

WG14 Part 9 Issues - CIM Issues #6368

The interplay between events and status measurements should be supported more cleanly

06/01/2023 09:14 AM - David Haynes

Status: New	
Priority: High	
Target version:	
Author/Contact Info: dhaynes@hubbell.com	Standard(s): 61968-9
Base Release:	Version: 4
Solution to be Applied To:	Clause: Annex C
Solution Version:	Sub-Clause:
Solution Applied By:	Paragraph:
Completion Date:	Table:
CIM Keywords: 61968-Metering	Originally Closed in Version:
Breaking Change: No	Origination Date: 06/01/2023
Breaking Change Description:	Origination ID:
CIM Impacted Groups: WG14	Originally Assigned To:
Requestor: David Haynes	
Description Part 9 Annex C offers an 18 part field to describe a measurement. Annex E offers a 4 part field to describe a status. However the first of the four parts indicates the source, and the last of the four indicates the new status. Quite often a subscriber will want to monitor the status of a condition that an event announces. If it an important condition, the subscriber will want to receive periodic status updates for fear it may have missed a published event. There are many many events and the coverage of measurements doesn't always correspond to it. It is unnecessarily awkward to relate a measurement status to an event. A change to the design of the standard could make it easier.	
Proposed Solution Add a new measurementKind of "EventTypeID". Then to publish a measurement of a status than an event is based on, the commodity field would be used to identify the source of the measurement (meter, sensor, EVSE, etc.). We could supply the EndDeviceDomain enumeration in the numerator field, EndDeviceSubdomain in the denominator field, set uom equal to "status", then supply the EndDeviceEventOrAction code as the value of the measurement. This would allow better interplay between measurements and events.	
Release Notes The business of "breaking change" is a good question. Breaking the CIM? Breaking someone's implementation? There are many other standards that use Annex C. Increasing the length to 20 attribute fields could break all of them.	

History

#1 - 06/01/2023 10:03 AM - David Haynes

- Proposed Solution updated

#2 - 06/01/2023 10:06 AM - David Haynes

- Proposed Solution updated

- Release Notes updated

#3 - 06/01/2023 10:09 AM - David Haynes

- Proposed Solution updated

- Release Notes updated

#4 - 06/01/2023 10:09 AM - David Haynes

- *Proposed Solution updated*

#5 - 06/01/2023 10:10 AM - David Haynes

- *Proposed Solution updated*

#6 - 06/01/2023 10:26 AM - David Haynes

- *Proposed Solution updated*

- *Breaking Change changed from Yes to No*

- *Breaking Change Description deleted (This creates a change to the 18 part ReadingTypeID field to make it 20 parts.)*

#7 - 06/01/2023 11:03 AM - David Haynes

- *Priority changed from Normal to High*