

New search « **Search** Save as

Find filters OASIS Energy Interoperation... Type: All Applied Assignee: All Contains text More **Search** Advanced

- FILTERS**
- My open issues
 - Reported by me
 - All issues
 - Open issues
 - Done issues
 - Viewed recently
 - Created recently
 - Resolved recently
 - Updated recently
- FAVORITE FILTERS**
- ReqResponse It...

1-25 of 25

Columns

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key ↑	Description	Resolved	Status
Improve consistency of Party / Counterparty in tables	Toby Considine	CLARITY	Pim van der Eijk	ENERGYINTEROP-656	In writing the document, I noticed that the summary tables often have the same role names ("Party", "Party") but the activity diagrams use different roles ("Party", "CounterParty"). It might be clearer to have distinct roles in the summary tables that match the values in the activity diagram. (Other standards, such as UBL, do this in a similar way). If messages can go in either direction, the table should have a two rows for the two situations. The activity diagram in 7.5.1.1 has "Party" in both swimlanes, this could be changed to "Party", "CounterParty" as in the other diagrams for consistency.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED
Editorial - narrative - Trevor Hardy	Toby Considine	editorial	Trevor Hardy, PNNL https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00000.html	ENERGYINTEROP-664	<p>page 9 line 23-26: This paragraph seems out of place as it is getting into the specifics of how any TE system should be designed, not just one using CTS.</p> <p>page 9 line 41-42 Since CTS doesn't define the full protocol stack, interoperability with minimal or no change is not guaranteed.</p> <p>page 10 line 53-54 What is meant by "none are interoperable either at the system level or for the actors"? Surely the systems were function and thus allowed the participants to interoperate. Do you mean they weren't standardized and didn't interoperate across demonstrations and deployments?</p> <p>page 16 line 268-269 "CTS message may be thought of as..." Are there consequences if I think of them in a different way? That is, perhaps the "may" should be changed to "must" or "shall" if that is the best and only way to think of them.</p> <p>page 30 line 668 "CTS Delivery is used to report and power flow from a node..." may not be the sentence you're trying to write. The meaning is unclear to me.</p> <p>page 30 line 668 "Every contract involves a includes a party that promises..." Something got messed up here.</p> <p>page 30 line 674 "In most TE markets, taking a greater delivery than contracted for in any interval..." Back-to-back prepositions are not clear to me.</p>	08/Jan/22	APPLIED
Incompatibility with existing TEMIX	Toby Considine	None	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX Inc https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-665	Any changes from the TeMix profile (TEMIX) of Energy Interop (EI) and Energy Market Information Exchange (EMIX) must require clear justification because the changes may be incompatible with TEMIX, published a decade ago, that existing implementations have, may have, or will rely on otherwise the claimed interoperability of the Proposal will fail.	08/Jan/22	APPLIED
Shane Calderwood Comments	Toby Considine	None	Shane Calderwood, NJIT and Energy Mashup Lab. https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00002.html	ENERGYINTEROP-666	<p>322 Is the reference ID able to be used as a correlation ID? From my understanding, there is a different reference ID for each message so wouldn't another field holding the reference ID of the sender need to be created in order to use the reference ID for correlation?</p> <p>560 Could this tender ID be used as a correlation ID? It may be helpful to add this information.</p>	08/Jan/22	APPLIED
Required encodings?	Toby Considine	CLARITY	Rolando Herrero https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html	ENERGYINTEROP-667	<p>Please find below the comments to the CTS draft.</p> <p>Thanks/</p> <p>Page: 10, Line: 76-80 -> Is SBE the recommended encoding for constrained IoT (embedded) devices ? What determines in what scenario/topology SBE (or JSON/XML) must be used? How is that negotiated?</p>	08/Jan/22	APPLIED
Joo Park comments (editorial)	Toby Considine	None	Joo Young Park, NJIT and Energy Mashup Lab. corrected comments in https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00004.html	ENERGYINTEROP-668	<p>576 "Each market in a Marketplace has a standard term which is the Counter PartyID to use to indicate the" should be changed to "Each market in a Marketplace has a standard term which is the Counter PartyID. This is used to indicate the"</p> <p>643 "For Position, a bounding interval is specified" Comma should be added between position and 'a'</p> <p>669 "Every contract involves a includes a party that promises to buy as well as a party that promises to sell" Should be changed to "Every contract involves a party that promises to buy as well as a party that promises to sell"</p>	08/Jan/22	APPLIED
FSGIM Streams Compatibility	William Cox	ARCH-CONF	Steve Ray https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00005.html	ENERGYINTEROP-669	Sections 1.6.3 and 1.6.4 (beginning at line 158) discuss conformance with WS-Calendar Streams and with FSGIM. It should be noted that FSGIM extended the idea of Streams beyond just a sequence of identical, contiguous intervals (as documented in the FSGIM User Guide, beginning at page 221). I would recommend that the CTS committee consider this more general specification, which supports the notion of Streams as well as other, less periodic sequences.	10/Feb/22	APPLIED
Semantics of Units of Measure	Toby Considine	PREREQ	Steve Ray https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00006.html	ENERGYINTEROP-670	<p>The identification of units of measure described on lines 344 and 347 seems prone to error, since there is no specification for how a unit is identified. One party might transmit kW while another uses kiloWatt, and a third uses kiloW.</p> <p>I suggest one of the following remedies, in order of increasing commitment: 1. (Easiest), Point to a persistent URI that uniquely identifies the desired unit, as documented at http://qudt.org. For example, http://qudt.org/vocab/unit/KiloW uniquely identifies a kiloWatt. This can be prefixed as unit:KiloW using the unit: prefix as registered at prefix.cc</p> <p>2. Model the key concepts found at http://qudt.org within the CTS standard, populated with just the necessary units for electricity transactions. These concepts include Quantity Kind (such as Power) and Unit (such as Watt). This would improve the likelihood of interoperability with future standards.</p> <p>3. Adopt the http://qudt.org specification (managed at https://github.com/qudt/qudt-public-repo). While not yet a standard, QUDT is likely to bear a strong resemblance to the future Digital SI specification being developed under the auspices of the BIPM.</p> <p>Steve</p>	08/Feb/22	APPLIED
Actor vs Party	Toby Considine	ARCH-CONF CLARITY	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-677	1. The Proposal introduces Actor as a synonym with Party. There is no apparent advantage to the change.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED
Instrument is Unnecessary	William Cox	CLARITY RES-PROD-INSTR	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-680	5. The addition of Instrument as a Product for a Duration in the Proposal is unnecessary, and any market engine that requires Instruments can apply the instrument concept in its interface with TEMIX.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED
Resource is unneeded	William Cox	CLARITY RES-PROD-INSTR	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-683	7. The Proposal's definition of a Resource is inconsistent with the definition of a Resource in EMIX and is not used in TEMIX.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED
Position Service unworkable	William Cox	FACET	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-686	10. The Proposal's discussion of a Position Service is incomplete and likely unworkable because of design flaws in the Proposal.	21/Feb/22	APPLIED

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key ↑	Description	Resolved	Status												
Support Pub/Sub as well as SOA	William Cox	ARCH-CONF CLARITY	Rolando Herrero https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html	ENERGYINTEROP-692	Page: 16, Line: 267-269 -> Message transport is affected by the topology. SOA is typically client/server while many of the modern IoT topologies are publish/subscribe (relying on MQTT or AMQP session management). This document should take into account the support of this latter scenario.	07/Feb/22	APPLIED												
Binary & Enumerations	William Cox	ARCH-CONF	Rolando Herrero https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html	ENERGYINTEROP-694	Page: 30, Line: 30 -> Some of these fields (like CURRENCY) should be binary encoded as enumerations (whenever possible). Specifically, many (IoT and non-IoT) devices in constrained environments rely on physical/link layer technologies (like IEEE 802.15.4) that are not designed to handle large payloads (even with upper layer adaptation)	08/Feb/22	APPLIED												
Mantissa and Scale throughout spec	Toby Considine	CLARITY PREREO	H Walter Johnson https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00007.html	ENERGYINTEROP-696	<p>Interesting work. Thanks for the opportunity to review. Here are a few things I noticed as I read through the doc.</p> <p>The definition of Scale in Table 3-3 appears to be incorrect. Scale is defined there as the Mantissa that specifies the size of the Resource Unit and the example given states that megawatts has a mantissa of 6. Assuming we are working in base 10, the prefix mega- refers to the 6th power of 10 (10^6), where 6 is the EXPONENT of the number, not the mantissa. In standard scientific notation, mantissa refers to the digits without the 10^n part. Therefore, the definition of scale should be the EXPONENT of the size prefix (mega or 6 in the example), not the mantissa (the fractional part or precision of the number).</p> <p>Nevertheless, the effect of the definition of scale is correct: the example for Size (5 kW), with the explanation that the 5 is the size and 3 is the scale, makes sense, since the scale part of this is kilo- (10^3) and thus the exponent (NOT the mantissa) of 5 x 10^3 is 3. But why is Size constrained to be an integer? Why not allow a Product to have a fractional Size (for example "0.5 MW") rather than requiring this to be expressed as 500 kW (or even 500000 W)?</p> <p>I'm not sure that I understand the example of Stream Payload Mantissa in Table 5-1, but it seems to contain the same confusion between mantissa and exponent.</p> <p>The definition of Quantity Scale in Table 6-2 definitely confuses mantissa and exponent.</p>	08/Feb/22	APPLIED												
Streams and Intervals	William Cox	ARCH-CONF	Donald Hammerstrom https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-711	The original white paper/submission can be read in the URI under "environment". There are 30 specific recommendations in the "Specific Recommendations" section of the submitted Hammerstrom paper. I have numbered them all for traceability as I recombine them into specific issues. The original white paper/submission can be read in the URI under "environment". 28. Figure 11-2 (and elsewhere re payload intervals): I've observed that CTS streams reference integer interval series, whereas many interaction payloads reference Interval objects. It is unclear to me what, if anything, associates a Party's CTS streams to specific Instrument Interval objects.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED												
Order of streams	William Cox	ARCH-CONF editorial	Donald Hammerstrom https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-714	19. Line 452 - 3: Since conformant CTS implementations need not be owned by the same implementer, it is unwise to permit omission of the UID property. This permission to omit also appears in Tables 5-1 & 5-2.	07/Feb/22	APPLIED												
Editorial	Toby Considine	None	Donald Hammerstrom https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-717	There are 30 specific recommendations in the "Specific Recommendations" section of the submitted Hammerstrom paper. I have numbered them all for traceability as I recombine them into specific issues. The original white paper/submission can be read in the URI under "environment". 13. Lines 355 - 6: Editing needed. 14. Lines 349 - 362: Recommend deleting since content was addressed by EMIX and is permitted as stated in Line 363. 15. Line 376: Editing needed. 25. Lines 596 - 7: Editing needed. 29. Section 12.1: Why must this [E] content be duplicated and not included simply by reference?	08/Jan/22	APPLIED												
Clarify Position	Toby Considine	FACET	Donald Hammerstrom https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-718	• An Actor owns a Position via an accumulation of Instruments.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED												
Tender Update	Toby Considine	ARCH-CONF	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html	ENERGYINTEROP-726	Tender Facet - Update The standard does not call for an Update Tender payload. There are multiple practical instances where an actor would have to update an uncommitted tender. The alternative of canceling and resubmitting, introduces more implementation complexity, excessive communication, and dead time of potential missed transactions. [Lines 545]	08/Jan/22	APPLIED												
Product, Instrument, and Interval	Toby Considine	None	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html	ENERGYINTEROP-728	Tender Facet à Product, Instrument, and Interval Is not interval a key aspect of an Instrument instead of a product? (Duration is an aspect of the product). [Lines 555]	08/Jan/22	APPLIED												
Transactive State	William Cox	ARCH-CONF	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html	ENERGYINTEROP-730	Transactive State Transactive state values are not documented in CTS nor [EMIX]. While one can imply the meaning, the boundaries of each state seem vague when analyzed. Is there an implied order too? What state would a delivered and settled tender take? Delivery or publication? What about in a market where settlement occurs at the time of the transaction before delivery? Having the same transactive state map over both tenders and transaction is a stretch when taking the individual values. This dual-use also becomes a source of confidential information and implementations intent between a tender transactive state and the transaction transactive state. [Lines 555, 599]	08/Feb/22	APPLIED												
Transaction Facet	William Cox	FACET	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html	ENERGYINTEROP-731	Transaction Facet The interaction pattern and payload are confusing. The interaction diagram shows Party and a Counter Party with the Party initiating the EICreateTransactionPayload(). This seems counterintuitive for a typical scenario, where a market actor would match two parties. For each of their contracts, one is the Party the other CounterParty. The market needs to notify each and confirm the transaction. What is the expected payload of the market sent to the two parties? EICreateTransactionPayload or EICreatedTransactionPayload? In what scenario does a Market actor need to expose both? ... If the latter, who would call EICreateTransaction? [Lines 592]	08/Feb/22	APPLIED												
Editorial	Toby Considine	editorial	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html	ENERGYINTEROP-736	Minor typos and formatting issues <table border="1"> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>"Is a means", double use of the word including.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>249</td> <td>Inconsistent use of periods on definitions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>668</td> <td>"involves a includes"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>918</td> <td>Unpaired closing quotes around man-in-the-middle</td> </tr> <tr> <td>980</td> <td>Typo used the word tame instead of the same.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Page 2</td> <td>Keywords section, RFC2119 is a broken hyperlink.</td> </tr> </table>	10	"Is a means", double use of the word including.	249	Inconsistent use of periods on definitions.	668	"involves a includes"	918	Unpaired closing quotes around man-in-the-middle	980	Typo used the word tame instead of the same.	Page 2	Keywords section, RFC2119 is a broken hyperlink.	08/Jan/22	APPLIED
10	"Is a means", double use of the word including.																		
249	Inconsistent use of periods on definitions.																		
668	"involves a includes"																		
918	Unpaired closing quotes around man-in-the-middle																		
980	Typo used the word tame instead of the same.																		
Page 2	Keywords section, RFC2119 is a broken hyperlink.																		
Joseph Passalacqua Comments (editorial)	Toby Considine	editorial	Joseph Passalacqua NJIT and Energy Mashup Lab https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00002.html	ENERGYINTEROP-737	367 Italicize See Section 2.2.3 and explain what the name is like how it was done in Market Context, and Standard Terms See Section 6. "Market Facet" 387 What is [E]? Maybe an explanation on that. Is it related to Energy Interoperation? As seen on pg 25. Explanation on using E is clear 432 Maybe try to fit the contents on page 25 if possible so there's not a big clear page.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED												