**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 – June 26, 2025

**DATE:** June 30, 2025

**NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD**

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

**Conference Call with Webcasting**

**June 26, 2025 from 1:00 PM to 3:00 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 Mr. Smith, to adopt the agenda as final. The motion passed a simple majority vote without opposition.

Mr. Phillips reviewed the draft minutes from the May 29, 2025 meeting with the participants. No changes were offered. Ms. McKeever moved, seconded by Mr. Sappenfield, 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_bps052925fm.docx>.

1. **Joint WEQ/RMQ BPS: Continue to Discuss 2025 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 Collaborative Utility Solutions had additional material to share that was not covered during the previous meeting due to time constraints. He asked Mr. Hickman to review the presentation.

Mr. Hickman stated that effective utilization of DERs by the electric industry will require industry collaboration and coordination to conduct the various required information exchanges between the market participants. He suggested that national or interoperable regional DER registries would enable parties to share such information in an efficient and cost-effective manner. He explained that a DER registry would house the needed information necessary to support processes related to DER registration, aggregation, approval, change management, and reporting activities. He stated that such a registry would create a single point of truth for all stakeholders to access data and better enable automation of operational and market processes.

Mr. Hickman noted that a registry framework built using the an International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) Common Information Model (CIM) would help promote data integrity. He stated that use of IEC CIM will allow the registry to support dynamic data governance frameworks configurable to specific data access, security, and privacy requirements defined by the applicable regulatory authority. He explained that use of IEC CIM would also promote interoperability between the registry and other industry tools and may reduce the need for market participants to develop customized interface solutions.

Mr. Smith stated that ISO-New England is in the process of designing its systems to support the implementation of FERC Order No. 2222 directives and noted that a number of decisions have been driven by workflow analysis. He explained creating workflow diagrams has been one area of challenge and suggested that workflow models may be helpful for industry. Mr. Hickman noted that defining workflows can be especially helpful given the number of parties that are exchanging DER-related information and the number of processes.

Mr. Smith noted that a number of DERs are co-located, such as batteries and solar farms, explaining that this can create issues for operational management of the resources as well as cause confusion related to performance measurements and expectations. He asked if a DER registry could help address issues related to participation in multiple markets or programs. Mr. Hickman responded that a DER registry could be constructed to help support dual participation requirements.

Mr. Phillips asked participants for perspective on how business practice standards could help support a framework for a DER registry or better enable industry use of such a tool. Mr. Hickman suggested that the subcommittees may want to consider a gap analysis to identify areas where standards may be most beneficial. He noted that the NERC is currently developing reliability standards that should identify data necessary to support operational processes related to system modeling and planning and that the NERC System Planning Impacts from DER Working Group (SPIDERWG) has developed a number of white papers related to DER data exchanges. He stated that the WEQ/RMQ BPS may be able to leverage these documents to perform the gap analysis and identify areas to consider for standards development. Mr. Phillps stated that the chairs can reach out to NERC staff and coordinate with NAESB.

1. **RMQ BPS: Continue to Discuss 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 the chairs had developed draft documents to serve as initial work papers leveraging the prior DLT-model business practices developed by the WEQ/RMQ BPS to support the NAESB Base Contract for the Sale and Purchase of Voluntary Renewable Energy Certificates. She reviewed the drat REQ.6.12.3 Contracts Related Model Business Practices, REQ.6.12.6.1 Contracts Dataset, REQ.6.12.6.2 Transaction Confirmation Dataset, REQ.6.12.6.3 Invoice Dataset, and REQ.6.12.6.4 Invoice Response Dataset.

Ms. Sieg asked the participants to review the drafts and come prepared to the next meeting with any proposed modifications that should be discussed or considered. Ms. McKeever stated that the participants will also need to determine if the draft standards need to include sample contract, transaction confirmation, and invoice examples. Ms. Sieg noted that as the majority of changes are non-substantive, the participants may be able to vote out a recommendation within the next two meetings.

1. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 2:17 PM Central on a motion by Ms. McKeever.

1. **Attendance**

| **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Organization** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Jonathan | Booe | NAESB |
| Thomas | Chamberlain | Entergy |
| Scott | Coe | Collaborative Utility Solutions |
| Bret | Giles | Southern Company |
| Chris | Hickman | Collaborative Utility Solutions |
| David | Kathan | Collaborative Utility Solutions |
| Darren | Lamb | CAISO |
| Deborah | McKeever | Oncor |
| Amrit | Nagi | NAESB |
| Joshua | Phillips | SPP |
| Kristen | Rowley | MISO |
| Cory | Samm | Hoosier Energy |
| Keith | Sappenfield | KS Energy Consultant |
| Eric | Shick | Arizona Public Service |
| Lisa | Sieg | LG&E and KU Services |
| Doug | Smith | ISO-New England |
| Kimberly | Sperry | MISO |
| Caroline | Trum | NAESB |