



**REGIONAL EVALUATION,
MEASUREMENT & VERIFICATION FORUM**

**Quarterly Project Committees Meeting
July 29, 2010, Teleconference Notes and Action Items**

Participants:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Cindy Jacobs	Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control	Dave Jacobson*	National Grid
Gene Fry	Northeast Utilities	Bill Saxonis	New York Department of Public Service
Earle Taylor	Consultant to Northeast Utilities	Kathryn Mammen	New York Department of Public Service
Brian Gallagher	Delaware Sustainable Energy Utility	Mary Cahill	New York Power Authority
Laura Magee	PEPCO	Victoria Engel-Fowles	NYSERDA
David Pirtle	PEPCO	John Zabliski	Rochester Gas & Electric
Lucia Nixon	Efficiency Maine Trust	Pam Stonier	Vermont Public Service Board
Kristy Fleischmann	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Pierre van der Merwe	Vermont Energy Investment Corporation
Sheldon Switzer	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Jamie Howland	Environment Northeast
Huilan Li	Maryland Public Service Commission	Don Gilligan	NAESCO
Stacy Sherwood	Maryland Public Service Commission	Cecily McChalicher*	NEEP
Ralph Prah	Advisor to Massachusetts EEAC	Julie Michals*	NEEP
Nancy Seidman	Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection	Elizabeth Titus*	NEEP
Marilyn Ross	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities		

* denotes in-person

A portion of this meeting was digitally recorded

Meeting Action Items:

1. NEEP is accepting feedback from Forum participants on the draft cost modification guidelines through the next week, and discuss the guidelines with the Steering Committee co-chairs to help determine the Steering Committee's appropriate level of oversight.
2. Heads up was provided to Forum participants that a revised version of the *Common Statewide EE Reporting Guidelines* will be shared for review in early September.
3. Heads up was provided that the Net Savings paper will be distributed in early September for Forum participant review, after subcommittee comments have been incorporated.
4. NEEP to discuss the 2011 project *Guidelines for Integrating Efficiency into System Planning* with the Steering Committee to determine if it should remain on the 2011 project agenda.
5. The 2011 Emerging Technologies project description will be modified to include addressing comprehensive program designs.
6. NEEP to provide more detailed descriptions of the potential 2011 projects, where requested by Project Committee members.

7. NEEP to translate the list of potential 2011 projects to a matrix format that identifies the project, the need/purpose it serves (example: to support participation of efficiency in capacity markets), and the timeframe/urgency (next year or in the future), and share with Forum participants in September.
8. Forum participants to provide NEEP with suggestions of other potential 2011 projects not included in the 2011 project survey.
9. Forum participants to provide NEEP with feedback about which Research and Evaluation projects should be conducted in 2011 to balance the Protocol Development projects.
10. NEEP to consider different approaches to the budget development process for 2011.

Meeting Overview:

Julie Michals (NEEP) opened the meeting and reviewed the meeting attendees and meeting agenda.

A. Operational Updates

New Project Committees co-chairs

Julie Michals stated that the following new Project Committees co-chairs began their term on July 1: Protocol Development co-chairs Mary Cahill and Helen Eisenfeld, NYPA; and Education and Information Access co-chair Pam Stonier, Vermont Public Service Board. She thanked departing Protocol Development co-chairs Jennifer Meissner and Larry Pakenas, NYSERDA, and Education and Information Access co-chair Mike Sherman, Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources, for their service over the past two years. She added that Research and Evaluation co-chair Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, will also be departing his co-chair position once NEEP confirms a new Research and Evaluation co-chair to replace him.

Julie Michals reviewed the co-chair responsibilities, which are to advise, guide and inform EM&V Forum projects and activities, participate in monthly co-chair calls and quarterly Project Committees and Steering Committee meetings, and assist with planning and participate in the Annual Public Meeting.

Project Cost Modification Guidelines

Julie Michals explained that the Steering Committee requested the development of cost modification guidelines at its May 27 meeting. NEEP has developed draft guidelines with input from Project Committees co-chairs as well as Crissy Godfrey, Maryland Public Service Commission, since the MD PSC was a driver of this effort. NEEP plans to share the draft guidelines with the Steering Committee co-chairs in August and present the guidelines as an amendment to the Forum's Operational Guidelines at the quarterly Steering Committee call on September 15. NEEP would like feedback from Forum participants on the draft guidelines and will accept comments after this meeting.

Julie Michals shared that the purpose of the cost modification guidelines is to establish a process for requesting and approving 1) Forum project cost increases, and 2) the use of contingency funds.

For Forum project cost increases, the draft guidelines state that any project cost increase request that is less than \$40,000 requires written approval by the project funders and the Project Committee co-chairs, with Project Committees co-chairs' discretion to determine if Steering Committee review and approval of the project cost increase is needed. Any project cost increase request that is equal to or greater than \$40,000 requires written approval by the project funders, the Project Committees co-chairs, and the Steering Committee. Julie Michals explained that the \$40,000 figure is 25% of the contingency fund, which at \$160,000 is 10% of the annual Forum project budget.

For contingency funds, any use requires prior written approval by those funders whose funding would be used for purposes that are approved by Project Committees co-chairs and the Steering Committee.

Ralph Prah (Advisor to MA EEAC) stated that these guidelines require more budgetary oversight for cost modifications than is required for entering into the original project contract. He questioned why the Steering Committee should be involved with a cost modification of \$40,000 when they are not involved

with approving an initial project contract of \$600,000. He stated that the Steering Committee should approve the initial contract if they are going to be involved in cost modifications.

Julie Michals replied that NEEP is moving to a more formal process for the approval of the initial contract budget in which NEEP will obtain approval of the initial project scope from every funder. She asked for feedback from regulatory staff in particular on the appropriate level of Steering Committee involvement in approving project scopes and budgets.

Bill Saxonis (New York Department of Public Service) stated that the magnitude of the budget change should dictate Steering Committee involvement, and he suggested referring cost modifications to the Steering Committee based on a percentage of the originally contracted project budget. He added that the Steering Committee may not want to be involved in day-to-day project management.

Julie Michals replied that the Project Committees co-chairs discussed using a percentage of the original budget as the threshold for Steering Committee involvement, but the amounts would be very different between large and small projects. She suggested using the higher of a percentage or a certain amount.

Earle Taylor (Consultant to Northeast Utilities) stated that the cost modification guidelines could be viewed as a flagging mechanism to alert the Steering Committee that a project is going awry.

Julie Michals stated the Forum Operational Guidelines' basic process is for issues that are not resolved at the Project Committee level to go to the Steering Committee. NEEP will discuss the cost modification guidelines with the Steering Committee co-chairs to help determine the Steering Committee's appropriate level of oversight. NEEP can then bring options regarding the cost modification guidelines to the Steering Committee for their consideration in September.

Julie Michals explained that NEEP thought it needed a budget addition for the Unitary HVAC Loadshape project to accommodate a two week extension of the project, but found that this is not necessary as the contractor's budget based on the final sample design is lower than the contracted amount. She presented slides about this budget request situation as an example of what a cost modification request would look like.

Julie Michals added that Project A2 and Project A3 went over budget. NEEP is reflecting on why that happened and will apply the lessons learned from that experience into its budget planning process for future projects.

Action Item:

1. NEEP is accepting feedback from Forum participants on the draft cost modification guidelines through the next week, and discuss the guidelines with the Steering Committee co-chairs to help determine the Steering Committee's appropriate level of oversight.

B. Project A3 Update: Common Statewide Energy Efficiency Reporting Guidelines

Project A3 Overview

Julie Michals provided a briefing update about Project A3: Common Statewide Energy Efficiency Reporting Guidelines. She shared that the NMR Group team, including Dottie Conant and Cadmus, was the contractor for this project. The contractor produced a report with recommended common reporting guidelines and reporting templates this spring. NEEP extracted the reporting templates from the NMR report and created a standalone Forum document consisting of a preface and the guidelines. NEEP initially planned to bring the guidelines to the Steering Committee at its May meeting, but the schedule was too aggressive. NEEP has engaged in direct outreach to ensure that Forum participants and other interested parties and users have reviewed the guidelines. NEEP held a project subcommittee call on July 15 to review comments on the draft guidelines.

Key Revisions for Project A3

Julie Michals stated that comments on the draft A3 guidelines are posted on the A3 website. NEEP has revised the preface based on the comments and will add recommendations for the implementation of the guidelines. The subcommittee was asked if the scope should include only SBC-funded programs or if it should also include programs with other funding sources. The subcommittee would like the first version of the guidelines to address SBC-funded programs only, though the guidelines may address other efficiency programs over time. The subcommittee identified a need to revise the templates, in particular to clarify definitions and provide guidance on the reporting categories. Julie Michals reminded participants that the two main goals for this project are to: 1) develop consistency in how data and energy efficiency impacts are reported, and 2) provide transparency in those instances where consistency is not appropriate so we can understand what reported information represents.

Next Steps for A3

Julie Michals shared that the budget for Project A3 has been expended. NEEP staff, the project subcommittee, and the Project Committees co-chairs discussed the possibility of extending NMR's contract so that they can revise the guidelines. It was decided that using NMR is not an appropriate use of contingency funds, so NEEP staff will revise the report with the help of several subcommittee members. The goal is to have a revised set of guidelines for the next Steering Committee meeting in September. NEEP will not ask for Steering Committee approval at the September meeting but aims to present the guidelines for adoption by year-end.

Julie Michals added that the Forum's Glossary update project is being coordinated with Project A3. She added that a potential 2011 project is to provide support for the implementation of the guidelines and to convert the reporting templates to a usable electronic format. NEEP is also coordinating with SEE Action Network's effort to develop a national reporting template, and is submitting comments to help inform the process to revise EIA Form 861 (Schedule 6), which provides data on efficiency program impacts. NEEP is also in contact with US DOE, and will stay apprised of any efforts to develop reporting guidelines for ARRA.

Dave Jacobson (National Grid) asked if NEEP has had enough input from regulatory staff to ensure the A3 guidelines will meet their needs.

Julie Michals replied that NEEP has received feedback from regulatory staff in most states but is still reaching out to a few states. She added that NEEP also needs guidance from the Steering Committee.

Ralph PrahI asked who was involved in reviewing the guidelines for Massachusetts.

Julie Michals replied that Jeff Schlegel provided input on Massachusetts' behalf, and Commissioner Tim Woolf from the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities is also involved.

Julie Michals gave Forum participants a heads up that a revised version of the Guidelines will be shared with the Forum participants in early September. Julie concluded by thanking everyone for being involved in the A3 project. She added that the Forum's success in adopting and implementing common statewide energy efficiency reporting guidelines would have implications for national reporting standards and would help energy efficiency to be used in system planning.

Action Item:

2. Julie Michals gave Forum participants a heads up that a revised version of the Guidelines will be shared with the Forum participants in early September.

C. Other Forum Project Briefings

Project A4 - EM&V in Wholesale Capacity Markets

Julie Michals explained that NEEP monitors ISO-NE and PJM activities related to EM&V and also the NAESB M&V project. NAESB is working to develop retail energy efficiency M&V model business practices and wholesale energy efficiency M&V standards. Julie Michals is on the residential task force, and Elizabeth Titus is on the wholesale task force.

Julie Michals reported that there is a wide range of stakeholders on the retail task force. The task force has developed an outline of what will be included in the model business practices, which will focus on gross savings at a high level and will start with the NAPEE Impact Evaluation guide. The technical glossary for the NAESB project will be based on the EM&V Forum's Glossary. She added that there is not much to report on the wholesale side.

Project A5/PD5 - Mid-Atlantic TRM

Elizabeth Titus (NEEP) reported that Version 2 of the mid-Atlantic TRM is underway. The project subcommittee recently approved a proposal to use the same contractors for the 2010 project as were used for the 2009 project. The contract for Version 2 will be executed within the next week, and the project subcommittee will select the measures to be added to the TRM after the contract is signed. The measures will be divided equally between gas and electric.

Dave Jacobson asked if the TRM update projects will continue for the duration of the Forum. He questioned if the whole Forum should be involved in updating TRMs or if it should be a project that NEEP administers separately from the Forum.

Elizabeth Titus replied that the Forum initially anticipated that more states would be involved in the TRM. She suggested that this issue be brought up for discussion at a later time.

Project B1 Phase 2 - Loadshape Study

Elizabeth Titus explained that there are two parts to the second phase of the loadshape study - a Unitary HVAC study, and a C&I Lighting study. For the Unitary HVAC study, primary research through metering is underway, and an 8760 spreadsheet tool is under review by the project subcommittee. Data collection will extend through September. The C&I Lighting study is in the data collection phase and is employing available data. Both projects will be worked on intensely during the summer/fall period. Draft results, if not final results, will be complete by year-end.

Dave Jacobson questioned why the C&I Lighting study is taking so long since KEMA is the contractor and they already have most of the data.

Elizabeth Titus replied that NEEP is focusing on the Unitary HVAC study since there are immediate time constraints and is allowing the contractor to employ a slower timeline for the C&I Lighting study. She added that KEMA will be re-weighting its C&I lighting data from an earlier study, which will be particularly valuable.

Project B2 - Commercial Lighting Measure Persistence

Elizabeth Titus reported that on-site data collection is underway for this study. KEMA, the contractor, revisited the sample design due to data challenges related to the misclassification of projects. NEEP is holding a call tomorrow morning with the project subcommittee to consider KEMA's suggestion about how to tweak the sample design to respond to the data issues. NEEP expects data collection to proceed through summer, and analysis to take place in the fall and winter.

Project B3 - Net Savings White Paper

Elizabeth Titus stated that NEEP has received a draft paper from NMR Group, the contractor, and the project subcommittee will meet in early August to review the draft. The subcommittee will also be asked to propose a scope of work for the Forum's 2010 project on net savings based on the information in the report. The preliminary findings are that estimating net savings is a standard requirement for reporting program impacts in most states, is increasingly expensive and unreliable, and impedes innovative program approaches needed to achieve aggressive energy savings goals. Leading options to address these issues are to: 1) Develop standard definitions/methods for calculating net savings, 2) Shift the focus of net savings methods to not include free riders and spillover (e.g., rely on billing analysis, market level approaches), 3) Establish regulations that require manufacturers and retailers to provide relevant national sales and shipment data at the county and state level, and 4) Calculate net savings only when the value of the savings justifies the cost.

Ralph Prah stated that the executive summary of the draft report is nuanced and takes a balanced approach to the issue of net savings.

Elizabeth Titus noted that the Net Savings paper will be distributed in early September for Forum participant review, after subcommittee comments have been incorporated.

Action Item:

3. The Net Savings paper will be distributed in early September for Forum participant review, after subcommittee comments have been incorporated.

Project RE3 - Energy Efficiency Savings from Building Codes

Elizabeth Titus explained that the Energy Efficiency Savings from Building Codes Workshop will take place in Marlborough, MA on September 28 and will also be a webinar. She added that the workshop is being planned in conjunction with NEEP's policy team. The workshop's objectives are to build understanding and awareness of available tools for attributing savings from codes and standards, and to learn what is happening on this topic in states including California, Arizona, Connecticut, Vermont and Massachusetts. More information about the workshop is forthcoming.

Project RE1 - Incremental Cost Study

Elizabeth Titus stated that NEEP will distribute the Incremental Cost Study RFP to bidders within the week. NEEP will receive proposals by early September, review proposals in September, and hopes to select a contractor by the end of September. She added that consultant Denise Rouleau is managing this project for NEEP.

Project RE5 - Natural Gas Program Evaluation

Elizabeth Titus shared that a project subcommittee call was recently convened to brainstorm topics for this project's scope of work. At that call, the following topics for joint research were identified: 1) Early replacement design considerations, 2) Market assessment/market baseline study, 3) Benefits of installer training, and 4) Spillover. NEEP will work with the subcommittee to refine the list of topics and develop a draft RFP later this summer and fall.

D. 2011 Preliminary Project Agenda

Julie Michals shared the process NEEP follows to complete each year's project agenda. The first step is complete, which is for NEEP to develop an initial list of projects informed by: a) follow up to 2010 projects; b) areas of interest identified throughout the year by Forum participants; c) feedback from Project Committees co-chairs; and d) Forum Three-Year Plan. NEEP is now on Step 2, which is to conduct a survey with Forum participants to prioritize potential projects.

Julie Michals thanked the representatives from each state who provided feedback to the online 2011 project survey. NEEP received comments from most states, but still needs final comments from New York and comments from the District of Columbia.

Julie Michals reviewed the next steps to develop the 2011 project agenda. NEEP will refine the list of priority projects and attach estimated budgets based on the outcome of today's discussion. The Steering Committee will review the top 2011 project ideas at its meeting in mid-September. Later in the fall, NEEP will reach out to states to get further feedback on projects and will bring a recommended budget and agenda to the Steering Committee for adoption in December. She explained that Steering Committee adoption of the agenda and budget confirms state interest in the projects, with the understanding that funding commitments will be subject to project scope approval. For each approved project, NEEP will convene a subcommittee to develop the scope of work and seek approval from all funders before issuing an RFP. NEEP is open to suggestions for improvements to this process, which is quite challenging because of the different approval processes in each state.

Julie Michals explained that an evaluation of Forum to determine if it should continue is on the 2011 agenda per the Forum's Three-Year Plan. She stated that the top-rated 2011 project, based on the

survey results, is Methods & Savings Assumptions for Emerging Technologies, which had been identified as 2010 project and is already on the 2011 agenda per decision by the Steering Committee in May.

Julie Michals added that the Guidelines for Integrating Efficiency into System Planning project had also been identified as a 2010 project and is also moving to 2011 per the Steering Committee decision in May. This project received a low survey ranking, but there is some momentum building for this topic. The ISO interviews in Project A3 were intended to help inform this project by collecting information about system planners' data needs with respect to energy efficiency. Furthermore, ISO-NE's Regional Energy Efficiency Initiative recently contacted NEEP for help to develop a straw proposal as to how ISO-NE can integrate energy efficiency, the Regulatory Assistance Project is holding a webinar on this topic on August 24, and the Forum's Education and Information Access Committee co-chairs suggested having ISO/RTO representatives discuss this issue at the Forum's Annual Public Meeting. She added that some have questioned if the Forum has enough influence to tackle this topic. Given that this was a 2010 project pushed to 2011, and the Project Committees now does not think it is a priority, NEEP will discuss this project with the Steering Committee to determine if it should remain on the 2011 project agenda.

Julie Michals asked for feedback on potential 2011 projects in order to determine what should drop off the list of projects, and which of the projects that were ranked in the middle should be pursued.

Ralph PrahI stated that four of the five top-rated projects are protocol development projects. He added that Massachusetts may benefit more from the Forum's research and evaluation projects than its protocol development projects and suggested finding a balance between each type of project.

Gene Fry (Northeast Utilities) suggested weighting the rankings based on the amount of funding provided by each funder rather than giving equal weight to each state.

Loadshape Research - Phase 3

Julie Michals shared that the potential 2011 Loadshape Project - Phase 3 was highly rated, but several respondents stated they cannot commit to another phase of the loadshape project until they see the results of the current study.

Dave Jacobson said that loadshape research is a priority. He added that the results of the existing Unitary HVAC study will be particularly useful.

Review Cost-Effectiveness Tests in the Region

Bill Saxonis (New York Department of Public Service) stated that it is difficult to determine how important a project is without more details about its scope. For example, with respect to the potential project to address cost-effectiveness, there are already a lot of papers about this topic. If the Forum project would simply rehash this information, it would be a low priority project. If there is a different angle to the project, it would be of more interest.

Julie Michals reviewed the description of the potential project to Review Cost-Effectiveness Tests in the Region. The project would focus on cost-effectiveness testing related to new types of program designs. NEEP is aware that cost-effectiveness has been addressed in recent conferences and does not want the Forum to regurgitate information that has already been developed. She added that the purpose of the Forum is to bring forward this information for a discussion amongst policymakers in the region.

Bill Saxonis asked what emerging energy efficiency programs and policies would be addressed in the cost-effectiveness project. He added that the lowest-ranked project is a study of non-energy impacts, but it is important to understand non-energy impacts if you are reevaluating the total resource cost test. He appreciates that NEEP is providing an opportunity to discuss these projects, but needs more detail about the project scopes.

Julie Michals replied that NEEP will describe these projects more clearly and added that this is an opportunity to discuss what is not clear.

Evaluating Comprehensive Program Designs

Julie Michals asked for feedback on the potential project Evaluating Comprehensive Program Designs, which is ranked high.

Dave Jacobson replied that this type of project would be very difficult to do, and he is not optimistic that the effort would result in a uniform, consistent message.

Elizabeth Titus added that it might be too early for programs like advanced lighting.

Earle Taylor agreed that this project would be very difficult.

Ralph PrahI suggested merging the Evaluating Comprehensive Program Designs project with the Emerging Technologies project.

Dave Jacobson suggested that comprehensive program designs could be viewed as another measure within the emerging technologies project. There was agreement that this is appropriate.

Empirical Baselines for New Construction

Julie Michals shared that the feedback on the potential Empirical Baselines for New Construction project was mixed. She added that Connecticut ranked this project very high, as it is expensive research and may be well-suited to the Forum.

Ralph PrahI stated that this may be useful for those who do not have their own state data, but he is unsure to what extent baselines vary across the region. He added that state level data is more reliable than regional data.

Dave Jacobson said that he no longer believes this project is as much of a priority as he indicated in his survey response.

Gene Fry said he would like to tag along with the baseline activities in Massachusetts and is aware of the large C&I baseline studies that are already underway. He does not see a role for the Forum to do this type of study.

Ralph PrahI stated that residential baseline research has not been that expensive or difficult in Massachusetts. He added that Massachusetts is planning to conduct a non-residential study with KEMA, but has received very high quotes for the cost of each site visit. This may be a rationale for the Forum to do a non-residential baseline study.

Elizabeth Titus stated that a baseline study would not be valuable for Massachusetts, New York, Maryland or Vermont because they have already done baseline studies. She does not know how comparable the results of those studies have been from state to state. She agreed that a large and expensive non-residential study may have some value.

Dave Jacobson added that a meaningful regional study on this topic would likely cost millions of dollars.

Incremental Cost Research - Phase 2

Ralph PrahI stated that he believes incremental cost research is a high priority and assumes that others ranked it low because Phase 1 is not complete. He cautioned that we might decide not to do something that is valuable because people did not provide a rating.

Elizabeth Titus replied that NEEP would have liked to have one large project for the major research projects, but NEEP cannot do this due to the annual budgeting process. She would prefer to have one large incremental cost study that would cover many measures. She suggested that future budgeting efforts could be based on a list of priority projects for which Forum participants would come to

agreement on the top priorities. She added that it is difficult to find an appropriate balance between detail and flexibility in the budgeting process.

Bill Saxonis stated that it is hard to support a project, like the Incremental Cost Research Phase 2 project, when we have not yet selected a contractor for Phase 1. He suggested ranking a certain number of projects, and using a placeholder for incremental cost research. If the results of Phase 1 are satisfactory, the Forum could pursue Phase 2.

General Project Agenda Planning and Budget Discussion

Pam Stonier (Vermont Public Service Board) suggested that participants focus on how the results of the potential projects will be used. She added that Vermont gave its support to certain projects as indicated in the survey based on how urgent it is for Vermont to use the results. Vermont does not want to do research for research's sake.

Julie Michals suggested that NEEP will work to provide the list of projects in matrix format that identifies the project, the need/purpose it serves (example: to support participation of efficiency in capacity markets), and the timeframe/urgency (next year or in the future). This matrix could show how the projects fit into state needs.

Ralph PrahI stated that Massachusetts is conducting forty studies that cover the fifteen most urgent needs. He would like the Forum to address needs that are not being done on a state level.

Julie Michals asked participants to provide NEEP with feedback about which Research and Evaluation projects should be conducted in 2011 in order to balance the highly-rated Protocol Development projects.

Julie Michals suggested that NEEP consider different approaches to the budget development process for 2011. It is challenging for NEEP to develop estimated budgets for each project and enter into purchase orders or contracts that designate a certain amount for a certain project.

Julie Michals suggested providing the Steering Committee with a total budgeted amount (about the same as 2010) and a list of Protocol Development and Research and Evaluation projects of interest, some of which are contingent on the outcome of current activities. This would allow some flexibility to allocate funds to different projects, depending on need throughout the year.

Action Items:

4. NEEP to discuss the Guidelines for Integrating Efficiency into System Planning project with the Steering Committee to determine if it should remain on the 2011 project agenda.
5. The 2011 Emerging Technologies project will be modified to include comprehensive program designs.
6. NEEP to provide more detailed descriptions of the potential 2011 projects.
7. NEEP to translate the list of potential 2011 projects to a matrix format that identifies the project, the need/purpose it serves (example: to support participation of efficiency in capacity markets), and the timeframe/urgency (next year or in the future), and share with Forum participants in September.
8. Forum participants to provide NEEP with suggestions of other potential 2011 projects not included in the 2011 project survey.
9. Forum participants to provide NEEP with feedback about which Research and Evaluation projects should be conducted in 2011 to balance the Protocol Development projects.
10. NEEP to consider different approaches to the budget development process for 2011.

E. Education & Information Access Committee Activities Update

Julie Michals shared that the Education and Information Access Committee held a meeting on July 26. In the meeting, the Committee addressed potential topics for the Forum's Annual Public Meeting, which will be held in Baltimore on October 19. The preliminary panel topics identified are: 1) State of

the Forum, 2) Common Statewide EE Reporting Overview, 3) Integrating Efficiency into System Planning (including system planners and market monitors), and 4) What's Next for Net Savings.

Julie Michals stated that the Education and Information Access Committee also addressed the Forum's Communications plan, which identifies information and tools to increase the visibility of the Forum and help support the adoption, implementation, and use of Forum products.

In closing the meeting, Julie Michals stated that the next Project Committees meeting will take place in late October/early November. The Forum's Steering Committee will meet on September 15 and again in December. She reminded participants that the Forum's Codes and Standards Workshop is now scheduled for September 28.