derived type.  
 note multiplicity of quotes is in EiCreateQuote
- EiClasses:830 change to maxOccurs = "1"
- EiClasses:833 correct spelling  
 <!-- 7.3 Transactions -->  
 should be  
 <!-- 7.3 Transactions -->
- EiClasses:837 correct documentation so that a Transaction is associated only with a single Tender. Compound Transactions may be considered post 1.0.
- Change to:  
 < xs:documentation>A Transaction is a specific agreement to accept a specific Tender.</xs:documentation>
- EiClasses: 841 and 842  
 Change to maxOccurs = "1"
- Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-582] Editorial Revisions to Section 3.1 re Transaction Sides</b> Created: 18/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None

**Fix Version/s:** [wd32](#)

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** New sections at beginning of Section 3 have been applied to WD32

**Description**  
 Please see <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/orig/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/43972> for update.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-583] Figure 3-7 shows old operation names** Created: 19/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Updated figure 3-7

**Description**  
 Figure 3-7 shows old operation names

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-584] Program definition in section 5.2.1 is not appropriate for its intended purpose and should be deleted.** Created: 20/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd29</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Proposal:** I suggest that we delete section 5.2.1 from the spec and the schemas replace it with the following. Extend the emix:itemBase with an EI specific type called levelType that has the limit attributes expressed in section 5.2.1. Since emix:itemBase is the attribute that is attached to specific signals we can use this new type to attach these attributes to a specific level signal when appropriate. I think this will achieve the same result of section 5.2.1 in cleaner and more effective fashion.

**Resolution:** Misleading Program has morphed into SimpleLevel and Level, no longer suggesting that this conveys a Program.

**Description**  
 Program definition in section 5.2.1 is not appropriate for its intended purpose. It is wholly inadequate and starts to tread into the realm of meta-data for programs which should not be addressed in verion 1.0 of the spec. When we do start adding meta data about programs this information should not be in the event and we should create a seperate program service with accompanying data strctures to express the program meta-data. Examples of meta-data we might include about a program include the following:

- What are the program constraints, i.e. when can I expect to get signals
- What signals can I expect to receive when I do get an event
- For each signal what are the attributes of the signal, including type and value constraints where appropriate.
- What type of feedback (reports) should be generated for this program

If everyone recalls there use to be a seperate program service and one of the reasons that we deleted it was because we did not want to flush all this out in 1.0. In one of our TC meetings in April we decided to put this sort of program meta-data off to 1.1.

Below I propose an alternate solution that I think will achieve the intended goal of section 5.2.1 in a much more effective fashion and not tread too far down the program meta-data rat hole.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 26/Oct/11 11:36 AM ]  
 Simply chaning the anme does not address the core issue which is that these attributes are being defined in the context. They are signal attributes and should be defined with the other signal attributes so they can be applied in a manner consistent with the other signal attributes. I think it is ok to keep these attributes in the model, but we shold move where the are defined.

Please do the following:

In the spec move section 5.2.1 to be a subsection of 5.3.3.

Apply the original proposed solution, i.e. extend the emix:itemBase with an EI specific type called levelType that has the limit attributes expressed in section 5.2.1. Since emix:itemBase is the attribute that is

attached to specific signals we can use this new type to attach these attributes to a specific level signal when appropriate. I think this will achieve the same result of section 5.2.1 in cleaner and more effective fashion.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-585] Multi-address event delivery** Created: 22/Oct/11 Updated: 29/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

**Description**

It has been stated that it is desirable to sign up a single VEN at a single address and send Events (and signals) directly to multiple IP addresses/ resources.

Please make a suggestion as to how we do this in the Registration/Enrollment process.

**Comments**

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 23/Oct/11 04:24 PM ]

The characterization of this issue may not be correct depending upon the definition of a VEN. What was suggested is the following use case which is supported today:

- EdKea is a customer of PG&E

- EdKea signs up for PG&E's CPP DR program and offers one of his stores as a DR resource into that program. From PG&E's perspective the EdKea store is the only service delivery point and is the only thing eligible to offered up as a resource in the program and will be what PG&E dispatchs against.

- EdKea installs multiple devices (i.e. endpointts, one on each floor) in his store, each receiving their own DR signal from PG&E's servers.

Based upon recent discussions the EI entities in this relationship are not clear. I'm not convinced that EdKea is a single VEN. As soon as we map the following real world entities into into EI's definitions then hopefully the solution is more evident. Here is my cut at it:

- (1) PG&E (party and VTN?)
- (2) EdKea the customer (i.e party)
- (3) EdKea's the store (i.e. resource)
- (4) EdKea's devices for receiving DR signals (?)

In NAESB and OpenADR Taskforce terminology and use cases (4) are assets. EI did not want to adopt assets, but wanted to do some sort of resource heirarchy so in that respect I guess they are resources from EdKea's perspective, but not from PG&E's perspective. How those map to VEN's is still a little unclear.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 23/Oct/11 07:16 PM ]

>> EdKea installs multiple devices (i.e. endpointts, one on each floor) in his store, >> each receiving their own DR signal from PG&E's servers.

This is the scenario I don't think we are handling well, now. It "could" be 40 VENs, but that does not, per se, address the "and sens all messages to the master VEN" that you outlined. To me, that sounds like sending messages directly to Resources but notifying the Ven, with all at a single (more or less) Service Delivery Point.

Ikea having 40 VENs in 40 towns is straightforward. 10 of those VENs might be over the border in a different Utility - the analysis does not change. SOme of them may respond to different service area notices. That one I think we handle just fine.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Oct/11 05:12 PM ]

If we look in the comments on <http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-580>

We see a proposal that Resources "can" be registered (not that they must be). Perhaps they only need to be registered for a direct connection as described above.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 24/Oct/11 09:22 PM ]

I suggest that physical Resources such as a Generator or a DER be registered. There are already established procedures for this so each physcal resource should already be assigned a UID.

Virtual Resources need to be enrolled in a Program / market Context. Virtual resources don't exist until they are so enrolled. Physical Resources can can also be enrolled in a Program / Market Context.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Oct/11 11:17 AM ]

There is nothing that stops an application from collecting its own [IP addresses] for Resources "behind" a VEN, and then sending duplicate EIEvents to each of those addresses as well as to the VEN. It is appropriate that the specification neither requires nor hinders this configuration.

No need to handle this issue in the spec.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 27/Oct/11 02:03 PM ]

We still need to work thru the EdKea and similar use cases. It is not just a "behind the VEN" and an IP address for Resources issue in my mind.

But we are all talking past each other. I think and we need to meet and go thru some use cases.

This is not a transactive issue, but an issue of "what is a VEN?"

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 31/Oct/11 10:15 PM ]

This is one of the issues that I need to have closure on before I consider the spec complete.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 04/Nov/11 06:37 PM ]

I am comfortable that the recent proposed text by Bill leaves open the possibility of solving this issue in a couple of different ways and I propose that we close this issue.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 29/Nov/11 10:39 AM ]

Missed the closing of resolved issues earlier.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-586] Minor Schema Issues** Created: 23/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd31</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Fix as recommended
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fix as recommended

**Description**  
 Minor issues in schemas wd32-wip2 if you're in the area:

EiClasses.xsd:  
 registeredParty is still a global element

EiEnrollment.xsd:  
 EnrollingEntityEnumeratedType - we got rid of "Enrolling" due to ambiguity. Suggest changing to "EnrolleeEnumeratedType"

entityID (of type Power::MridType) doesn't show in my model; I've added it. It's a local declaration in line 18 of EiEnrollment.xsd.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 24/Oct/11 05:05 PM ]  
 Why is entity not a party?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-587] Reading Type is muddled** Created: 23/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Girish Ghatikar</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Proposal:**

- \* Direct Read - Reading is read from a device that increases monotonically, and usage must be computed from pairs of start and stop readings.
- \* Net - Meter or [resource] prepares its own calculation of total use over time
- \* Allocated—Meter covers several [resources] and usage is inferred through some sort of pro rata computation.
- \* Summed - Several meters together provide the reading for this [resource]. This is specifically a different than aggregated, which refers to multiple [resources] in the same payload. See also Hybrid.
- \* Derived - Usage is inferred through knowledge of run-time, normal operation, etc.
- \* Mean -- Reading is the mean value over the period indicated in Granularity.
- \* Peak - Reading is Peak (highest) value over the period indicated in granularity. For some measurements, it may make more sense as the lowest value. May require special handling for aggregate readings. Only valid for flow-rate itemBases, i.e., Power not Energy.
- \* Hybrid - if aggregated, refers to different means reading types in the aggregate number.

To this list, for DR, I might add

- \* Contract - unmetered [resource] is reported at agreed upon rates.
- \* Projected - reading is in future and is not yet measured

**Resolution:**

- \* Direct Read - Reading is read from a device that increases monotonically, and usage must be computed from pairs of start and stop readings.
- \* Net - Meter or [resource] prepares its own calculation of total use over time
- \* Allocated—Meter covers several [resources] and usage is inferred through some sort of pro rata computation.
- \* Summed - Several meters together provide the reading for this [resource]. This is specifically a different than aggregated, which refers to multiple [resources] in the same payload. See also Hybrid.
- \* Derived - Usage is inferred through knowledge of run-time, normal operation, etc.
- \* Mean -- Reading is the mean value over the period indicated in Granularity.
- \* Peak - Reading is Peak (highest) value over the period indicated in granularity. For some measurements, it may make more sense as the lowest value. May require special handling for aggregate readings. Only valid for flow-rate itemBases, i.e., Power not Energy.
- \* Hybrid - if aggregated, refers to different means reading types in the aggregate number.
- \* Contract - unmetered [resource] is reported at agreed upon rates.
- \* Projected - reading is in future and is not yet measured

**Description**  
 Semantics of Reading Type are muddled

First, what Reading Type is not

- It is not what is being measured, that is in ItemBase
- It is not the address of the [resource], that is in subject
- It is not the address of the Meter, that is in dataSource

Reading type is an optional element of reports that indicates how this reading was made. Current enumerations are:

- \* Accumulation - Reading is accumulated over time, so that measured value must be computed by subtracting previous reading.
- \* Mean - Reading is the mean value over the period indicated in Granularity.

- \* Derived - Reading is derived through computations applied to some behavior or activity and perhaps a subset of an observation.
- \* Peak - Reading is Peak (highest) value over the period indicated in granularity.

I think that this more obscure than it needs to be.

When working in buildings, I think of these approaches:

- \* Direct Read - Reading is read from a device that increases monotonically, and usage must be computed from pairs of start and stop readings.
  - \* Net - Meter or [resource] prepares its own calculation of total use over time
  - \* Allocated—Meter covers several [resources] and usage is inferred through some sort of pro rata computation.
  - \* Summed - Several meters together provide the reading for this [resource]. This is specifically a different than aggregated, which refers to multiple [resources] in the same payload. See also Hybrid.
  - \* Derived - Usage is inferred through knowledge of run-time, normal operation, etc.
  - \* Mean -- Reading is the mean value over the period indicated in Granularity.
  - \* Peak - Reading is Peak (highest) value over the period indicated in granularity. For some measurements, it may make more sense as the lowest value. May require special handling for aggregate readings.
- Only valid for flow-rate itemBases, i.e., Power not Energy.
- \* Hybrid - if aggregated, refers to different means reading types in the aggregate number.

To this list, for DR, I might add

- \* Contract - unmetered [resource] is reported at agreed upon rates.
- \* Projected - reading is in future and is not yet measured

Comments very welcome

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Oct/11 10:01 PM ]

As directed in Meeting

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-588] Add Elements to match each of the enumerated types** Created: 23/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add an element instantiating each extensible enumerated type make coding simpler.For example, for OptReasonEnumeratedType defien the element: <xs:element name="optReasonEnumerated" type="eitc:OptReasonEnumeratedType"/>
------------------	---

Description

In the existing Schemas, almost are enumeration are extensible. They follow the general form

```
<xs:element name="optReason" type="eitc:OptReasonType"/>
<xs:simpleType name="OptReasonType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>Reason for Opting.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:union memberTypes="eitc:OptReasonEnumeratedType eitc:EiExtensionTokenType"/>
</xs:simpleType>
<xs:simpleType name="OptReasonEnumeratedType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>Enumerated Reasons for Opting.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:restriction base="xs:token">
<xs:enumeration value="economic"/>
<xs:enumeration value="emergency"/>
<xs:enumeration value="mustRun"/>
<xs:enumeration value="notParticipating"/>
<xs:enumeration value="outageRunStatus"/>
<xs:enumeration value="overrideStatus"/>
<xs:enumeration value="participating"/>
</xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

In using the most common tool sets (which seem based on either SAX or MSXML), this requires extra work to get to the enumerated values and increases not only the difficulty of code, but the complexity of code. Add an element instantiating each to make coding simpler.

In the example above, this would be:

```
<xs:element name="optReasonEnumerated" type="eitc:OptReasonEnumeratedType"/>
```

This does not change the messages or the information content, but makes coding easier. It is also consistent with NIEM expectations, perhaps for the same reason.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-589] Update UML to match WD32 Schemas and replace all UML illustrations** Created: 23/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine

<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>

**Resolution:** Diagrams updated for wd33; further modifications to match wd34 schemas in progress.

**Description**  
Update UML to match WD32 Schemas and replace all UML illustrations

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 23/Oct/11 12:29 PM ]  
 Check-off to stay visible and in the queue  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:32 AM ]  
 Partially completed in wd32. Full update in progress for wd32, including sequence diagrams. Document diagrams still have ext\_ref, cleanup in progress.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]  
 Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**Collector for EiReport Issues** (ENERGYINTEROP-601)  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-590\] Report Service in Spec does not reflect all Operations; Split into separate section](#) Created: 23/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine

**Proposal:** Expand and clarify this section, and add appropriate schematics.  
 Split into separate section 10; this is no longer as closely related to Event as it was.

**Resolution:** It is now in its own section and includes an expanded set of operations

**Description**  
Report Service text in spec does not reflect the richness of the operations now in the report services (as evidenced in payloads.xml) , i.e., Report / Snap / Projection / Historian.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:34 AM ]  
 Updated to add split into separate section.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:34 AM ]  
 Moving to resolved; details TBD.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-591] Use consistent naming in Stream-derived types** Created: 23/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine

**Proposal:** rename eiReportPayload and associated type to reportPayload  
 pick a single pattern for IDs. I recommend dropping the ei

**Resolution:** rename eiReportPayload and associated type to reportPayload  
 to use a single pattern for IDs.  
 Drop "Ei" prefix on "small" things/types in the schema and specification.  
 Merge ReportPayload and EiReportPayload

**Description**  
Stream derived things are named inconsistently.  
 streamBase:

eiEventSignal, eiEventBaseline, eiReport, eiDelivery  
 streamPayloadBase  
 signalPayload, eventBaselinePayload, eiReportPayload, deliveryPayload  
 refID  
 signalID, baselinelID, eiReportID, eiDeliveryID,

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 23/Oct/11 01:00 PM ]  
 Assigning to Cox for comment  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:35 AM ]  
 I agree. "Big" things should start with Ei; non-Big things should not. General application through the spec.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 12:48 PM ]  
 To apply the changes (spec and schema)  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-592] Clean up inheritance and substitution in partyIDs** Created: 23/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Created abstract actorID Made all PartyIDs of type actorID Payloads will be cleaned up in a spearate process. Accepted Ed's comments on clarity in spec 3.2.1
--------------------	--

Description

In current schema, all PartyIDs are derived from PartyID (implicitly through substitution group). PartyID itself was previously abstract, and now is concrete. This periodically causes processing errors, particuarly when MinOccurs is allowed. For example:

For example, the type EiTarget includes (abbreviated)

```
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="eitc:venID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
<xs:element ref="eitc:partyID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
</xs:sequence>
```

As currently defined a venID is a PartyID, so the processor may be unable to determine whether a listed venID is one of the unbounded venIDs or the first of the unbounded partyIDs. This only occurs because of the indeterminacy of the count of venID above. there would be no problem if, for example, venID was specified as minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 23/Oct/11 01:12 PM ]  
 From the spec: <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-xmlschema-1-20041028/#cos-nonambig>

Schema Component Constraint: Unique Particle Attribution

A content model must be formed such that during

- validation- of an element information item sequence, the particle component contained directly, indirectly or - implicitly- therein with which to attempt to - validate- each item in the sequence in turn can be uniquely determined without examining the content or attributes of that item, and without any information about the items in the remainder of the sequence.  
 Note: This constraint reconstructs for XML Schema the equivalent constraints of [XML 1.0 (Second Edition)] and SGML. Given the presence of element substitution groups and wildcards, the concise expression of this constraint is difficult, see Analysis of the Unique Particle Attribution Constraint (non-normative) (\$H) for further discussion.  
 Since this constraint is expressed at the component level, it applies to content models whose origins (e.g. via type derivation and references to named model groups) are no longer evident. So particles at different points in the content model are always distinct from one another, even if they originated from the same named model group.

Note: Because locally-scoped element declarations may or may not have a {target namespace}, the scope of declarations is not relevant to enforcing either of the two preceding constraints.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 23/Oct/11 01:21 PM ]

This is a new issue. Previously, partyID was abstract and all instances of PartyID named, c.f., enrolleePartyId, registreePartyID, etc.

In this WD, we have moved aggressively to adopt the Party/CounterParty terminology for transactive services with the resulting use of partyID, counterPartyID in numerous payloads. This broke our ability to have a non-specific "partyID" in payloads (which was quite useful) as well as the ability to distinguish between a single instance of, say, counterPartyID and partyID.

Two paths are visible:

- 1) generic abstract version becomes "Actor", with the abstract "actorID" being used for all type-safe generic references. PartyID would then be demoted to stand alongside the other ActorID-derived types. This would require re-writing the beginning of section 5.
- 2) make partyID abstract again, and use another terminology for pairs in Transactive messages, i.e., partyID and countnerPartyID. This causes problems in the type party whis currently concrete but would then have an abstract ID which would require substitution in any communication. That "might" be a good thing.

Whenever this is done, several payloads would require review to make sure their cardinality is correct.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 23/Oct/11 07:50 PM ]

Repeat of comment posted to list but not to JIRA in error.

In Section 3.1we begin with use of the term Actor where in a Party is an Actor in a Transactive Interaction. A Party can be a customer, generator, retail service provider, ISO, etc.

However when we get to Section 3.2.1 An Actor is a VTN or VEN, but someone has adder "Actors or Parties" to the text which confuses.

My sense is Path 1 is best.

An Actor may be both a Party and a VEN or VTN.

An Actor in VEN/VEN interactions participates not as a Party but as a VTN or VEN.

An Actor in Transactive interaction participates not as a VNT or VEN but as a Party.

As a separate issue, I am still confused between a Resource and a VTN in EI. Would it not be more accurate to recognize the VTN Actor as A Resource Actor or a Virtual Resource? This is how Gale Horst defined it in the EPRI White Paper.

And in his paper a VTN is a REC (Resource Energy Controller). A REC then can be a VEN to a lower level REC and that VEN acts as a virtual resource to the REC/VTN.

This structure I think fits with the concept of a "virtual power plant" and DR as a "resource".

In other words, if a VEN is a Resource do we need Resource as a separate construct in EI?

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 23/Oct/11 08:38 PM ]

Based on Ed K's use case in Issue 585:

PG&E is an Actor.

For Transactive Services, the Actor PG&E enrolls as a Party in any Transactive Market Context such as the WSCC Bilateral Market.

For a DR Program such as CPP, the Actor PG&E enrolls as a VTN in the PG&E CPP DR Program Market Context.

EdKea, the Customer is an Actor that may enroll as a Party in any Transactive Market Contexts that may be available in some states.

EdKea the Customer is an Actor that may enroll as Actors multiple Resources in the various DR Programs available to it in its various jurisdictions.

Each Resource is a VEN to the VTN for the DR Program it which it is enrolled.

Resources can be Stores or Floors in Stores as an Example.

As is convenient for EdKea, it can create EdKea private DR Programs with by creating a new VTN/VEN interaction where the VTN is a controller to a set of Resources such as floors in a store and where each floor is a Resource or VTN. Or it may expose each Floor as a Resource (VTN) to the PG&E VTN by enrolling each Floor in teh PG&E DR CPP Program.

Yes, as Ed K says, all of this is complicated and confusing. In the real world we deal with parties in transactive market where only the energy or capacity is transacted and where options on such may be used. In the real world we also deal with DR programs managed by a DR Operator who manages a set of curtailment and DER resources.

The terminology of VEN and VTN is new and we will have to see if it is useful for more than architecture. But is is clear that we should not confuse a Party in Transactive Market with a virtual Resource in a DR market. The Resource is not a Party.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 27/Oct/11 01:28 PM ]

TC agreed on Path 1 in Oct 26 meeting.

The deeper issue of usage of Party, Resouces, VENs, VTNs to be subject of a separate issue.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-593] Recommended edits to WD32 payloads for transactive services.** Created: 23/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	WD32 SPEC		

<b>Proposal:</b>	EiPayloads 583: change maxOccurs to "1"
	EiPayloads 732: change maxOccurs to "1"
<b>Resolution:</b>	Changed both counterParty IDs to minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1" as proposed

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-594] Clarify the meaning and usage of the terms Actor, Entity, Party, VTN, VEN & Resource in WD32** Created: 25/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Clarify text as needed. Eliminate use of "Enrolling Entity".
--------------------	--

Description

In WD 32 Entity is used for enrollment but not elsewhere. Is an Entity an organization or individual? Is a Resource an Entity or Actor?

Are VTN and VENS Parties or can a VEN be a Resource and not a Party? Just a few of the questions.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 10:14 AM ]

The classes that inherited from EnrollingEntityType are now inheriting (wd32) from EnrolleeType. This is because "Enrolling" is ambiguous - is it the thing that's enrolling, or the one that's writing it down - so we now have Enrollee and EnrollAdmin.

The text uses "entity" and should not.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-595] RequestStatus should be replaced by EiRequestEvent** Created: 26/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Remove references to EiStatus (line 1218) and EiRequestResponseSchedule (line 1630)
<b>Resolution:</b>	Remove references to EiStatus (line 1218) and EiRequestResponseSchedule (line 1630). (See <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-600</a> for operations related to this capability.)

Description

In examining the payloads and earlier wd interaction patterns, the Status interaction seems to be covered completely by EiRequestEvent. I suggest removing references to EiStatus service operations.

wd32 Line 1615 lists EiRequestResponseSchedule which seems to be the same thing.

Comments

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 26/Oct/11 11:43 AM ]

Before finalizing this decision we should discuss. There was identified a use case in the OADR Alliance wherein the Status was being pushed from the VEN to the VTN. There does not seem to be an equivalent operation in the EIEvent service.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 02:26 PM ]

Resolved in TC meeting 201111027. Emailed EITC list and Ed Koch regarding comment today.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for EiReport Issues** (ENERGYINTEROP-601)

**[ENERGYINTEROP-596] Ei Report Issues** Created: 26/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Hard to say until I get better clarity on how EiReports works.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Re-write if Section 10 (perviously 9.2) for further clarity

Description

Inie 1088 Reports put the onus on VTN's to configure the report 5.4. Not necessarily true that a party requests any party to prepare a report. In some cases the VE N specifies the report.

line 1089 what are the historian and projection services?

line 1094 the report specified only seems to be appropriae for periodic repeating measurements.

Section 5.4.1.2 should be a subsection to 5.4.1.1

5.4 is hard to comprehend and I don't know how to use the structures defined.

9.2 seems incomplete and I can't comprehend how it is related to section 5.4

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 28/Oct/11 05:58 PM ]

Report Schedule includes scheduling a one-time report.

Expanded section 10 (was 9.2) to better address these issues.

Recommend leaving open until Ed can review WD33

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:17 PM ]

I believe that a partial rewrite is in process; Toby should evaluate and address.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 03:15 PM ]

No, Bill.

Re-write was in Wd33. I need further feedback.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-597] Add an Interval to Request and Reply payloads to limit responses to that interval if present** Created: 26/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox - See Also <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-595</a> and <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-600</a>		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Make It So.
--------------------	-------------

Description

From the EITC Meeting discussion 20111027.

Add an xcal.IntervalType [0..1] to each Request payload, and each Reply payload where appropriate, to indicate that only results that touch that time interval should be included.

This allows (e.g.) EiRequestEvent to reply with only the events that are (say) current and in the next week, or alternatively, any past events that you know about.

This also addresses issues related to EiStatus (see [ENERGYINTEROP-595](#)) and the proposed EiPushPendingEvent operation (see [ENERGYINTEROP-600](#) )

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 03:18 PM ]

Should also clarify the Request format and limitation to cited items if present; belongs in Section 5 as a new section.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Oct/11 12:02 PM ]

Adjusted requests.

What is wanted in the Responses? If requested, re-iteration of Interval that was used?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 27/Oct/11 09:18 PM ]

No, on re-examination I don't see any place that an interval needs to be in the "reply" -- you know what you asked for. I guess there's an extra error condition, interval has nothing in it, but we already have a return of zero items.

In short ignore ", and each Reply payload where appropriate," -- I'll update the description at another time.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**Collector for EiReport Issues** ([ENERGYINTEROP-601](#))

**[ENERGYINTEROP-598] The EiReport service interactions for Historian - eliminate StopHistorian, add flag to CancelHistorian to indicate "send final report"** Created: 26/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox - EITC 20111026		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Eliminate StopHistorian and StoppedHistorian.  Add to the CancelHistorian payload:  sendFinalReport: boolean [1..1] - if absent or false, stop the historian and market buffered data for deletion. If true send a final report using the reportID  reportID [0..1] MUST be present if sendFinalReport is true. Indicates what report to send the next/final of to take care of all flushed data. Normal rules apply for when the buffered data is marked for deletion or implicitly marked.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Eliminate StopHistorian and StoppedHistorian.  Add to the CancelHistorian payload:  reportToFollow: boolean [1..1] - if absent or false, stop the historian. If true send a final report using the updateReport

reportID [0..1] MUST be present if reportToFollow is true. Indicates what report to send the next/final of to take care of all flushed data. Normal rules apply for when the buffered data is marked for deletion or implicitly marked.

**Description**

Discussion was around eliminating StopHistorian versus CancelHistorian. The former indicates that the rest of the recorded information may be picked up, the latter to discard.

Gerry Gray suggested that a flag on CancelHistorian that says either  
 (a) Stop what you're doing on this and you can toss everything you've saved, or  
 (b) Stop what you're doing on this and send a final report  
 would fit the interaction patterns better (rejected approach: add "ChangeHistorian" to say "stop" etc -- too much complexity)

BUT the historian is NOT the one sending the reports. It only records.

So the change would be to add SendFinalReport: boolean to CancelHistorian AND to include a reportID so you know what report to finalize and send. In this way the receiver can call their internal code to mimic a "send final report" with the reportID, AND stop the Historian at the appropriate time.

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 05:03 PM ]

Bulk open. No email.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-599] Ensure that the schema headers and metadata from PR02 schemas are in the schemas for wd33 et seq** Created: 26/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

**Resolution:** Update headers as described.

**Description**

In talking to the TC Admin, it will speed up the public review process to have the PR02 schema headers/notices included now in the working schemas.

**Comments**

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 05:03 PM ]

Bulk open. No email.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Oct/11 10:03 PM ]

But I though we agreed that the Schema Headers were non-normative, and included security that should be composed in...

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Nov/11 02:54 PM ]

Moving to resolved for publication/vote on schemas.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-600] Create RequestPendingEvents/ReplyPendingEvent operations in EiEvent Service: add definition of "Pending"**

Created: 26/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">service</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Gerald Gray</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox and Ed Koch		

**Proposal:** Add service operation and definition as suggested in the Description  
**Resolution:** The requested Operations were added to WD33. They were re-worked under numerous Jira issues defining Pending, Active, etc in WD34. Closing. If there are still issues, please open a new Jira issue referencing a later version.

**Description**

See also [ENERGYINTEROP-596](#) and [ENERGYINTEROP-597](#). This partially addresses [ENERGYINTEROP-484](#) (previously closed).

The following use case was described:

A VEN pushes a list of the event IDs it's working on to its VTN. This can be symmetric, allowing for push of relevant and/or restricted set of Event IDs.

The events are those that are "pending".

This relates to text using pending at table/text lines 1011, 1164, 1344, and 1869.

Add a definition of Pending:

A PENDING event is one where the present time is within the closed interval from and including the notification time, and to and including the end time.

(in other words, the present is in the [notification-time, end-of-event-time] closed interval)

I propose that the service be named not Status (because it's not clearly event status) but "EiPushPendingEvents".

Source is either Ven or VTN. May be limited to those that the sender wants to communicate. No response, as it's a hint and oneway.

Attributes of the request:

List of EventIDs, possibly empty

VEN ID [0..1]

VTN ID [0..1]

emix:MarketContextType [0..1] - if absent, relationships in any market context that the destination and source of the request are engaged in.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 04:43 PM ]

Assigning to GGray regarding operation name.

Comment by [Gerald Gray](#) [ 26/Oct/11 04:50 PM ]

In the attempt to limit the set of verbs we use (Create/Created, Request/Reply, Cancel/Canceled, Delete/Deleted, Distribute) I would suggest

CreatePendingEvent

However, I wonder, if these are events what is it about the current Event object that is unsatisfactory?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 05:19 PM ]

Following up on GGray's comment, this differs from EiRequestEvent in three important ways:

(1) It returns IDs only (could do this with a flag that says "just return IDs")

(2) It returns only PENDING events, those that overlap the present moment

(3) It's a push operation (In that sense, RequestEvents is a pull - you ask for the events you know about and you get the events back, which includes the ID) combined with (1) - only IDs.

I've changed this to EiRequestPendingEvents/EiReplyPendingEvents.

Note that pushing will happen on an application defined schedule.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-601] Collector for EiReport Issues** Created: 26/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

Sub-Tasks:	Key	Summary	Type	Status	Assignee
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-590</a>	<a href="#">Report Service in Spec does not refle...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-596</a>	<a href="#">Ei Report Issues</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Toby Considine
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-598</a>	<a href="#">The EiReport service interactions for...</a>	Sub-task	Closed	William Cox
	<a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-614</a>	<a href="#">EiReports section is still very unclear</a>	Sub-task	Closed	Ed Koch

**Resolution:** Moving to resolved as all sub-issues resolved

Description

Collector for EiReport-related issues starting with wd32

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 26/Oct/11 05:03 PM ]

Bulk open. No email.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-602] Enroll Service spec uses Enrolling Entity; list is incorrect and incomplete wd32-1535. Operations are incorrect. Spec is not synchronized with Schema** Created: 26/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema, spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox related to <a href="#">ENERGYINTEROP-566</a>
<b>Proposal:</b>	Correct section to match (evolving) model and schema.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Verified that WD 32 matches this description

**Description**  
 Section 8 Enroll Service is seriously out of date and has duplication. This will be an expanding list of items to correct/change/add.

Table 1535:  
 This is EnrolleeType, not EnrollingEntity.  
 Customer is not one of the items--this reflects a buy-sell relationship and is ambiguous. Entity is no longer used except with specific name ("Load Serving Entity" and "SchedulingEntity" below). These names reflect IRC and NAESB submissions.

The subtypes are  
 Aggregator  
 Consumer  
 Distribution  
 Resource  
 EnrollingAuthority  
 Generator  
 Lse  
 Market  
 MeterAuthority  
 SchedulingEntity  
 ServiceProvider  
 Supplier  
 SystemOperator  
 Tdsp  
 Transmission

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 27/Oct/11 11:35 AM ]  
 All are in WD32 schemas.

Resource is named differently than the rest, as EirResource. Changed to match.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-603] Editorial comments wd32 Section 4** Created: 26/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	As in the description
--------------------	-----------------------

**Description**  
 Editorial:

Line 664: change "EMIX, which itself incorporates WS-Calendar" to "EMIX, which defines Schedules and types conforming to WS-Calendar"

Line 671: change "are here" to "are listed here"

Line 711 wording "...and nothing herein is meant to redefine or modify those definitions" -- compare to wording on line 670-671. The earlier lines are before the table, the 711 line is after. Put both before their respective tables and make the wording the same.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-605] Issues with figures and tables in wd32** Created: 27/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Make corrections and update as shown.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Make corrections and update as shown.

Description

I've separately uploaded at [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/44142/WD32\\_Figures\\_Tables\\_20111027-B.xlsx](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/44142/WD32_Figures_Tables_20111027-B.xlsx) a spreadsheet showing all figures and tables in wd32.  
 Comments are noted on each item that needs specific changes.  
 Many are "update and correct UML"; some are interaction diagrams.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:16 PM ]  
 Changes done and applied in wd33; some further changes in wd34 include schema updates reflected in the diagrams. Closing this as it's on wd32.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-606] Payload issues with wd32** Created: 27/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">model</a> , <a href="#">schema</a> , <a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Apply detailed changes to payloads and types as required. Update specification after the payload diagrams and schemas are synchronized.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Apply detailed changes to payloads and types as required. Update specification after the payload diagrams and schemas are synchronized.

Description

Several major issues need addressing post wd32! This is with respect to the payloads.xsd in wd32 schemas, and compares the spec and specific changes. This is a high level list, as many details need changes in the payloads.  
 When I have a detailed spreadsheet together showing each detail it will be linked here.  
 (1) Payloads are missing (e.g. along the way some changes reflected in posted diagrams are not in the schema)  
 (2) Some are changed due to other Jira items (e.g. eliminating StopHistorian/StoppedHistorian, EiRequestStatus)  
 (3) other additions (e.g. the IDs of pending events, in another Jira item) need to be applied. (e.g. EiCreateReportType needs vtnID , partyID, eiReportRequest 1..\*, and requestorParty;) - must be validated and coordinated with other work including update of Report section.  
 The full class-by-class description is in progress and will be linked here as mentioned above.  
 Work should not start adjusting payload diagrams, schemas, and detailed changes until the full set is uploaded.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-607] A Comment and Recommended Resolution on Multiplicity in EI Transactions and Tenders in EI WD33.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	I recommend alternative 2 for EI Release 1.0 and recommend deferring consideration and design of alternative 1 to a Post EI 1.0 Release.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Apply allternative 2 for EI Release 1.0 and recommend deferring consideration and design of alternative 1 to a Post EI 1.0 Release.

Description

In theory the potential multiplicity in Transactions is unlimited:

One can contemplate  
 1 Party to 1 Party Transactions,  
 n Party to 1 Party Transactions, and  
 n Party to m Party Transactions.

Additionally, any transaction can be for 1 interval or multiple intervals, and any Transaction can be for 1 EMIX product or many.

Tenders have the multiplicity of Transactions plus additional potential multiplicity such as:

For an n Party to m Party Tender are one or more Transactions for a subset of the Party and CounterParties allowed or must all n to m Tenders accepted as a single Transaction?

And is the EMIX quantity for each Tender Integral Only or not ( all of the tendered quantity must be transacted or none)?

In practice most tenders and transactions are bilateral (1 Party to 1 Party) for a single product. This is because of complex negotiation and default issues in complex transactions. And where complex m to n party transactions are desired, an exchange or clearing house is often the counter party to all of the Parties.

Market matching methods are out of scope for EI. It would seem we have two choices for Transaction and Tender multiplicity in EI.

1. Allow unlimited multiplicity and expect implementers to restrict the multiplicity. Either restriction is by conformance rules or by using as yet undeveloped restrictions on multiplicity communicated in the Market Context.
2. Allow only 1 party to 1 party transactions and tenders for 1 EMIX Product on sequences of one or more intervals wherein the quantity in each interval is variable or integral only.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 11:08 AM ]

Although this comment was on WD33, it appears that the schemas in WD33 are already configured as suggested in the resolution

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-608] Glossary Definitions of Resources are muddled and inconsistent with EMIX.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Resource : Resource is a logical entity that is dispatchable. A Resource is solely responsible for its own response. The Resource can be Tendered to a CounterParty as an EMIX Product or as EMIX Resource Offers to a Counterparty. A Resource in a VEN/VTN relationship is a VEN.
<b>Resolution:</b>	A resource is a Thing, and has no responsibilities...update definition to match emix, omitting relationship text in Description and Proposal. See William Cox email to the EITC list 20111103

Description

2123 Resource (as used in Energy Interoperation): a Resource is a logical entity that is dispatchable. The  
 2124 Resource is solely responsible for its own response. A resource description specifies the  
 2125 performance envelope for a Resource. If a Resource can participate in multiple markets, it may  
 2126 have multiple descriptions.  
 2127 Resource (as defined in EMIX): A Resource is something that can describe its capabilities in a Tender  
 2128 into a market. How those Capabilities vary over time is defined by application of the Capability  
 2129 Description to a WS-Calendar Sequence. See [EMIX].

EMIX Resources are both dispatchable and can be tenders as capabilities. There seems to be no need for a distinction between an EI Resource and an EMIX Resource.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:27 PM ]

Resources are associated with Tenders, but are not themselves Tenders -- you don't offer the Resource, you offer its capabilities (and how you deliver is out of scope -- in particular, you may use multiple Resources to deliver on a promise).

A Resource is NOT an actor. A Resource is a Thing which may be associated in various ways with an actor.

This is in Appendix B, non-normative glossary, but should be fixed.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:30 PM ]

Normative definition is in referenced EMIX specification.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 04/Nov/11 01:38 PM ]

If a Resource (i.e. a generator ) is a "Thing" is a "Demand Response Resource" (a common industry term) a "Thing" or a "Virtual Thing" ?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 07/Nov/11 08:50 PM ]

Surely this depends.It might be as concrete as a single stone crusher, or as virtual as a thousand consumer systems, of which statistically 57% will respond.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-609] Muddled Resource / VEN definition in Table 3.1 vs. Figure 5-14.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		

<b>Proposal:</b>	A Resource is a VEN in a VTN/VEN relationship.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Close no action.

**Description**  
 Table 3-2 describes the floor of a building as a VEN where its VTN might be the building.  
 Figure 5-14 describes the floor of a building as one of several Resources of a VEN.  
 Which is correct?

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 01/Nov/11 08:25 PM ]  
 Both or either could be correct.  
 It could also be that 5-2 is presented to the outside, but is internally managed as in 3-2.  
 Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 02/Nov/11 01:01 AM ]  
 My view. Fundamentally, all VENs and VTNs are Resources and are not Parties. A VTN is a virtual Resource that aggregates (and may control or manage) a set of VEN Resources. Resources, VTNs and VENs are not Parties, they are Resources owned and managed by Parties. A Party can own and manage more than one Resource and hence several VTNs and VENs. Behind an ESI a Resource can be a building, a floor, a washing machine, or the motor in a washing machine. All may be owned by a single Party and all can be viewed as curtailment or dispatchable Resources, VENs and VTNs. Whether the Resources behind an ESI are exposed as VENs is up to the owning Party.  
 I advocate the Transactive Energy Model but Transactive Energy relies on a dispatchable control model inside the ESI. The VEN/VTN Resource model works there for Transactive Energy. Others that support the VEN/VTN model from the customer to the system operator can also cleanly work with VTNs and VENs as Resources and not Parties.  
 I propose that VENs and VTNs not be represented as Parties in EI and only owned by Parties.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:52 PM ]  
 The separation of actor roles from Resources is important; see William Cox email to EITC list 20111103.  
 Recommend reject change, as it's inconsistent with likely and planned deployment models.  
 More detail in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop/201111/msg00097.html>  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Nov/11 02:45 PM ]  
 Figure 5-14 is part of an example, not "The Way To Do Things." Likewise, Table 3-1 is a table of "Possible Actor Names" to illustrate the text in section 3.2.  
 There is no need to have these be exactly consistent, as they are examples and Possible names that MIGHT be relevant to deployment.  
 Recent email discussions may illuminate this issue in a later Note.  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop/201111/msg00097.html>  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Nov/11 02:46 PM ]  
 Editor may consider whether "example" needs to be near each cited location (wd33 lines 1172 and 599)  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]  
 Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-610] SignalTypeEnumeratedType has been completely changed and is no longer consistent with the way it was previously defined and used.</b> Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Blocker
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Go back to wd28 enumerated types and extend those. DO NOT remove items. The enumerations from that version were the following: <pre>&lt;xs:restriction base="xs:token"&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="signalDelta"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="signalPercent"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="signalLevel"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="signalPrice"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="signalPriceRelative"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="signalPriceMultiple"/&gt; &lt;xs:enumeration value="signalSetpoint"/&gt; &lt;/xs:restriction&gt;</pre>
<b>Resolution:</b>	added priceRelative and priceMultiplier signalTypes eliminated use of priceBase in payloadPrice, and added payloadTypes to use price/ priceRelative, and priceMultiplier directly.

**Description**  
 SignalTypeEnumeratedType has been completely changed and is no longer consistent with the way it was previously defined and used. Types that were previously there, not longer exist. If new types were needed then they should have been added to the list and previously defined types should not have been removed. With the new enumerated types we can no longer create singals that are factored the way we doing it through wd28 and would like to continue doing.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 05:39 PM ]

To support the conversation, putting current (wd33) enums in here

```
<xs:simpleType name="SignalTypeEnumeratedType">
<xs:enumeration value="delta">
<xs:enumeration value="level">
<xs:enumeration value="multiplier">
<xs:enumeration value="price">
<xs:enumeration value="product">
<xs:enumeration value="setpoint">
</xs:simpleType>
```

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 31/Oct/11 05:48 PM ]

I don't think "product" belongs here. Not sure what that really means. Other types have specific use cases that support integration with controls and systems within building. How does a "toaster" use this information?

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 31/Oct/11 08:36 PM ]

Before I suggest any changes, perhaps I simply don't understand how the previous set of enumerations map into the new set of enumerations. Obviously all the names have changed so maybe I'm just missing something. If someone can please show me a one to one mapping from old enums to new enums then perhaps I'm wrong and no changes are necessary at all. Otherwise it looks to me like some of the attributes that were in the previous version are no longer in the new version and some of the constructs we use to use which allowed us to insure that the same signal type was instantiated across all the signal intervals can no longer be done. Again I have no problem adding signal types, but taking them away actually has consequences.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 31/Oct/11 08:45 PM ]

In addition to my earlier comment on "product" enum value, I don't know why the use of "setpoint" was singled out -- are we sending the direct load control messages to the devices -- what are the other devices? Why temperature use case specifically? I haven't heard any detailed discussions on this.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 31/Oct/11 09:22 PM ]

Yes this deserves more discussion.

A set point can be a thermostat set point or as the ISO uses it a generator set point.

It is direct load control, good or bad.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 31/Oct/11 11:02 PM ]

The purpose of setpoint is to specify a specific load level objective which is not direct load control.

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 01/Nov/11 12:46 AM ]

Sorry, I am confused -- is it DLC or not?

What's the load level communicated with setpoint type?

We need some good understanding and consensus among the members before we include any types in our data models.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 01/Nov/11 02:37 AM ]

Assuming that the new enumeration which says setpoint is the same as the old enumeration that said signalSetpoint then an example value would be setpoint = 400 KW. We started using the term setpoint a long time ago when it was submitted in a JIRA and discussed at one of our meetings. We started using the term setpoint because we realized that in OpenADR 1.0 we only had a single type for absolute load levels and we needed to have both a delta offset and an absolute setpoint which we did not have in OpenADR 1.0. In fact it may have been me that decided to use the term setpoint because that is the term most often used by the ISO when they send out dispatch levels. No this is not DLC.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 01/Nov/11 02:51 AM ]

It would behoove everyone to go back and look at JIRA 468. This is where we added the setpoint and delta types and coincidentally this is also where we added the priceRelative and the priceMultiplier types that seem to have disappeared recently for some reason. I think there is a VERY simple fix to this issue to put it back where it was, but I want to wait for Toby to clarify the semantics and mapping from the old schema to the new schema.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 01/Nov/11 09:48 AM ]

Tracing the semantics of SignalType

There were four changes in the enumerated signal types since WD28 WIP4: naming convention, multiplier, and prices, and product.

1) Naming convention - eliminate signal from each enum

I considered whether I could make messages even larger by moving from

```
< signalType>signalLevel</signalType>
```

to

```
< signalTypeforEiSignal>signalLevelForTHisIntervalOfTheEiSignal</signalTypeforEiSignal>
```

but instead decided the pattern below would be adequately precise.

```
< signalType>level</signalType>
```

2) Raised the issue of muddy semantic of percent and proposed changing to multiplier to match the semantics of price in a Jira issue

<http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-570>

After three weeks with no comments, applied the issue as part of wd33

3) Prices.

In a quorate vote, the TC votes to use the semantics of EMIX for price. The signal semantics for were changed from those of EMIX to a similar but not identical price semantic, and then back a few times and reached its current semantics with WD28 WIP4.

The signal-type-based semantics came in with WD24, which was followed by the TC vote, and then changed back by me after a comment from Ed K one Saturday (WD27?) and then were changed back in WD28 WIP4. The stable point for the Alliance plug-fest was WD28 WIP8.

The non-alignment, non-normalization was identified as a critical issue back in August. This issue has added weight because we use the EMIX semantics in many payloads, including optionally in has added weight because we use the EMIX semantics in many payloads, including optionally in product-based event signals.

Price now indicates an emix:PriceBase in the payload, with a conformance rule that the price type in all payloads in a given signal be identical.

4) signalEmix became signalProduct became product

In EMIX, an EMIX Base is an abstractType for a schedule. An EMIX Product is a concrete representation in which a Product Description is place inside each interval of a schedule. In this Signal Type, an EMIX Product Description is conveyed as the payload in each interval of the compressed format Stream.

It seemed that this Type was semantically an EI optimization of the Product, hence the signal type "Product"

Hope this clarifies how we got to "this" point.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 01/Nov/11 09:53 AM ]

In an unrelated issue, the enumeration "Product" appears twice in the schema.

Documentation of all types appear in the schema. For setpoint, it is, as Ed K describes...

"Signal indicates a target amount of units (denominated in Itembase or in the EMIX Product). Payload Type is Quantity"

Consistent with the description in the previous comment, this should probably be

"Signal indicates a target amount of units (denominated in Itembase or in the EMIX Product Description). Payload Type is Quantity"

Comment by [Girish Ghatikar](#) [ 01/Nov/11 08:36 PM ]

It makes sense to have the load level described in two types:

1. Load Amount to shed
2. Load Amount to go to (from the current levels).

The terms setpoint is confusing. The standard term is used regularly in HVAC language as temperature set-points! We need to come up with a better term so the names make sense (just like we did for others).

I still don't understand Toby's comment on "product" and need better explanation. While being well aware of the "quorate" vote, it was specific to the price information for multiple, and relative represented via EMIX – The description of product seems confusing. I don't understand it's use or relation to the explanation.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/11 11:46 AM ]

(per meeting) Add priceMultiplier and priceRelative as signalTypes

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-611] Inconsistency between the eiCreateEvent and eiCreatedEvent payloads with respect to response codes and/or reference id's** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	none yet
<b>Resolution:</b>	Added requestID to this and many other payloads.

**Description**

Inconsistency between the eiCreateEvent and eiCreatedEvent payloads with respect to response codes and/or reference id's. What does eiCreatedEvent:eiResponse:refID refer to? Furthermore eiCreateEvent:eiResponse seems to be unnecessary and redundant with eiCreateEvent:eventResponses:eventResponse.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:19 PM ]

They should be consistent.

Their should be a message/transmittal ID of the CreateEvent. That Message ID should be in the refID for the eiResponse

There may 1-unlimited events in the message, each of which has an EventId. That array of Events leads to the array of eventResponses.

Created does this. Changed does not. Changed should be made like Created.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:21 PM ]

(of course, it could be eventMessageld, but that is a conversation swooping across several oter Jirs issues, and the answer here should reflect the answer to the others,)

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-612] eiDistributeEvent:eiTarget is redundant with eiDistributeEvent:eiTarget:eiTarget,** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Delete eiDistributeEvent:eiTarget.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Make eiDistributeEvent:eiTarget optional

**Description**

eiDistributeEvent:eiTarget is redundant with eiDistributeEvent:eiTarget:eiTarget,

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:11 PM ]

I am guessing this is eiDistributeEvent:eiTarget is redundant with eiDistributeEvent:eiEvent:eiTarget?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-613] Need to change cardinality of eiDistributeEvent:eiEvent to 1..many.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
----------------	--------

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">errata</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change cardinality of eiDistributeEvent:eiEvent to 1..many.
<b>Resolution:</b>	EiDistributeEvent Payload has 1..* cardinality.

**Description**  
Need to change cardinality of eiDistributeEvent:eiEvent to 1..many.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 30/Oct/11 09:58 PM ]  
 This issue was reported incorrectly. The schema is fine in this regard.  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 06:00 PM ]  
 Back around the workflow to get the resolution clear.

**Collector for EIReport Issues** ([ENERGYINTEROP-601](#))  
[\[ENERGYINTEROP-614\] EIReports section is still very unclear](#) Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Sub-task	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	The section should start with a basic description of the core functionality and what is trying to be accomplished which is to exchange report information. Describe what reports are and the services that are used to describe the exchange of reports. After that you can start laying on some of the support services that MAY (let me re-emphasize the word MAY) be used to control the reporting behaviour and define the meta-data. Again the latter services are necessary evils and should not be required for the VEN to send the VTN a simpler report. Perhaps we should find someone other than Toby to write this section to make sure that there is at least more than one person that understands this stuff.
<b>Resolution:</b>	See narrative in the comments. Section rewritten for wd34.

**Description**  
 I honestly still do not understand how to use the EIReports to do some of the very simple feedback use cases that I want to support. The sections seems to be a muddled collection of services and it is not clear what services are really required and how you would use them. There seem to be a bunch of bureaucratic services for creating "historians" and "report specifications", but how they are tied together and used is very unclear. If I can't understand this then I honestly don't know how someone coming into this cold has a hope of understanding it.  
 For example on line 1707 it says "EiReport is prepared by a Party upon request and supplied to the requesting party. It may also be defined in the expectations of the Market Context." Does this mean that the only way a report can be generated is by request? The simple use cases deployed today do not require any registrations or report specification services or any of this overhead. The report specifications and what not are created by convention and while some systems may want to employ all these extra meta data services they should not be required.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Oct/11 06:22 PM ]  
 Could you describe the few simple feedback cases you want to support, in English (no need for xml), so I can demonstrate (or fail) how to use the report services?  
 thanks  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 31/Oct/11 10:00 PM ]  
 It would help if someone could describe the operations used and show some xml artifacts for the following simple scenario:  
 VEN is configured by convention (i.e. no historian or report specifications need be exchanged) to allow the VEN to report the following to the VTN.  
 VEN is configured to PUSH reports to the VTN periodically with the following characteristics:  
 data source = meter1  
 data set = usage information  
 data source - meter2  
 data set = usage information  
 usage information for both meters is collected at 15 minute intervals and reported every 15 minutes, BUT on occasion communications goes down for an hour and the next time the VEN pushes a report it must send all the usage information that has not been previously transmitted, i.e. instead of normally sending a single meter reading it occasionally sends 4.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 01/Nov/11 08:23 PM ]  
 Thanks.  
 That's very clear.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Nov/11 03:10 PM ]  
 Bringing over from where miss-posted on 621  
 If we take Ed's example:  
 One can certainly define a Historian whose purpose is to measure Real Power at an Emix Interface at a granularity of 15 minute intervals.  
 One can define a reportBack Duration for that historian of every 15 minutes.  
 If the [VTN] is unreachable, the application could keep or toss the reading. It is a conformance spec to declare the application should save un-delivered reading for eventual delivery instead of discarding. I think

specifying that behavior is out of scope. I am open to adding a flag.

So: That says we can define the report. When we define a report and create a schedule, we have a request and therefore a reportRequestID. That could be standardized. Let's say its name is OpenADR20-favorite.

We can specify that a VEN must deliver OpenADR20-favorite and put it in the market context. It can be Requested, so folks can find out what it is. It can be a pre-loaded into every Alliance-certified system so it is always known.

That is a reasonable white-paper topic. Is there anything else we need?

[ Show » ] Toby Considine added a comment - 04/Nov/11 03:14 PM If we take Ed's example: One can certainly define a Historian whose purpose is to measure Real Power at an Emix Interface at a granularity of 15 minute intervals. One can define a reportBack Duration for that historian of every 15 minutes. If the [VTN] is unreachable, the application could keep or toss the reading. It is a conformance spec to declare the application should save un-delivered reading for eventual delivery instead of discarding. I think specifying that behavior is out of scope. I am open to adding a flag. So: That says we can define the report. When we define a report and create a schedule, we have a request and therefore a reportRequestID. That could be standardized. Let's say its name is OpenADR20-favorite. We can specify that a VEN must deliver OpenADR20-favorite and put it in the market context. It can be Requested, so folks can find out what it is. It can be a pre-loaded into every Alliance-certified system so it is always known. That is a reasonable white-paper topic. Is there anything else we need?

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Nov/11 03:11 PM ]

Assigned to look at what's remaining (if anything) per comments.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 06/Nov/11 12:19 PM ]

Although I still believe the reports may be difficult to approach for a newbie, I have reviewed the reports schema in wd34 and believe this to be resolved from my perspective.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-615] Assymetry between the eiCreateEvent, eiDistributeEvent, and eiReplyEvent in that they should all contain the vtNID.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd32</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add eiCreateEvent:vtNID, eiDistributeEvent:vtNID.
<b>Resolution:</b>	add vtNIDs (mandatory) as shown.

Description

Assymetry between the eiCreateEvent, eiDistributeEvent, and eiReplyEvent in that they should all contain the vtNID. Add eiCreateEvent:vtNID, eiDistributeEvent:vtNID.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:08 PM ]

This makes sense as far as it goes, in the Event services. There are hard issues if one were to try to extend this to transactive services where the concept of VTN and VEN are meaningless.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-616] 7.5.5 Full Requirments Verification - what is it?** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Drop Section 7.5.2
<b>Resolution:</b>	Drop Section 7.5.2

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:00 PM ]

Placeholder from earlier drafts; delete section.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-617] Change EiDelivery to use EMIXBase and change Service names to Request and Reply.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>

<b>Proposal:</b>	see above.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Edelivery now uses the EMIX-Base derived emix:delivery

Description

EiDelivery

EiDelivery is basically a request to a meter at an EMIXInterface, or to a data service hosting the meter data. The request is for the energy delivered for in each measurement interval during a request interval. The requestorParty is any authorized Party. The MarketContext will specify the measurement interval duration, units, injection Boolean, etc. Effectively, the payload for each measurement interval will be MarketContextUID, StartTime, and Quantity

It would seem that the only two services required are EiRequestDelivery and EiReplyDelivery. The current spec uses EiCreateDelivery and EiCreatedDeliver which is confusing.

If we think of CreateDelivery as creating the delivery record in memory at the meter or in a database, then CreateDelivery is out of scope, I assume.

Having reviewed the application of the simplified report structure and its use of streams, I can see no benefit and perhaps complexity and cost to that structure over EMIXBase for this application. Also since EiReport is new, I suggest we use EMIXBase for EiDelivery. EiReport can still be used by practitioners if it meets their needs for delivery information.

Note the UML Diagrams for EiDelivery are out of date.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]  
 Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-618] WD33 Transactive EiPayloads Schema Comments and Corrections</b> Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>

<b>Proposal:</b>	See changes above.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Resolved as per description and comments

Description

Transactive EiPayloads Schema Comments and Corrections

808 <xs:documentation>Tender Indicates a specific offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for any number of EmixBase derived types, and the Tender is treated as all-or-none.</xs:documentation>

Change to:

808 <xs:documentation>Tender is an offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for any number of EmixBase derived types. If more than one EMIXBase the a Tender for all EMIXBases must be transacted once or none transacted. .</xs:documentation>

819 <xs:documentation>A specific offer to sell for a particular price. A Quote can be for any number of EmixBase derived types, and the Quote is treated as all-or-none.</xs:documentation>

Change to:

819 <xs:documentation>An Indication of the price of a possible Tender such as the transacted price of a previous Tender or a published forecast of a price of a possible Tender. A Quote can be for any number of EmixBase derived types.</xs:documentation>

830 <xs:documentation>A Transaction is a specific agreement to accept a specific Tender or Tenders.</xs:documentation>

Change to:

830 <xs:documentation>A Transaction is a specific agreement to accept a specific Tender.</xs:documentation>

833 <xs:element ref="ei:transactionID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>  
 834 <xs:element ref="ei:tenderID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>  
 835 <xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>

Change to:

833 <xs:element ref="ei:transactionID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>  
 834 <xs:element ref="ei:tenderID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>  
 835 <xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>

See Jira 607 to explain above changes.

812 <xs:documentation>Request for usage [delivery], Party-to-Party, specifying interval, what is to be measured, and the direction for the measurement.</xs:documentation>

Change to:

812 <xs:documentation>Request for usage or generation [delivery] at an EMIXInterface by a requestor Party, specifying interval, what is to be measured, and the direction for the measurement.</xs:documentation>

See separate Jira 617 on EiDelivery

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 31/Oct/11 10:58 AM ]

808 <xs:documentation>Tender is an offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for any number of EmixBase derived types. If more than one EMIXBase the a Tender for all EMIXBases must be transacted once or none transacted. .</xs:documentation>

819 <xs:documentation>An Indication of the price of a possible Tender such as the transacted price of a previous Tender or a published forecast of a price of a possible Tender. A Quote can be for any number of EmixBase derived types.</xs:documentation>

In previous comment, above two documentations should be changed to:

808 <xs:documentation>Tender is an offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for one EmixBase derived type.</xs:documentation>

819 <xs:documentation>An Indication of the price of a possible Tender such as the transacted price of a previous Tender or a published forecast of a price of a possible Tender. A Quote can be for one EmixBase derived type.</xs:documentation>

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-619] WD33 Figure 8-1 Service Consumer should be Actor and Service Provider should be EnrollAdminParty.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>	<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet

<b>Proposal:</b>	see summary
<b>Resolution:</b>	WD33 Figure 8-1 Service Consumer should be Actor and Service Provider should be EnrollAdminParty.

Description

WD33 Figure 8-1 Service Consumer should be Actor and Service Provider should be EnrollAdminParty.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-620] Mismatch between eiCreateEvent and eiChangeEvent** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None	<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>	<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Lets get Create/Created Event just write (see other Jira Issues, including ones on uis vs mod num) and then make Change/Changed match
------------------	---

Description

This is NOT a new issue. If the previous JIRA was closed on this topic then it was obviously ignored. The following problems exist in the Event payloads:

eiCreatedEvent should be IDENTICAL to eiChangedEvent. Changing an event is the same thing logically to deleting and creating a new event and the reponses from the VEN should have all the same attributes as if it had.

Furthermore the eiCreateEvent and the eiChangeEvent allow your to specify multiple events, BUT the eiCreatedEvent and eiChangedEvent only allow you to respond to a single event.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:03 PM ]

I assume the title should be "Mismatch between eiCreateEvent and eiChangeEvent"?

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:09 PM ]

Correct.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 04:45 PM ]

If I have event7 mod-2, and you have event-7 mod 7, and we RESTfully pick up from the server a ChangedEvent that defines event-7 Mod-11, do we each do the same thing, i.e., I delte 2, you delete 7, and we both have mod 11 afterwards. In other words, is the EventID the only identifier that matters for ChangedEvent behavior?

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 31/Oct/11 09:47 PM ]

Im not sure your question reflects the real issue. We don't have to interpret the contents of the messages to resolve this issue. Simply look at the create and chagne payloads and their respective replies. There should an equivalence in what you can do through each operation, i.e. look at the cardinality of the operations.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:50 PM ]

Cloned Change to Match Create, Changed to match Created

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 01:06 PM ]

Change affects one to many events, with a single changeComment. Create does not have a string Comment, but I have no objection to including it (but it can't be a CHANGEcomment...)

Changed should match Created - thanks for catching the disconnect.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-621] Placeholder for Event payload issues to support making PUSH/PULL operations consistent** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		

Description

This is a placeholder for a number of issues that will need to be addressed within EI to support some payload issues being debated within the OpenADR Alliance. The key is that the Alliance is trying to make the PUSH and PULL scenarios more consistent and to this may require some changes to the existing payloads. The Alliance will not require that EI wait for the Alliance to come to full agreement on all the issues, but there will be some changes submitted that will allow the Alliance to pursue a couple of different options.

Comments

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 30/Oct/11 10:19 PM ]

I'm assuming that it is OK for the Alliance to simply extend payload definitions with Alliance specific features. If so then many of the JIRA's I've filed can be handled in that fashion instead of making changes in EI.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Nov/11 03:31 PM ]

Treating this as a collector (task) rather than issue. No actionable information as of this date/time.

Collectors are not blockers, actionable issues are, so changing priority to Major to be consistent.

Please create new related issues as SubTasks.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 06/Nov/11 12:18 PM ]

I have reviewed payloads in wd34 and I think this is resolved.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-622] EIQuote payloads and interaction patterns need to be made consistent with EIEvent.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Blocker
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Resolved by application of other Jira items and update to working draft 34.

Description

EIQuote payloads and interaction patterns need to be made consistent with EIEvent. Once the EIEvent have stabalized then we willneed to apply the same changes to EIQuote.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:00 PM ]

Which ones? For example, CreatedQuote has publisher/subscriber, response/responses, and CreatedEvent has the equivalent.

CancelEvent has some difference - you have to be able to cancel multiple quotes. CancelEvent is just one.

Please take wd33 and sketch what's being requested.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:08 PM ]

Given that I submitted heaps of JIRA's over the weekend on the Event payloads, its seems to follow that whatever we are doing for events in the end may have to also be applied to the quote payloads as well.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:52 PM ]

I "think" I have now handled all of the Event comments, but am not sure what to do with the Quote operations

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:59 PM ]

Since delivering quotes is somewhat analogous to delivering events, we need to look at the changes we made to the event payloads and potentially apply them to the quote payloads. Of course there isn't complete equivalence between the two, but I'm assuming that some of the changes made to the event payloads will also need to be made to the quote payloads.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 02:56 PM ]

requestIDs, intervals

eventFilter doesn't seem to fit

anything else?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 03:14 PM ]

If we take Ed's example:

One can certainly define a Historian whose purpose is to measure Real Power at an Emix Interface at a granularity of 15 minute intervals.  
One can define a reportBack Duration for that historian of every 15 minutes.

If the [VTN] is unreachable, the application could keep or toss the reading. It is a conformance spec to declare the application should save un-delivered reading for eventual delivery instead of discarding. I think specifying that behavior is out of scope. I am open to adding a flag.

So: That says we can define the report. When we define a report and create a schedule, we have a request and therefore a reportRequestID. That could be standardized. Let's say its name is OpenADR20-favorite.

We can specify that a VEN must deliver OpenADR20-favorite and put it in the market context. It can be Requested, so folks can find out what it is. It can be a pre-loaded into every Alliance-certified system so it is always known.

That is a reasonable white-paper topic. Is there anything else we need?

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 04/Nov/11 06:33 PM ]

I'll take a closer look at the schema and make sure I can construct my sample payload.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 04/Nov/11 06:35 PM ]

Whoops I think Toby posted his comment to the wrong JIRA and I responded to it. I assume that Toby is still looking at the real issues of this JIRA and will try to make the EIQuote Payloads consistent with the EIEvent payloads. I think you are correct in that requestID's and intervals don't fit.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 05/Nov/11 03:08 PM ]

Ahh, Ed, you caught me, keeping too many Jira issues at once

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 06/Nov/11 12:17 PM ]

I have reviewed changes in wd34 and this is resolved.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-623] eiReplyPending events is missing the modificationNumber attribute.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Add modificationNumber to eiReplyPendingEvents.		
<b>Resolution:</b>	ed qualifiedEventID as below. Added QualifiedEventID in eiEventResponse as well as in pendingTransactions		

Description

eiReplyPendingEvents is missing the modificationNumber attribute.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Nov/11 07:00 PM ]

Creating the new type

```
<!-- 9.8.1.1 Unclassified Complex ID Types -->
< xs:element name="qualifiedEventID" type="ei:QualifiedEventIDType"/>
<xs:complexType name="QualifiedEventIDType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>Fully Qualified Event ID includes the eventID and the Modification Number</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="ei:eventID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
<xs:element ref="ei:modificationNumber" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
```

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-624] eiRequestPendingEvent :transactionName and eiRequestEvent:transactionName seems to be unnecessary.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Delete it.
<b>Resolution:</b>	In each, replace with an optional (0-1) marketContext.

**Description**  
 eiRequestPendingEvent :transactionName and eiRequestEvent:transactionName seems to be unnecessary.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Nov/11 06:03 PM ]  
 The informational purpose behind transactionName in these requests was later replaced by the marketContext.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-625] Add additional filters to eiRequestEvent and eiRequestPendingEvent.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Add additional filters to eiRequestEvent and eiRequestPendingEvent to cover the above cases.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Added eventFilter to payloads, incorporating semantics as defined in <a href="http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-635">http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-635</a> and <a href="http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-634">http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-634</a> . Defined interaction between the filters Active and Pending and the Interval filter in the event requests. Updated schema and added language discussing same to section specifying Event Operations <a href="http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-635">http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-635</a>

**Description**  
 Need to add additional filters to eiRequestEvent and eiRequestPendingEvent for the following cases:  
 - All events (pending and active)  
 - Only pending events (not yet active)  
 - Only active events (not pending, but active)

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-626] May need to add parameter to eiRequestEvent and eiRequestPendingEvent to limit the number of events returned.** Created: 30/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	We are discussing this within the OADR Alliance and if we can simply extend the payloads we can probably deal with it there instead of in EI.
<b>Resolution:</b>	Added replyLimit to Event requests. Incorporated language from <a href="http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-636">http://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/ENERGYINTEROP-636</a> into specification in section discussing Event Operations.

**Description**  
 May need to add parameter to eiRequestEvent and eiRequestPendingEvent to limit the number of events returned. This may require conformance rules to order the events and a way to index into the list.  
 We are discussing this within the OADR Alliance and if we can simply extend the payloads we can probably deal with it there instead of in EI.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 02:42 PM ]  
 If there are 10 events pending, and you limit the returned to two...  
 which two?  
 Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 31/Oct/11 02:59 PM ]  
 There is a well defined set of rules that we used in OpenADR 1.0 and we are adopting in the Alliance for how to order the events, based upon their schedule, state, and priority attribute. This establishes an ordered list which in principle a requesting party can index into and select subsets. IF we decided to support this in EI then we would also need to adopt those ordering rules. I'm not convinced we should be doing this EI, but I also want to make sure that we can extend the payloads appropriately if we want to add this feature in the Alliance.  
 Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
 Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-627] WD 33 Transactive EiClasses Schema Comments and Corrections</b> Created: 31/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	see above.
<b>Resolution:</b>	All edits applied as per Description

Description

WD 33 Transactive EiClasses Schema Comments and Corrections  
See Jira 607 to explain changes below.

804 7.1 Tenders

808 <xs:documentation>Tender Indicates a specific offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for any number of EmixBase derived types, and the Tender is treated as all-or-none.</xs:documentation>

Change to:

808 <xs:documentation>Tender Indicates a specific offer to buy or sell. A Tender can be for one EmixBase derived type. .</xs:documentation>

812 <xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>

Change to:

812 <xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>

815 7.2 Quotes

819 <xs:documentation>A specific offer to sell for a particular price. A Quote can be for any number of EmixBase derived types, and the Quote is treated as all-or-none.</xs:documentation>

Change to:

819 <xs:documentation> An Indication of the price of a possible Tender such as the transacted price of a previous Tender or a published forecast of a price of a possible Tender. A Quote can be for one EmixBase derived type.</xs:documentation>

828 7.3 Transactions

830 <xs:documentation>A Transaction is a specific agreement to accept a specific Tender or Tenders.</xs:documentation>

Change to:

830 <xs:documentation>A Transaction is a specific agreement to accept a specific Tender.</xs:documentation>

833 <xs:element ref="ei:transactionID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>

834 <xs:element ref="ei:tenderID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>

835 <xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>

Change to :

833 <xs:element ref="ei:transactionID" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>

834 <xs:element ref="ei:tenderID" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1"/>

835 <xs:element ref="emix:emixBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>

Comments	
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]	
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09	

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-628] Change cardinality of eiEvent:eventMessageID to be optional.</b> Created: 31/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change cardinality of eiEvent:eventMessageID to be optional.
<b>Resolution:</b>	requestIDs added to all payloads which MAY reference multiple [payloads] for use in responses.  eiEvent:eventMessageID is now optional

Description

There is ongoing debates within the OADR Alliance about how to implement the message ID stuff and we would like to make this optional to give the Alliance flexibility in doing it different ways.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/11 11:20 AM ]

From meeting:

- 1) We need to apply the payloadID across all the Create\* (certainly whenever there is a multiplicity)
- 2) Make eventMessageID optional

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-629] 475 - statement that there are no direct interactions across the ESI does not seem to be enforced in EI.** Created: 31/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		

**Resolution:** The concept of ESI is not defined in Energy Interoperation. There is therefore no enforcement; configurations may bridge ESIs, but (out of scope for Energy Interoperation) the cleanest way is to place an actor at the ESI that presents the VEN role to the outside and the VTN role (if needed) to the inside.  
 Close no action required.  
 It is acceptable to delete line 475 and add a footnote "The SGIP I2G and B2G Domain Expert Working Groups are working on a definition of the ESI; a similar concept with the same name can be found in OpenHAN."  
 Similarly the text near 1237 may be updated at the editor's discretion. There are no actionable or conformance items in that introductory material.

Description

475 It would seem that the assumption of no direct interaction across the ESI is not enforced in EI as multiple Resources inside the ESI are exposed to the grid side of the ESI  
 If the customer side of the interface is managed using the VEN/VTN approach wherein the ESI is a VEN that does not expose any VTNs inside the ESI VEN then we can still observe 475.  
 1238 Do all VENs have an ESI? For example does an aggregator acting as a VEN to an ISO have an ESI?

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 05/Nov/11 02:46 PM ]

Agree. But to clarify, a Party acting in a Transactive Role can be placed as the ESI as an alternative to a VEN.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-630] 5.2.2 Application Specific Extensions appear to violate the statement on 475 on no direct interaction across the ESI.** Created: 31/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

Description

5.2.2 Application Specific Extensions - clearly is a violation of the statement on 475 of no direct interaction across the ESI. If the Application were just a VEN inside the ESI to the VTN at the ESI would we need Application Specific Extensions?

Comments

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:02 PM ]

There may be all sorts of reasons why implementors may need to extend the payload content. I don't think allowing a VTN to communicate across the ESI would be one of those reasons. Suggest that we change the terminology to something a little more generic for extensions. Remove the example from the text of communicating with an application in the ESI.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 31/Oct/11 03:43 PM ]

It would be helpful for you to state the three most important payload content extensions you are identifying.

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 31/Oct/11 04:34 PM ]

We only do examples in Committee notes.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Nov/11 06:51 PM ]

A party MAY agree to add occupancy sensors and could be asked to Report on same.

A Party MAY agree to provide remote weather sensing

A Party May agree to allow some sort of direct control.

A Party that does not wish to allow these, May refuse signals, MAY refuse to provide reports.

It may be that the nominal VEN is requesting activities or Reports from the "upstream" partner, the nominal VTN.

The Key issue is that if the information is one of those listed in the spec, (price, quantity, usage) then it must not be communicated except by the mechanisms described in this spec.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-631] WD 33 Specification Misc Textual Corrections and Clarifications** Created: 31/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Notes in line in Description - lines starting with *
<b>Resolution:</b>	Per notes in Description. Mostly accept.

Description

383 Change [TeMIX] to [EMIX]  
 \* Accept

Comment: Billing cycles may be monthly today, but in some cases are and can be much more frequent than monthly. Suggest eliminating reference to billing cycle. Therefore 455 change "is smaller than the billing cycle" to "is typically one hour or less".  
 \* Change to "might be smaller than the billing cycle. Intervals are typically one hour or less."

487 change "two or more actors" to "pairs of actors"  
 \* ...pairs of actors, and in a deployment relationships are established among two or more actors."

489 insert "Transactive" before EI.  
 \* Accept

555 insert "event-based" before dispatch  
 \* Accept

655 "services and events" should be "services" I think.  
 \* Accept

673 insert after Interoperation (with the exception of all single interval TeMIX profile interactions)  
 \* Accept. Also change "payload that varies" to "payloads with values that vary"

984 "Feedback" should be "Report"  
 \* Accept

1224 change "both buyer and seller will" to "any party may"  
 \* Accept

1278 Accounts are not in the current schemas. Remove reference to Accounts.  
 \* Accept

1486 : I disagree with the implication that "price signals" are quotes and tenders are not "price signals" Tender are more specific price signals than quotes which are only indications of a possible tender price.  
 Recommend deleting 1486 and 1487 or giving a fuller explanation as above.  
 \* Partial accept. This is intended to say "don't call it a price signal, call it "a quote". The contrast between actionable and non-actionable price information is important - suggest "Price Quotes (via the EiQuote) service are not actionable as they are not a Tender. A Tender offers prices at which Transactions may be made."

1532 - EiCreatedTransactionType correct the "ext\_ref\_nnn"  
 \* Accept - in corrected diagrams for wd34

1538 "eliminate 1539 to 1545 which refer to verification and requirements tariffs.  
 \* Reject. This is the only place that Full Requirements tariffs are discussed, IMO.

1584 Figure 8-1 Service Consumer is EnrolleeParty and ServiceProvider is EnrollAdminParty  
 \* ACCEPT

14 Profiles - should have EIMarketContext and EiEnroll in both the OpenADR and TeMIX Profile and possibly the Price Distribution Profile.  
 \* ACCEPT

1966 : The Two paragraphs are for OpenADR and Not for Price Distribution.  
 \* ACCEPT - may be useful as a footnote in contrast?

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:50 PM ]  
 Fixed in part - see details in Description, text starting with "\*\*".

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 03:42 PM ]  
 1486 became

Price distribution, which is sometimes referred to as price signals, is accomplished using the EiQuote and EiTender services. Quotes are indications of a possible tender price; they are not actionable. A Tender offers prices at which Transactions may be made; they are actionable.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 04/Nov/11 07:25 PM ]  
 Wrote new section for Price Profile. Accepted as per comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 05/Nov/11 10:28 AM ]  
 The comment and change with respect to line 485 needs more clarification.

To date Transactive interactions are all between pairs of Parties and not more that two Parties.

The idea was that a multiparty transaction can be constructed from several bilateral transactions and that the process of reaching a multi-lateral agreement is out of scope EI for EI.

The VTN/VTN interactions in WD33 are all described as pairwise at least in the introduction and I think all of the serives are actor to actor pairs.

However the statement on 475 allows for direct multi-lateral (many party to many party or many actor to many actor ) interactions.

Moreover the concept of a "deployment relationship" is new to EI and without definition.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-632] Use of Extension Base for Signal and Report** Created: 31/Oct/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Bruce Bartell</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Bartell		

**Resolution:** Added clarifying language and example to the schemas. See comment below.

Description

Cannot find where to add/access Extension Base for Signal and Report. I see contextBase in Maret Context. But nothing for the other 2.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 04:39 PM ]

For the existing signals, the extension is of hte form:

```
<!-- 6.4.2 Signal Payload -->
< xs:element name="signalPayload" type="ei:SignalPayloadType" substitutionGroup="strm:streamPayloadBase"/>
<xs:complexType name="SignalPayloadType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>The Signal Payload for conveyance within an EiEventSignal.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:complexContent>
<xs:extension base="strm:StreamPayloadBaseType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="ei:payloadBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:extension>
</xs:complexContent>
</xs:complexType>
```

There are similar constructed for reportBase.

Is your proposal that we have a specific named wrapper for the ASE's? Easy enough.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 04:41 PM ]

Wrong extension...

This is the model we should use:

```
<xs:element name="payloadEmix" type="ei:PayloadEmixType" substitutionGroup="ei:payloadBase"/>
<xs:complexType name="PayloadEmixType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>This is the Payload for Signals that require an EMIX Product Description.</xs:documentation>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:complexContent>
<xs:extension base="ei:PayloadBaseType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="emix:productDescription" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:extension>
</xs:complexContent>
</xs:complexType>
```

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 31/Oct/11 04:53 PM ]

No proposal. I just didn't see how to use the proposed extensions.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 31/Oct/11 05:01 PM ]

Its already supported, but far from as clear as it could be.

Do you have any thoughts on what the reportSpecifier for ASEs should look like?

Comment by [Bruce Bartell](#) [ 31/Oct/11 05:19 PM ]

Nope. Low priority compared to the rest of the recent JIRA issues.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Nov/11 06:45 PM ]

```
<!-- These types are used in all EI Streams (Signal, Payload, Baseline) to convey the information that changes as conformed by the SignalType/ReportType/Baseline -->
< xs:element name="payloadApplicationSpecific" type="ei:PayloadApplicationSpecificType" abstract="true" substitutionGroup="ei:payloadBase"/>
<xs:complexType name="PayloadApplicationSpecificType">
<xs:annotation>
<xs:documentation>This Payload contains the information that changes in each Stream payload.</xs:documentation>
<xs:appinfo> Applications that wish to use this should (1) define the appropriate extension to the abstract applicationSpecificPayloadBase and (2) agree to indicates its use with a signalType conforming to the EI Extension pattern (x-). Different extensions should be made for Signals, Reports, and perhaps Baselines.</xs:appinfo>
</xs:annotation>
<xs:complexContent>
<xs:extension base="ei:PayloadBaseType">
<xs:sequence>
<xs:element ref="ei:applicationSpecificPayloadBase" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
</xs:sequence>
</xs:extension>
```

</xs:complexContent>  
</xs:complexType>

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 09/Nov/11 05:37 PM ]

Moving issues through process per TC approved motion 20111109.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-634] Please define Active as in "Active Event"** Created: 02/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Create EventFilter type in payloads that incorporates the rules as per comments. Incorporate language on semantics and use of eventFilter in section on event operations.

Description

If we would like an operation to return all Active Events, then we must have Active defined. The definition should be able to answer "Active Now", as well as Active with an Interval "Active between now and 3:00" and "Active between 2 and 4 tomorrow"

Comments

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 02/Nov/11 08:12 PM ]

active is defined by the period of time specified by the active period. During this time period eventStatus will also be active.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Nov/11 07:26 PM ]

Active Period or Active Interval (Making sure)

We have the Notification Interval the Ramp Interval, the Active Interval, and the Recovery Interval.

Is an event Active during Notification Interval?

The Ramp Interval may immediately precede the Active interval or start at the same time as the Active Interval. In the former case, is an event Active during Ramp Interval?

Is an Event Active during the Recovery Interval?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 03/Nov/11 07:29 PM ]

How do these definitions interact with the loosely defined EventStatusEnumerated?

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 03/Nov/11 08:34 PM ]

if eiEvent:eventDescriptor.createdDateTime < eiEvent:activePeriod:properties:dtstart then the event is pending.

if eiEvent:eventDescriptor.createdDateTime > eiEvent:activePeriod:properties:dtstart AND eiEvent:eventDescriptor.createdDateTime < (eiEvent:activePeriod:properties:dtstart + eiEvent:activePeriod:properties:duration) THEN the event is active.

pending state is equivalent to eiEvent:eventDescriptor:eventStatus = near OR far

active state is equivalent to eiEvent:eventDescriptor:eventStatus = active

BTW Active period is the active interval.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-635] Please define Pending as in "Pending Event"** Created: 02/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Resolution:** Create EventFilter type in payloads that incorporates the rules as per comments. Incorporate language on semantics and use of eventFilter in section on event operations.

Description

If we would like an operation to return all Pending Events, then we must have Pending defined. The definition should be able to answer "Pending Now", as well as Pending any time today and "Pending next week"

Comments

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 02/Nov/11 08:13 PM ]

pending is the period of time before the active period starts as specified by the active period interval.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-636] Defined the ordering of Events</a> <small>Created: 02/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11</small>			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Add rules for ordering, as per comment, to Event Operations section		
<b>Description</b>			
It is useful to be able to say "Return the first 5 Active Events" or "Return the First 10 Pending Events". This requires an ordering of those events. Please describe the rules for inclusion in the spec.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Ed Koch</a> [ 03/Nov/11 05:44 PM ]			
You can order events by the following rules:			
- Active events have priority over pending events			
- Between two active events priority is determined by eiEvent:eventDescriptor:priority			
- Between two active events with the same priority as defined by eiEvent:eventDescriptor:priority, the one with the earlier start time as defined by eiEvent:activePeriod:components:dtstart has the higher priority			
- Between two pending events the one with the earlier start time as defined by eiEvent:activePeriod:components:dtstart has the higher priority			
- All above factors considered if the priority is still indeterminant then the priority is arbitrary, but must remain consistent.			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]			
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09			

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-637] Add request identifier to all requests (Createm Cancel, Request) that have multiple payloads</a> <small>Created: 04/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11</small>			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Add requestID to all operations that convey multiple artifacts		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Added requestID to all operations that convey multiple artifacts		
<b>Description</b>			
It is necessary to reference the message in Responses. Particular if there are multiple (or zero) artifacts with identifiers in the little-r request, we need an identifier to reference it in the klittle r response.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]			
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09			

<a href="#">[ENERGYINTEROP-638] Create paragraphs discussing VEN and Resource and Multiplicity for [end of] section 3</a> <small>Created: 04/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11</small>			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Resolution:</b>	New section (3.3) written incorporating this discussion		
<b>Description</b>			
From meeting notes on 11/2			
VENs and resourcers.			
- One side: a ven has exactly one resource, all it shares.			

- Other side: a ven may have multiple resources that it may choose to share.  
 - 3rd occasionally - a single VEN might be instantiated as buildings or in hundreds of locales.

I think a VEN is a resource. A VTN is virtual resource. A party can manage or control multiple VENs and VTNs.  
 That's where you get the multiplicity of a party into resources.

VEN is sometimes a party and sometimes a resource. confusing. 1::1 ven::resource

EK I don't think a ven is a party or resource. it's a means of interacting with a VTN. A service point.

Resources and parties: Documentation is a bit muddled.

Vens and resources

EK is it reasonable to say a party is an entity. Resource is a commodity potentially owned by a party. VEN is a role.

AGree: VEN is a role that a Party takes

EC gale horst wrote a nice paper expressing in one way. What you're proposing is different. Haven't seen that written down. Need the arch model for the business relationships.

ACTION BILL - write section in context of wd33?

T: Section 3 is about that - where we wrote it down. Fundamental issue tapdancing around in section 3. EdKea doesn't damage things as much. Edge of the same problem.

Trying to not say "this is the only way you can do business" If we said "this is the only way to set up your business relationships" would remove ambiguity. But that ambiguity allows you to structure as you wish (or already have). When I sketch a ven - see it atop the meter with an internet connection. But don't want to say what target does - their VEN is in Minneapolis and is distributed all over. Should I say everyone should do it that way? No, EdKea says no. Want to allow different people to do different business relationships with these parts. Don't prevent different people doing that.

We fought over section 3 long and hard - not touching it. We can summarize at end, ...so it doesn't damage the rest of it.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 04/Nov/11 11:50 AM ]

Despite my hope to help unuddle, I suggest we leave things where they are with respect to Section 3 and definitions and use of resources, VENs, and VTNs. I suggest it is up to those who develop profiles such as the profiles we have in Ei, to unuddle from their perspective. These and other profiles will work things out in the market place and hopefully in time some consensus will emerge.

Comment by [Ed Koch](#) [ 04/Nov/11 12:51 PM ]

I think Ed C is right in that we need to allow people to sort this out and not dictate. Even I tend to morph these concepts a bit depending on the context. I think it is sufficient to have the separate concepts of party, resource, and VTN/VEN without forcing specific relationships between them in the spec. As long as there are attributes that allow associations between them to be made in a flexible manner. I think the text that Bill drafted yesterday portrays this and I would support adding it to the spec. What we should therefore avoid in the spec are any definitive statements that specifically constrain the relationship between parties, resources and VTN/VEN's.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 05/Nov/11 02:39 PM ]

Agree that there's no need to force a particular relationship (if any) between VEN, VTN, Actor, Resource, etc.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-639] Make Target optional in DistributeEvent** Created: 04/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Meeting		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Make Target optional in DistributeEvent
<b>Resolution:</b>	Make Target optional in DistributeEvent

Description

As discussed in 11/2 meeting, make Target optional in DistributeEvent

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-640] WD33 line 1955 - add EiEnroll to OpenADR profile to allow enrolling resources** Created: 04/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd33</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Add EiEnroll with reference to table 14-1, wd33.
--------------------	--

Description

The EiEnroll service is used to Enroll a Resource. It should be added to Table 14-1.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-641] Corrections to Work In Progress (WIP) based on wd34 schemas, with all UML diagrams for wd34 included.** Created: 05/Nov/11 Updated: 06/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Unresolved		

**Proposal:** EiDeliveryType: should be EmixBaseType and not StreamBaseType  
 EiTransactionType should be tenderID: refID[0] and not tenderID: refID[0..1]  
 EiClasses: EiQuote still has ext\_ref\_xxx etc. and EiTransaction and EiDelivery need correction as above.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 05/Nov/11 03:41 PM ]

Additional Corrections:

Tender Payloads EiCreateTender correct ref\_element203

EiCreatedTender counterPartyId should be actor[1]

Transactive Payloads

didn't find eiDeliveryPayloads

eiCreateTransaction re\_element234: requestID needs correction

EiCreatedQuote publisherPartyID should be actor [1]

EiTender, EiQuote, EiTransaction Sequence Diagram should be Party and CounterParty

EiDelivery Sequence Diagram should not be VEN and VTN. gather readings is wrong.

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 06/Nov/11 07:22 PM ]

These issues, where not address have been entered as specific WD34 issues.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-643] WD 34 WSDL EiDelivery Missing from a package** Created: 06/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">service</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

**Proposal:** Add EnergyInterop-Delivery.wsdl with RequestDelivery and ReplyDelivery operations  
**Resolution:** EnergyInterop-Delivery.wsdl with RequestDelivery and ReplyDelivery operations added

Description

EnergyInterop-Delivery.wsdl with RequestDelivery and ReplyDelivery operations needed.

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-644] Ei Delivery should be based on EMIXBaseType and not StreamBaseType** Created: 06/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd35</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet
<b>Proposal:</b>	Change EIClasses 422 to read "eiDeliver is based on EMIXDelivery and provides metering information in Transactive context" 425 change extensionbase to emix:emixBase "minOccurs="1",maxOccurs1" 1622 UML Figure 7-1 should be of emix:EMIX BaseType
<b>Resolution:</b>	Change the following: Payloads: EiCreateDelivery emix:DeliveryType [1..*] (needs to be filled in by the party receiving the message)  Correct schema and diagrams to match. EiCreatedDelivery EiDeliverType [0..*]  EIClasses: EiDeliveryType should NOT extend StreamBaseType  Delete DeliveryPayloadType  Reasoning: This is not a stream, but an emix:Delivery, so should not extend the stream base or the stream payload base.

**Description**  
Use of EMIXBaseType previously discussed and decided on. Practioners can also use Reports based on streams.

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 07/Nov/11 06:35 PM ]  
Suggest instead "...measurement information in a Transactive context."  
  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-645] Correct WD34 UML Diagrams with refElementXXX</b> Created: 06/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd35</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	EiCreateTender 1574 Figure 7-6 ----- change ref-element203 EiCreate Transaction 1596 Figure 7-9 ---- change ref_element234
<b>Resolution:</b>	EiCreateTender 1574 Figure 7-6 ----- change ref-element203 EiCreate Transaction 1596 Figure 7-9 ---- change ref_element234

**Description**  
EiCreateTender 1574 Figure 7-6  
EiCreate Transaction 1596 Figure 7-9

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 07/Nov/11 09:03 PM ]  
Corrected both to requestID: refID [1..1]  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-646] WD34 EiPayloads : EiDeliveryPayloads should be EiRequestDelivery and EiReplyDelivery</b> Created: 06/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">schema</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change EiDelivery Payloads to Request and Reply
<b>Resolution:</b>	EiDelivery service operations are Create/Created consistent with all other services.  Ensure that the schemas and document are consistent with that.

Description

Current EI Delivery Payloads are Create and Created which is incorrect.  
Line numbers are in payloads.xsd schema.

Comments

Comment by [Edward Cazalet](#) [ 06/Nov/11 05:49 PM ]

Line numbers in EIPayload for these two changes are 851 and 863

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 07/Nov/11 05:27 PM ]

Create is the initiation of the Delivery "report"; this is the same pattern as "CreateQuote" -- in the interaction the first thing done is to create the message that asks.

See e.g. 1812 on Create Projection and Created Projection

Verify that the schemas and diagrams and spec and WSDLs are correct for Create/Created.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-647] Correct Errors in EiTender and EiQuote UML Diagram Parties** Created: 06/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd35</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Change wd34 spec as follows:  Line 1562 Figure 7-4 Line 1567 Figure 7-5 Both figures should be Party and CounterParty and not Registree and Registrar
<b>Resolution:</b>	Change wd34 spec as follows:  Line 1562 Figure 7-4 Line 1567 Figure 7-5 Both figures should be Party and CounterParty and not Registree and Registrar

Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 07/Nov/11 05:30 PM ]

UML Diagrams need fixing. Schemas appear correct

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-648] WD34 Spec : Correct EiDelivery diagram and Figure errors.** Created: 06/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd35</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	WD 34 Spec  Line 1615 table 7-5 Operation should be EiRequestDelivery and Resonse should be EiCreatedDelivery Note should be: Request by a Party for metered delivery for including injection flag for measurement direction  Line 1618 Parties should be RequestorParty and Party ( Party is the Party with the meter data in the meter or in a meter data base)
<b>Resolution:</b>	Correct the parties and the sequence diagram in Figures 7-5 and 7-11 to show Party and Party.

Description

Table 7-5 and 7-11 list incorrect actors.

Comments

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 07/Nov/11 05:59 PM ]

Note that RequestorParty has a specific meaning elsewhere.

Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 07/Nov/11 08:58 PM ]

Diagram changes applied (and in email to the editor). Reassigned for the table headings.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]

Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-649] Corrections to Table 8-1 line 1646 WD 34** Created: 06/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd35</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Line 1646 Table 8-2 -- change Service Consumer to Enroll Admin and Enrollee Party		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Line 1646 Table 8-2 -- change Service Consumer and Service Provider to Party.		

**Description**  
Column headers should be Party for both consumer and provider.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 07/Nov/11 05:32 PM ]  
Table 8.2 all providers should Party / Party  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

**[ENERGYINTEROP-650] WD 34 Section 6.3 Improvements to description of Enrollment for Transactive Market Contexts** Created: 06/Nov/11 Updated: 07/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Unresolved		
<b>Proposal:</b>	See <a href="http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/ra/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/44241">http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/ra/workgroup/energyinterop/download.php/44241</a> for proposed edits to Section 6.3 - word document with track changes on.		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Delete non-normative Section 6.3		

**Comments**  
Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 07/Nov/11 05:57 PM ]  
See also wd34 Section 3.3 with similar wording. Both are non-normative.

**[ENERGYINTEROP-651] WD34 Spec Line 475 - need to clarify direct interaction across ESI.** Created: 06/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11

<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None		
<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Edward Cazalet</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	No Action		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Cazalet		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Delete 475 or clarify what direct interaction across the ESI means and how no direct interaction is enforced in EI.		
<b>Resolution:</b>	No change. Deleting will reduce consensus.		

**Description**  
Line 475 states:  
This work assumes there is no direct interaction across the ESI.

**Comments**  
Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]  
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-652] Include conformance statement from TC discussions August 2011</b> Created: 07/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd34</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd35</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Critical
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Include first full section from <a href="http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43152/EI%20Conformance%20Draft%2020110809.pdf">http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43152/EI%20Conformance%20Draft%2020110809.pdf</a>		
<b>Description</b>			
The text in <a href="http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43152/EI%20Conformance%20Draft%2020110809.pdf">http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/43152/EI%20Conformance%20Draft%2020110809.pdf</a> is missing. This described conformance, partial conformance, and networking.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]			
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-653] Issues with Conformance statements</b> Created: 08/Nov/11 Updated: 09/Nov/11			
<b>Status:</b>	Closed		
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>		
<b>Component/s:</b>	None		
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd35</a>		
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd36</a>		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Ed Koch</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	Ed Koch		
<b>Proposal:</b>	<p>line 2080 currently says: Service and Operation payloads.</p> <p>This line should be deleted.</p> <p>line 2097 has the following sentence: In addition, interoperation payloads MUST be used as defined or extended; in the event that payloads are 2097 extended a description of the extension(s) SHALL be included in the Implementation's conformance 2098 statement.</p> <p>This sentence should have the MUST changed to a SHOULD to says the following:</p> <p>In addition, interoperation payloads SHOULD be used as defined or extended; in the event that payloads are 2097 extended a description of the extension(s) SHALL be included in the Implementation's conformance 2098 statement.</p> <p>Furthermore to allow flexibility in defining product profiles within the OpenADR Alliance I recommend that we soften the language on the requirements for services. More specifically line 2032 is the following sentence:</p> <p>We present in simplified tabular form the Energy Interoperation services required as part of the OpenADR Profile.</p> <p>This sentence should be modified in the following way:</p> <p>We present in simplified tabular form the Energy Interoperation services that SHOULD be supported as part of the OpenADR Profile.</p>		
<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>Use text in <a href="http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/44276/energyinterop-conformance-changes%2B20111108.pdf">http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/44276/energyinterop-conformance-changes%2B20111108.pdf</a> .</p> <p>This clarifies and simplifies the conformance statements; implementations not implementing all services and artifacts ("Full Conformance") list the services and operations and information types that they are not implementing, or have extended (brief summary).</p>		

<b>Description</b>			
The new conformance section that was added in wd35 seems too restrictive if the OpenADR Alliance is going to claim they are conformant with EI. In general there are two things the Alliance wants to do that may not be in line with the conformance statements:			
(1) Create product profiles wherein some of the profiles do not implement all of the services in the OpenADR profile.			
(2) Create transport specific payloads that are particular to the networking means that they are pursuing, i.e. not SOAP.			
Both these are reasonable approaches to how they are profiling the EI spec and do not effect the data schema's, or the type of services and operations that are supported.			
In the proposal section of this JIRA I am recommending some very explicit and minor mods to the language to allow for the above objectives within the Alliance to be achieved and still claim conformance to EI.			
<b>Comments</b>			
Comment by <a href="#">William Cox</a> [ 08/Nov/11 10:02 PM ]			
In wd36.			
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 09/Nov/11 11:32 AM ]			
Moved to closed per unanimous vote (Aaron no longer present) in TC Meeting 2011-11-09			

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-654] Errors in UML Diagrams</b> Created: 08/Nov/11 Updated: 08/Nov/11	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	None
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd35</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">wd36</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	ed cazalet		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Fix as recommended
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fix as recommended

**Description**  
 Figure 7-8 Interaction Diagram for EiTransaction still has Registree & Registrar rather than Party & CounterParty in the diagram headers.  
 Figure 7-10 UML Diagram for all Transactive still has some old ref\_nnn\_xxx

<b>[ENERGYINTEROP-662] Errata, all editorial</b> Created: 12/Dec/11 Updated: 01/Feb/12	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Energy Interoperation TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">spec</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">PR03</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">David Holmberg</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Environment:</b>	David Holmberg		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Correct editorial issues identified; also change "some" to "same"
--------------------	---

**Description**  
 Line:  
 264 "no errors is"  
 509 "Sell Side" should be Buy I think  
 565 last period  
 838 table, row 3 description "can completed"  
 844 table row 5 first sentence doesn't make sense to me.  
 845 "is changes"  
 1005 table 4th row "set of elements to that"  
 1011 "playing the current"  
 1157 "Party species"  
 1158 "Request are"  
 1167 table, second row second sentence should be in the third row as examples of report type. Row 2 should say something about units.  
 1170 "what how it is" (that might be proper English somewhere...)  
 1171 table, row 1, last sentence needs a period at end.  
 1210 table, row 2, "which means is"  
 1222 table 5-16, row 2, "indication different"  
 1341 "concatenated the name"  
 1388 put a comma after "interaction" and then "need to be track"  
 1395-1409 this section repeats earlier section—can that not be referenced?  
 1420 sentence makes no sense.  
 1424 "responding do"  
 1446 "Responses and Responses"  
 1455 "An Response"  
 1468 "one instances"  
 1470 ", than the"  
 1476 "/"  
 That is as far as I got.

**Comments**  
 Comment by [William Cox](#) [ 01/Feb/12 01:54 PM ]  
 Bulk change to make consistent references to wd36 == PR03 == CSPRD03