

DRAFT

February 14, 2014 EEAC Executive Committee Meeting Notes

Attendees: Christina Halfpenny (DOER), Matt Saunders (AG), Christina Dietrich (ENE), Elliot Jacobson (LEAN), Eric Belliveau (Consult – by phone), Dave Bardaglio (Consult – by phone), Paul Johnson (Greentek), Carol White (National Grid), Lisa Shea (NU), Jodi Hanover (PAs), Steven Venezia (DOER), Lyn Huckabee (DOER), Ian Finlayson (DOER), Barry Perlmutter (DPU), Alex Pollard (DOER)

Agenda:

- Consultant work plan and budget
- Long term EEAC topic schedule
- February EEAC agenda
 - Q4
 - Priorities
 - Work plan and budget
 - Topic schedule
 - Database – interim system
 - EM&V update – C&I mid size study and webinar

Meeting began at approximately 10:10am

CONSULTANT WORK PLAN AND BUDGET

- (Halfpenny) Posits that the EC and consultants need to better balance the hours in the work plan. There are too many hours allocated toward the residential sector and the website. They need to scale back and the EEAC does not need a focus on branding. She asked for weigh in from the EC.
- (Dietrich) Agrees that the EEAC doesn't need to spend money on building a brand and suggested that the branding budget could be better utilized to finance the build out of website functionality. She also would like to see a total budget for the website (not just the budget for 2014). Additionally, she would like more clarity on what "cross-cutting" activities mean when there is a clear need for consulting services on the C&I side.
- (Finlayson) Suggested that "cross-cutting" is likely a catch-all but agreed that it would helpful to have a better idea of the thinking behind the category.
- (Johnson) Feels that the consultants need to make a case for their activity
- (Saunders) Again concerned with soft language and the EC's ability to measure progress against immeasurable targets. He would like to see progress on past work plans,

explanations of what tasks are new. In general, he would like to see value spelled out in plan.

- (Jacobson) Questioned what the next steps would be if there are still concerns about the content of the work plan. Do the consultants need to resubmit?
- (Saunders) Expressed concern about reworking the plan now when we need to sign the contract but asked when the EC could edit the plan.
- (Johnson) Wants to see deliverables from the Consultants
- (Halfpenny) Suggested that the EC listen to Belliveau's overview before drawing a conclusion.
- (Pollard) Asked that the EC clarify the role of travel costs in the work plan and budget.
- Belliveau and Bardaglio called in at 10:31am.
- (Halfpenny) Asked the consultants for an overview of their workplan
- (Belliveau) Explained that they reviewed the RFR, past experiences, and new priorities within the same budget which led to a zero sum delivery. This reflects the changes communicated since the proposal was written. They added cross-cutting category to reflect the time when consultants were working together to solve a problem. The residential sector generally requires more organizational effort and the C&I sector activity is more task-based.
- (Halfpenny) Requested more detail about the nature of those tasks and asked how the EC can measure their progress. Used the example of how the work plan will be evaluated during the performance review cycle.
- (Belliveau) Explained that he expected that the EC would approve the work plan first and then they could collectively establish the tasks and objectives on which the consultants would report back at review time.
- (Halfpenny) Asked what form the deliverables would take? Indicated that the current monthly reports are not substantive enough moving forward.
- (Belliveau) Imagines that the deliverable will look more like a memo or presentation in addition to the report whereas the report would list progression on the task.
- (Saunders) Asked consultants to run a scenario where the EC was the DPU and the consultants, like the PAs, needed to prove that they did what they said they did in 2013.
- (Belliveau) Believes that the revised work plan addresses the task of justifying their work and providing measurable metrics.
- (Johnson) Would like to know what is different.
- (Halfpenny) Offered an analysis of the hours done by DOER staff. They figured that 27 hours/week were allocated to Residential tasks and 60 hours/week were allocated to planning and analysis. C&I had the lowest ratio of hours/week. How were these numbers planned when C&I is the biggest priority?
- (Belliveau) The P&A numbers include support for ISO/Forecasting/AESC. P&A numbers also include coordination and project management for the sector specific activity. AESC schedule was moved up so more time for the study was included in 2014.

The activity in the C&I sector is focused on market analysis and segmentation (included in the “cross cutting” category) because more focused activity cannot happen without the background data. The outline they sent out recognized that, although C&I was a higher priority than residential, the residential sector still had a few heavy lift priorities for the year.

- (Bardaglio) Cautioned against making the work plan overly specific to the detriment of flexibility.
- (Johnson) Wants to see more detail about residential sector.
- (Shea) Reminded the EC that they can expect 3-5 deep dives in the March implementation updates which could easily change the EEAC’s consulting needs.
- (Halfpenny) Expressed a desire to understand what deliverables the Council can expect without knowing every task.
- (Dietrich) Asked if travel was included in the work plan and budget (yes), whether the AESC will cost more next year (yes), and how much the study costs last year (not sure but Belliveau will check)?
- (Saunders) Asked if the timelines could be broken out. Perhaps quarterly.
- (Johnson) Wants to know where the residential numbers come from.
- (Halfpenny) Asked if there is room for reductions in travel time?
- (Belliveau) Clarified that 3% of the budget is travel which is a very lean estimate that doesn’t include mileage for local consultants.
- (Halfpenny) The website doesn’t need a great deal of work in branding/identity. The website overhaul should emphasize function, not creativity.
- (Johnson) Indicated that the website serves a PR function so may need user research.
- (Belliveau) Indicated that there was no markup included on the web contractor so they can look elsewhere for a leaner quote.
- The EC then had a brief discussion of what they want out of the website but did not come to any conclusions.
- (Belliveau) Reminded the EC that the consultant rates have gone down since 2010. He laid out the next steps as getting approval from the Council, and then working on a timeline for reporting.
- (Saunders) Does the EC need to meet once more before the EEAC meeting?
- (Halfpenny) The Council must approve the consultant work plan and sign the contract by the February meeting so they need to do what is required to come to a resolution. She suggested that the consultants submit an updated work plan by next week.
- (Bardaglio) Reminded Halfpenny that there is precedent for approving the consultant contract based on a resolution approving the budget and an overall scope of work without the specific work plan agreed upon.
- (Halfpenny) Agreed to make that recommendation to the Council if the plan of getting the update by Wednesday and convening the EC on Friday at 10 am doesn’t work.

- (Venezia) Committed to noticing a Friday February 21, 10am EC meeting

SUBJECTS/SCHEDULE

- (Halfpenny) Asked if the EC had any additional desired edits. After no suggestions from the EC, she announced that the list will go to the Council in February.

COUNCIL PRIORITIES

- (Halfpenny) Admitted that the edits of the resolution text are not finished and committed to finishing them by the now agreed Friday EC meeting.

FEBRUARY AGENDA

- (Halfpenny) The priority is the Q4 results analysis from both the consultants and the PAs, separately.
- Engaged in a brief discussion about future expectations of results reporting where the EC concluded that both consultants and PAs give their own independent assessment of program results.
- (Halfpenny) Council priorities resolution given 15 minutes for vote. The work plan and budget needs 20 minutes for discussion. The topic schedule sheet will get 15 minutes. Interim data plans will get 20 minutes. EM&V update on significant studies gets 15 minutes.

Meeting adjourned at 11:58am.