

North American Association of Issuing Bodies Conference Call Meeting Notes

May 3, 2006 2:00pm-3:00pm EDT

Telephone Participants:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Belval, DBH for NEPOOL GIS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg Brehm, CEC for WREGIS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Helgeson, WI PSC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ed Holt, Ed Holt and Associates/Consultant to CRS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg Morris, Green Power Institute for WREGIS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aleka Niedermier, CRS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sam Swanson, Pace Energy Project for Clean Power Markets
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meredith Wingate, CRS

Introduction:

Goals of this call:

- Review finalized Recommended Common Practices for Treatment of Behind the Meter (Customer Sited Distribution Generation) Certificates document.
- Acceptance of this document in order to send out to larger stakeholder committee.

Discussion

There were several comments on the working BTM draft from Ed Holt. Ed suggested that in the introduction that there is a statement acknowledging that some recommendations are based on the size of the system, rather than the fact it is a BTM system. In these instances, we should note that fact, and recommend that BTM systems are treated the same as other systems of similar size.

There were no changes to the Section entitled, “Practices that do not need specific policies related to BTM facilities.”

Under Section entitled, “Recommended Common Practices” Ed commented that the first recommended common practice does not read like a common practice because much is left to the states and then, only if the state does not already have a recommended common practice, we say that these suggestions should come into play. Meredith clarified that what we are trying to do is provide model language that can be used and looked to in the absence of an established state policy. The group decided not to make any changes to this recommendation.

Ed suggested we clarify the language in the second recommended common practice titled *Measuring Output and Verification of Dynamic Data* to be more specific about how the confidence level is determined. The main question is whether the confidence level is applied to the number of systems verified, or to the method of verification. Meredith and Sam both thought that the confidence level related to the size of the sample pool i.e. the former. However, because there was some uncertainty, Meredith agreed to check this assumption with Robert Burke and Jan Pepper who were most vocal on this issue when the recommendation was developed.

There were no other changes to the rest of the listed recommended common practices.

Next Steps

Meredith will make the agreed upon changes to the document and will circulate to this group with one week to comment. The document will then be sent to the larger stakeholder group for their comments. However, the Double Counting document that was previously discussed will go out to stakeholder group first. Meredith asked the group if it would be a good idea to add similar “disclaimer” language to the Double Counting document? Sam Swanson suggested that this language could be added to ALL documents that the NAAIB produces. Meredith noted that this could be text that we develop as a group to color all documents that we produce.

Announcements about Upcoming meetings

The next NAAIB call will take place on May 23rd from 2:00pm to 3:30pm EDT. We will continue our discussion of transferring certificates between tracking systems.