

## MA Statewide EE Database Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Monday January 23, 2014, 1:30pm – 3:30pm

100 Cambridge Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, Conference Room C

**Attendees:** Ian Finlayson (DOER), Matt Saunders (AG), Christina Dietrich (ENE), Sharon Weber (DEP), Brad Swing (Boston), Bob Rio (AIM), John Howat (NCLC), Eric Winkler (ISO), Amy Vavak (MECA), Debra Hall (DHCD), Shaela Collins (Rich May), Lisa Shea (NU), Leo Steidel (Energy Platforms), Mike Myser (Energy Platforms), Barry Perlmutter (DPU), Jeff Leopold (DPU), Lawrence Masland (DOER), Mary Downes (Unitil - phone) Eric Belliveau (Optimal - Phone), Steve Bower (Optimal - phone)

### Meeting Agenda

- Introductions ( 10 minutes)
- Review Vision Document (EP 15 minutes)
- Vision relative to proposed Database specification (DOER 20 minutes)
  - Aggregated data only (current reporting)
  - Project / measure and usage data (current draft specification)
- Vermont example (Optimal 15 minutes)
- Vision Document feedback (45 minutes)
- Conclusion and next steps (15 minutes)

Leo Steidel, Energy Platforms reviewed the current Vision Document.

Ian reviewed the vision document relative to proposed database specification

### Database Vision discussion:

EricW proposed three goals for the statewide DB:

- visualization
- accountability to meeting goals
- look at potential improvements

EricW stated that the TRM automation will create accountability needed by the ISO.

Shaela said that the work to support a separate database increases the opportunity for additional error, and questioned if this will replace the current PA tracking systems.

Barry said that the PA specific data will be fed into the statewide database, which should become the official statewide reporting tool.

Shaela stated that she doesn't envision the statewide database supporting PA reporting requirements. PAs will still be relying on their internal systems. One goal is to verify benefits.

How would we verify costs? The PAs will only put aggregated data into the database. The draft specification calls for detailed data.

Brad said that there is a changing world emerging among the cities and towns of the Commonwealth. This new world is an awakening awareness that resources must be conserved. We must define the authority for decision making, and we are not moving forward to do so.

Shaela stated that the PAs are willing to report at the current level of aggregation into the database and create a definitive source of data. PAs file three year plans and numbers change throughout the plan execution.

EricW drew a distinction between interim data and final data, being two different versions of the same set of data.

Ian asked if the PAs in contrast to the draft specification are proposing that the database should simply be a repository for filing.

Barry said a database is a faster way to get data.

EricW asked what we are trying to decide. He has some proposed modifications to the specification.

Shaela and Lisa have a different view of the database, as a document repository.

Brad said it would be useful to Cities and Towns. Brad said that the value proposition part of the vision statement is great, but the whole document should be one or two pages.

Barry said that we are looking behind, but this is the path to move ahead. There are three important things; what's in it, frequency, and who has access to what.

Barry stated that in the future, there is a fundamental question; what is reasonable content? At best, these issues are for the next three year term. Barry said that the PAs must meet the regulatory requirements, but if we add others we need to know for what purpose (unless the PAs agree to do it).

Jeff stated that these issues are still open at the DPU, and opinions may differ from Barry's.

Lynn asked what the baseline reporting requirements are.

Ian stated that there is a lot of value in usage data. DOER is very challenged without more data on buildings participating in programs, usage, for GHG planning as well as energy efficiency. The database would be the "goto" resource, instead of the EIA. While they will be able to glean much more from detailed data, this raises privacy concerns that need to be carefully considered.

Bob stated that there are serious privacy issues. He is very concerned about this. For industrial customers the perception of lack of privacy is a barrier to program success.

Ian agreed that there are plenty of reasons to protect the data.

Bob stated that Zip code level is not sufficient for commercial customers.

Amy said that there are lots of valid concerns, but, like Brad, wants to contribute to the effort to solve the issues.

Brad said that energy efficiency is a wonderful partnership, with emerging, growing interest from communities. This trend is only going to increase. He characterizes the “bottom up” interest to characterize the nature of the data.

**Vermont example:**

Steve provided a summary of the statewide data system in Vermont. Efficiency Vermont/VEIC gets all usage data from all customers with the exception of some industrial customers. The data are automatically uploaded. Three major utilities upload usage data every month. Minor utilities upload usage data twice per year. They have a standardized upload format. Confidentiality is kept to VEIC, which is only one organization, simpler than MA. The MA specification would have different sets of user groups.

Steve stated that VEIC’s detailed dataset is primarily an in-house tool without a public facing element. They do also have mapping information in the public view with specific queries that enable public analysis by customer class (building type, usage, geography, income), and to see how the implementation is going.

Steve stated that the availability of usage data does not mean there is an expectation to look at a single house and learn anything. But obviously geographic groups of many homes can be analyzed statistically.

VEIC has a single tracking system, but have many subcontractors that upload project data. This is a two stage process; field tools upload the data, then workflow is used to cleanse and apply quality assurance. Larger projects have a three stage process.

EricW pointed out that VEIC does not include Burlington, and calling it a statewide database is a stretch.

Steve said that data are collected from 15 different utilities.

Ian stated that the value in looking at Vermont is to show that you can get usage data from utilities and put it in a single place. Then they apply public mapping tools. The Energy Platforms data model is similar, but the institutional model is different. VEIC needs that data to run their programs effectively.

Mary pointed out that it would be easy to upload usage data. But the PAs are running the programs in Massachusetts.

Ian said that the granular data has large internal value, and also enables the public view. Ian stated that in the draft spec there is also a policy regulatory view and a PA view.

EricW said that ERCOT collects usage data from every customer. VEIC collects usage data to implement programs. He understands that you can aggregate usage data. It is not rocket science to put usage data into a database. In order to tie usage to the impact of projects you need additional more detailed data. EricW questioned what the value would be.

EricB stated that the data in the EM&V database can be put in a central repository, that data is largely what we want in the statewide database.

Ian said that one view is to do nothing more than reporting requirements. If that's what we do, that is not a very creative solution. We are ultimately putting the Council and PAs in a difficult position when we negotiate 3 year plan goals without a lot of information.

Ian asks is there a particular next step for the subcommittee. Usage data is possible, project data is possible, the PAs don't want to provide it. Is the committee committed to refining this document to produce something that puts PAs out of their comfort zone?

Ian asked for next steps, that Energy Platforms is hamstrung, suggested we should keep the February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

EricW said that we should resolve what the PAs can legally provide.

John said that Tilak stated that the PAs will not provide usage data. We are spinning our wheels. We need to answer these questions before proceeding.

There was general agreement that a February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting may be too soon to be beneficial.

Ian adjourned the meeting.