| **Chat Transcript from the June 29, 2023 NAESB Gas-Electric Harmonization Forum** |
| --- |
| **Time**  | **To**  | **From**  | **Chat**  |
| 1:12pm | Hosts and panelists | Rachel Hogge  | We lost sound from Steve  |
| 1:12pm | Everyone | Nancy Bagot  | I can hear Stephen  |
| 1:12pm | Everyone  | Joshua Phillips  | Still clear  |
| 1:13pm | Hosts and Panelists  | Rachel Hogge  | I apologize…just me |
| 1:38pm | Hosts and Panelists  | Alan Kloster  | Is the tool available to use today by electric entities and is there a cost involved? |
| 1:40pm | Everyone  | Enrico Montesa  | Any plans from Argonne to include pipeline capacity allowed by an LDC in NY City for electric generation during the winter months? |
| 1:46pm | Everyone | Keith Sappenfield  | Do plans for security access to tool include registration of users and limiting users to energy industry participates that have a valid interest in the available data? My understanding that access to pipeline data requires a Trading Partner Agreement and EDI Exhibit |
| 1:49pm | Everyone  | Rachel Hogge | Keith, pipelines are required to provide certain information publicly without a TPA |
| 1:50pm | Everyone | Terri Eaton  | I appreciate the overview. This tool is very interesting and could bring a significant value to the system. But I did want to echo some of the questions and statements regarding security. First, even if the data is open source, this raises questions about whether all of the applicable data SHOULD be open source. Second, I think beyond vetting of users there needs to be some sort of system to ensure confidentiality and appropriate management of the data in and access to the system |
| 1:52pm | Everyone  | Robert Aytes  | Does this tool help provide real time data? I may have missed that |
| 1:57pm | Everyone  | Joshua Phillips  | This looks tool looks in line with several of the comments raised during the GEH forum and in consideration of Standards Request 21006. It also reinforces that if critical notices are the best way to communicate outages and impacts, having locational data would be helpful. It would also be helpful to have some common approach, similar to electric industries Emergency Energy Alerts, that would provide support for the Artificial Intelligence that is evaluating the notices |
| 1:57pm | Everyone  | Sue Tierney  | Everyone - I apologize for having to drop off of the meetings for a bit. I'll be back as soon as possible. Thanks for hanging in there with us. Sue |
| 1:57pm | Everyone  | Terri Eaton | I should add that my questions/concerns are grounded in national security, not competitive issues. FWIW |
| 1:57pm | Everyone  | Joshua Phillips  | perhaps these can be addressed through the recommendations in the final report |
| 1:58pm | Everyone  | Mark Spencer  | What are the prospect of additional funding for further development of the tool and how can this forum nudge that forward? |
| 1:59pm | Everyone  | Terri Eaton  | No question. Just commentary.  |
| 2:00pm | Everyone | Jonathan Booe  | Thanks, Terri |
| 2:03pm | Everyone  | Michelle Mendoza | Can you please provide insight into this tool with regard to interstate deliveries to LDC's? |
| 2:08pm | Everyone  | Kenneth Yagelski | The LDC report described only summarizes volumes delivered to the LDC... that includes the LDC purchases PLUS the third-party deliveries (for large transportation customers) operating behind the LDC meter. Still interesting information, but NOT to be confused with LDC-only activity. |
| 2:08pm | Everyone  | Bobbi Welch | MISO is also interested in evaluating this tool further. Ability to see near real-time nominations is of particular interest. Is there a fee for the tool? |
| 2:11pm | Hosts and Panelists  | George Danner  | NGInsight is a very nice dashboard that certainly supports situational awareness so that the participants in the energy chain can make critical decisions. However, what it is not is a simulation, that would allow you to test the various policy initiatives that the Forum is proposing. That would be a Digital Twin. It would be very helpful if we could use the Argonne underlying data to construct a Digital Twin |
| 2:12pm | Hosts and Panelists  | Grant Roberson | Can a municipal that operates local gas distribution system have access on some level? If so, how soon and how can we take part |
| 2:13pm | Everyone  | Renee Bartlett  | Great information being discussed here and appreciate the details of the dashboard! Hoping to obtain the presentation to share with my colleagues after the webinar. Thank you, Renee (Black Hills Energy) |
| 2:14pm | Everyone  | Nancy Bagot  | <https://www.naesb.org/pdf4/geh062923w2.pdf> |
| 2:19pm | Everyone | Sylvia Munson  | Doesn't the real value to electric generators, from the Argonne tool, come from the availability of Non-Interstate data from intrastates, LDCs and producers? |
| 2:20pm | Everyone  | Shawn Grant  | Are there other companies that do the same thing that Argonne does? |
| 2:21pm | Everyone | Mark Spencer  | Shawn, WoodMac (formerly Genscape) aggregates the same without the machine learning tools |
| 2:22pm | Everyone  | George Danner  | Shawn, beyond the aggregation of the data there are several companies that build models |
| 2:24pm | Everyone | Shawn Grant  | Should be actually call out one company in the recommendation, if there are other companies that can provide the same information. |
| 2:25pm | Everyone | George Danner  | That’s an excellent point, Shawn  |
| 2:25pm | Everyone  | Mark Spencer  | I think there are a number of companies. I was only offering one example |
| 2:25pm | Everyone | Andrew Ritter  | Similarly, why are only two trade associations specifically referenced? |
| 2:25pm | Everyone | Shawn Grant  | TY Mark and George for the information |
| 2:27pm | Everyone | Joshua Phillips | Good points Craig. The Argonne tool could also be enhanced and leveraged to support study recommendations |
| 2:31pm | Everyone | Nancy Bagot  | Is there any initial intel or impressions that DOE would be willing to continue to fund a tool like NGInsight on a political basis -- i.e., will zero emission goals impact the willingness to financially support a tool to ensure the interconnected gas and electric systems operate as well as possible? This is not intended in any way to be disparaging to any party, agency, or side in that discussion, but it's an important concern if we think we intend to utilize a tool whose funding would be dependent on some of that. I agree with Bob that this should be a critical funding priority, and Argonne is not a private vendor so avoids some of the "govt picking winners among vendors" concern -- or so I think. Which raises the question about whether there should be consideration of alternative tools or systems |
| 2:31pm | Everyone | Mark Spencer  | Pat J, I would offer that when PJM issues a MaxGen alert it moves the gas markets significantly. I think that train has left the station |
| 2:36pm | Everyone | Mark Spencer  | Pat J, I would offer that when PJM issues a MaxGen alert it moves the gas markets significantly. I think that train has left the station.What is the additional data the panelists are describing? It would require defining it and compelling the entities to provide it. |
| 2:42pm | Everyone | Nancy Bagot  | To address the info needs via contracts, would this require restructuring contracts among the nearly 9000 producers, to Pat J's point? And is the same info needed across all types of periods (ie, normal operations v critical or extreme event periods)?(I am just asking questions and hope I don't come across as skeptical in any way. I think it's clear we as an industry need better situational awareness! Just wondering how we hone in on what is needed and what we can/should get, when...) |
| 2:44pm | Everyone  | Mark Spencer  | Weren't gas producers in the PJM footprint net exporting to the Gulf during WSE? It seems like there's a significant focus on a physical disruption when supply was sufficient. Maybe we should ask whether it was a market breakdown. |
| 3:08pm | Everyone | Bill Wolf  | Just for the record, Kinder Morgan's comments to recommendation 12 and 13 are different than what is on the screen, and we believe our comments should be threaded into the document, not what is currently displayed. |
| 3:09pm | Everyone  | Jonathan Booe  | Bill - These are redlines that NGSA submitted |
| 3:19pm | Everyone  | Nancy Bagot  | I have comment on cost recovery issue being discussed now |
| 3:19pm | Everyone | Jonathan Namazi | Thank you, Jonathan and Chairs. EQT does not have anything to add to its written comments on Recommendation 14 at this time |
| 3:28pm | Hosts and Panelists  | Craig Glazer  | Not clear why these costs are not recoverable in the market? A generator that has a more secure gas supply can enjoy energy revenues at higher prices while those who don’t have such a secure gas supply would have to take a forced outage and not get any energy revenues. So not sure why this is a state regulatory question |
| 3:38pm | Everyone  | Robert Aytes  | weatherization should be considered for the benefit of all |
| 3:38pm | Everyone | Ana Garza-Beutz | Who would vote on these proposed studies? |
| 3:39pm | Everyone  | Mark Spencer  | You could move the purpose of 14 into 15. That is, examining interconnections between interstate pipelines hedges regional supply disruption. Only 3 pipelines in PJM declared FM during WSE due to supply disruptionsHow and who pays for larger interconnection capability between interstate pipelines is a different matter that may be addressed post-study |
| 3:42pm | Everyone | Andrea Chambers  | If the RTOS accomplish this first, the study can be ended. So far, it has not been implemented |
| 3:47pm | Hosts and Panelists  | Heather Polzin | FERC-NARUC was one option for doing the forum, but there's no reason we would need to be the ones doing such a study |
| 3:49pm | Everyone  | Mark Spencer  | How do these recommendations intersect with NERC, NGSA, and Argonne's efforts to advance a study with DOE? The recommendations read very similarly to the study scope |
| 3:50pm | Everyone | Heather Polzin  | Sure, just didn't want to be limiting the options, that's all |
| 3:51pm | Everyone | Nancy Bagot  | What are the expectations for discussion and actions on July 13? I'm assuming there needs to be some version of edited recommendations in advance of a vote |
| 3:53pm | Everyone | Andrea Chambers  | I agree with Nancy, it would be helpful to see the revised recommendations before the meeting. Also, can you talk about the voting process for those who are not familiar |
| 3:58pm | Hosts and panelists | Jonathan Namazi | EQT stands by its comments on Recommendation 18 and echoes NGSA's comments on this recommendation |
| 3:58pm | Everyone | Ana Garza-Beutz | Thank you for the voting explanation Jonathan |