MA Statewide EE Database Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Monday January 13, 2014, 2pm – 4pm
100 Cambridge Street, 2nd floor, Conference Room B

Attendees: Christina Halfpenny (DOER), Matt Saunders (AG), Christina Dietrich (ENE), Nancy Seidman (DEP), Brad Swing (Boston), Bob Rio (AIM), John Howat (NCLC), Amy Vavak (MECA), Debra Hall (DHCD), Eric Winkler (ISO), Shaela Collins (Rich May), Monica Cohen (Columbia Gas), Lynn Westerlind (National Grid), Lisa Shea (NU), Mary Downes (Unitil), Margaret Song (Cape Light), Leo Steidel (Energy Platforms), Mike Myser (Energy Platforms), Eric Belliveau (Optimal), Jeff Schlegel (Consultant), Michael Blasnik (Consultant), Steve Bower (Optimal), Steven Venezia (DOER), Ian Finlayson (DOER), Lawrence Masland (DOER), Barry Perlmutter (DPU), Jeff Leupold (DPU), Cara Mottola (DPU)

Meeting Agenda
Database Benefits
Technical Resource Manual (TRM)
Control of Database
Project/Measure level data
Usage data
Next Steps

Notes:
Tina Halfpenny opened the meeting and asked members of the Subcommittee for feedback on collecting usage data:
Brad stated that usage data is valuable to towns and cities.
Nancy said we need the data for transparency and to oversee the huge amount of money being spent.

Shaela stated that there was confusion about the next steps. We had a great discussion in the working group, but we haven't had the discussion about the nature of the data.

EricW stated that perhaps aggregated usage data is valuable by rate class and geography, and sought clarification on whether the database is proposed as a planning tool or a reporting tool.

Tina said we can use the data to streamline EM&V.

EricW said that the data need to be available. We need standardized methodology for reporting meter data, and house it in a completely separate facility. Is individual billing data needed for reporting? Planning is separate from this piece.

Lynn said that through an EM&V contract, DMV-KEMA has commercial usage data, and are in the process of building a residential data set. Should we use these data as a source? PAs are working with Green Justice and are providing another way to get them answers.

Brad asked what is the purpose of the statewide database? We are interested in ZIP code level data.

Michael stated that the data are already being collected, the PAs are using it. Should we have 9 or 10 different systems? Will small PAs have these data? Wouldn't it be better to have it in one place?

Jeff S said we need a statewide view.

Brad asked if statewide interests are different than local interests.

Ian asked if we should collect these data in a bunch of places, or do we build a statewide repository? It is a one vs. many discussion.

Monica raised broad PA concerns around privacy of data outside PA systems

Tina stated that privacy is a very important concern.

Shaela said that the source for usage data is different than the tracking systems. Why replicate it in another place?

Steve said that statewide database should enable analytics, not just enhance reporting. If usage data is integrated with EE data, the value is dramatically increased. There are lots of benefits to bringing these data sets together.

Tina said we are looking for the deeper savings metrics.

Monica said that if a C&I customer doubles production we will never see the savings.

EricW asked what are we paying for not associated with locations? Reporting, not analysis

Tina stated as an example of analysis that PARIS puts together a visualization of measure mix.

Shaela asked if the statewide database will replace EM&V work.

Monica stated that analysis needs to be done. PAs are not answering the questions themselves. The point of the evaluation framework is to do these analyses.

Ian suggested that significant EM&V analysis could be done on a more timely basis if a centralized dataset existed.

Michael said that the data would enable much more than EM&V, but that EM&V is expensive, and the statewide database would reduce cost.

Lynn said that the PAs do process evaluation.

Barry said that we have lots of assertions, doesn't understand. EM&V is a new point, does the statewide database have an EM&V function? If you can agree that is has value, how to do it? Why do you want to see the data? Is it about PA performance? Why?

Lynn said that they are already collecting the data.

Tina stated that we still need EM&V. How much can the database streamline the process?

John said he is frustrated sitting in these meetings. Is there a clear vision of what the database is? What exactly are we trying to do? What will it cost? Bottom line: we should have had a clear vision from DOER what the database expectation is.

EricW said that there is no guarantee that meter data will help you. It cannot answer every single question. Data is valuable, just not in this format. Will it be valuable if merged into a new system? Aggregating data has a cost, what is the value?

Tina stated that DOER did not have a preconceived vision for the database, that is why we have a stakeholder process. The need is the lack of ability to get accurate data. Will the subcommittee adopt the proposal? We need to do it quickly.

John stated that there is nothing about specific data points in the specification. The specification should not determine who does what and why, or how often.

Tina stated that we are going through iterations of the specification. We are not yet close to procurement. The subcommittee could recommend that we proceed in a different way.

There was general discussion of control of the database and security of data. DOER does not want to own it. Among the PAs Columbia has the strictest guidelines and agreed to formulate a response from their lawyers regarding security of data.

Jeff S stated that we need to delineate privacy requirements; are they corporate, statutory or regulatory. We must differentiate between these.

Monica stated that it doesn't matter what level of access is granted, what matters is what goes out the door (PAs releasing data). PAs IT do not want to host this database.

Monica stated that they look at evaluation from a statewide perspective. The database is redundant because evaluations answer questions already.

Lynn said that if we could clear the confidentiality concerns we can deliver with what we have. It's a different solution than uploading data to a public space. We need to see data at the statewide level.

Tina said that we have general agreement on digitizing the TRM and that more detailed data need to be offered up.

Barry asked is the level of data sufficient to know that PAs are complying? DPU needs to know, are we effective? What can we do to improve? Are the 08-50 models sufficient? How can we do this better? Is project/measure needed?

Bob expressed concern about mission creep. He wants to make sure we are spending the money on what we are supposed to. How much would it cost, are there better ways to do it? Suggested that if cities and towns need data PAs will deliver it.

Jeff S stated that we should not lose sight of the budget.

John said we have a lot of work to do, and we have not reached consensus on what we want to do. We are not close. This needs to be very structured.