

# May 26, 2011 NIST Smart Grid Privacy Subgroup Meeting Notes

Minutes by Rebecca Herold

Please send this distribution list any necessary corrections or additions.

Next full group teleconference meeting:

**Thursday June 9, 2011 at 11:00am est**

Here are my summary notes from the meeting:

## 1. Past meeting notes

- See <http://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sggrid/bin/view/SmartGrid/CSCTGPrivacy>
- Note the spiffy new look!

## 2. Team Updates

- NSTIC Team: Krystina Schaefer, (team lead)
  - Krystina, regrouping the team. 1<sup>st</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursdays at 9am edt
  - Tanya: The June NSTIC conference will address the governance issues for NSTIC. NIST is hosting. Hope is to get private sector entities in to talk about governance. More information at <http://www.nist.gov/nstic/>
  - Rebecca: Will this conference create any additional information beyond the NSTIC document that has already been published?
  - Lee: Final document is still high-level. Recently an inner agency group solicited groups and reached out to some privacy advocates and they plan to release a White House / NSTIC document. A DOE/NIST group.
  - Tanya: Trying to think about which group it would be.
  - Lee: Nick Singh with office of science and technology was the one who sent the message.
  - Tanya: Will look into.
- Third Party Data Sharing Team: Brent Struthers (team lead) will include discussion of relationship to the NAESB document
  - Tanya: Introductory language that references the NAESB document and the California work (footnotes point to them). Goal is not to duplicate work. No opinions about them.
  - Ward: Has anyone besides Tanya read through the NAESB documents themselves? Not necessarily a group position. Just independent thought.
  - Lee: Has not read through them all. Looked at them a month or so ago. It is very limited and narrow in scope. Deferential to what someone else's rules will be.
  - Ward: Someone in the NAESB group is looking at what CA put out to see gaps.
  - Tanya: Chris Villarreal was very active in the NAESB group. Agree, it is exceptionally deferential to other documents and regulatory authority. Don't like the blanket statements. A lot of kickback from the utilities stating that if it is different from the PUC they would follow the PUC.
  - Ward: While the document is a recommendation, at the end of the day they will do what the regulatory agency says they must do. However we want to do what will be considered a best practice.

- Tanya: Utilities say it depends upon what the PUCs say.
  - Rebecca: Our group has an opportunity to actually create a true best practices document, without worrying about the politics involved. If current efforts are not actually addressing the privacy issues, then it would provide great value for our group to create something that does.
  - Tanya: We may need to redo what we are doing then.
  - Krystina: Ohio PUC looks to the NISTIR a lot. PUCs would look at any type of recommendations paper on this topic as well.
  - Lee: Everyone, NAESB and the PUCs seems to be punting responsibility. Pointing fingers to others to make decisions/recommendations.
  - Tanya: California seems to have gone first.
  - Lee: The EFF had to jump start the process in CA. We decided to just write what was best from our perspective.
  - Rebecca: Ward, it may help those new to the group to know more about your perspective if you could let us know what organization you're with.
  - Ward: I'm with the Southern Company, a utility. Cover four PUCs. Heavily involved with the NAESB document creation, at least our legal team has been. I have been a on the periphery as an advisor. Scope of the 3<sup>rd</sup> party sharing document actually came from a utility. NAESB is getting a lot of requests for standards. A lot of debates about what should really be private. A lot of discussion in NAESB about whether or not data will be required. California has made the most progress. Yet, it has always been deference to the PUCs within the NAESB documents.
  - Rebecca: A great value in our group is that, as NIST, a science and technology group doing true research into the actual issues, we can go beyond NAESB to provide more details and more recommendations can't we?
  - Ward: Definitely more value in more details. Utilities want to use any type of authoritative documentation that is beneficial.
  - Tanya: Not sure what kind of reception our document would have by NAESB. Perhaps what would be of value would be a conversation with Jonathan Booe from NAESB to let him know what we would like to do, but that we're not trying to step on toes.
  - Rebecca: Good idea
  - Tanya: If we do approach, have some concrete examples of our concerns with the current NAESB draft. Tell them how we would do differently.
  - Rebecca: Tanya, let's discuss offline.
- Privacy Use Cases Team: Christine Hertzog, Smart Grid Library (team lead)
    - Sarah, Christine, and Rebecca have sent for review by the other team members.
    - Will get something done in the next month or two.
    - Christine: Conversation at Connectivity Week on managing the data avalanche. Different domains with different entities that are interested in all this data. Utility operational (meter to substation); within a dwelling/home (beyond energy to water, gas, etc.; also health & wellness);
      - Acknowledging privacy issues need to be addressed.
      - No argument about the consumer owning the data.
      - What happens when the consumer moves? What happens to that data?
      - Discussion around the perishability of the data. Most has a very short life with regard to usefulness of data for analytics purposes.
      - These use cases will consider these issues.
      - Consumer symposium on one day. Very few utilities, primarily vendors.
      - Connectivity Week and the Customer Service Week in Orlando, FL

- Rebecca: Just got an email from Ken Wacks with pretty much the same thoughts!
- PEV Team:
  - Tanya: Coop, Ben (from Ohio PUC) and Tanya will work on outline for PEV privacy issues. Then the hiatus over summer to look at the issues within the Roaming group. After summer will start again.
- Training and Awareness Team: Rebecca Herold (team lead)
  - Hope to have the matrix completed after 1-2 more meetings, and then will provide to the full group to go through.

### 3. Miscellaneous

- Report on Minnesota outreach meeting last week: Brent Struthers
  - He's at funeral, so will need to wait.
- General discussion: Noticing increased interest in smart grid privacy in various public group messages and publications. (NOTE: I will send a thread of discussion messages in a separate message for reference.)
  - Rebecca: Looking at the LinkedIn groups specific to Smart Grid provides many insights into some of the attitudes and opinions that exist about privacy issues. Helps to show where more awareness is needed.
- Meetings are the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Thursdays of each month. Next full group meeting will be Thursday, June 9.
- Other?
  - Tanya: Article in Smart Grid Today about "Energy Lawyer Asks Can An Energy Consent Form Be Too Clear?" About a consent form in Colorado. Docket 10R-799E. It scares people because it is so detailed. Gave example of an excerpt.
  - Lee: CA laws place a chain of responsibility for the data usage. Utilities are required to do certain activities to obtain consent, etc. It couldn't be this scary.
  - Klaus: The article is at the online Smart Grid Today site. Wednesday May 18. <http://www.smartgridtoday.com/public/2956print.cfm>

Thanks,

Rebecca