



# NEPOOL GIS Usability Group Meeting

## Agenda

Date/Time: 12/19/2018 1:00 PM EST

Participants: NEPOOL GIS Usability Group

Dial-in Number: 1-408-792-6300; Participant Access Code: 297 362 204

**Subject:** NEPOOL GIS Q4 2018 Usability Group Meeting 12-19-2018

---

### Action Items:

#	Description	Owner	Date Opened	Status
1	Send out survey to prioritize change requests.	APX	12/19/2018	Open
2	Provide Day Pitney Q3 2018 and Q4 2018 estimates	APX	12/19/2018	Open
3				

### Agenda Items:

- 1) Review Agenda
- 2) Roll Call
  - a) Bill S. – Consultant
  - b) Matt O. – Eagle Creek Renewable Energy
  - c) Menglu T. – CT Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
  - d) Lewis W. – SRECTrade
  - e) Lynn F. – Day Pitney
  - f) Devon W. – APX
  - g) Joel O. – APX
  - h) Bao Ngo – APX
  - i) Devor T. – ISO-NE
  - j) Lisa L. – Berkshire
- 3) NEPOOL GIS Usability Group Enhancement Updates
  - a) Q2 2018 Usability Group Enhancements
    - i) The following items are in UAT and expected to be released by 1/15/2018
      - (1) Addition of CT Hydro ROR Flag
      - (2) Price/Notes field for Certificate transfers
      - (3) Four new public reports
      - (4) Timing on when Public reports are available in NEPOOL GIS
  - b) Q3 2018 Usability Group Enhancements
    - i) APX is working on estimates to provide to Day Pitney by the end of January to be included in the February 2019 MC Meeting.

- (1) RECs in NEPOOL-GIS
- (2) Emails sent when transferring or confirming RECs

4) Discuss Change Requests for Review

- a) Forward Certificate Transfer (FCT) Rounding -- Matt Ocwieja, Brown Bear II Hydro, Inc.
  - i) Issue: The way the FCT as currently implemented, if a user puts in a FCT for a certain % for a facility, if the % results in fractional number of RECs to be transferred, the system always rounds up for the month. If there are multiple parties and multiple classes of RECs, counter parties can potentially get the wrong number of RECs transferred.
  - ii) Request – Propose to round to the nearest whole number of RECs. If the fractional generation is .5 or above, the system rounds up, if the fractional generation is .499 or below, the system rounds down. (Example: 10.1 rounds to 10, 10.5 rounds to 11)
  - iii) Discussion: There is an accounting standard change about revenue recognition RECs, particularly has to do with timing of revenue recognition vs time the recs are issued. Matt would like to create irrevocable FCTs to recognize future REC issuance in advance, but can't do it if the FCT of RECs are incorrect
  - iv) The Operating Rules presumes that whoever puts in the FCT puts in total that adds up to 100, but users can put in fractional amount in GIS that doesn't add up. The Operating Rules don't exactly explain the current situation very well, and we could use this opportunity to clean it up.
- b) Update to State Sub-Account Reports – Bill Short, Consultant
  - i) Recently the Usability Group approved the addition of public reports capturing for the first time where all the system mix RECs end up after the end of a trading period. Previously, only residual mix information is available.
  - ii) Request: Add search/sort function to the new reports to find out where all the RECs went - 1) state, 2) location, and 3) state RPS program.
  - iii) Discussion:
    - (1) There's a lag for when States release RPS information to the public. Without waiting for state to release their RPS reports, adding these new search/sort function gives people the ability to see where all GIS RECs are coming from and where they are going to.
    - (2) Lisa – This would be very useful to find out how RECs are trading and where they are settling and what RPS they are being used to satisfy.
    - (3) This report enhancement would not disclose any individual generator or LSE information and provides more transparency and letting users see essentially what the regulators are seeing for their respective state and other respective states
    - (4) Question: Are all the necessary information and data points tracked in the database somewhere? Yes, all the information is currently in the database and would be able to make it work.
- c) APX Enhancements – Devon Walton
  - i) APX proposes to do enhancements at our own costs but wanted to run the high-level ideas by the Usability Group.
  - ii) Updates to Menu Tool Bar
    - (1) Request: Extend menu bar to include more high-level items so users do not have to scroll through the dashboard to look for specific modules. This would make navigating GIS easier and more logical process by adding modules to the menu bar.
    - (2) Discussion
      - (a) Add different modules to menu bar, similar to NYGATS.
  - iii) Meter Data Adjustments for NON-projects

- (1) Within GIS, there is currently no option to identify where meter adjustments are coming from and adjusted data is just added to the next available trading period.
  - (2) Request: Make reporting of meter adjustments for NON projects similar to ISONE facilities. The adjustments will take away from or add to the next available month's issuance. This enhancement would help with reporting and would make each adjustment more transparent.
  - (3) This enhancement would affect verifiers because they will need to update two files; normal meter upload, plus an adjusted file for adjustments.
  - (4) Discussion
    - (a) How would negative adjustments be handled? The Verifier would upload actual adjusted meter read amount and the system calculates the +/- adjustments and adjusts the next available month's issuance.
    - (b) Regulators need to be informed of the changes
  - iv) Failed Feasibility for NON-projects
    - (1) GIS does not currently capture capacity factor
    - (2) Request: Introduce feasibility validation at a more accurate level considering normalized capacity factor for fuel types in the system and not allow issuance to occur until feasibility issues are resolved.
    - (3) Most of the time, incorrect nameplate capacity results in feasibility failure or the amount of meter adjustments applied to the next month causes feasibility failure.
    - (4) Have you fleshed out the detail of how to apply the capacity factor? We would 1) look at historical generation to get to that level of granularity and 2) look at EIA and average nation capacity factor and determine a reasonable number to avoid frequent failures.
    - (5) Wherever feasibility calculation is not possible, we would ignore feasibility calculations for those projects. (I.e. MA APS, NH Class I Thermal)
    - (6) This is not something that will be released any time soon and there will be a lot of plenty of lead time. However, we wanted to run by Usability Group first before going through the process.
- 5) General Comments and Questions
- a) The Markets Committee agendas have been packed for the December and January meetings. The earliest these items will get onto a MC meeting agenda is for the February 2019 agenda.
  - b) What do these new enhancement requests mean in terms of the timing for implementation? Would it be released a year from now? If it involves a rule change, then we would try to implement by the next rule change data of July 15<sup>th</sup>, but if it does not involve a rule change, it can be done quickly after it has been approved. It depends on the MC process that has to be followed.
  - c) In terms of the available budget, are we outside of what we are doing for enhancements? When these new enhancements are reviewed, we will be in the 2019 operating year and we will look at the 200 available hours for 2019 for these enhancements. Any enhancements above 200 hours will be at cost.
- 6) Next Steps
- a) APX will post meeting notes to NEPOOL GIS website.
  - b) APX will create a survey and send out to the usability group for users to prioritize the Changes Requests that were discussed on today's call.