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**TO:** Interested Industry Parties

**FROM:** Caroline Trum, NAESB Deputy Director

**RE:** Final Minutes from November 10, 2021 WEQ BPS Meeting

**DATE:** November 22, 2021

**WHOLESALE ELECTRIC QUADRANT**

**Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting**

**Conference Call**

**November 10, 2021 – 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM Central**

**FINAL MINUTES**

1. **Welcome**

Mr. Phillips welcomed the participants to the meeting. Ms. Trum provided the antitrust and meeting policies reminder. The participants introduced themselves. Mr. Phillips reviewed the agenda. The agenda was adopted on a motion by Mr. Schmitt, seconded by Mr. Pearson.

The participants reviewed the draft minutes from the October 19, 2021 meeting. No changes were offered. Mr. Rahimi moved, seconded by Mr. Schmitt, to adopt both sets of draft minutes as final. The motion passed a simple majority vote without opposition. The final meeting minutes from the meeting are available at the following link: <https://naesb.org//pdf4/weq_bps101921fm.docx>

1. **Continue to Discuss 2021 WEQ Annual Plan Item 7 – Develop and/or modify standards for information and reporting requirements to support battery storage/energy storage and, more broadly, distributed energy resources in front and behind the meter**

Mr. Phillips stated that in response to the request for informal comments on the Distributed Energy Resource Aggregation Registration Use Case, informal comments had been submitted by ISO-New England, Voltus, and Southwest Power Pool (SPP).

Mr. Pearson reviewed the [informal comments](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps101921reqcom_isone.docx) submitted by ISO-New England. He stated that ISO-New England had reviewed the data elements identified in the use case and compared them to the information ISO-New England is proposing to collect. Mr. Pearson explained that while some of the data ISO-New England is proposing to collect as part of initial resource registration are contained in the use case, other data elements would only be needed further in the process. He stated that ISO-New England sees value in retaining a broad list of data elements, as there could be other entities that use such information but noted that any standards should include language to indicate that differing information could be required by the governing documents of an entity. Mr. Phillips asked if there were any specific pieces of information not included in the use case that should be considered. Mr. Pearson responded that the data elements included in use case appear to be sufficient but noted that the informal comments include links to ISO-New England’s tariff filings that identify the data ISO-New England is proposing to collect.

Mr. Phillips stated that the second set of [informal comments](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps101921reqcom_voltus.docx) were submitted by Voltus but noted that a representative from Voltus was not present to review the comments. The participants began by reviewing the written comments provided by Voltus. Mr. Phillips noted that the comments do not accurately characterize the NAESB process. He stated that NAESB follows ANSI requirements for open standards development and that any interested party can participate in standards development, including by submitting comments. Ms. Trum stated that the NAESB Board of Directors has established a nominal, non-member meeting participation fee intended to cover costs. She indicated that as Mr. Phillips stated, NAESB welcomes participation from all parties, regardless of membership status in the organization.

The participants reviewed the [feedback](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps101921reqcom_voltus_attachment.docx) provided by Voltus regarding the proposed data elements included in the use case. The participants agreed to provide written responses to the data element feedback provided by Voltus as there was not a representative participating in the meeting. It was noted that several of the comments provided by Voltus address which entity is providing the information. Mr. Phillips stated that in developing the use case, the participants agreed that the initial step would be to identify the potential data elements and that the identification of which party was providing the information would be done as part of drafting of standards. He indicated that feedback provided by Voltus on which data elements could not be provided by an aggregator or asset owner will be considered by the subcommittee as draft standards are developed.

It was noted that there were several data elements included in the use case which Voltus indicated was likely unneeded or too granular in detail, such as the asset owner of all resources comprising an aggregation. The participants agreed to take these comments into consideration in determining which data elements should be included as part of potential standards. Mr. Phillips noted that some of the data elements identified in the use case could cover information that is needed not as part of the initial registration process but as part of subsequent actions to fully complete the registration process. He explained that for an aggregation registering with SPP, the aggregator will likely not have to provide information regarding individual assets if those individual distributed energy resource assets are already registered within SPP.

The subcommittee’s response to the Voltus informal comments can be viewed at the following link: <https://naesb.org//pdf4/weq_bps111021a1.docx>

Mr. Phillips reviewed the [informal comments](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps101921reqcom_spp.xlsx) submitted by SPP. He stated that the comments are a spreadsheet that takes the data elements identified in the use case and adds a column to identify what information SPP is proposing to collect and what information is not applicable to SPP’s process. Mr. Phillips noted that in reviewing the data elements to prepare the informal comments, it appeared that some data elements may be duplicative or redundant.

Ms. Trum stated that NAESB staff had informed NERC staff of the WEQ BPS request for informal comments. She stated that NERC staff, to assist in the coordination of defined terms between NERC and NAESB, had provided a [document](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps111021w1.pdf) created by the NERC SPIDERWG that identifies terms and working definitions related to distributed energy resources. Ms. Berdahl asked how the definitions attributed to NERC working groups or committees had been developed. Ms. Trum stated that she would reach out to NERC staff regarding this question.

Mr. Phillips reminded the participants that the subcommittee had created a [work paper](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_bps111021w4.docx) identifying potential standard terms and definitions earlier in the standards development process. Mr. Wood stated that any defined terms created as part of the standards development process will not only need to take into account terms and definitions already in use within the industry but also existing terms and definitions within WEQ-000.

Mr. Phillips volunteered to create a work paper that combines the feedback provided by the informal comments into a single document for the next meeting. He stated that this could be used to help draft standards that identify the specific information/data elements, who is providing that data, and the communication protocols for the process. Ms. Berdahl stated that any standards will need to drafted to ensure that the language is inclusive of all data that could be applicable while not being overly burdensome. Mr. Phillips agreed, noting that while the use case was specifically focused on registration data associated with the ISO/RTO process, it would be beneficial if any developed standards could be broadly applicable. Mr. Wood noted that FERC Order Nos. 841 and 2222 are only applicable to organized markets operated by ISOs/RTOs. Mr. Phillips stated that having a standard that defines a common approach could be especially helpful for aggregators and asset owners that might be participating in multiple regions of the country by reducing uncertainties regarding the registration process. Ms. Berdahl indicated that there are distributed energy resources operating within BPA.

Ms. Berdahl asked if informal comments regarding the use case could still be submitted. Mr. Phillips stated that any interested party can submit documentation or work papers at any time. He encouraged subcommittee participants to consider what types of data elements could be generally applicable to any aggregation or distributed energy resource registration process.

1. **Next Steps/Review Action Items**

Mr. Phillips stated that the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 1. He stated that he will prepare for that meeting the work paper combining informal comments. Ms. Trum stated that she would reach out to NERC staff regarding the SPIDERWG document.

1. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 2:34 PM Central on a motion by Ms. Berdahl.

1. **Attendance**

| **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Organization** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rebecca | Berdahl | BPA |
| Patrick | Foley | NV Energy |
| Cory | Herbolsheimer | NV Energy |
| John | Pearson | ISO-NE |
| Joshua | Phillips | SPP |
| Farrokh | Rahimi | OATI |
| Robin | Rebillard | Manitoba Hydro |
| Paul | Schmitt | Duke Energy |
| Scott  | Stewart | BPA |
| Caroline | Trum | NAESB |
| JT | Wood | Southern Company |