

Ongoing Activities on Smart Grid Architecture (an SGAC-centric view)





A Little History – define the road

SGAC Conceptual Architecture

- Create a Conceptual Architecture with artifacts traceable to National Smart Grid requirements
- Employ an architectural methodology to document these artifacts

EU M.490 – Reference Architecture methodology (RAWG)

- Unification efforts between EU-M490 and SGAC
- Align EU Smart Grid Architecture Methodology (SGAM) with SGAC approach
- Use Conceptual Architecture artifacts where applicable

IEC TC57 WG 19 – Reference Architecture

- Explore potential synergies
- Explore including portions of architectural methodology into reference architecture







Direction Avoiding a Tower of Babel

Current activities

- Clarify terms employing ontology
- Identify actors, roles and levels of granularity
- Alignment effort with TC 57 WG19 on architectural approach and methodology reference
- Continuing work with EU M490 RAWG
- Beginning work with TC57 WG19

Next step activities

- Absorb cyber security and communications architectures currently CSWG & EU M490
- Integrate use case standardization activities (EU M490 sustaining process & IEC TC8 WG5 & 6 use case standardization) Assist EU M490 team with next refinement of their reference architecture document
- Continuing work with TC57 WG19





Architectural Goals

Grid-Interop

Develop a common methodology unifying asynchronous efforts

- Employ TOGAF approach
- Adopt Open Group Service-Orientation and Ontology
- Embed IEC TC8 WG 5 & 6 Use Case Standardization (just being formed)
- Leverage ongoing SGiP and EU Smart-Grid Coordination-Group (SC-CG) activities
- Integrate SGiP-CSWG & EU SC-CG security architecture Points-of-view
- Re-use and integrate standards from other industries as appropriate

Results

- Mitigate risk
- Accelerated standards development
- Standards derived from business drivers not technologies
- Terminology, semantic crispness and alignment across standards
- Useful Use Case repository -(common use case structure and approach mapping to business drivers to services and workflow)
- Holistic approach to solutions development
- Lifecycle maintenance



The Open Group Architecture Forum (TOGAF)





Open Group Service Definition

- Service orientation is a way of thinking in terms of services and service-based development and the outcomes of services.
- A service:

Is a logical representation of a repeatable business activity that has a specified outcome (e.g., check customer credit; provide weather data, consolidate drilling reports)

- Is self-contained
- May be composed of other services
- Is a "black box" to consumers of the service
- An architectural style is the combination of distinctive features in which architecture is performed or expressed.



SGAC example: Outage Management





Goal rationalize Actor to roles map to services





SGiP-SGAC Actors Effort

Actor	Original Alternative Actor Name (Including Actors Names with duplicate function)	Actor/Role	Hierarchy Physical/ Logical/ Conceptual	Role (from role tab)	Туре	Domain
Access Point (ie.						
Data Aggregation						
Point)	IE: Distribution Access Point	Actor	Logical		Device	Distribution
		Actor or				
Account		Collection of				
Management		Roles	Conceptual		Applicatio	Service Pr <mark>ov</mark> i
Actuator		Actor	Physical		Device	Distribution
Aggregation						
Resource	N: Resource	Actor	Conceptual		Organizat	Market
Aggregator	RM: Energy Services Company; NR: Aggregator / Retail Energy Provider; EU: Supplier; xx: Energy Services Aggregator	Actor	Conceptual		Organizat	Service Prov



EU and SGAC Architectures Alignment

SGAC

- Kept at Conceptual level to avoid being prescriptive
- Organizationally focused
- Bulk Generation and DER merged

- EU M490 RAWG
- Logical architecture leveraging NIST Conceptual and GWAC
- Functionally focused
- DER -No interfaces to Transmission or Customer









Grid-Interoperation ethodology Alignment Activities

EU's Smart Grid Architectural Methodology maps to NIST Conceptual Architecture & GWAC Stack



NIST Conceptual

Architecture



Business Layer / Function Layer



Needs further clarification - Herb and John Used to show inheritance between layers & layer independence (Service-Oriented and loose-coupling) - Heiko



Information Layer





Communication Layer



12



Component Layer





Steps to work out

- Open Group SOA Ontological approach
- Define and agreement on basic terms
- Complete actor to service mapping
- We are here Create message maps
 - Unify "identical" services and messages
 - How to identify "Stickybits"
 - Work flow notation (BPM, BPEL, other)
 - Application Building Block criteria
 - Repository for joint work (catalogues, ontologies, etc)
 - Others?



Questions?

How does this work?



SGAC

- Ron Ambrosio IBM
- Stephan Amsbary EnerNex
- Jay Britton Alstom
- Jean Raymond HydroQuebec
- John Ruiz Johnson Controls WG19
- Terry Saxton Xtensible
- Paul Skare PNNL

EU M.490 RAWG

- Heiko Englert Siemens
- Mathias Uslar Offis
- Peter Hermans Stedin
- Raymond Forbes Ericsson
- Jan Bruinenberg Alliander
- Eric Lambert EdF