

**PJM NET ENERGY METERING SENIOR TASK FORCE (NEMSTF)
PARKING LOT FOR QUESTIONS, CONCERNS (WORKING DRAFT)
Initially Drafted Monday, January 30th, 2012
Updated Monday, February 6th, 2012**

1/30/2012 Items

1. What does it mean to be a QF (or not)?
2. Future activity: NEMSTF to create a process to determine generation “point” (LAT/LONG, electrically, Zip code, etc.)
3. Final STF recommendations must be designed with ample flexibility to accommodate changing NEM standards and regulations
4. Identification of potential gap in order to accommodate any NEM projects more granular data/information may be required (identify BTM resource information or recertify annually)
5. Consider data volume risk and run time/processing time impacts to existing PJM applications (14hrs eSchedules, 12 hrs eMTR). May require longer data acquisition times, and shorter processing publication times
6. Analyze the symmetry of NEM impacts to Market designs versus customer decisions
 - a. John Farber – Delaware PSC - Regarding the issue in the “parking lot” addressing the need for PJM procedures for net metering facilities impact on hourly energy market operations, whereas such procedures would not be required for changes in load (and resulting impact on hourly energy market). When we start discussing details (in the weeds) it might not be difficult to construct scenarios whereby customer decisions regarding increases or decreases in usage could have a greater impact in the hourly energy market than would the operations of net metering facilities, however, the NEMSTF would only require PJM procedures for the net metering facilities.
7. Consider targeted special sessions to be added to the NEMSTF workplan, including the potential to task work to sub groups
8. If there is a rapid proliferation of NEM's, desiring to work directly with the PJM administered market, it may require revisions of PJM workflows and processes
9. Electric cars – who would have the responsibility for the interconnection, car dealer or purchaser, or other?
10. General concerns to ensure administrative burdens are not increased due to NEM. Determine whether studies or which projects require interconnection studies
11. NEMSTF may examine precedents established in other North American regions regarding NEM's
12. February 1, 2012 - Suggest that the net metering “parking lot” include a reference to a MW threshold(s) below which PJM procedures would not apply unless and until a potential issue/impact on the grid is identified. (Note – this may require an examination of similar/differing levels across interconnection, modeling, real-time metering and or revenue metering procedures, manuals or standards.

2/6/2012 Items

13. Identify any timing or changes to frequency for PJM Markets settlements as a result of NEM additions. At this time, there are no anticipated changes.
14. Billing reports and MSRS: is access limited to PJM members only?
15. Does an opportunity exist to improve or provide new data requests for Behind the Meter (BTM) and NEM generating facilities?
16. Review aggregated “threshold” criteria. Review materiality and variability with respect to aggregate totals. (Example: 1mW on a 34kV circuit and, footnote #3 from Jurisdictional decision table - 300kW).
17. Review Electric Distribution Companies (EDC) treatment of incidental energy injections
 - a. California Rule #21 “Inadvertent export” and “Hybrid Units” (BTM + NEM)
 - b. What does PJM desire of or by EDC’s
 - c. What do EDC’s desire of or by PJM
18. Do all states possess or observe a PURPA rate?
19. Do any participants have an NEM without a Utility agreement, thereby limiting their compensation for energy flows?

2/27/2012 Items

20. Cost impact minimization