**via posting**

**TO:** NAESB Retail Markets Quadrant (RMQ) and Wholesale Electric Quadrant (WEQ) Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS) Participants and Interested Parties,

**FROM:** Caroline Trum, NAESB Director of Wholesale Electric Activities

**RE:** Joint WEQ/RMQ BPS and RMQ BPS Conference Call Draft Minutes – August 8, 2025

**DATE:** August 12, 2025

**NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD**

**Joint WEQ/RMQ BPS and RMQ BPS Meeting**

**Conference Call with Webcasting**

**August 8, 2025 from 2:00 PM to 4:00 PM Central**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

1. **Welcome**

Mr. Phillips welcomed the participants to the meeting. Ms. Trum provided the Antitrust and Other Meeting Policies reminder. Mr. Phillips reviewed the agenda. Mr. Sappenfield moved, seconded by Ms. McKeever, to adopt the agenda as final. The motion passed a simple majority vote without opposition.

Mr. Phillips reviewed the draft minutes from the June 26, 2025 meeting with the participants. No changes were offered. Mr. Sappenfield moved, seconded by Ms. Duffley, to adopt the draft minutes as final. The motion passed a simple majority vote without opposition. The final minutes for the meeting are available through the following hyperlink: <https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_rmq_bps062625fm.docx>.

1. **Joint WEQ/RMQ BPS Discussion: WEQ Annual Plan Item 5.a / 2025 RMQ Annual Plan Item 2.b – Consider and develop business practices to support the integration of DER/DER aggregation registries by the industry**

Mr. Phillips stated based on participant suggestion during the previous meeting, the chairs reached out to NERC staff regarding any white papers and other DER related reliability efforts that could be beneficial to review as the subcommittees explore potential areas of priority for industry and work to define a scope and direction for standards development. He stated that NERC staff identified two NERC SPIDERWG white papers, [Transmission and Distribution Coordination Strategies](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_rmq_bps080825w6.pdf) and [Reducing DER Variability and Uncertainty](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_rmq_bps080825w7.pdf), and asked Mr. Skeath if there were any comments he would like to provide.

Mr. Skeath stated that the reliability guidelines developed by the NERC SPIDERWG recommend collaborative efforts to facilitate data sharing between transmission and distribution entities and that the Transmission and Distribution Coordination Strategies White Paper identifies three possible information sharing strategies. He noted that of the three areas identified, a DER registry built on the Common Infrastructure Model (CIM) was considered by the SPIDERWG to be of greatest benefit.

Mr. Skeath stated that the use of a DER registry is further explored in the Reducing DER Variability and Uncertainty White Paper. He explained that this white paper was developed based on feedback provided as part of an industry survey and DER data exchange case studies. He noted through this information, the SPIDERWG concluded that CIM provides a better approach for DER data exchanges and that a CIM-based DER registry could serve as a system record. As provided in the white paper, an accepted system record that can serve as a single point of truth was found to be an important control for the validation of DER data.

Mr. Skeath noted that a CIM-based DER registry could have broad applicability for industry beyond system planning. The Reducing DER Variability and Uncertainty White Paper identifies five categories of DER data that could be represented: capability, configuration, commercial, conditions, and controls. Mr. Skeath explained that a DER registry could also be beneficial to support new DER-related reliability requirements being developed in response to FERC Order No. 901, validate DER-related information provided as part of reliability assessments, and prevent double-counting.

Mr. Maples stated that the revisions to MOD-032 Data for Power System Modeling and Analysis include requirements related to the collection of DER information in support of FERC Order No. 901 directives. He explained that while the DER aggregator is often the most accurate source of this information, this category of entities as well as some distribution providers, are not required to follow NERC Reliability Standards. He suggested that a DER registry would be a beneficial tool for entities that need to obtain DER information from market participants that are not a NERC registered entity.

Mr. Hickman suggested that development of a CIM-based DER registry could help the industry collaborate more effectively and efficiently. Mr. Phillips stated that the subcommittees should consider how such a concept could be standardized through supporting NAESB Business Practice Standards. Ms. McKeever suggested that the participants consider the areas that have been discussed to determine possible parameters for standards development. Mr. Skeath suggested that one area of consideration could be the five information categories necessary to maintain a system record as a single point of truth identified in the Reducing DER Variability and Uncertainty White Paper. Mr. Maples noted that the table included in NERC MOD-032-2 Attachment includes types of DER data required to effectively model the transmission system. He suggested that any developed standards which specify data requirements for the DER registry be inclusive of these data types.

Mr. Ipakchi stated that agreed upon business processes and definition of the entity relationships associated with DER operations and utilization is another area of consideration for standards development. He explained that such standards will establish requirements for who controls and manages DER data. Mr. Hickman agreed, stating that there should also be consideration of how DER registry standards can help support consumer protections as part of aggregation registration process. Mr. Jewell suggested that standards addressing confidentiality and security would also be important data protections.

Mr. Ipakchi stated that in developing standards, participants will also need to determine if the DER registry is intended to be a static or dynamic dataset. Mr. Kathan noted that a dynamic dataset could include information related to retail tariffs and participation, which would help to ensure accurate representation of the DER and prevent double-counting. Mr. Ipakchi agreed, stating that aggregation validation is an important aspect of compliance with FERC Order No. 2222. He explained that this will require identification of the aggregation rules, the aggregator, and the retail customers the aggregator is representing.

Mr. Phillips suggested that participants use the noted considerations to frame the discussion for the next meeting. Ms. McKeever agreed, explaining that further definition of the operational and functionality needs of a DER registry will inform decisions around what standards should be developed.

1. **RMQ BPS Discussion: 2025 RMQ Annual Plan Item 2.d – Develop Distributed Ledger Technology (DLT) RMQ Model Business Practices to support the automation of the NAESB Distribution Grid Services Base Contract and Conditions Precedent Addendum**

Ms. Sieg stated that based on the discussion regarding the draft model business practices during the previous meeting, non-substantive modifications had been made to REQ.6.12.6.1 Contracts Dataset and REQ.6.12.6.2 Transaction Confirmation Dataset. She reviewed the changes. No other comments were offered by participants regarding additional modifications.

Ms. McKeever moved to adopt the draft [REQ.6.12.3 Contracts Related Model Business Practices](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_rmq_bps080825w4.docx), [REQ.6.12.6.1 Contracts Dataset](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_rmq_bps080825w3.docx), [REQ.6.12.6.2 Transaction Confirmation Dataset](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_rmq_bps080825w2.docx), [REQ.6.12.6.3 Invoice Dataset](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_rmq_bps080825w1.docx), and [REQ.6.12.6.4 Invoice Response Dataset](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_rmq_bps080825w5.docx) as the recommendation to support 2025 RMQ Annual Plan Item 2.d. Mr. Sappenfield seconded. The motion passed a simple majority vote without opposition.

Ms. McKeever stated that the recommendation will be posted for an industry formal comment period and considered by the RMQ Executive Committee, along with any received formal comments, during its next meeting on October 23, 2025.

1. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 PM Central by consensus.

1. **Attendance**

| **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Organization** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Jonathan | Booe | NAESB |
| Tanner | Brier | BPA |
| Cade | Burks | Big Data Energy |
| Katie | Davis | BPA |
| Reece | Dobson | Big Data Energy |
| Kim | Duffley | NARUC |
| Cory | Herbolsheimer | NV Energy |
| Chris | Hickman | Collaborative Utility Solutions |
| Ali | Ipakchi | OATI |
| Michael | Jewell | Collaborative Utility Solutions |
| David | Kathan | Collaborative Utility Solutions |
| Darren | Lamb | CAISO |
| Hayden | Maples | KCP&L and Westar, Evergy Companies |
| Deborah | McKeever | Oncor |
| Amrit | Nagi | NAESB |
| Chris | Norton | American Municipal Power |
| Joshua | Phillips | SPP |
| Keith | Sappenfield | KS Energy Consultant |
| Lisa | Sieg | LG&E and KU Services |
| John | Skeath | NERC Staff |
| Kimberly | Sperry | MISO |
| Caroline | Trum | NAESB |
| Jason | Williams | Southern Company |