WG13 Issues - CIM Issues #3922

Angle measurements
Direct angle SCADA measurements need to

09/14/2021 03:43 PM - Herbert Falk

Status:	Closed		
Priority:	Low		
Target version:			
Author/Contact Info:	Kendall Demaree	**Standard(s):**	
Base Release:	IEC61970CIM14v13 IEC61968CIM10v30 combined	**Version:**	
Solution to be Applied To:		**Clause:**	
Solution Version:	CIM15	**Sub-Clause:**	
Solution Applied By:	LOO	**Paragraph:**	
Completion Date:	09/02/2010	**Table:**	
CIM Keywords:		**Originally Closed in Version:**	CIM15
Breaking Change:	No	**Origination Date:**	08/03/2010
Breaking Change Description:		**Origination ID:**	13_21
CIM Impacted Groups:	WG13	**Originally Assigned To:**	
Requestor:			

Description

Angle measurements
Direct angle SCADA measurements need to be clearly defined and convenient to model because they will become much more common. The 61970-452 and 301 presently define a cim:Measurement.measurementType:String normative table with "Angle" as one type, but presumably this only the local voltage and curerent angle.. It is not clear how to use CIM to specify PMU type angle measurements that are referenced to something not local. Method to model an angle difference or specify voltage or current angle relative to a reference angle is needed.
Common measurement types should be specified in the core model and not left to each profile to define/redefine. The SCADA model must be left open to extension to add specific localized meaning to SCADA values.
61850 measurement types should map into 61970 types (as they are documented in 61970-301).

Entered as action item from WG14 modeling call. Herb Falk also may have additional input.

Proposed Solution

Resolution needs work yet.
One potential option is to include "61850 vector" or phasor values which include both a magnitude and angle value, but clealry we need simple angle and simple magnitude support as well. A new measurement subtype might be tramatic to implementations and the CIM moddel in general. Another option is additoinal measurementType normative values. Is this still an issue? 6/26/2019