

# sttp

## Streaming Telemetry Transport Protocol



**Version:** 0.1.15 - August 19, 2017

**Status:** Initial Development

**Abstract:** This specification defines a [publish-subscribe](#) data transfer protocol that has been optimized for exchanging streaming [time series](#) style data, such as [synchrophasor](#) data that is used in the electric power industry, over [Internet Protocol](#) (IP). The protocol supports transferring both real-time and historical time series data at full or down-sampled resolutions. Protocol benefits are realized at scale when multiplexing very large numbers of time series [data points](#) at high speed, such as, hundreds of times per second per data point.

Copyright © 2017, Grid Protection Alliance, Inc., All rights reserved.

---

### Disclaimer

This document was prepared as a part of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government (DE-OE-0000859). Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

### License

This specification is free software and it can be redistributed and/or modified under the terms of the MIT License [\[2\]](#). This specification is distributed in the hope that it will be useful, but WITHOUT ANY WARRANTY; without even the implied warranty of MERCHANTABILITY or FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## Table of Contents

Section	Title
	Title Page
	Preface
1	Introduction
2	Business Case
3	Definitions and Nomenclature
4	Protocol Overview
5	Data Point Structure
6	Commands and Responses
7	Data Point Characteristics
8	Metadata
9	Compression
10	Security
11	References and Notes
12	Contributors and Reviewers
13	Revision History
A	Appendix A - Functional Requirements
B	Appendix B - STTP API Reference
C	Appendix C - IEEE C37.118 Mapping
D	Appendix D - Other Protocol Evaluations

# Introduction

---

Use of synchrophasors by U.S. utilities continues to grow following the jump start provided by the Smart Grid Investment Grants (2010-2014). Several utilities now have PMU installation counts of 500 phasor measurement units (PMUs) or more and other utilities anticipate being at this level within the next few years. The dominant method to exchange synchrophasor data remains the IEEE C37.118 <sup>[1]</sup> protocol that was designed for and continues to be the preferred solution for substation-to-control room communications. It achieves its advantages through use of an ordered set (a frame) of information that is associated with a specific measurement time. When IEEE C37.118 is used for PDC-to-PDC communication or for PDC-to-Application communication, large data frames are typically distributed to multiple systems.

To address the challenges presented by these large IEEE C37.118 frame sizes, many utilities have implemented purpose-built networks for synchrophasor data only. Even with these purpose-built networks, large frame sizes result in an increased probability of UDP frame loss, or in the case of TCP, increased communication latency. In addition, IEEE C37.118 has only prescriptive methods for the management of measurement metadata which is well-suited for substation-to-control-center use but which becomes difficult to manage as this metadata spans analytic solutions and is used by multiple configuration owners in a wide-area context.

The Advanced Synchrophasor Protocol (ASP) Project was proposed to DOE in response to FOA-1492. In this proposal, the argument was made for a new protocol that overcomes the limitations of IEEE C37.118 for large-scale synchrophasor data system deployments. The new publish-subscribe protocol to be developed under the ASP Project is called the Streaming Telemetry Transport Protocol (STTP). STTP leverages the successful design elements of the secure Gateway Exchange Protocol (GEP) that was originally developed by the Grid Protection Alliance (GPA) as part of the SIEGate project (DE-OE-536).

On May 1, 2017, a DOE grant (DE-OE-859) was awarded to GPA and the other 25 collaborators on the ASP Project (see [Contributors](#) section) to: (1) write a detailed definition of the STTP protocol (*i.e., this document*); (2) develop software to support it including production-grade implementations of STTP API's for multiple development platforms along with a collection of tools to test and validate STTP; and (3) demonstrate and evaluate its efficacy with multiple vendors and utilities.

## Scope of this Document

The purpose of this document is to define STTP and to include, as appendices, descriptions as to how to use its supporting software tools. This STTP specification is focused on effective "streaming data" delivery of which synchrophasor data is a very important use case.

In the [Protocol Overview](#) section of this specification, high-level features and the business value of STTP are presented. The balance of the sections of the specification provide the details of protocol design.

[Appendix A - Functional Requirements](#) provides the set of functional requirements and use cases needed for successful STTP deployment.

[Appendix B - STTP API Reference](#) provides instructions to enable software developers to integrate and use of STTP within other software systems.

[Appendix C - IEEE C37.118 Mapping](#) provides a detailed look at the process of transforming IEEE C37.118 into STTP as well as creating IEEE C37.118 streams from STTP.

[Appendix D - Other Protocol Evaluations](#) provides insight into other protocols that were considered for suitability when developing the STTP use cases and functional requirements.

While the format and structure of this document, established to facilitate collaboration, is different than that used

by standards bodies, it is hoped that the content within this document can meet all the information requirements needed to enable repackaging of this specification into draft standard formats.

## Business case

---

At the conclusion of the ASP project in April 2019, it is anticipated that STTP will be a well-tested, thoroughly vetted, production-grade protocol that will be supported by ASP project team vendors. An open source tool suite for STTP will be developed as part of the project (see [Appendix B](#)) that will include a test harness that will allow utilities and vendors outside the project to test and validate STTP in their systems and API's.

STTP offers both short-term cost savings and strategic value in that it is:

### Intrinsically Robust

By design, STTP packet sizes are small and are optimized for network MTU size reducing fragmentation which results in more efficient TCP performance and less overall data loss with UDP. STTP also puts significantly less stress on network routing equipment and facilitates mixing of streaming data traffic and other general network communications. With STTP, purpose built networks are not required to reliably support very large phasor data streams.

### Security Centric

STTP has been built using a "security first" design approach. Authentication to establish a connection with other parties requires a certificate. While public certificate providers can be used, it is recommended that symmetric certificates be exchanged out-of-band to avoid the risk and cost of management of public keys. Best-practice encryption is natively available in STTP but not required given the common practice to manage encryption at the network layer.

### Reduces First Cost

A protocol similar to STTP called GEP has been measured <sup>[5]</sup> to have less than half the band width requirements of IEEE C37.118 <sup>[1]</sup> when used with TCP and simple methods for lossless compression. With the compression, a single signal or measurement point (i.e., an identifier, timestamp, value and quality code) requires only 2.5 bytes. By comparison, IEEE C37.118 requires 4.5 bytes per measurement on average. The signal-based GEP protocol incorporates Pub/Sub data exchange methods so that unnecessary data points need not be exchanged - thereby further reducing overall bandwidth requirements as compared to IEEE C37.118.

### Reduces Operating Cost

STTP will automatically exchange and synchronize measurement level meta-data using a GUID as the key value to allow the self-initialization and integration of rich meta-data with points from multiple connected synchrophasor networks. This eliminates the need to map measurements to a pre-defined set identifiers and dispenses with the cost and hassles of synchronization of individual utility configuration with a centralized registry. Permissions for data subscriptions can be grouped and filtered using expressions to assure that only the signals that are authorized are shared (for example, all phasors from a specified substation) while the set of points available is dynamically adjusted as PMUs come and go without the need for point-by-point administrator approval.

### An Enabling Technology

STTP provides an alternative to the existing method for utility data exchange that will enable future generations of SCADA/EMS systems to both (1) utilize full-resolution synchrophasor data streams and (2) significantly reduce the cost of maintaining the configuration of components to exchange other real-time data. An ISO/RTO will typically exchange hundreds of thousands of data points every few seconds with its members and neighbors.

 ICCP (IEC 60870-6/TASE.2) is the international standard used to exchange "real-time" SCADA data among electric utilities. Analog measurement data is typically exchanged continuously every 2 to 10 seconds

with bi-modal data such as breaker status information only being exchanged "on change". ICCP came into coordinated use in North America in the mid-1990s.

Promising technologies are being developed for cloud computing and these technologies are moving toward native implementations at individual utilities and ISOs. These cloud computing technologies can also be leveraged to support larger native implementations such as those for an interconnect. The common theme among these technologies is the ability to process significantly more data quickly with improved reliability.

It's possible that a protocol like STTP which allows secure, low-latency, high-volume data exchange among utilities at low cost can be a major factor in driving change toward these new technologies. New higher-speed forms of inter-utility interaction will be possible, and new approaches for providing utility information services will be realizable.

### **Built Upon A Proven Approach**


STTP will enhance the successful design elements of the Gateway Exchange Protocol (GEP) as a foundation and improve upon it. GEP is currently in production use by Dominion, Entergy, MISO, PeakRC, TVA, FP&L, Southern Company, among others.

# Definitions and Nomenclature

 Please add liberally to this section as terms are introduced in the spec

## Definition of Key Terms

The words "must", "must not", "required", "shall", "shall not", "should", "should not", "recommended", "may", and "optional" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [\[3\]](#).

 All the terms below are hyperlinked to a key source for the definition or to a reference where more information is available.

Term	Definition
<a href="#">data point</a>	A measurement of identified data along with any associated state, e.g., time of measurement and quality of measured data.
<a href="#">data structure</a>	An organized set of primitive data types where each element has a meaningful name.
<a href="#">frame</a>	A data-structure composed of primitive data types that has been serialized into a discrete binary package.
<a href="#">endianess</a>	The hardware prescribed ordinal direction of the bits used to represent a numerical value in computer memory; usually noted as either <i>big</i> or <i>little</i> .
<a href="#">Ethernet</a>	Frame based data transmission technology used in local area networks.
<a href="#">fragmentation</a>	Network fragmentation is the process that breaks frames into smaller fragments, called packets, that can pass over a network according to an MTU size limit. Fragments are reassembled by the receiver.
<a href="#">measurement</a>	
<a href="#">packet</a>	A block of data carried by a network whose size is dictated by the MTU. Also called <i>network packet</i> .
<a href="#">phasor</a>	A complex equivalent of a simple cosine wave quantity such that the complex modulus is the cosine wave amplitude and the complex angle (in polar form) is the cosine wave phase angle.
<a href="#">primitive type</a>	A specific type of data provided by a programming language referenced by a keyword that represents the most basic unit of data storage - examples can include integer, float and boolean values. Also called <i>primitive data type</i> .
<a href="#">publish/subscribe</a>	A messaging pattern where senders of messages, called publishers, do not program the messages to be sent directly to specific receivers, called subscribers, but instead characterize published messages into classes without knowledge of which subscribers, if any, there may be.
<a href="#">null</a>	A value reserved for indicating that a reference, e.g., a pointer, is not initialized and does not refer to a valid object.
<a href="#">serialization</a>	Process of transforming data structures into a format that is suitable for storage or transmission over a network.
<a href="#">signal</a>	
<a href="#">synchrophasor</a>	A phasor calculated from data samples using a standard time signal as the reference for the measurement. Synchronized phasors from remote sites have a defined common phase relationship.

<b>time series</b>	A series of data points indexed in time order, most commonly measured as a sequence taken at successive equally spaced points in time.
<b>term</b>	definition

## Acronyms

Term	Definition
<b>API</b>	<a href="#">Application Program Interface</a>
<b>BES</b>	<a href="#">Bulk Electric System</a>
<b>DOE</b>	<a href="#">United States Department of Energy</a>
<b>DDS</b>	<a href="#">Data Distribution Service</a>
<b>GEP</b>	<a href="#">Gateway Exchange Protocol</a>
<b>GPA</b>	<a href="#">Grid Protection Alliance, Inc.</a>
<b>GPS</b>	<a href="#">Global Positioning System</a>
<b>GUID</b>	<a href="#">Globally Unique Identifier</a>
<b>ICCP</b>	<a href="#">Inter-Control Center Communications Protocol</a>
<b>IP</b>	<a href="#">Internet Protocol</a>
<b>ISO</b>	<a href="#">Independent System Operator</a>
<b>MTU</b>	<a href="#">Maximum Transmission Unit</a>
<b>NaN</b>	<a href="#">Not a Number</a>
<b>PDC</b>	<a href="#">Phasor Data Concentrator</a>
<b>PMU</b>	<a href="#">Phasor Measurement Unit</a>
<b>STTP</b>	<a href="#">Streaming Telemetry Transport Protocol</a>
<b>TCP</b>	<a href="#">Transmission Control Protocol</a>
<b>UDP</b>	<a href="#">User Datagram Protocol</a>
<b>UTC</b>	<a href="#">Coordinated Universal Time</a>
<b>ZeroMQ</b>	<a href="#">Brokerless Messaging Queuing and Distribution Library</a>

## Document Conventions



Markdown notes in combination with the [Github Emogi](#) images are used as callouts. The standard callouts are:

 This is a call out in the spec to provide background, instruction or additional information

 This note use used to highlight important or critical information.

 This note is used to call out information related to reference implementations or API development.

 A informal note to document authors to facilitate specification development

  (author's initials): *May be used by anyone to toss out questions and comments that are temporal. These may be inserted at any point in any of the markdown documents. These questions will preserved as they are migrated to the [QuestionsSummary.md](#) file from time-to-time.*



Code blocks are shown as:

```
public function void DisplayHelloWorld()
{
    Console.WriteLine("Hello world!");
}
```

Code is also shown `inline` as well.

# Protocol Overview

---

STTP is an open, data point centric publish/subscribe transport protocol that can be used to securely exchange time-series style data and automatically synchronize metadata between two applications. The protocol supports sending real-time and historical data at full or down-sampled resolutions. When sending historical data, the replay speed can be controlled dynamically for use in visualizations to enable users to see data faster or slower than recorded in real-time.

The wire protocol employed by STTP implements a publish/subscribe data exchange model using simple commands with a compressed binary serialization of data points. The protocol does not require a predefined or fixed configuration - that is, the data points values arriving in one data packet can be different than those arriving in another. Each packet of data consists of a collection of data points where each instance is a compact structure containing an ID, a timestamp or sequence, a value and any associated flags.

STTP is implemented using a *command channel* and a *data channel*. The actual IP transport protocols for these channels varies based on need, but is often either a single TCP/IP transport for both the command and data channel -or- a TCP/IP based command channel with a UDP/IP based data channel.

The command channel is used to reliably negotiate session specific required communication, state and protocol parameters. The command channel is also used to authenticate with other STTP instances, exchange metadata on available data points, and request specific data points for subscription. The data channel is used to send compact, binary encoded packets of data points.

STTP includes strong access control and encryption and is configurable to allow use of private keys in a highly isolated environment. When encryption and strong identity verification is enabled, STTP utilizes standard key management services with X.509 identity certificates for authentication.

In this section of the STTP specification, first data communication fundamentals are presented that set the boundary conditions for protocol design. These are followed by an introduction to the major components STTP.

 Recommend a pattern of providing an introduction to what follows in the opening paragraphs of each major section.

## Background

In typical messaging exchange paradigms, a source application hosts a block of structured data, composed in memory, with the intent to transmit the data to one or more receiving applications. The data has *structure* in the sense that it exists as a collection of simpler primitive data types where each of the data elements is given a name to provide useful context and meaning; most programming languages represent data structures using a primary key word, e.g., `class` or `struct`. Before transmission, the data structure must be serialized - this is necessary because the programming language of the source application which hosts the data structure defines the structure in memory using a format that is optimized for use in the application. The process of serializing the data structure causes each of the data elements to be translated into a format that is easily transmitted over a network and is suitable for deserialization by a receiving application.

The applications that are sending and receiving data structures can be running on the same machine or on different physical hardware with disparate operating systems. As a result, the details of the data structure serialization format can be complex and diverse. Such complexities can include issues with proper handling of the endianness of the primitive data types during serialization which may differ from the system that is deserializing the data, or differences in the interpretation of how character data is encoded <sup>[6]</sup>.

The subject of serializing data structures in the field of computer science has become very mature; many solutions exist to manage the complexities of serialization. Today most computer programming languages, or their

associated frameworks, include various options for serializing data structures in multiple formats. However, these solutions tend to only work within their target ecosystems and are usually not very interoperable with other frameworks or languages.

When interoperability is important, other technologies exist that focus on data structure serialization that works regardless of hardware, operating system or programming language. Two of these serialization technologies that are in wide use are Google Protocol Buffers <sup>[7]</sup> and the Facebook developed Apache Thrift <sup>[8]</sup>. Both of these serialization frameworks create highly compact, cross-platform serializations of data structures with APIs that exist in many commonly used programming languages.

**i** For the purposes of this specification, serialized data structures will be referred to as a *frames*, regardless of the actual binary format.

For smaller sized, discrete data structures, the existing available serialization technologies are very fast and highly effective. However, as the data structures become larger, the process of serialization and deserialization becomes more costly in terms of both memory allocation and computational processing. Because of this, large frames of data are not recommended for use by these serialization technologies <sup>[9]</sup> <sup>[10]</sup>. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, there are also penalties that occur at the network transport layer.

### Data Structure Serialization in the Power Industry

In the electric power industry, the IEEE C37.118 <sup>[1]</sup> protocol exists as a standard serialization format for the exchange of synchrophasor data. Synchrophasor data is typically measured with an accurate time source, e.g., a GPS clock, and transmitted at high-speed data rates, up to 120 frames per second. Measured data sent by this protocol is still simply a frame of serialized primitive types which includes data elements such as a timestamp, status flags, phasor angle / magnitude pairs, etc. The IEEE C37.118 protocol also prescribes the combination of data frames received from multiple source devices for the same timestamp into one large combined frame in a process known as concentration. The concentration process demands that a waiting period be established to make sure all the expected data frames for a given timestamp arrive. If any frames of data do not arrive before the waiting period expires, the overall combined frame is published anyway. Since the frame format is fixed, empty data elements that have no defined value, e.g., NaN or null, still occupy space for the missing frames.

### Large Frame Network Impact

Under the Internet Protocol (IP), all frames of data to be transmitted that exceed the negotiated maximum transmission unit (MTU) size (typically 1,500 bytes for Ethernet networks <sup>[11]</sup>) are divided into multiple fragments where each fragment is called a network packet, see Figure 1.






Figure 1

Since IP is inherently unreliable, the impact of large frames on an IP network can be determined by the number of

network packets required to send the frame. Network packets can only be transmitted over a connection one packet at a time; when two or more network packets arrive for transmission at the same time on any physical network media, the result is a collision. When a collision occurs, only one packet gets sent and the others get dropped <sup>[12]</sup>. IP defines a variety of different transport protocols for network packet transmission, each of which behave in different manners when dealing with packet loss. Consequently, many of the impacts a large frame has on an IP network is dependent upon the transport protocol used to send the frame.

 KEM: *Can you have a collision on a full duplex system? If so, it sounds like buffering is improperly implemented.*


 JRC: *A full duplex system prevents network media collisions between incoming and outgoing traffic. It does not prevent UDP data loss from buffer overruns in the OS network stack nor does it prevent collisions from simultaneous traffic.*

### Large Frame Impacts on TCP/IP

The most common Internet protocol, TCP/IP, creates an index for each of the network packets being sent for a frame of data and verifies that each are successfully delivered, retransmitting packets as many times as needed in the case of loss. This functionality is the basis for TCP being considered a *reliable* data transmission protocol.

Since each packet of data for the transmitted frame is sequentially ordered, TCP is able to fully reconstruct and deliver the original frame once all the packets have arrived. However, for very large frames of data this causes TCP to suffer from the same kinds of impacts on memory allocation and computational burden as the aforementioned serialization technologies, i.e., Protocol Buffers and Thrift. The unique distinction for IP based protocols is that at some level, these issues also affect every element of the interconnected network infrastructure between the source and sync of the data being exchanged.

Another critical impact that is unique to TCP is that for data that needs to be delivered in a timely fashion, retransmissions of dropped packets can also cause cumulative time delays <sup>[13]</sup>, especially as large data frames are published at rapid rates. Time delays are also exacerbated during periods of increased network activity which induces congestion and a higher rate of collisions.

 Synchrophasor data is the source for real-time visualization and analysis tools which are used to operate the bulk electric system (BES). This real-time data is required to be accurate, dependable and timely in order to be useful for grid operators <sup>[14]</sup>. Any delays in the delivery of this data could have adverse affects on operational decisions impacting the BES.

### Large Frame Impacts on UDP/IP

Another common Internet protocol is UDP/IP. Transmission of data over UDP differs from TCP in the fact that UDP does not attempt to retransmit data nor does it make any attempts to maintain the order of the transmitted packets. This functionality is the basis for UDP being considered a *lossy* data transmission protocol, but more lightweight than TCP.

Even with the unreliable delivery caveats, UDP will still attempt to reconstruct and deliver the originally transmitted frame of data. However, even if a single network packet is dropped, the entire original frame will be lost and any packets that were already accumulated get discarded <sup>[15]</sup>. In other words, there are no partial frame deliveries - frame reception with UDP is an all or nothing operation.

Since UDP attempts frame reconstruction with the received packets, the impact of large frames of data with UDP are similar to those with TCP and serialization technologies in that there is increased memory allocation and computational processing throughout the network infrastructure.

The more problematic impact with UDP and large frames of data is that the increased number of network packets

needed to send a large frame also increases the probability of dropping one of those packets due to a collision. Since the loss of any one packet results in the loss of the entire frame of data, as frame size increases, so does volume of overall data loss.

### Impacts of UDP Loss on Synchrophasor Data


For synchrophasor data, UDP is often the protocol of choice. The density of synchrophasor data allows analytical applications to tolerate *some* loss. The amount of loss that can be tolerated depends on the nature of the analytic because as the loss increases, the confidence in the analytic results decreases [\[citation needed\]](#). Another reason UDP is used for synchrophasor data is its lightweight nature; use of UDP reduces overall network bandwidth requirements as compared to TCP [\[16\]](#). Perhaps the most critical reason for use of UDP for synchrophasor data is that UDP does not suffer from issues with induced time delays caused by retransmission of dropped network packets.

For IEEE C37.118 [\[1\]](#) deployments, large frame sizes can have adverse affects on data completeness; as more and more devices are concentrated into a single frame of data, the larger frame sizes contribute to higher overall data losses. In tests conducted by PeakRC, measured overall data loss for the transmission of all of its synchrophasor data using IEEE C37.118 averaged over 2% [\[5\]](#) when using a data rate of 30 frames per second and more than 3,100 data values per frame. To help mitigate the data losses when using UDP, some companies have resorted to purpose-built, dedicated synchrophasor networks [\[17\]](#). Although a dedicated network is ideal at reducing data loss (minimizing simultaneous network traffic results in fewer collisions), this will not be an option for most companies that treat the network as a shared resource.

## Changing the Paradigm with STTP

Existing serialization technologies are not designed for messaging exchange use cases that demand sending large frames of data at high speeds, often falling short in terms of timely delivery or data loss depending on the IP transport protocol used. The obvious solution is to break large data structures into smaller ones, recombining them as needed in receiving applications [\[9\]](#). Although this strategy can work fine for one-off solutions where data structures are manually partitioned into smaller units for transport, this does not lend itself to an abstract, versatile long term solution.

Instead of serializing an entire data structure as a unit, STTP is designed to package each of the distinct elements of the data structure into small groups. Serialization is managed for each data element, typically a primitive type, that gets individually identified along with any associated state, e.g., time and/or quality information, see [Figure 2](#). Ultimately more information is being sent, but it is being packaged differently.

 For the purposes of this specification a data element, its identification and any associated state, e.g., time and quality, will be referred to as a *data point*.

### Mapping Data Structure Elements to Data Points




Figure 2

To resolve issues with large frame impacts on IP based networks, a primary tenet of the STTP design strategy is to reduce fragmentation; as a result, STTP intentionally limits the number of data points that will be grouped together to form a frame to ensure its size is optimized for transmission over an IP network with minimal fragmentation.

Because each data point is uniquely identified, the elements that appear from one frame to another are not fixed allowing interleaving of data from multiple simultaneous data exchanges - this notion supports the delivery of any number of data structures where each can have a different publication interval, see [Figure 3](#).




Figure 3

While it is possible to always target zero fragmentation by making sure the frame size is below the current MTU size, STTP implementations should allow tuning for some fragmentation to accommodate different deployment scenarios and use cases, i.e., allowing target frame sizes that are larger than the current MTU size. For deployments in high-performance network environments, overall loss due to data collisions may be statistically the same for frame sizes that are a few multiples of the MTU.

### STTP Bandwidth Impact

Since data points include identity and state along with the primitive type value, serializations of STTP data carry extra information; so by its very nature uncompressed STTP will often require more bandwidth as compared to traditional data structure serialization technologies.

Although it will be common for use cases that demand a protocol like STTP, e.g., transmission of large data sets with variable availability at high speeds, to be deployed in environments that are not bandwidth constrained - simple testing has shown that deviation based compression techniques that have negligible processing impact

can yield overall bandwidth requirements for STTP that are equal to or less than other serialization technologies, even when carrying extra information. For synchrophasor data, tests have shown data point serializations to have less than half the bandwidth requirements of IEEE C37.118 <sup>[1]</sup> when used over TCP with simple stateful methods for lossless compression <sup>[5]</sup>.

Bandwidth requirements for STTP can often be further lowered by reducing the amount of data being transmitted. For most data structure serialization technologies and protocols, the very process of packaging and sending data in the form of data structures means that some data ends up being transmitted that is not used nor needed by receiving applications. Data reduction for these technologies means creating smaller data structures where it can be costly to maintain separate configuration models for multiple data structures just to achieve bandwidth improvements. Since STTP is designed as a publish / subscribe technology, a receiving application can choose to subscribe to only the individual data points it needs.

### **Data Point Level Publish / Subscribe**

STTP intrinsically manages data at its most fundamental level, primitive types. Each uniquely identified primitive type value represents some form of physical measurement. When measured with periodicity and associated with a timestamp at the moment of measurement, the resulting sequence of measured values and associated timestamps are known as *time series* data. Since data points that are serialized by STTP can include time as part of the state information for a value, STTP can be considered a time series data transmission protocol. However, the state information for values being transmitted is flexible - what is *time* for one data point could simply be a *sequence* for another. Additionally, the existence of some data points can be temporal, for example, to exchange a set of binary data, a temporary data point ID may be created that only exists until the binary data transfer is complete.

STTP uses a publish / subscribe based model for control of the data to be exchanged. This exchange is managed at the data point level where data sourced at a sending application, i.e., the *publisher*, will make a set of data points available for publication. A receiving application, i.e., the *subscriber*, will select a subset of the available points for subscription. As new data is made available at the publisher, the subset of the data as selected by the subscriber will be transmitted.

### **Data Point Metadata**

A critical part of the publish / subscribe process is defining the data points that are available for subscription. An STTP publisher will define a tabular list of available data point identifiers and associated descriptive information as the *metadata* that is available to a subscriber.

Each data point includes a unique identifier; regardless of the binary transmission format, this identifier will exist as a statistically unique GUID in the defined metadata for the available data points. This makes the metadata from multiple publishers easier to merge into local repositories used by a subscriber.

At a minimum, each row in the STTP publisher metadata will include the GUID based data point identifier, a short human readable alpha-numeric *tag*, the primitive data type used for the value of the data point, a description, the enabled state and timestamps for the creation, last update and deletion of the data point.

Metadata in STTP is designed to be extensible. Different industries may require different kinds of available metadata in order to properly map and integrate with other protocols and environments. To accommodate the extensibility, other tabular datasets can be made available by a publisher as needed.

### **Data Point Access Control**

STTP puts publishers in full control of access to data. A publisher can choose not to allow connections and/or expose any data to a subscriber that is not strongly identified. Publishers can choose to restrict data access at an individual data point level, a group level or at an identified subscriber level.

Selection of available points for an identified subscriber or a group can be controlled by an expression. Expression based access control means that the even as the data sources available to a publisher change, the expressions will still apply and need not be updated. For example, metadata will need to contain information about the primitive data type for a given data point - an expression based on this data type may look like the following:

```
ALLOW WHERE DataType='BOOL'
```

For this expression, all data points as defined in the metadata that have a data type of `BOOL` would be allowed for the group or identified subscriber. This expression would cause the allowed metadata to dynamically change as the available source data configured in the publisher changed.

## Data Transport Channels

STTP data transport requires the use of a *command channel* using TCP/IP for reliable delivery of important commands. Optionally a secondary *data channel* can be established using UDP/IP for the transport of data that can tolerate loss. When no secondary UDP/IP is used, both commands and data will share use of the TCP/IP channel for communications.

Although not precluded from use over other data transports, the design of STTP is targeted and optimized for use over IP, specifically TCP/IP and UDP/IP. Even so, since the command/response implementation and data packet distribution of the STTP protocol is fairly simple, it is expected that commonly available middleware data transport layers, such as ZeroMQ or DDS, could easily support and transmit data using the STTP protocol should any of the messaging distribution and management benefits of these transport layers be useful to a particular deployment environment. However, these types of deployments are outside the scope of this documentation. If needed, STTP integrations with middleware layers should be added as reference implementation repositories to the STTP organizational site <sup>[4]</sup>.

🍌 ? JRC: The question has been raised if a UDP only transport should be allowed? In this mode, any critical commands and responses would basically be sent over UDP. Thought would need to be given to commands and/or responses that never arrive and the consequences thereof.

🍌 ? SEC: We may also consider a UDP method that is not bi-directional. Much like how C37.118 currently supports such a data stream. This could be encrypted by storing the client's public key on the server and encrypting the cipher key periodically. It could be used when transporting from secure environment to an unsecure one. Anytime TCP is used, the potential of buffering and creating a DOS attack on the more secure system is possible. And UDP replies through a firewall are really easy to spoof.

😞 JRC: Presume that this would require an out-of-band pre-defined configuration to be "known" or handle it the way C37.118 currently manages this, i.e., sending a "config frame" once per minute. In context of STTP, this might be a reduced set of metadata that represented "what" was being published. This would need some "rules" to operate properly.

💡 KEM: The advantage in this case is that UDP will operate unidirectionally, TCP won't. However for commands you really need to close the loop. I suggest that STTP only be developed for TCP as suggested above, but do not state that it cannot be adapted to UDP.


## STTP Feature Summary

- Perform at high volume / large scale
- Minimize data losses (e.g., over UDP)
- Lower bandwidth requirements (e.g., over TCP)
- Optimized for the performant delivery of individual data points





- Automated exchange of metadata (no centralized registry required)
- Detect and expose communication issues
- Security and availability features that enable use on critical systems to support critical operations
- Publish/subscribe at data point level
- API implemented in multiple languages on multiple platforms
- Metadata will be versioned and tabular in nature
- Sets of metadata from multiple parties will be easy to merge
- Points defined in metadata will have a clear ownership path
- A minimal set of metadata will exist to support any STTP deployments
- Industry specific metadata extensions will exist to support specific industry deployments
- Ability to support broadcast messaging and distribution of critical system alarms

## Data Point Structure

 Lead with paragraph on purpose / value of the section - (1) what is a data point structure and (2) why have a data point structure / value? Next paragraph would be contents of section...


... this section includes:

- Identification - maps to 128-bit Guid, transport mapping should be small
- Timestamp (required? could simply be a auto-incrementing counter)
- Value - multiple native types supports
- Flags - standardize minimal set of simple flags, complex state can be new data point

  SEC: Rather than require all data to be mapped into a predefined Data Point, the lowest level of the protocol that defines how data is serialized should be a free-form data block that is defined at runtime. Instead, the Data Point Structure should be more like:

- C37.118 Data Point Structure
- DNP Data Point Structure
- ICCP Data Point Structure
- IEC 61850-90-5 Data Point Structure
- Generic Time-Series Data Point Structure (Original Data Point Structure listed above)

At some level, all measurements can be mapped to Generic Time-Series Data Point Structure, but they shouldn't be required to be from the get-go. This would allow the creation of a front-end data transport that could move any kind of time series data in its raw format and the consumer of the data can decide how to translate the data. This also means that these raw protocols could be encapsulated and transported over encrypted channels without requiring a stateful metadata repository to map all measurements to a GUID.

 JRC: I think this could be supported in an automated process (and perhaps starting with code) found in serialization technologies like Google Protocol Buffers. The openECA style data structure handling has been on my mind as a way to handle "mappings" of other protocols, basically as data structures like you mention. Cannot get away from some sort of Identification of the "instance" of a mapping though - even if the mapping ID defaulted to something simple. At a wire protocol level though, sticking to primitive types helps keep protocol parsing very simple - and- there are just too many other technologies that already exist to serialize data structures- STTP should not be trying to re-solve that problem. A consumer of STTP should be able to parse any packet of data even when what the data represented was unknown.

## Data Point Value Types

- Null
- Byte
- Int16
- Int32
- Int64
- UInt16
- UInt32
- UInt64
- Decimal (IEEE Standard 754-2008)
- Double

- Single
- DateTime (need some thought on proper encoding, perhaps options)
- TimeSpan (Tick level resolution, or better, would be ideal)
- Char (2-byte Unicode)
- Bool
- Guid
- String (encoding support for UTF-16, UTF-8, ANSI and ASCII)
- Byte[]

🍅 ? KEM: *Is decimal the same as float?*

💡 JRC: *Actually "decimal" is an IEEE standard data type, standard 754-2008 - I added that parenthetically above. It's a floating point number that doesn't suffer from typical floating point rounding issues - often used for currency operations. See here for more detail: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decimal\\_data\\_type](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decimal_data_type)*

🚧 Need to determine safe maximum upper limit of per-packet strings and byte[] data, especially since implementation could simply *span* multiple data points to collate a larger string or buffer back together.

🍅 ? JRC: *Should API automatically handle collation of larger data types, e.g., strings and buffers?*

# Commands and Responses



Purpose of command/response structure, fundamentals of how it works, why it is needed

## Commands

All commands must be sent over the command channel.

Code	Command	Source	Description
0x00	<a href="#">Set Operational Modes</a>	Subscriber	Defines desired set of operational modes.
0x01	<a href="#">Metadata Refresh</a>	Subscriber	Requests publisher send updated metadata.
0x02	<a href="#">Subscribe</a>	Subscriber	Defines desired set of data points to begin receiving.
0x03	<a href="#">Unsubscribe</a>	Subscriber	Requests publisher terminate current subscription.
0x0n	etc.		
0xFF	<a href="#">NoOp</a>	Any	Periodic message to allow validation of connectivity.

### Set Operational Modes Command

This must be the first command sent after a successful connection - the command must be sent before any other commands or responses are exchanged so that the "ground-rules" for the communications session can be established. The rule for this operational mode negotiation is that once these modes have been established, they will not change for the lifetime of the connection.

The subscriber must send the command and the publisher must await its reception. If the publisher does not receive the command in a timely fashion (time interval controlled by configuration), it will disconnect the subscriber.

As part of this initial exchange, the subscriber will propose the desired protocol version to use.



In modes of operations where the publisher is initiating the connection, the publisher will still be waiting for subscriber to initiate communications with a `Set Operational Modes` command.

- Wire Format: Binary
- Requested operational mode negotiations
  - String encoding
  - Compression modes
  - UDP data channel usage / port

### Metadata Refresh Command

- Wire Format: Binary
  - Includes current metadata version number

### Subscribe Command

- Wire Format: Binary
  - Includes metadata expression and/or individual Guides for desired data points

### Unsubscribe Command

- Wire Format: Binary

## NoOp Command


No operation keep-alive ping. It is possible for the command channel to remain quiet for some time if most data is being transmitted over the data channel, this command allows a periodic test of client connectivity.

- Wire Format: Binary

## Responses

Responses are sent over a designated channel based on the nature of the response.

Code	Response	Source	Channel	Description
0x80	<a href="#">Succeeded</a>	Publisher	Command	Command request succeeded. Response details follow.
0x81	<a href="#">Failed</a>	Publisher	Command	Command request failed. Response error details follow.
0x82	<a href="#">Data Point Packet</a>	Any	Data	Response contains data points.
0x83	<a href="#">Signal Mapping</a>	Any	Command	Response contains data point Guid to run-time ID mappings.
0x8n	etc.			

 For the response table above, when a response is destined for the data channel, it should be understood that a connection can be established where both the command and data channel use the same TCP connection.

### Succeeded Response

- Wire Format: Binary (header)
  - Base wire format includes *in-response-to* command code
  - Can include response that is specific to source command:

### Succeeded Response for Metadata Refresh

- Wire Format: String + Binary
  - Includes response message with stats like size, number of tables etc.
  - Includes temporal data point ID for "chunked" metadata responses
  - Includes number of metadata data points to be expected

### Succeeded Response for Subscribe

Subscriber will need to wait for

- Wire Format: String + Binary
  - Includes response message with stats like number of actual points subscribed, count may not match requested points due to rights or points may no longer exist, etc.
  - Includes temporal data point ID for "chunked" signal mapping responses
  - Includes number of signal mapping data points to be expected

### Succeeded Response for Unsubscribe

- Wire Format: String
  - Includes message as to successful unsubscribe with stats like connection time

### Failed Response

- Wire Format: String + Binary (header)
  - Base wire format includes *in-response-to* command code
  - Includes error message as why command request failed
  - Can include response that is specific to source command:


### Failed Response for Set Operational Modes

Failed responses to operational modes usually indicate lack of support by publisher. Failure response should include, per failed operational mode option, what options the publisher supports so that the operational modes can be re-negotiated by resending operational modes with a set of *supported* options.

- Wire Format: Binary
  - Includes operational mode that failed followed by available operational mode options

### Data Point Packet Response

- Wire Format: Binary
  - Includes a byte flag indicating content, e.g.:
  - Data compression mode, if any
  - Total data points in packet
  - Includes serialized data points

 The data point packet is technically classified as a response to a `subscribe` command. However, unlike most responses that operate as a sole response to a parent command, data-packet responses will continue to flow for available measurements until an `unsubscribe` command is issued.

### Signal Mapping Response


- Wire Format: Binary
  - Includes a mapping of data point GUIDs to run-time signal IDs
  - Includes per data point ownership state, rights and delivery characteristic details

## Data Point Characteristics


---

STTP will allow the ability to define delivery and quality of service characteristics for each data point made available for publication. These characteristics include priority, reliability, verification, exception and resolution.

The publisher is in full control of what per data point delivery characteristics are allowed. The transport layers in use for the connection will also dictate the availability of some characteristics, e.g., reliability. Regardless, the subscriber can always request a specific set of per data point delivery characteristics, but these may be denied by the publisher.

 Once defined, reference associated command / response details that define the negotiations for data point delivery characteristics.

The delivery characteristics for each data point have been defined to fit within a single byte. Default delivery characteristics will be assumed during subscription initialization for data points when none are otherwise defined, i.e., data point delivery characteristic flags value will be 0x00.

 As an optimization, subscribers need to be able to group multiple delivery characteristic requests into a single message with an optimized payload size since request could be sizable for a very large number of data points. Same goes for any publisher response payloads.

Since publisher will be able to reject, en masse, subscriber requested data point delivery characteristics, there will need to be a way in the publisher configuration to define the required and allowable characteristics for each data point.

Another consideration is that it may be desirable that these configurations be changeable per subscriber. For example, user may want to require that a subscriber with a known slow connection to be forced to use an alternate lossy data communications channel for streaming data point values that can tolerate loss, but allow command communications channel for all data for subscribers using more reliable connections.

Publisher configuration could be greatly simplified (possibly reduced) if data points can be assigned as required and allowable characteristics based on some automated high-level data point classification, such as, data points that can tolerate loss (streaming) or data points that require verification (control / critical).

Overall thoughts on data point delivery characteristics are that since publisher is exclusively in control of delivery requirements from both a "required" and "allowed" perspective – to reduce negotiations, publisher should provide the required and allowed characteristics with the meta-data that is provided to the subscriber – this way subscriber won't inadvertently request something that is not allowed.

## Priority Characteristic

Per data point subscriber request will assign data point level routing priority at the publisher. All priority values will be specific to each subscription.

### Flag Definition

Three-bit value defining 8 priorities, i.e., 0 to 7, where 0, default, is the lowest priority and 7 is the highest priority. Note that value 7 is a reserved system-level priority, leaving a total of 7, ranging from 0 to 6, user-level priorities. Data point priority value occupies bits 0 to 2 of the data point delivery characteristic flags where the unsigned 3-bit integer is encoded in big-endian order.

### Rights and Responsibilities

Publisher will have the right to reject subscriber requested priority levels. If publisher rejects requested priority

levels, then failure response to subscriber will include assigned levels for each data point so that subscriber can accept and update its run-time priority levels with those proposed by publisher or otherwise terminate the connection.


Subscriber can request desired priority levels but is subject to publisher assigned levels. A common use case may be that data points with the verification characteristic enabled will also be requested to use higher priority levels. If the subscriber does not agree with assigned data point priority levels then, with appropriate response before termination, the subscriber will close the connection.

#### Recommended Operational Statistics

- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points are configured at each priority.
- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points have been published at each priority.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points are configured at each priority.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points have been received at each priority.

## Reliability Characteristic

Per data point subscriber request would have publisher send data point values over reliable command communications channel (e.g., TCP) or send without retransmission over lossy data communications channel (e.g., UDP). Reliability flag will be ignored when there is no defined alternate data communications channel.

 If a spontaneous, unicast only data publication mode is supported by STTP, then need to address that mode of operation here. For a unicast only publication mode, any reliability characteristics published as part of the configuration would all need to be set to lossy mode.

### Flag Definition

Single bit value where 0, default, is *send data point over the reliable command communications channel* - and 1 is *send data point over the lossy data communications channel*. Data point reliability value occupies bit 3 of the data point delivery characteristic flags.

### Rights and Responsibilities

Publisher will have the right to reject subscriber requested reliability values. If publisher rejects requested reliability values, then failure response to subscriber will include assigned values for each data point so that subscriber can accept and update its run-time reliability values with those proposed by the publisher or otherwise terminate the connection.

Subscriber can request desired reliability values but is subject to publisher assigned values. A common use case may be that typical streaming data that can tolerate loss be restricted by the publisher to a lossy data communications channel, e.g., UDP, to reduce possibility of command communications channel queuing over slow or noisy connections. If the subscriber does not agree with assigned data point reliability values then, with appropriate response before termination, the subscriber will close the connection.

Note that if publisher requires that any of the subscribed data be published over a lossy data communications channel and the subscriber has not defined one, the publisher, with appropriate notification of issue to subscriber, will terminate the connection.

#### Recommended Operational Statistics

- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points are




configured for both command communications channel and data communications channel.


- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points have been published for both command communications channel and data communications channel.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points are configured for both command communications channel and data communications channel.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points have been received for both command communications channel and data communications channel.


## Verification Characteristic

Per data point publisher assigned characteristic will inform subscriber that a reply must be provided with receipt of data point delivery. Failure to receive receipt, within configured timeout of sender, will be exposed via API so that host application can manage any appropriate action, e.g., exception logging and/or queue for retry. It is expected that verified data points only be used for sending critical data, either from subscriber to publisher or publisher to subscriber, e.g., a control value that will require verification of receipt.

 Once defined, reference associated command / response details that define the negotiations for data point verification.

Data point verification functions must exist in both publisher and subscriber. In the case of the subscriber, critical data points sent from publisher that are marked with a verification characteristic must be replied to with a verification message upon receipt of value. For the publisher, data points can be made available that are updatable by the subscriber, e.g., write registers or data points used for control “ when these data points are marked with a verification characteristic, the publisher will reply to subscriber with a verification message upon receipt of value.

 End users managing publisher configuration should be made aware of the implications of requiring data point delivery verification, e.g., increased bi-directional bandwidth requirements as well as induced data point latencies because of round-trip confirmation messages “ this awareness is needed so that verification characteristics are applied judiciously. For example, high-speed streaming data would not be a good candidate for delivery verification.

 If a spontaneous, unicast only data publication mode is supported by STTP, then need to address that mode of operation here. For a unicast only publication mode, no form of verification could be supported.

## Flag Definition

Single bit value where 0, default, is data point received receipt is not required and 1 is data point received receipt is required. Data point verification value occupies bit 4 of the data point delivery characteristic flags.

## Rights and Responsibilities

Publisher has full authority over determination of which data points require verification. Any verification flags that may be specified by subscriber during data point delivery characteristic requests will be ignored. Subject to rights verification of subscriber to send data points back to publisher, any data points destined to publisher that are marked for verification must respond with a verification receipt back to subscriber upon successful delivery.


Subscriber must reply to publisher upon receipt of data points that are marked for verification. If the subscriber does not agree with the volume of subscribed data points that require verification then, with appropriate response before termination, the subscriber can terminate the connection. For example, if publisher specifies verification for a large volume of the subscribed data points, this may exceed subscriber's configured upload bandwidth and connection will need to be terminated.

## Recommended Operational Statistics

- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points are configured for delivery verification.
- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points have been published with delivery notification.
- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many delivery receipts have been sent to subscribers.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points are configured for delivery verification.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points have been published with delivery notification.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many delivery receipts have been sent to publisher.


## Exception Characteristic

Per data point subscriber request would have publisher either always send data points when they are made available or only send data points when they change as compared to last published value, i.e., on exception. Where applicable by data point value primitive type, i.e., numeric types, the exception can be restricted to a deviation of last published value. Exceptions with specified deviations for numeric types would be calculated as the absolute value of the last published data point value minus the current data point value being greater than or equal to the specified deviation, e.g.: `canPublish = abs(lastValue - currentValue) >= deviation`. The default deviation for any numeric primitive type will always be zero such that any change in value will trigger a publication. For any data points with values that are non-numeric primitive types, publisher will always send value when it changes, i.e., no deviation logic will be applied when sending by exception for non-numeric primitive data types.

 Primitive data types need a clear classification of being "numeric" in order for exception characteristic to function properly.

Per data point deviation for numeric types will need to be accommodated in subscription request - this is too large to fit within single byte characteristic flags.

As an optimization, deviation data should only be sent when exception characteristic is requested. Also, subscribers need to be able to group multiple delivery characteristic requests into a single message with an optimized payload size since request could be sizable for a very large number of data points. Specifying deviation based on a data point classification would be useful.

 If a spontaneous, unicast only data publication mode is supported by STTP then for a unicast only publication mode, no form of subscriber specified exception handling could be supported - receiver would simply be subject to what was provided.

## Flag Definition

Single bit value where 0, default, is publisher will send data points when made available and 1 is publisher will only send data points on exception. Data point exception value occupies bit 5 of the data point delivery characteristic flags.

## Rights and Responsibilities

Publisher must respect subscriber requested exception characteristics. If publisher cannot fulfill subscriber subscription request for specified exception characteristics, e.g., based on volume, then, with appropriate

notification of issue to subscriber, publisher will terminate the connection.


Subscriber can request desired data point exception characteristics to reduce data reception volume with the expectation that if subscription to publisher succeeds, requested exception characteristics will be respected.


#### Recommended Operational Statistics

- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points are configured with exception based delivery.
- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points have been published with exception based delivery.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points are configured with exception based delivery.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points values have been received with exception based delivery.

## Resolution Characteristic


Per data point subscriber request would have publisher either always send data points at full resolution or with down-sampling. Down-sampling options include latest, closest, best-quality and filtered.

 JRC: Need to carefully consider the pros and cons of this characteristic - especially the options. While extremely valuable, much energy could be spent on this with limited value in the final implementation. Filtering option is a tricky industry / data type specific thing. May need to be prescriptive in reference implementations / API that it can provide custom down-sampling functions.

 Per data point down-sampling resolution will need to be accommodated in subscription request. As an optimization, subscribers need to be able to group multiple delivery characteristic requests into a single message with an optimized payload size since request could be sizable for a very large number of data points. Specifying down-sampling resolution per subscription or per data point classification would be useful.

Filtering options are expected to be very lightweight and non-intrusive to make sure down-sampling does not adversely impact publisher performance. Even so, publisher should reserve the right to reject a filtered request and suggest something more lightweight, e.g., latest value.

It is expected that implementation will be a function of data point value primitive type, e.g., a simple average where applicable for numeric types. For non-numeric types and digital style values, like flags, a major filter will be needed. For synchrophasors, phase angles will need to be unwrapped, averaged then wrapped to provide an accurate average.

 If a spontaneous, unicast only data publication mode is supported by STTP then for a unicast only publication mode, no form of subscriber specified down-sampling could be supported - receiver would simply be subject to what was provided.

## Flag Definition

Single bit value where 0, default, is publisher will send data points at full resolution and 1 is publisher will send data points at a down-sampled resolution. Data point resolution value occupies bit 6 of the data point delivery characteristic flags. Two-bit value defining 4 down-sampling options, i.e., 0 to 3, where 0, default, is latest data point, 1 is data point that is closest to publication timestamp for target down-sampled resolution, 2 is data point that has the best quality and 3 is default configured filter for the data point classification, e.g., average. Data point resolution down-sampling option occupies bits 7 and 8 of the data point delivery characteristic flags where

unsigned 2-bit integer is encoded in big-endian order.

## **Rights and Responsibilities**

Publisher must respect subscriber requested resolution characteristics when down-sampling resolution is requested, however, publisher has the right to reject subscriber requests for full resolution data or the type of resolution requested, for example, publisher may only allow non-filter based options for down-sampling to reduce loading. If publisher cannot fulfill subscriber subscription request for specified down-sampling characteristics or if publisher rejects requests for full resolution data or down-sampling options, then failure response to subscriber will include the proposed resolution characteristics for each data point so that subscriber can accept and update its run-time resolution values with those suggested by publisher or otherwise terminate the connection.

Subscriber can request desired data point resolution characteristics to reduce data reception volume with the expectation that if subscription to publisher succeeds, requested down-sampling characteristics will be respected. If publisher rejects requested characteristics, subscriber can expect that proposed resolution characteristics by the publisher will still provide down-sampling. If the subscriber does not agree with the proposed publisher resolution characteristics then, with appropriate response before termination, the subscriber will close the connection.

### Recommended Operational Statistics:

- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points are configured with down-sampled delivery.
- Publisher will maintain overall and per-subscriber statistical count of how many data points have been published with down-sampled delivery.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points are configured with down-sampled delivery.
- Subscriber will maintain statistical count of how many data points have been received with down-sampled delivery.

# Metadata

---

JRC: Following needs some extra thought

Metadata information will be described in one of two formats. **Basic Metadata** or **Advance Metadata**. Basic Metadata has fewer restrictions and intended for use where a persistent metadata repository is not desired and limited programming support exists where XML encoding would be cumbersome. (Ex. PMU or intermediate PDCs)

Advance Metadata contains more formally defined metadata structures necessary to version the metadata and provide synchronizing and filtering and permission-based access. This would require access to a repository that would maintain this data. (Ex. Large Scale PDCs, Gateways, Historians)

## ### Basic Metadata

- \* Attributes are Key/Value pairs
- \* Supports Nodal Relationships (Site Information → Device Information → Point Information)
- \* Data requests are full dumps
- \* Data can be sent on demand when streaming measurements
- \* Contains a Runtime Version Number
- \* This number is incremented on any metadata change
- \* This number also changes every process restart

## ### Advance Metadata

- \* Wire Format: Tabular XML format (XML) – highly compressible
- \* Primary data point identifier is Guid (describe)
- \* Extensibility
- \* Rights based content restriction

## Dataset Contents

- Minimum required dataset for STTP operation
- Industry specific dataset extensions (outside scope of this doc)

## Dataset Filtering

- Format of expressions that work against metadata
  - SQL style expressions
  - Regex style expressions
- Application of expressions
  - Metadata reduction (by subscriber)
  - Data point access security

## Dataset Versioning

- Versioned
- Difference based publication

## Dataset Serialization

- Serialization for transport
  - Packet based publication using temporal data point

- Publisher reduction by access rights and diff-version
  - Subscriber reduction by filter expression
- Serialization to local repository
  - Merging considerations
  - Conflict resolution
  - Ownership control

# Compression

---

- Types of compression
  - Stateful data compression (TCP)
  - Per-packet data compression (UDP)
  - Metadata compression (GZip)
- Compression algorithm extensibility
  - Negotiating desired compression algorithm

# Security

---

- Access control list (ACL) security is always on

## Encrypted Communications

- Transport layer security (TLS) over TCP command channel
- UDP data channel traffic secured via AES keys exchanged over TCL command channel

## Strong Identity Validation

- X.509 certificates
- Self-signed certificates

## Publisher Initiated Security Considerations

How does publisher initiated connection, to cross security zones in desired direction, affect identity validation and TLS?

## Access Control Lists

- Allow/deny for specific points (data point explicit)
- Allow/deny for group with specific points (group explicit)
- Allow/deny for filter expression (filter implicit)
- Allow/deny for group with filter expression (group implicit)

## Expression based Access Control

- Expressions can be used to define filters and groups
- How do filters work against extensible metadata, missing columns?

## Access Control Precedence

- (1) Data Point Explicit
- (2) Group Explicit
- (3) Filter Implicit
- (4) Group Implicit



## References and Notes

---

1. [C37.118.2-2011 - IEEE Standard for Synchrophasor Data Transfer for Power Systems](#), IEEE, 2011
2. [The MIT Open Source Software License](#)
3. [RFC 2119, Current Best Practice](#) Scott Bradner, Harvard University, 1997
4. [STTP Repositories on GitHub](#), Various specification documents and reference implementations, 2017
5. [New Technology Value, Phasor Gateway](#), Peak Reliability, Task 7 Data Delivery Efficiency Improvements, DE-OE-701., September 2016
6. [Character Encoding](#), Jukka Korpela, February 27, 2012
7. [Google Protocol Buffers Overview](#), Google, May 31, 2017
8. [Thrift: Scalable Cross-Language Services Implementation](#), Mark Slee, Aditya Agarwal and Marc Kwiatkowski, April 1, 2007
9. [Protocol Buffers - Techniques - Large Data Sets](#), Google, December 10, 2015
10. [Thrift Remote Procedure Call - Protocol considerations - Framed vs. unframed transport](#), Apache Software Foundation, Apache Thrift Wiki, Sep 21, 2016
11. [The default MTU sizes for different network topologies](#), Microsoft, Article ID: 314496, June 19, 2014
12. [Collisions and collision detection - What are collisions in Ethernet?](#), Valter Popeskic, November 16, 2011
13. [The Delay-Friendliness of TCP](#), Eli Brosh, Salman Abdul Base, Vishal Misra, Dan Rubenstein, Henning Schulzrinne, pages 7-8, October 2010
14. [Real-Time Application of Synchrophasors for Improving Reliability](#), RAPIR Task Force, October 18, 2010
15. [User Datagram Protocol \(UDP\) and IP Fragmentation](#), Shichao's Notes, Chapter 10
16. [Synchrophasors and Communications Bandwidth](#), Schweitzer Engineering Laboratories, April 1, 2010
17. [Implementation and Operating Experience with Oscillation Detection at Bonneville Power Administration](#), Matt Donnelly, March 2017

## Contributors

The following individuals actively participated in the development of this standard.

- J. Ritchie Carroll, GPA
- F. Russell Robertson, GPA
- Stephen C. Wills, GPA
- Steven E. Chisholm, OG&E
- Kenneth E. Martin, EPG

## ASP Project Participants



Project Collaborators	Project Financial Partner	Vendor	Utility	Demonstration Host
Bonneville Power Administration	♦		♦	
Bridge Energy Group				
Dominion Energy	♦		♦	EPG
Electric Power Group	♦	♦		
Electric Power Research Institute				
ERCOT			♦	
Grid Protection Alliance (Prime)	♦	♦		
ISO New England			♦	
MehtaTech		♦		
Oklahoma Gas & Electric	♦		♦	WSU
OSIsoft		♦		
Peak Reliability			♦	
PingThings		♦		
PJM Interconnection			♦	EPG
Southern California Edison			♦	
San Diego Gas & Electric	♦		♦	WSU
Schweitzer Engineering Laboratories	♦	♦		
Southern Company Services			♦	
Southwest Power Pool	♦		♦	WSU
Space-Time Insight		♦		
Trudnowski & Donnelly Consulting Engineers		♦		
Utilicast	♦	♦		
Tennessee Valley Authority	♦		♦	WSU
University of Southern California				
V&R Energy		♦		
Washington State University	♦	♦		
26	11	11	12	6

## **Specification Copyright Statement**

- Copyright © 2017, Grid Protection Alliance, Inc., All rights reserved.

## Major Version History

Version	Date	Notes
0.1	July 7, 2017	Initial draft for validation of use of markdown
0.0	June 15, 2017	Specification template

## Appendix A - Functional Requirements

---

 Candidate topics (for now, these are a mix of functional and non-functional requirements)

- Performance and throughput(latency & bandwidth)
- Scalability
- Pub/Sub configurability
- Metadata management
- Quality of Service
- Extensibility
- Confidentiality / Key management
- Access Control
- Integrity
- Alarming and notifications
- Enable best-practice security
- Reduced Risk of Non-Compliance
- Deployment for high-availability
- Disaster recovery considerations
- System Integration
- Installation and deployment

### Feature List

- Full Data Stream - Capable of sending all of the data points to any connecting stream.
- Basic Metadata - Defines each data point with only a short descriptor.
- Subscribed Data Stream - Allows the incoming connection to define the measurements that will be selectively streamed.
- Access Control - Permissions controls on a point by point basis.
- Data Backfilling - Allows backfilling missing data in the event of a communications outage.
- Encryption - Data channels are encryption and the connection is authenticated.
- Data Stream Compression - The data stream will support advance compression methods.
- Advance Queries - Must be able to handle more advance request/reply queries.
- Data Pushing - Capable of initializing a connection and writing data out.

### Use Case Examples

This is a list of all use cases along with the predefined set of features that must be supported by this use case.

\*optional features

#### A. PMU

Features:

- Full Data Stream
- Basic Metadata
- Subscribed Data Stream\*
- Data Backfilling\*

- Encryption\*

## **B. PDC**

Features:

- Full Data Stream
- Basic Metadata
- Subscribed Data Stream
- Data Backfilling\*
- Encryption
- Data Compression\*

## **C. Gateway**

Features:

- Full Data Stream
- Basic Metadata
- Subscribed Data Stream
- Data Backfilling\*
- Encryption
- Data Compression

## **D. Historian**

Features:

- Basic Metadata
- Encryption
- Data Compression
- Advance Queries

## **E. Data Diode**

To facilitate moving data from a more secure environment to a less secure one (eg. Prod to Dev) a separate service will be created that can connect to (or accept connections from) a publisher. This communication can be a fully implemented sttp connection and thus can manage subscriptions that will be exported to lower level clients.

This data diode will then establish a connection with a lower security level and forward data to this client. The client will only be able to turn on/off the data stream, request metadata, and request a user configurable amount of historical data that may be missing during a communications outage. These requests must be handled by the data diode with no modifications made to the established connection to the publisher. Each connection must operate independently of each other.

Features:

- Data Pushing
- Basic Metadata
- Encryption
- Data Compression

---

(Old use case examples)

**A. High-volume, real-time phasor data exchange** (e.g., ISO/RTO -to- ISO/RTO)

Use case text

**B. Medium volume, real-time data exchange with name translation** (e.g., Transmission Owner -to- ISO/RTO)

Use case text

**C. Medium-volume historical phasor data exchange** (e.g., ISO/RTO -to- Transmission Owner)

Use case text

**D. Within an Entity**

Use case text

**D. Low-volume real-time phasor data exchange with automated gap filling** (e.g., Substation PDC -to- Control Center)

Use case text

 The following are *proposed* ideas that may need a home -- purposely written in future tense

## Operational Requirements

### Data Classes

(1) commands & notifications & transactional data - **The Command Channel**

 some text from SIEGate doc as a starting point

The command channel will be used to reliably negotiate session-specific communication, state, and protocol parameters. It will:

- exchange metadata information between gateways in a trusted union, with each publishing gateway only exchanging information that the subscribing gateway is allowed to view.
- allow the connecting gateway to request points for a streaming data subscription from the publishing gateway. Requests for points that are not in the access control list for the subscribing gateway will be denied with a returned error.
- minimize the bandwidth required for communicating measurement IDs and time-stamps.
- allow the subscribing gateway to start and stop the data stream.
- exchange and optionally synchronize measurement point metadata information received from external trusted gateway unions to the local configuration source so that users can examine points that are available for subscription.
- enforce trusted gateway measurement point publication and subscription lists as defined in the configuration database. The system will drop data that it is not configured to receive.
- provide the necessary mechanisms to negotiate QoS configuration with the receiving entity.

Provide the necessary communication to establish a trusted connection between a STTP publisher and subscriber by:

- establishment of a trusted STTP union will be handled through a manual configuration process out-of-band, that is, not over the gateway-to-gateway network over which the gateways communicate.
- information being used to establish a trusted union between an STTP publisher and subscriber will be protected on the local system and will be considered information known only to the two gateways participating in the union.
- the gateways participating in the trusted union will exchange authentication information in an accepted and interoperable manner. For that reason, TLS and identity certificates should be used if possible.

## (2) streaming data - **The Data Channel**

The data channel will be used to send compact packets of identifiable measured values along with a timestamp with high-fidelity accuracy and flags that can be used to indicate both time and data quality.

### **Data Exchange with Other STTP Systems**

#### **Subscription Delivery Options**

Per subscription delivery window “this subscription level setting would constrain data delivery to a provided timespan (in terms of UTC based start and stop time). This could either be a maximum (future) time constraint for real-time data or, where supported by publisher, a historical data request.

Publisher will likely want to validate size of historical requests, or least throttle responses, for very large historical requests.

#### **Other Data Point Delivery Options**

Send a sequence of values “with respect to specified per value delivery settings (think buffer blocks)

Send latest value “command allows for non-streaming request/reply, such as, translation to DNP3

Send historical values “subject to availability of local archive / buffer with start and stop time- it has been requested many times that single value data recovery option will be available to accommodate for simple UDP loss, however this should be carefully considered since this basically makes UDP and TCP style protocol “if implemented, restored point should likely flow over TCP channel to reduce repeat recovery requests. Also, this should include detail in response message that recovery either succeeded or failed, where failure mode could include “œdata not availableœ. To reduce noise, at connection time publisher should always let know subscriber its capabilities which might include “œSupport Historical Data Bufferœ and perhaps depth of available data. That said there is true value in recovery of data gaps that occur due to loss of connectivity.



## Appendix B - STTP API Reference

---

appendix body

appendix body

💡 Links to language specific auto-generated XML code comment based API documentation would be useful.

## Appendix C - IEEE C37.118 Mapping

💡 JRC: We've already been considering options - especially for reference implementations - that are prescribed outside the STTP specification for mapping structures into and out of the protocol - this seems like one of those use cases. Need to discuss the following suggestions in light of the implications they have when considering the of primary tenants of the protocol...

### Encapsulation

A C37.118 stream can be encapsulated in its raw format inside sttp using the following definitions. The intent of this definition is to make sttp transparent so a sttp service can transport insecure C37.118 over an untrusted medium.

C37.118 -> sttp -> C37.118

**Use Case:** A light weight front-end processor manages connectivity to all or a subset of PMU/PDCs communicating via C37.118. Existing server applications can through a single connection, connect to this front-end processor to receive all of the raw data. This application then uses its own mapping to interpret the raw data. Since each vendor has their own proprietary mapping, it's naive to think we can create one mapping that everyone will adopt. In addition, a neighboring utility can also run a lightweight service that can connect to this front-end processor and translate it back into a C37.118 stream without having to maintain another local database of how to map it back into a C37.118 stream.

🍅 ? JRC: I was thinking the following kind of mapping would be available in a extended metadata table, e.g., `IEEEC37.118` table with an ID or name for the mapping, the field types and measurement mappings.

💡 SEC: I would think it would not be advantageous to make a dedicated hard coded table that will maintain this mapping information. It would make extensibility more difficult.

Metadata for each Data Point:

- (int16) Data Concentrator ID Code
- (int16) ID Code of data source
- (int32) Time Base
- (char) Value Type (S=Stat, P=Phasor, F=Freq, Q=DFreq, A=Analog, D=Digital)
- (int8) Size (2/4)
- (char) Phasor Type (R=Rect, P=Polar)
- (int16) Position Index (eg. whether this is the first or second phasor or analog)
- (int16) PMU Number (eg. whether this is the first of second PMU in a concentrated stream)
- (char16) Station Name
- (char16[16]) Channel Name (Array of 16 if channel type is Digital)
- (int16) Nominal Line Frequency
- (int16) Rate of data transmission
- (int16) Config Change Count

😬 JRC: Note sure I understand the following - this seems to break the tenant of mapping primitives? Even if broken into chunks, this would require identification and sequencing of chunks? Perhaps I am missing your idea here...

💡 SEC: I see. I'm not trying to "map" primitives. I've created a new section in the

document for mapping into the generic Data Point type. This is simply what I understand is necessary to transport the data in it's raw format.

I'm focusing on what the transport layer looks like. How the higher level API decides to use this data has yet to be defined and can vary from application to application.

We may not decide support encapsulation, but either way, the wireline protocol should not care how the API decides to use it.

## Data Point

- (MetaData) All of the metadata that was exchanged with this point, mapped to a Runtime ID.
- (uint32) SOC
- (uint24) FrameSec
- (uint8) Time Quality
- One of the following:
  - Status, Digital, Int16 Freq, Int16 DFreq, Int16 Analog
    - (int16) Value
  - Float Freq, Float DFreq, Float Analog
    - (float) Value
  - Int16 Phasor (Rect or Polar)
    - (int16) Value1 (Mag/Real)
    - (int16) Value2 (Ang/Im)
  - Float Phasor (Rect or Polar)
    - (float) Value1 (Mag/Real)
    - (float) Value2 (Ang/Im)

## Mapping

To be described later once a generic Data Point has been described.

## Appendix D - Other Protocol Evaluations

Various other standard protocols were evaluated for suitability as a starting point for STTP, most were quickly eliminated for one of the following reasons:

- Request / Reply (i.e., non-streaming) nature
- Insufficient specified limits on data throughput
- Restrictive payload formatting, e.g., inability to send binary data
- Forced transport specifications, e.g., HTTP

Other protocols that dealt with streaming data were found to not meet all the use case requirements that were desired for STTP. Suitability determinations for these protocols follows.

### RFC 3350 - RTP: Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications

At first blush, there seems to be much overlap in the requirements defined for the STTP protocol and those defined for RTP. In particular, its ability to reliably deliver real-time streaming data with several channels (e.g., audio and video) to a participant.

At a high-level, here are some the features of RTP:

- Used for applications transmitting real-time data, such as audio and video
- Designed to be independent of the underlying transport
- Services include payload type identification, sequence numbering, time-stamping and delivery monitoring
- Primarily designed to satisfy the needs of multi-participant multimedia conferences

RTP defines how to send, at a wire level, several related streams of data (i.e., content) for delivery to multiple participants simultaneously, i.e., all consumers receive the same data. However, since the desired use case for the STTP protocol can describe a different stream per consumer, i.e., where each consumer decides specifically what data they want, this multicast ability of RTP is not a feature that would be particularly useful. RTP also defines a fixed frame header timestamp that is used to synchronize several streams back together at the consumer level - such as lining up audio and video together for playback. The STTP use case, however, has a requirement to deliver a varying number of points each with its own timestamp, so the single header timestamp would not be useful “existing synchrophasor protocols also operate this way, i.e., with a single timestamp followed by payload measured at that time.

The RTP protocol also has stated caveats against multiplexing too many points:

#### 5.2 Multiplexing RTP Sessions

For efficient protocol processing, the number of multiplexing points should be minimized, as described in the integrated layer processing design principle [10]. In RTP, multiplexing is provided by the destination transport address (network address and port number) which is different for each RTP session. For example, in a teleconference composed of audio and video media encoded separately, each medium SHOULD be carried in a separate RTP session with its own destination transport address.

Separate audio and video streams SHOULD NOT be carried in a single RTP session and demultiplexed based on the payload type or SSRC fields.

This indicates that the most appropriate use of this protocol would be to define each data point stream onto its own network address/port number - this would not be ideal as the total number of port numbers on a system is a fixed resource and the number of data points two STTP connections will want to exchange could range in the hundreds of thousands.

Perhaps the largest technical issue with RTP for the STTP use case is the fixed number of possible multiplexed points. The RTP protocol defines a SSRC per packet header field as well as multiple CCRC per packet header fields that allow you to identify up to 16 points (SSRC + 15 CCRC) in the same packet for a given timestamp. If you ignored the header timestamp and other stated issues, it might be possible to make RTP work for the streaming data portion of the STTP use case requirements if you took the 16 packet points, each with a fairly large header, and applied per-point identification in the data payload for each packet - in this case the represented data could change packet-to-packet. However, doing this attempts to twist an existing protocol beyond its original design intentions to simply meet one portion of the needs of the current STTP use case simply for the sake of using an existing standard. This also does not solve the other STTP use case requirements, e.g., providing meta-data for the points being subscribed.

Regardless of the appropriateness of this standard to the desired use case, there is much that can be gleaned from this real-world production use protocol. In particular the dynamic ability to change encoding and frame-rates in response to changing network conditions should be noted as possible desired features of the STTP protocol.