

ENERGY EFFICIENCY ADVISORY COUNCIL

DATABASE SUBCOMMITTEE

April 22, 2013

Subcommittee: Tina Halfpenny, Chair, Matthew Saunders, Robert Rio, Jeremy McDiarmid, Penn Loh, John Howat, Eric Winkler (via telephone).

Attendees: Brad Swing-City of Boston, Ian Finlayson-DOER, Lawrence Masland-DOER, Lisa Shea-NSTAR, Matt Nelson-NSTAR, Lynn Westerlind-National Grid, Shaela Collins-RichMay, Pat Kelley-AG, Christina Dietrich-ENE, Eric Belliveau-Optimal Energy, the Council Consultants. Recorder: Steve Venezia-DOER.

Chair person Halfpenny convened the meeting to order just after 9:30am. She then asked the group to go around the room and introduce themselves. The chair then announced that she had previously sent electronic copies of a proposed draft Database Project Charter which sets forth the role, responsibilities and expected timeline for the subcommittee. The need to make several minor edits was identified and the subcommittee members agreed to the suggested edits. Ms. Collins stated that the Program Administrators (PAs) had not seen the revised draft before the meeting and, as such, she had no comments to make on their behalf at this time. Halfpenny also distributed copies of the proposed draft RFR Statement of Work regarding Consultant Services to Facilitate the Design of the Massachusetts Statewide Energy Efficiency Tracking Database-Design Phase. The draft was prepared by Eric Belliveau of the Council Consultants.

The draft was circulated reflecting some comments previously submitted by Winkler regarding the draft. Halfpenny invited the members to review the document from beginning to end. Discussion ensued regarding the appropriate title for the RFR to reflect what service is being procured. Saunders suggested the adoption of the term “design phase” to further describe the scope of work. Winkler expressed his general concern regarding the potential misperception about engaging a consultant to hire a consultant. The subcommittee settled on the term “design phase” but expressed a desire to revisit the title for this RFR.

Saunders offered additional edits to page 2 of the draft and Winkler prompted discussion regarding the apparent exclusion of renewable in the second sentence of the GCA subheading under Background on page 2. The group went through the document paragraph by paragraph suggesting and discussing revisions. There was general debate whether the document needed to identify a specific goal of the database or whether potential goals should be left alone until the subcommittee knows more about what is possible for the eventual issuance of the phase 2 RFR concerning the system requirements of the database.

Global Warming Solutions Act (“GWSA”) section of the RFR draft:

Collins expressed her discomfort with the inclusion of GWSA as an independent component under “Enabling Legislation” as, in her view, the GWSA had no binding authority on the PAs per se and its mandates were not a requirement placed on them. She stated that the PAs agreed to support activities in furtherance of the GWSA but asserted that they were not bound by GWSA. Rio observed that emissions data potentially captured by the database would inform the GWSA and not the other way around whereby the GWSA was directing the reporting of such emissions information into the database. Others concurred. There was general agreement that Belliveau would rework the heading and placement of the GWSA piece by relegating it and moving it elsewhere but removing it from the Enabling Legislation section under “Background”.

DPU Order – Statewide Database section:

In response to Collins comments regarding the language of the DPU Order on the database, the last sentence of the paragraph was deleted and the drafters would take another look at page 60 of the Order to see if additional revisions might be necessary.

Stakeholders section:

There was discussion to eliminate the word “key” in describing the stakeholders and using the term “interested parties” in describing participants in the RFR process, as well as a shortening of the list by citing members of the EEAC and other interested parties.

Overview of Efficiency Program Administrators section:

Saunders offered some edits and questioned the necessity of the last paragraph on page 4. Masland, Halfpenny and Belliveau responded that some explanation would be helpful to potential bidders less familiar with the way energy efficiency programs are delivered in Massachusetts. A decision was made to retain the paragraph.

Current Energy Efficiency Program Tracking Systems section:

There was extended discussion with respect to the characterization of measure data as “core” versus “extended”. There was a sense that these words were not the right ones to describe the relationship between data sets. Belliveau agreed to revisit and rework both the choice of these words and the content following.

Halfpenny then directed the subcommittee to briefly examine page 9 and the scope of work described there as the allotted time for the meeting was close to the end. The group understood that these activities were the core of the draft RFR and committed to examining them further at the next meeting. Monday, April 29, 2013 at 2:00 pm was selected as the time for the next meeting. The meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.