Energy Reporting Framework

draft-nordman-eman-er-framework-02

Bruce Nordman
Keep it Simple!

But highly capable
Anything wrong with EMAN framework?

• Yes.

• Re-engineered from an implementation
  • Not a bad idea in general, however, in this area (new to the IETF) many initial choices need re-consideration
  • Too many implementation choices moved to the framework
  • Too many new concepts were introduced
    • Some early stage concepts are outdated
  • Too many
  • Not Simple.

• Inconsistent sections
  • Coming from different sources, not well aligned in style and terminology
  • Many text sections not needed at all

• Not accessible to many desirable audiences
  • e.g. energy professionals
How to make it better?

• Rewrite the framework based on many insights gained in WG and framework author discussions

• Take only necessary concepts (in their most simple version)
  • Drop the rest as unneded (e.g. relationships)

• Use a clear and simple document structure
  • Introduction of six concepts (Section 2)
  • Discussion of energy-related topologies (Section 3)
  • Detailing the framework using the EMAN requirement structure
    • basic features (Section 4), advanced features (Section 5)
  • Operational considerations (Section 6)
Why call it Energy Reporting (ER) Framework?

• >95% of the ER and EMAN frameworks is about reporting.

• Configuration items are few

• The ER framework even reduced need for control by simplification:
  • Control only needed for setting power states
  • For switching power at an outlet, the power state of the power interface is set
Simple Framework

• Concepts used for ER framework
  • Energy Management System
  • Device, power interface, component, energy object, battery

• List of topology types
  • Power distribution
  • Metering
  • Reporting (in case of a device reporting for other devices)

• Information model directly derived from EMAN requirements
  • Split into basic mandatory elements and
  • advanced optional elements (that most readers can skip)

• Ensure all needed functionality is present, e.g. aggregation
Next Steps

• Critical review on the list to directly compare the two drafts
  • Clarity
  • Completeness
  • Simplicity
  • Capability
  • Accessibility to diverse audiences

• Base decisions on empirical results