

New search « **Search** Save as

Find filters OASIS Energy Interoperation... Type: All Resolved 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...

1-14 of 14

Columns

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key ↑	Description	Resolved	Status
Bias in Matching Algorithm	William Cox	CLARITY MARKET	Trevor Hardy, PNNL <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00000.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00000.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-673	page 16 line 261-262 It has already been stated that CTS does not prescribe the nature of the matching engine but doesn't the definition of part and counter-party at least strongly imply some kind of matched bi-lateral trade? Double-auctions can artificially create the appearance of bi-lateral trades after the clearing price and quantity have been established but it would be a layer of artifice. For the concept of "party" and "counter-party" to be an integral part of CTS seems to heavily lean towards bi-lateral matching engines.	22/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Missing Transport	Toby Considine	CLARITY RES-PROD-INSTR	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-679	3. There is no formal role in the Proposal for Transport Products as in TEMIX.	22/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Definition of Transaction inconsistent with EI	William Cox	ARCH-CONF CLARITY	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-681	4. The definition of a Transaction in the Proposal is different from TEMIX for no apparent reason.	22/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Are Independent Markets required?	William Cox	CLARITY MARKET	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-687	11. While the Proposal includes bilateral transactions, the Proposal's favored alternative of independent, local clearing markets (market engines) is unworkable in a grid where fine locational and time granularity is essential, and liquidity of tenders is minimal.	22/Feb/22	RESOLVED
PartyID Uniqueness	Toby Considine	ARCH-CONF	Rolando Herrero <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-693	Page: 18, Line: 307 -> How are PartyIDs assigned? Are they unique? How is uniqueness enforced?	08/Feb/22	RESOLVED
TransactionID and Data Types	Toby Considine	ARCH-CONF	Rolando Herrero <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-695	Page: 41, Line: 604 -> How is the transaction ID defined? Some of these tables like 8-2 and 9-2 should specify the data type of each attribute.	08/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Conformance with WS-Calendar	Toby Considine	ARCH-CONF	H Walter Johnson <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00007.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00007.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-697	When discussing Conformance (Section 14), line 780 says Portions of CTS conform to and use updated and simplified versions of the specifications. I guess it's possible for a spec's conformance rules to allow the CTS spec to both conform to it and to extend it, but it does sound somewhat paradoxical. Besides, the WS-Calendar spec says [lines 1553-1554] that "Specifications that...claim conformance with WS-Calendar SHALL define the business meaning of zero duration intervals and I don't find that in the CTS spec.	07/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Market Cloudiness	William Cox	CLARITY MARKET	Donald Hammerstrom <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-709	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" 8. Table 2-1: Row "Market Context": Acronym "URI" has not been previously defined and should be spelled out on its first use, please. 9. Table 2-2: Facet "Marketplace" might be needed where multiple markets exist. • The Market is an object from among Marketplaces and may have numerous attributes. 21. Section 6: This is finally made clear that the "Market Facet" refers to a defined query behavior or "interaction profile." Why not use an informative, intuitive name like "Request Market Characteristics" instead of inventing all these "facets"?	22/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Power vs Energy	Toby Considine	CLARITY PREREQ	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-719	<b>Power vs Energy</b> In the initial part of the document both power and energy are referred to as acceptable values for a Resource. Given there's an ongoing confusion between power and energy, I believe the TC should not promote both in the standard as acceptable. To have any practical TE use energy must always be bound to a unit of time and thus a rate of delivery (power). Whether the power should be leveled or follow an acceptable curve within the interval as defined in [EMIX] that's beyond the scope. The resource that an actor tenders, transacts, delivers, and settles is energy. Power is just an attribute of that energy tender, contract, and delivery. [Lines 11,16,17,229]	22/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Market-Product-Resource Relationship	Toby Considine	CLARITY MARKET RES-PROD-INSTR	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-722	<b>Market-Product-Resource Relationship</b> In a few places in the standard, there is vagueness that can be misinterpreted around the cardinality relationship between a market, product, and resource. [Lines 249 Table 2-1]	22/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Transactions vs Contracts	Toby Considine	ARCH-CONF editorial	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-724	<b>Transactions vs Contract</b> The standard implies a one-to-one relationship between transaction and contract. In practice, I believe it is more appropriate to have a one-to-many relationship between transactions and contracts. Each party of a transaction will receive its own distinct contract (the counterparty may not be public to each other). Also, for the market to match an integral tender, I may have to match with multiple counterparties tenders to create a transaction. [Lines 282, 318, 379]	22/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Distribute Tender	Toby Considine	FACET	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-727	<b>Tender Facet à Distribute Tender</b> I cannot find a practical use or understand the need for EIDistributeTender payload. [Lines 549]	08/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Tender Payloads	Toby Considine	FACET RES-PROD-INSTR	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-729	<b>Tender Facet à Payloads Definition</b> Why is a resourceDesignator required when theAtender already infers it? Tender implies an instrument. Instrument implies product. Product implies a market. Market implies a resource. If the intent is to identify the market, why not specify the product or market directly? Why is there a CounterPartyID in the responses for EICreatedTender and EICanceledTender payload? [Lines 572]	08/Feb/22	RESOLVED
Security & Privacy	Toby Considine	CLARITY OTHER	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-735	<b>Security and Privacy</b> Line 916 refers to encryption of messages using a lower case "should" whilst on line 985 the same encryption of messages is referred to with RFC uppercase MAY. This may inflict contradicting/vague recommendations in terms of message encryption. I suggest you use the same term for the use of encryption. I also believe that encryption, if not an absolute requirement, should be at least referred to with the word SHOULD and RECOMMENDED as defined by RFC2119. The example on line 979 in reference to a distribution system operator does not seem to be related to either security or privacy. Line 988 is using a confusing statement format. Consider rephrasing for clarity "counterparty of the market" to "market as the counterparty". [Lines 916,985,979,988]	22/Feb/22	RESOLVED

1-14 of 14