



# NEPOOL GIS Usability Group Meeting

## Agenda

Date/Time: 06/25/2020 1:00 PM EDT

Participants: NEPOOL GIS Usability Group

<https://apx.zoom.us/j/91044052050?pwd=MkxLaFYzNVcwNjhyODVTSElrTVZBdz09;>

**Subject:** NEPOOL GIS Q2 2020 Usability Group Meeting 06/25/2020

---

### Agenda Items:

- 1) Review Agenda
- 2) Roll Call
  - a) Peter Ehrenberg, Eagle Creek Renewable Energy
  - b) John Wassam MA DOER
  - c) Lynn Fountain Day Pitney
  - d) Jon Ornelas, DTE Energy Trading
  - e) Alison Lee, 3 Degrees
  - f) Michael Macrae, Harvard Dedicated Energy Limit
  - g) Joshua Bancroft, VPPSA
  - h) Jeff Pentz, Unitil Service Corporation
  - i) Stephen Lapointe, PowerDash Inc.
  - j) Lewis Wagner, SRECTrade
  - k) Devon Walton, APX, Inc.
  - l) Bao Ngo, APX, Inc.
  - m) Joe Varnas Jr., APX, Inc.
  - n) Shelley Nauss, Direct Energy
  - o) Davor Tomasic, ISONE
  - p) Joyceline Chow, Harvard Dedicated Energy Limit
- 3) Discuss Change Requests for Review
  - i) Important improvements in processing of Independent Verifier CSV uploads – Stephen Lapointe, PowerDash**
    - (1) Issue:
      - (a) Stephen – Currently, if you include any facility that is not currently assigned in your NEPOOL GIS account as a Verifier, the entire upload fails. Many changes may happen to projects before reporting deadlines, and it can impact ability for a verifier to upload data efficiently into NEPOOL GIS.
      - (b) Bao - APX and PowerDash discussed the second issue and it is currently not an issue in GIS, so the second request was removed from the request.
    - (2) Request:

- (a) Stephen - If a verifier attempts to include facility in CSV that is not currently in GIS account, validation errors will provide specific reason for the project data not being reported (ex. it's not present in the account), but all the other projects with no issues are reported successfully. This will make it much more efficient for verifiers and allow them to upload more frequently.
- (3) Discussion:
  - (a) Bill – Do you know what it might cost GIS to make the changes? Devon - We do not do any estimates until after we discuss with Usability Group for the first time and if it is something, they want to move forward with we will start the review process.
  - (b) Bill – Is this an issue partly at the verifier's end? Stephen: This will help report generation more regularly and prevent having to do manual crosschecks to make sure there is 100% agreement between our system and GIS before reporting data. This will be beneficial for all Independent Verifiers.
  - (c) Devon – We are currently working with MA DOER to implement the Clean Peak program in NEPOOL GIS. We will be implementing an API set up to help with meter reporting. We will provide more information when it becomes available. This will allow verifiers options to manually upload data or use the API to report data.

**ii) GIS enhancements to facilitate MA RPS Compliance Reporting – Michael Macrae, Harvard University**

- (1) Issue:
  - (a) Michael – 11 items listed that were compiled from running notes as we prepared MA RPS filing. The GIS reports are currently not aligned with requests from the MA RPS filing and should work on making it more harmonious. Recognize that every state that has RPS has unique and often time complex requirements in how and/or what they are looking for to report, but would like the collection of GIS reports to be more streamlined across all the State RPS reporting.
- (2) Request:
  - (a) Michael - Is there preference how to move forward? Bao: After reviewing the list of 11 items, we should split requests into different categories. The first item is for better reporting to help with the State's RPS reporting and the other items are for enhancements and fixes to the GIS reports improve the user experience.
- (3) Discussion:
  - (a) Bill – Have you talked to other folks that are reporting RPS and receive feedback? Discussions with others will enable you to build more unified momentum to speak of your changes. Michael –because of the timing of the Usability Group meeting coincides with the close of RPS filing and its fresh in our minds, we wanted to bring it up to look for ideas on how to streamline the process. Bill: Build sub-working group offline to discuss ideas and bring to the group to review.
  - (b) Devon – We can tackle the first item as a broader project across all the states and spend some time reviewing a larger enhancement we can work on soon before the next reporting season.
  - (c) Shelley – Direct Energy files for all state RPS. Process is currently better than it was 3 years ago but agrees this is something we can improve.
  - (d) Bao– The plan is to take this conversation offline and categorize requests and discuss an enhancement that will be beneficial for all States.

- (e) Michael – interested to hear from state regulator perspective on what may work better for them. John W. – MA DOER download reports and synthesize data to make sure data in GIS matches what each supplier is reporting in filings.

**iii) API endpoint to access the Account Holder public report – Lewis Wagner, SRECTrade**

(1) Issue:

- (a) Lewis - One API endpoint that is used a lot is the Delivery Transfer API to move RECs between accounts.
  - (i) The API requires you to provide the ID for the account that you want to deliver the REC to, but the challenge is to assure that the supplied ID is correct and validated.
  - (ii) The current way to obtain the Account ID is to pull the Account Holder public report by pulling data from the report and make sure the entered ID in the API are true and correct.
  - (iii) There have been changes on NEPOOL GIS report side that is preventing us from pulling the data in a scripted way.

(2) Request:

- (a) Enable the Account Holder Public report to be accessible via API, to access without manual intervention.
- (b) When browsing through the public report, might be good to review if all the public reports can be available via the API, if there are some economy to scale that we can leverage.

(3) Discussion:

- (a) Josh B.- investigating whether other public reports can be included in the implementation it will be helpful for them to save some time.

4) General Comments and Questions

- a) Bill – Harvard’s request will be taken offline for further discussion, but what is the planned resolution for PowerDash and SRECTrade proposals? Bao – I will send out an email to the Usability Group to review the two items and if we get a majority approval, we send it to the Markets Committee for review and approval.

5) Next Steps

- a) APX will send out an email to the Usability Group to review items 1 and 3. If there are no issues, the change requests will be referred to the Markets Committee for review.
- b) For Item 2, we will continue to have offline conversations, get organized, and continue discussions moving forward.