



Steering Committee  
 March 18, 2009 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Conference Call  
 Notes and Action Items  
 (Submitted March 30, 2009)

**Participating Steering Committee Members and Representatives:**

Name	Agency/Company	Name	Agency/Company
Allen, Riley	VT PSB staff	Ross, Marilyn	MA DPU staff
Below, Clifton	NH PUC Commissioner	Saxonis, Bill	NY PSC staff
Betkoski, Jack	CT DPUC Commissioner	Sedano, Rich (co-chair)	RAP (and NEEP Board member)
Bishop, Ann	VT PSB staff	Seidman, Nancy	MA DEP Director
Cleverdon, Dan	DC PSC staff	Sherman, Mike*	MA DOER staff
Engel, Victoria	NYSERDA staff	Stonier, Pam	VT PSB staff
Iqbal, Al-Azad	NH PUC staff	Timmerman, Calvin	MD PSC staff
Lawrence, Taresa	DC DDOE staff	Townsley, Mike	NY PSC staff
Loncke Lancelot	DC DDOE staff	Volz, Jim	VT PSB Commissioner
Marin Arthur	NESCAUM, Director	Vrabel, Tim	ME PUC staff
Morgan, Rick	DC PSC Commissioner	Woolf, Tim	MA DPU Commissioner
Mosser, Mona	NJ BPU staff	Michals, Julie	NEEP
Neme, Chris*	Efficiency Vermont	Coakley, Sue	NEEP
Newberger, Jeremy*	National Grid	Titus, Elizabeth	NEEP
Orsburn, Colleen*	Efficiency Vermont	Myers, Vivian	NEEP
Reishus, Sharon (co-chair)	ME PUC Commissioner		

\* Forum Project Committee co-chairs

**A. Action Items**

1. Steering Committee agreed to proposed dates for participation, funding sources, and receipt of commitments as follows:
  - o April 10, 2009 – confirm project participation
  - o April 10, 2009 – confirm funding sources within states
  - o April 17, 2009 – NEEP to receive funding commitments (which may vary in form depending on state funding processes), subject to confirmation with NYSERDA about feasibility of meeting this date
2. Steering Committee requested clarification and suggested changes to the three questions presented on slides 7-9 of the meeting presentation. **Suggested changes, with NEEP clarifications, are as follows:**
  - o *What are criteria for adoption of a Forum product?*
    - a) Forum product is reviewed and recommended by ~~(or has broad support of)~~ the relevant Forum Project Committee, through a transparent and timely process based on consensus (per Forum Operational Guidelines)

- b) The Forum product, if ultimately adopted and practiced by the states, serves the Forum goals and objectives to:
  - Increase ~~Develop~~ consistency in EM&V practices
  - Reduce EM&V costs for the states
  - Help to improve the credibility of EE resources
- o *What does it mean for the Steering Committee to recommend Forum products for adoption?*  
By recommending adoption of Forum products, the Steering Committee:
  - a) Encourages the products be used or implemented by and in the participating Forum states. ~~Provides leadership support for EE program administrators to make appropriate changes or improvements in their current practice; and~~
  - b) Acknowledges the criteria for adopting the Forum products.
- 3. The Glossary of Terms & Acronyms was adopted by consensus. Next steps include:
  - o Steering Committee members to send NEEP additions to the Glossary for future inclusion
  - o NEEP will develop a formal process for updating the Glossary
  - o Stakeholders will be notified that the Glossary is posted to the Forum website
  - o An announcement will be posted on the NEEP website about the Glossary
- 4. NEEP to develop a summary memo template to accompany future Forum Products proposed for Steering Committee recommended adoption, that provides an overview of the product's purpose and development process. **(See Attachment A as example for Glossary product, post dated)**
- 5. NEEP to keep Steering Committee informed of national EM&V protocol development discussions, and to evaluate where EPA is in its process to determine when would be a useful time for EPA/NAPEE leadership to hear from the EM&V Forum.
- 6. NEEP will follow up with meeting dates for next Steering Committee teleconference in June.

## B. Introductions and Meeting Objectives

*The conference call began at 3:05 pm.* Julie Michals opened the meeting and welcomed Rich Sedano as the acting co-chair of the EM&V Forum Steering Committee, replacing Paul DeCotis who resigned due to a potential conflict of interest. Sharon Reishus, co-chair, reviewed the items on the agenda.

## C. State Participation and Funding Confirmations

Julie Michals provided an update on the Forum 2009 projects (see meeting presentation and Table 1). The budget and projects are dependent upon funding from the states. As such the RFPs for the remaining 2009 projects will be developed in the spring/summer after funding is confirmed, in particular contingent upon New York and Maryland finalizing their commitments pending commission orders.

The District of Columbia will participate in the Forum in 2009, and as such the cost allocation across states (Table 2) now includes DC. The DC Public Service Commission has approved PEPCO funding for the EM&V Forum with a small amount of funding coming from the District Department of the Environment (DDOE).

1) Forum Product Deliverables: Julie Michals provided an overview of specific Forum products to be developed for each project, focusing on Project A2: Develop Common EM&V Methods and Survey Savings Assumptions, and how it may relate/interface with national protocol development. With regard to Project A3: Develop Common Energy Efficiency Reporting Guidelines, Julie noted that US EPA has indicated it would supplement funding for this project, with a subcommittee under development. With regard to Project A5: Common Savings Assumptions/Algorithms for Mid-Atlantic States, this project will produce the equivalent of a Technical Reference Manual (TRM) for the mid-Atlantic region, and has

received positive feedback from stakeholders, largely on basis that this resource will help support PJM M&V Plans for EE resources.

**Comments:** Nancy Seidman noted that Project A3 is important for RGGI purposes, to ensure same methods and reporting are used across states. Mona Mosser asked what the differences are between projects A2 and A5. Julie explained that Project A5 plans to create a common TRM for NJ, DE, MD and DC, and where for some states there is lack of data this project will help to fill the gaps until evaluation/research is conducted to update the TRM on an on-going basis. Project A2 may inform the data needs for A5. Both projects cover evolving issues.

2) Forum Cost Allocation. Julie Michals opened the discussion on the Forum Cost Allocation (Table 2). The states have been asked to confirm the cost allocation as currently defined.

**Comments:** Rick Morgan stated that DC didn't agree to the 7% minimum base cost for this year but they have decided that they would not make this a sticking point. Julie noted that if another state joins the Forum in 2010 (e.g. Pennsylvania) this would reduce the minimum base cost for participation in the Forum to 6%, as agreed to by the participating states.

3) State Confirmations for Project Participation and Funding Commitments: The Steering Committee was asked if they could agree to the proposed deadline dates for state funding commitments to the Forum:

- April 10, 2009 – confirm project participation
- April 10, 2009 – confirm funding sources within states
- April 17, 2009 – Receive funding commitments.

**Discussion:** Sharon Reishus noted that as Forum is well into 2009, we need to press forward. Each state needs to make a commitment to meet these dates. Pam Stonier asked if confirmations could be by email, to which Julie indicated that confirmation letters will be sent to each state requesting written confirmation. NEEP staff noted that demonstration of funding commitments will be flexible to work with particular states' processes. For example a letter or memo from NJ BPU saying it has committed to funding will be sufficient, understanding that issuing PO has to go through a comprehensive state process.

In terms of contingency plans, Julie explained that if funding commitments received by April 17 are insufficient to cover the projected project costs, then NEEP staff and project subcommittee members would revisit the affected projects and determine whether scope and/or budgets need to be adjusted. Mike Townsley indicated he doesn't see a problem meeting April 10 deadline for confirming project participation, but that there may be an issue with the April 17 deadline for NYSERDA to issue a PO. NEEP to discuss with NYSERDA.

**Action Item #1:** The Steering Committee agreed to accept the following deadlines:

- April 10, 2009 – confirm project participation
- April 10, 2009 – confirm funding sources within states
- April 17, 2009 – NEEP to receive funding commitments (which may vary in form depending on state funding processes), and subject to confirmation with NYSERDA about feasibility of meeting this date

#### **D. Adoption of Forum Products/Guidelines**

Rich Sedano opened the discussion regarding process by which Steering Committee would adopt Forum Products and the guidelines for such process, working from three questions.

- *What are criteria for adoption of Forum products?*
- *What does it mean for Steering Committee to recommend products for Forum adoption?*
- *In practice, what processes can states use to adopt Forum products?*

Rich explained that the Steering Committee needs to keep in mind that stakeholders are counting on the Steering Committee to do this work [recommend adoption of Forum products], and the process should address how to effectively do the work of the Forum and manage the Committee.

**Discussion:** *What are criteria for adoption of Forum products?*

Pam Stonier suggested that the goal is to make sure we are covering the Forum objectives and that the recommended Forum product is a quality one, where the principles in slide 7 define the quality. Pam noted that the Forum can put the guidelines out there as tools but cannot “develop” consistency in EM&V practices. Pam suggested using a different term instead of “develop.” Arthur Marin asked if participating entities are going to adopt the Forum products, to which Rich Sedano responded that the Steering Committee has two issues to address: recommending products for Forum adoption versus implementing them (individual state processes).

Jack Betkoski asked for clarification on funding sources for the Forum - Julie responded the funding sources are primarily from state EE programs, with some federal grant funding. Tim Vrabel noted he was OK with the criteria set forth in the slide.

Tim Woolf noted that there might be many products that meet these criteria, and Forum will need to prioritize the projects. Julie clarified that the criteria is not for selecting which projects to undertake, but rather to guide the Steering Committee’s adoption and implement of the recommended Forum product.

Mona Mosser asked for the definition of “broad support on projects” from the Project Committees (slide 7 bullet #1). Julie explained that there is no vote within the Project Committees, but rather a consensus process to inform project recommendation. Should there be dissenting opinion(s) on recommending a product to the Steering Committee for Forum adoption, such opinion(s) would be brought to the Steering Committee for consideration.

Mike Townsley noted that the process for developing Forum products should be transparent, and that such process should include addressing timeliness of a project. Julie commented that the Forum’s Operational Guidelines state that the processes must be transparent, but that this goal can be added to the criteria for clarity. Pam Stonier noted that all Forum materials are posted to the Forum website.

Jeremy Newberger suggested we spell out the process for developing a product and extent that it meets the criteria for adopting the Forum product i.e., the subcommittee would present a memo to the Steering Committee when making a recommendation to adopt a product. Products shouldn’t necessarily have to meet all the goals and objectives – i.e. if a product increases cost [e.g., to conduct a study that otherwise may not have been conducted, but increases credibility of EE resources]. A number of Steering Committee members agreed - NEEP will develop such a memo for each recommended Forum product going forward.

**Discussion:** *What does it mean for the Steering Committee to recommend products for Forum Adoption?*

Pam Stonier offered that when we adopt something it is worthy of being published. Clifton Below expressed concerned that as products are developed, precision could be sacrificed in favor of consistency, to which Rich noted that these types of considerations should be addressed during the project/product development. Julie added that this concern has been brought up and will continue to be addressed by the Project Committees as project scopes are developed. Rich Sedano also noted that Forum documents are “living” and that they would/could change to address the precision / consistency issue.

Jeremy Newberger inquired what “leadership support” means (bullet # 1 on slide 8). What if a program administrator decides not to use a Forum product that a regulator may recommend, what does this means

to a program administrator? Ann Bishop noted that Forum products should be considered high quality resources/tools that regulators will have to consider and approve for state practice. Chris Neme added that it's going to impossible for the Forum products to be perfect, and that the product will be very good resources that have to be taken seriously, and that need to be examined for their applicability for each state. Clifton Below suggested changing the word "leadership" (leadership suggests people not a thing). NEEP to propose alternative language.

**Discussion:** *In practice, what processes can states use to adopt Forum products?*

Jim Volz stated that we are contributing to the Forum because these are the products we want, with the intent/plan to use them. Rick Morgan agreed with Jim Volz.

Pam Stonier noted her interpretation of the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet to mean that Steering Committee members and program administrators can have dialog when it may not be appropriate to use Forum products. Ann Bishop added that she views the products as high quality resources that are available for states. Chris Neme agreed that it is impossible for the Forum to create perfect products, and that we should view them as very good resources that need to be examined for their applicability for each state.

**Action Item #2:** Steering Committee requested clarification and suggested changes to the three questions presented on slides 7-9 of the meeting presentation. **Suggested changes are as follows:**

- *What are criteria for adoption of a Forum product?*
  - a) Forum product is reviewed and recommended by ~~(or has broad support of)~~ the relevant Forum Project Committee, through a transparent and timely process based on consensus (per Forum Operational Guidelines)
  - b) The Forum product, if ultimately adopted and practiced by the states, serves the Forum goals and objectives to:
    - Increase ~~Develop~~ consistency in EM&V practices
    - Reduce EM&V costs for the states
    - Help to improve the credibility of EE resources
- *What does it mean for the Steering Committee to recommend Forum products for adoption?*

By recommending adoption of Forum products, the Steering Committee:

  - a) Encourages the products be used or implemented by and in the participating Forum states. Provides leadership support for EE program administrators to make appropriate changes or improvements in their current practice; and
  - b) Acknowledges the criteria for adopting the Forum products.

## E. Forum Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Elizabeth Titus led the discussion on the request to the Steering Committee to adopt the Forum's first product, the Glossary of Terms and Acronyms. The Glossary was developed by consultant Paul Horowitz, whose time was donated to the Forum by MA Department of Energy Resources and also funded in part by Forum start-up funds. The Glossary was informed by a broadly represented project subcommittee, and reviewed by Forum stakeholders. The Glossary built onto definitions from the National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency (NAPEE) Guide to Impact Evaluation developed by the US EPA, with additional terms added based on expert review.

**Discussion:** Clifton Below and Nancy Seidman noted that a few acronyms/definitions have been left out. Riley Allen would like further elaboration on the terms and stated he is open to contributing to the process. Elizabeth asked all members to send any updates to the Glossary for future inclusion.

Sharon Reishus requested that in the future, products considered by the Steering Committee should be presented using a memo template. NEEP to develop such a template.

Arthur Marin asked if the Steering Committee was voting on a living document at this time that will change over time, the answer to which was yes. Rich Sedano suggested that we create a process for updating the Glossary. NEEP to share updating process.

Sharon Reishus asked if there are any objections to moving the vote forward to adopt the Glossary of Terms & Acronyms. Hearing no objections the matter was approved. Rich Sedano thanked those who participated in product development. Julie Michals noted that the Glossary will be posted to the EM&V Forum website, and an announcement will be put on NEEP's website.

**Action Item #3:** The Steering Committee voted to adopt the Glossary of Terms and Acronyms, with next steps as follows:

- Steering Committee members to send NEEP additions to the Glossary for future inclusion.
- NEEP will develop a formal process for updating the Glossary.
- Stakeholders will be notified that the Glossary is posted to the Forum website
- An announcement will be posted on the NEEP website about the Glossary.

**Action #4:** NEEP to develop a summary memo template to accompany future Forum Products proposed for Steering Committee recommended adoption, that provides an overview of the product's purpose and development process. (See Attachment A as example for Glossary product, post dated)

## F. National EM&V Activities

Julie Michals led the discussion on national EM&V activities, seeking Steering Committee input on the role the EM&V Forum should play in the process. Julie began with an overview of NAPEE's national EM&V project, identified as a priority at the NAPEE leadership meeting on January 5, 2009. The project appears to be driven largely by the theme of paradigm change – that national protocols are needed given focus on energy efficiency – introduced by California PUC Commissioner Dian Grueneich. EPA staff state, however, have stated that national protocols are not a foregone conclusion. The EPA project is led by Denise Mulholland, with whom NEEP staff is scheduled to meet to discuss the national project in late March. NEEP has been invited to serve on the NAPEE technical work group for this project, and so will monitor and provide input into the national effort.

Sue Coakley noted that EPA, NAPEE, and DOE are also defining guidelines for reporting on use of funds for EE from stimulus package. Julie stated that NEEP is trying to connect the dots of these various national efforts, and are looking to the Steering Committee for guidance on how best to proceed.

Mike Sherman noted that Phil Guidice, Commissioner for the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources, is active in NAPEE and is co-chair for the national EM&V project, along with Dian Grueneich and Diane Munn. Mike suggested that discussions should be opened up as soon as possible.

Rich Sedano noted that in California, key issue is attributing savings to a particular program (spillover). These issues need attention. Julie noted that the Forum plans to address this in 2009 as a scoping paper.

With regard to the North American Energy Standards Board (NAESB) M&V project, Julie reported that NAESB is focusing on retail demand response M&V standards at this time, and may turn to energy efficiency next. NEEP has contacted Rae McQuade, NAESB's president, for an update on this – meanwhile, NAESB has indicated it would keep NEEP and EM&V Forum apprised of any developments. Julie noted that any EPA/DOE effort on national EM&V should be coordinated with NAESB. Rich asked

if NEEP could keep the Steering Committee informed of these developments. Rick Morgan noted that the Forum should inform the national process.

Julie suggested that an EPA representation be invited to the next Steering Committee meeting (June) to provide an update and information on the national EM&V project. Pam Stonier voiced that the process shouldn't wait until the June Steering Committee meeting. Rich Sedano asked if NEEP could evaluate where EPA is in the process so we can determine when it would be useful for the powers that be to hear from the EM&V Forum sooner than later. Julie stated that NEEP will follow up with this.

Rich Sedano noted Nancy Seidman's comment to make sure that the environmental issues and RGGI concerns are addressed in this process. Nancy Seidman offered to put Julie Michals in contact with staff at RGGI to address how energy efficiency EM&V and reporting needs for RGGI. Arthur Marin commented that as issues come up, we need to get/give input into the process. Nancy Seidman added that it is important that DC gov'n't is aware of the products of the EM&V Forum. Air regulators see a critical need to document how proceeds from carbon auctions should be invested, and how to measure progress.

Rich Sedano raised the issue of once projects are complete, how should products be promoted and how do we market what the Forum is doing and has done. Injecting this information at the right place and time is key. Sue Coakley noted it could be helpful to others for environmental folks to know about what it is NEEP is doing. Nancy Seidman offered to promote the Glossary once it is posted. Rich added that we need to pay attention to broad audiences that will be viewing the Glossary.

Clifton Below noted that New Hampshire has developed a cost effectiveness tool for applying for Stimulus funds, and asked how it can share these kinds of tools. Rich Sedano inquired whether the Forum can serve as a "bulletin board" for this kind of information. Julie Michals noted that the Forum has such a project planned for 2009 – essentially to build a library of EM&V resources.

#### ***Action Item #5***

- NEEP to keep Steering Committee informed of national EM&V protocol development discussions, and to evaluate where EPA is in its process to determine when would be a useful time for EPA/NAPEE leadership to hear from the EM&V Forum.
- Nancy Seidman to provide NEEP with RGGI staff contacts to address energy efficiency EM&V and reporting needs for RGGI.

#### **G. Next Steps**

Julie requested feedback for possible dates for next Steering Committee teleconference in June. Members identified following dates that don't work: MACRUC meeting on June 21 -24, and OPSI meeting Sept 30–Oct 2 and MACRUC retreat. Julie also inquired about possible in person meeting at November NARUC Annual Convention in Illinois – some members expressed difficulty to fit in additional meetings at NARUC. Vermont requested we not schedule meeting on Wednesdays.

***Action Item #6.*** Julie will follow up with Steering Committee on possible teleconf call dates in June.

#### **H. Adjourn**

The conference call was adjourned at 5:00 pm

## Attachment A

Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships, Inc.



**Regional  
EM&V Forum**

**To: Regional EM&V Forum Steering Committee**

**From: Julie Michals and Elizabeth Titus, NEEP**

**Re: Glossary of Terms and Acronyms, Version 1.0**

**Date: March 30, 2009 (post dated)**

---

The Regional EM&V Forum is pleased to announce that the 2009 Project A1: Glossary of Terms and Acronyms ('Glossary') has been completed. The Glossary is recommended by the Forum Project Committees for adoption by the EM&V Forum Steering Committee. The document is posted to the EM&V Forum website at [http://www.neep.org/EMV\\_Forum/ProjectCommittees.html](http://www.neep.org/EMV_Forum/ProjectCommittees.html)

The purpose of the Glossary is to help build a common understanding and language with which members of the EM&V Forum can work together to achieve its shared goals with respect to consistent and transparent and accessible information. The EM&V Forum plans to update the Glossary annually by adding and/or modifying terms as needed and in response to suggestions provided by Forum participants.

As a project of the EM&V Forum's Protocol Development Committee, the Glossary was completed with the assistance of a subcommittee composed of energy efficiency providers and representatives of the air regulatory community, as well as of the energy regulatory community in the region. The final draft of the Glossary was made available to all EM&V Forum participants for peer/expert review and comment earlier this year. A summary describing the comments received and their disposition is also posted on the EM&V Forum website.

Funding for this project came from a DOE grant and donations from the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources.