

1 MS. YORK: Move to provisional.

2 MS. MCQUADE: So, we changed D and E and
3 we're moving F to provisional.

4 MS. YORK: Other changes, Ed?

5 MR. SKIBA: That was all.

6 MS. YORK: Thanks. Matt.

7 MR. GOLDBERG: I guess I want to raise this
8 first as a question rather than promote a particular
9 view for our discussion. What I'm reflecting on here
10 is an email that went out from Aaron, EnerNOC, on
11 Monday regarding additional work that might be on the
12 business practices to support Demand Response and DSM
13 and Energy Efficiency programs. It's a comment and,
14 Aaron, I presume, you're still on the phone.

15 MS. YORK: He's in the room.

16 MR. GOLDBERG: Thanks. I think in substance
17 appears to be that NAESB -- it would be good to
18 memorialize that NAESB is intending to do more work on
19 this. It seems like that is a timely one for
20 preparing what goes into the Annual Plan. As I look
21 at the Annual Plan, though, looking at more about
22 Item 4, there's a number of things already on the plan
23 for further steps and I suppose, I guess, I want to
24 discuss and question, do any of those steps address --
25 already address what you were intending to see NAESB

1 memorialize and if not, why not -- well, depending on
2 the answer, so why don't we start with that.

3 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: Thank you, Aaron
4 Breidenbaugh, EnerNOC; and I almost asked Kathy to
5 swap the two agenda items because the discussion that
6 I think we're going to have in the next item relating
7 to DSM-EE efforts would be a good preamble to a
8 recommendation for an addition to the Annual Plan, and
9 I don't know. I just -- I didn't do that. I suppose
10 we can handle it any number of ways. I actually have
11 some suggested language for the Annual Plan that I was
12 going to offer up -- had you not spoken I was going
13 to -- I was going to state that so thanks for giving
14 me a nice intro to that.

15 My only concern is that offering up that
16 language without the benefit of the discussion about
17 why we need to do more that will come in the next
18 section might be premature.

19 MR. GOLDBERG: Let me jump in. Why are we
20 waiting? If the key item is thinking how to key up
21 additional work, why would we wait until Item 9?

22 MS. MCQUADE: So, we're going to just do 9b
23 now?

24 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: Yeah, with the permission
25 or -- and request of the Chair, I would ask that we go

1 to 9b now.

2 MR. GOLDBERG: I just want to be clear on
3 form. I'm -- at least the way we would view this is a
4 potential amendment to the Annual Plan. Are you
5 comfortable raising it as that?

6 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: Yeah, I'm going to make
7 an amendment. It's just that it's sort of easier to
8 do it with the intro associated with the Item 9, and
9 you want me to go ahead?

10 MS. YORK: Yes.

11 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: So, Item 9 relates to
12 recommendations that is actually currently in voting.
13 Provisional ballots went out, I think, on Wednesday
14 within last week. We had a meeting and by the end of
15 it, there was insufficient number of people to carry
16 it forward. So, the principle -- there was a number
17 of amendments that were made, all but I think one of
18 them friendly to the proposal that came out of the
19 subcommittee and one of the -- one of the items, and
20 the most important from our standpoint, was the fact
21 that the original recommendation that was -- that was
22 by no means uncontentious, if that's a word, that came
23 out of the subcommittee was the use of the word
24 "framework" in the title of the recommendation and
25 that was driven in a large part by the fact that there

1 are a number of parties that participated in the
2 subcommittee. I think I'm speaking for them, but
3 mainly for myself is that the product that is, you
4 know, pending now and is in balloting is a valuable
5 product. It's a great starting place. It lays out,
6 you know, in good detail sort of how to -- how to
7 discuss issues related to DR Energy, glossaries, sort
8 of just ways of considering the issues.

9 Unfortunately it -- and I think the actual
10 count might be 149 to now 150 -- uses the term
11 either "discretion of the system operator" or some
12 variant of that really as a -- in our minds, a
13 substitute for actual standards. Basically, I think
14 it's fair to characterize it says the standard is,
15 in fact, whatever the local system operator says it
16 is and in this context the system operator is --
17 because one of the other changes was to limit it
18 only to ISO and RTOs, that essentially whatever the
19 ISO/RTO says, and it just basically defers what we
20 would consider to be most of the sort of meat and
21 potatoes to the technical standard to whatever it is
22 the system operators come up with.

23 And, you know, I guess it's not surprising
24 that the system operators have their own processes
25 and constituency prerogatives that they want to

1 maintain. So, I understand it; but as far as a set
2 of technical standards that provide a valuable road
3 map to somebody who is trying to put together an M&V
4 program for Demand Response, let's say in this case
5 maybe it's a new ISO like MISO, for example, or some
6 other independent system operator, the consistent --
7 the constant reference to "system operator
8 preferences" doesn't really provide a lot of
9 guidance.

10 So, we think it's a good framework. It's
11 a good starting point, but it's not an end. The
12 analogy, you know me I like analogies, the analogy
13 is, you know, we have cars and we've determined that
14 they can go forward and backward and left and right
15 and they should have accelerators. That's a good
16 thing and, you know, that there should be roads, but
17 we don't have anything that says there should be
18 traffic signs or that there should be lanes in the
19 roads, you know, that maybe it's not a good idea for
20 people to drive in both directions on the same side
21 of the road and that's the kind of thing that we
22 need in here.

23 I mean, we defined sort of these five
24 basics ways of measuring demand response
25 performance; but, you know, we've got enough

1 experience now and we're active in every ISO
2 footprint and most of the utilities that have
3 programs. We have enough experience that a lot of
4 them don't work very well and others work really
5 well and we'd like to try to put something out there
6 or NAESB to put out something that allows people to
7 avoid the mistakes of the past and to recreate or
8 perpetuate some of the successes.

9 So, we just think there needs to be a
10 follow-on process to do that. Given that the
11 balloting is going on now there is nothing we can do
12 to change the actual standard itself, which I
13 suspect will pass, and with the addition of the
14 language we have suggested in the items here would
15 recommend passing. I mean, if I could -- if that
16 language was in there; and I could change my vote to
17 yes, I would do so. I don't think I can.

18 MR. GOLDBERG: Where I thought you were
19 going to go with this was suggest that the Annual Plan
20 reflect additional development.

21 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: I have language for that,
22 but we're on 9A now, not the Annual Plan piece. The
23 recommendation --

24 MR. GOLDBERG: I'm sorry, I don't know why
25 you're -- what I'm having trouble understanding, quite

1 frankly, is why you keep reverting to -- the issue
2 seems -- tell me if I'm misunderstanding this.

3 MS. YORK: Matt, this is Kathy. We asked
4 him to give us a discussion on this as to why he was
5 asking for an Annual Plan addition. So, we gave him
6 permission in the room to do this, to discuss Item 9
7 and what he had sent out to the WEQ EC members as the
8 recommended language to the proposal so that he could
9 get to the part of actually maybe a recommendation for
10 the Annual Plan addition.

11 MR. GOLDBERG: Okay.

12 MS. YORK: I just want to clarify, you
13 probably didn't hear us in the room; but I did give
14 him the nod to do that.

15 MR. GOLDBERG: Okay. But maybe I'm
16 belaboring the point. The point of the discussion is
17 whether or not the Annual Plan should be updated or
18 amended. Is that the point of this -- I mean.

19 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: Ultimately, yes.
20 Ultimately to effectuate whatever we say in some sort
21 of preamble to the vote or things that goes along with
22 the filing report to FERC. If it says we need to do
23 more work, the place where the work is going to get
24 tasked out is in the Annual Plan, and I was unaware
25 until I got to this meeting that we were entertaining

1 additions to the Annual Plan. Otherwise, instead of
2 recommending some fluffy language around the filing
3 letter, I would have recommended substantive changes,
4 which I actually have now for people's consideration.

5 MR. GOLDBERG: For whatever it's worth I
6 looked at the language in the email and I have issues.
7 I was concerned about it or reservations about
8 entertaining that as something that would be a part of
9 a filing to FERC, but I think that -- but it's very
10 useful for the Annual Plan. Now, it's your decision
11 ultimately about how you want to proceed forward and
12 how to do -- someone else would say it's too late for
13 you to make an amendment to the Annual Plan because of
14 the way this was agendaed, but I guess what I'm
15 suggesting is that discussion might be more fruitful
16 using it at an Annual Plan Amendment than as language
17 to append to the FERC filing.

18 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: Which I will make if I
19 can.

20 MS. YORK: Go ahead.

21 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: What I was going to
22 propose initially was that where Item 4B exists now,
23 you would insert -- and I'm not quite sure exactly
24 what B was appended to. So, we could either make it
25 Amendment to B or insert a new item. My first

1 suggestion was a new item that would go right after A,
2 because A is what we are, you know, in the process of
3 voting on right now; and it would be something along
4 the lines of this. "Develop Technical Standards for
5 the Measurement Verification of Demand Response
6 Programs in ISO/RTO footprint areas." And I use the
7 term "technical standards" because that's the one that
8 I heard most frequently in saying that what is
9 presently pending before the group is not, but I'm not
10 sure that everybody would even agree with that
11 characterization.

12 What I'm trying to get at is best
13 practices, but I'm not sure that that's a term that
14 has any sort of currency value within NAESB. If it
15 did, I would probably say develop a best practices
16 guide or best practices standards or technical
17 standards or really almost anything that makes it
18 clear that we're going beyond what is out there now.

19 MR. GOLDBERG: Can you reread your language
20 there?

21 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: Just a second, I got a
22 recommendation from Valerie, which would be: "Develop
23 Technical Standards which represent industry best
24 practices for the Measurement and Verification of
25 Demand and Response Programs in RSO/ITO footprint

1 areas." Thank you, Valerie.

2 MR. GOLDBERG: You want to amend that to B?

3 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: No, I would make it a new
4 4B, and everything else would just get notched up by
5 one letter, you can tack it on.

6 MS. MCQUADE: I like where you put it
7 because it makes sense.

8 MS. YORK: So, it would become 4B and
9 everything else drops.

10 MS. MCQUADE: So, it's: "Develop Technical
11 Standards for the M&V for measurement and verification
12 of -- Develop Technical Standards which represent
13 industry best practices for the measurement and
14 verification of Demand Response Programs in ISO/RTO
15 footprint areas."

16 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: And the latter part of
17 the ISO/RTO area footprint area is the latter
18 discussion we had about there not being any outside of
19 the ISO/RTO footprint.

20 MS. MCQUADE: And probably what would then
21 happen, once the business practices are complete on
22 the Retail side, there may be a very similar item
23 added for the technical.

24 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: Correct.

25 MS. MCQUADE: Date and assignment?

1 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: You guys know how your
2 processes work better than I, but I would say it's
3 likely to take about as long as the initial process
4 did because not so much -- we spent a lot of time in
5 initial process sort of identifying things with matrix
6 development and all that. We're not going to spend as
7 much time identifying things, but we're going to spend
8 more time arguing about them. So, I think we'll
9 probably -- you know, a year is probably not
10 unreasonable.

11 MS. MCQUADE: So, 2010.

12 MR. GOLDBERG: But, if I may, this is Matt,
13 given that we're drafting as we go, maybe what we want
14 to do is have as the Annual Plan item -- you know
15 identify -- the verb can change, but effectively
16 identify the scope. Doing otherwise, it's a little
17 arbitrarily for me to say, well, a year. Things I'm
18 tripping over immediately are the reference to "best
19 practice," by the way. You know, some demarcation of,
20 you know, scope identification and relationship of
21 further development of technical standards relative to
22 what's going on in other regions of the country which
23 meet in parts --

24 MR. WINKLER: Eric Winkler, can I get on the
25 list?

1 MS. YORK: Before we do that, Rae had picked
2 up the former Item 4B in the status where it says "not
3 started" in paren "scope to be initiated in second
4 quarter of 2009 after which a completion date will be
5 set." So, okay, Eric, go ahead.

6 MR. WINK: Well, I didn't understand what
7 you just said about the scope. Are you changing this,
8 or are you saying there's another item?

9 MS. YORK: We're added a new item and the --
10 there is a proposal on the table to add a new item and
11 it would become 4B instead of the current 4B. The
12 current 4B will become 4C. Insert a new item to read:
13 "Develop technical standards which represent industry
14 best practices for the M&V process of DR programs in
15 ISO/RTO footprint areas." The status would be "not
16 started" and parens "Scope to be initiated second
17 quarter 2009 after which a completion date will be
18 set."

19 MR. WINKLER: So, I just want to be clear
20 because, you know, if this recommendation to add this
21 item is coming from Aaron, I guess, I'll direct this
22 question to him. Just so I'm clear about what you
23 perceive to be completed with this task, are you
24 suggesting and I'll just give just one specific and
25 tell me if this is what you're thinking is going to

1 happen. In the current standards that are currently
2 being balloted, we have a requirement for the
3 telemetry interval. Are you -- are you suggesting in
4 the technical standards that -- the technical
5 standards that you're proposing be developed here
6 would specify a single value or a range of values that
7 would be enforceable across all the ISO/RTOs?

8 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: I guess first of all my
9 issues go less to those types of technical standards,
10 and I think we actually --

11 MR. WINKLER: Well, wait, can you just try
12 and answer the question?

13 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: I'm trying to. I'm
14 trying to. The focus is on M&V practices, not so much
15 on technical practices, but technical in the sense of
16 what timing interval and that sort of thing, but the
17 words say: "Consistent best practices," you know what
18 works. If the group concludes that what needs to work
19 is a different timing interval for different areas for
20 whatever reason, then I would say that that's the best
21 practice.

22 What I'm getting at is more -- approaches
23 to monitoring and verification. Like, for example,
24 if you have -- if you're doing M&V on loads that are
25 temperature sensitive, should you do a day ahead

1 adjustment. You know, those kinds of issues.

2 MR. WINKLER: Let me ask you this, let me
3 ask since you're -- I don't think you understood my
4 question. If we have a weather sensitive adjustment
5 for baseline, are you suggesting that all the ISOs
6 across the country would conform to a single standard?
7 Let's say it's a temperature adjustment, you know,
8 baseline adjustment for weather sensitive measures,
9 are you suggesting that this technical standard would
10 be a single standard, a numerical value or range of
11 values that would be applicable to all ISO/RTOs?

12 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: I guess that would be up
13 to FERC. If that's the best practice and --

14 MR. WINKLER: What you would envision the
15 technical standard to be.

16 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: It's not necessarily one
17 size fits all.

18 MS. MCQUADE: And we're actually debating
19 the details rather than the merit of the line item.

20 MR. GALLAGHER: Can I get in the queue,
21 please, here?

22 MR. WINKLER: Let me --

23 MS. YORK: Wait, wait, wait. Just a minute.
24 If we could ask Bill to interject.

25 MR. GALLAGHER: We're having a discussion on

1 what the scope is going to be, and I think that's the
2 purpose. Let's move on to approve the Annual Plan.
3 You guys can talk about the scope for the whole second
4 quarter of 2009.

5 MR. WINKLER: That's what I want to ask.

6 MR. GALLAGHER: It's not proper to do it on
7 this call.

8 MR. WINKLER: So, is this the scope, then,
9 that should be the title, the scope of the technical
10 standards for M&V of DR programs for ISO/RTO
11 footprints, not develop technical standards?

12 MS. OTONDO: Madam Chair, I was going to
13 raise the same issues that this is an inappropriate
14 discussion here and I would also point out if there's
15 not agreement to what should go in the Annual Plan,
16 the other way of doing this is to submit a request for
17 a standard; and that's actually the normal way to have
18 something put into the Annual Plan.

19 MR. GOLDBERG: This is Matt Goldberg. The
20 prior remark and to Bill's remark, I don't necessarily
21 disagree with your reservations; but as I've
22 understood it this discussion was going to be keyed up
23 as part of an agenda Item 9 anyway. If you think this
24 doesn't warrant discussion, I think that is a fair
25 observation, but I don't think you should be pointing

1 your comments at those of us who are raising questions
2 about this.

3 MR. GALLAGHER: We're going to have to move
4 it along, and I'm just pointing out that you were
5 discussing the scoping and that's not appropriate in
6 terms of what we're doing right now. We're trying to
7 put an item into the Annual Plan.

8 MR. GOLDBERG: I understand where you're
9 coming from, but the Executive Committee is going to
10 be asked to make a statement about what work the
11 Executive Committee intends to take time on and it's
12 hard to answer that question without understanding
13 what the scope is of what we're being asked to do. I
14 agree with you in a sense. So, I'll let it go.

15 MR. WINKLER: In terms of timing, the notion
16 that developing technical standards across all the
17 ISOs in North America, technical standards, the
18 details that are the underlying complaint from a
19 number of folks about this current standard being too
20 high level, will not take that same amount of time it
21 took just to get to here. So, I want to be clear that
22 the expectation that we're going to develop technical
23 standards in a year and a half or two, is probably one
24 that is rather unrealistic.

25 MR. GALLAGHER: That's why we're leaving the

1 day blank.

2 MS. MCQUADE: This is Rae. We can
3 certain -- if we choose to add this item to the Annual
4 Plan, which is frankly a lot easier than putting a
5 request in, and you got enough wording around it that
6 the EC and the subcommittee can determine what it
7 means because if you look at the language, "Scope to
8 be initiated in second quarter 2009." So, the group
9 is going to be defining the scope, which will then
10 define the completion date, because God knows we never
11 change a completion date once you put it on the plan.
12 So, you got the leeway to change it once it's there;
13 and you can have the assignment to the WEQ. We've
14 already all said that this was a first step, and that
15 we needed to go further. We have it in the record.
16 We have it on the transcript. We have it everywhere.

17 So, basically all B is doing is
18 acknowledging what we've said in the meetings. You
19 may not like the way it's worded, but you've got an
20 entire out by saying the scope is going to be
21 defined and the subcommittee is going to define the
22 scope and bring it back to the EC. So, I don't know
23 why we're having so many arguments here for
24 something that is so simply worded.

25 MR. WATTLES: Rae, Paul Wattles, ERCOT. Can

1 you read what is the proposed language again, then,
2 because the way Rae just said, it all makes scene.

3 MS. MCQUADE: The proposed language is:
4 "Develop technical standards which represent industry
5 best practices for the measurement and verification of
6 Demand Response programs in ISO/RTO footprint areas."
7 That wording may be giving people heartburn, but you
8 need to read the next statement. The next statement
9 is the status. It is not started and in parenthesis
10 it has the same statement that we've got for energy
11 reductions, for energy efficiency portfolio standards,
12 for renewable portfolio standards, for my personal
13 favorite, greenhouse gas, that says "Scope to be
14 initiated in the second quarter after which a
15 completion date will be set." So, even though we say
16 it's 2-10, we can change it. We're going to be
17 bringing a scope statement back and saying this is
18 what we think this means. This group will have to
19 approve it before it goes further. So, that's all it
20 is; and it's everything we said we were going to do
21 when we looked at the original recommendation the
22 first time we voted on it.

23 MR. WATTLES: I'm happy, thank you.

24 MS. MCQUADE: That's why I was a little
25 nervous about arguing about details of this.

1 MS. YORK: Syd.

2 MR. BERWAGER: This is Syd Berwager from
3 Bonneville Power Administration; and we don't have a
4 lot of experience, actually, using demand side to shed
5 peak load. I thought NAESB was here to develop
6 business practices. I guess I'm a little worried
7 frankly about the word "best practices." I mean, at
8 times some practices are good enough, and we can move
9 on with other things. So, when you get to priority
10 and you have an Annual Plan that says you're always
11 going to strive for the best practice, I think you set
12 yourself up for it's never good enough.

13 MS. MCQUADE: I doubt that we'll get the
14 votes for it anyway.

15 MR. GOLDBERG: This is Matt Goldberg, and in
16 an attempt to bring this to closure, I mean, quite
17 frankly it should go along the lines of "Develop
18 Technical Standard for the M&V process."

19 MS. MCQUADE: Which is what you recommended
20 initially.

21 MS. YORK: Okay. We're going to drop out
22 "which represent industry best practices."

23 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: Do you understand,
24 though, that technical practices does not mean what
25 we've done already because some people have suggested

1 that what we've done already are technical standards.
2 I frankly don't want to have this debate again after
3 we go to the subcommittee and somebody argues, well,
4 we're done because we've already got technical
5 standards and those technical standards are --

6 MS. OTONDO: We're going to get that either
7 way, doesn't matter.

8 MR. WATTLES: This is Paul. Would you
9 accept something like "more detailed technical
10 standards"?

11 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: Sure, I'll take whatever
12 I can get at this point.

13 MR. WATTLES: And what about instead of
14 "programs" we have used the terms "products and
15 services" throughout the standards document, can we
16 use those terms instead of "programs"?

17 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: That's fine, too.

18 MR. WINKLER: I would take out the term
19 "process."

20 MS. MCQUADE: So, it's: "Develop more
21 detailed technical standards for the M&V of DR
22 products and services in ISO/RT0 footprint areas," and
23 I will make conforming changes everywhere we've got
24 "programs" to say "products and services" because I
25 notice that they're in a couple of other places that

1 need to be changed.

2 MS. REHMAN: How about decoding "M&V"?

3 MS. MCQUADE: I will, I just said it quickly
4 to talk fast.

5 MS. YORK: Measure and verification. Ed.

6 MR. SKIBA: Just from a consistency
7 standpoint, any of these other items that we've said
8 that we're going to start the scoping in the second
9 quarter, they're listed in Phase 2 as opposed to
10 putting any date on them.

11 MS. MCQUADE: I'll make them Phase 2.

12 MS. YORK: Okay.

13 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: So, I'll move that
14 language. I can't read it, but I'll take your word
15 for it it's what you said.

16 MS. YORK: Any other amendments to 2009
17 Annual Plan? Simple majority, right, anyone opposed
18 in the room? Anyone on the phone opposed? Motion
19 carries. Lets go. Moving on now, we've got a little
20 bit into 9, but do we want to firm up? Are we done?

21 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: That obviates the need
22 for 9A or any discussion around B.

23 MS. YORK: All right.

24 MS. MCQUADE: One thing, though, you want
25 Cory to tell us where we are because we can't really

1 do -- let me reiterate where we are. We can't do what
2 we just said is on the Annual Plan unless the
3 recommendation that is currently out for voting
4 actually passes. So, let's explain where we are on
5 the votes. Please remember abstentions have -- while
6 they're called abstentions, they have the same effect
7 as a no vote.

8 MS. CUMMINGHAM: We currently have out of
9 the 36 EC members who are on the EC, we have 18 in
10 support of the recommendation, 2 opposed and 2
11 abstained. We need 25 total votes to reach super
12 majority and the obvious 40 percent of each subsegment
13 except that there are three subsegments with vacancies
14 due to recent -- three segments with vacancies and due
15 to the recent change in the voting rules, a segment
16 that is not fully populated doesn't get the benefit of
17 the 40 percent segment block. So, those three
18 segments don't have that.

19 MS. OTONDO: Which segments are those, Cory?

20 MS. CUMMINGHAM: I have to look it up real
21 quick. They are the end user segment.

22 MS. MCQUADE: Distribution.

23 MS. CUMMINGHAM: And market/broker.

24 MS. MCQUADE: And market/broker. You have a
25 vacancy in market/broker that needs to be filled, a

1 vacancy in distribution and a lot of vacancies in end
2 users.

3 MS. CUMMINGHAM: If anyone has any other
4 questions, feel free to see me.

5 MS. MCQUADE: And one comment I would make
6 because of the visibility of this issue, I would urge
7 those people that voted no or that have abstained to
8 get a comment on the record for why because I will be
9 asked and I would prefer not putting words into your
10 mouths. So, if you could very quickly give me a
11 little paragraph that says, "This is why I abstained,
12 this is why I voted no. This is my company's position
13 on why I did this."

14 Now, I've checked with Bill Boswell and
15 Bill said and this goes for everybody, even the
16 people that have voted yes already because the
17 notational ballot is still open, you can reconsider
18 your vote.

19 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: In that case, to the
20 extent we haven't passed the Annual Plan yet.

21 MS. MCQUADE: We passed it. It's up to the
22 Board now.

23 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: The plan was passed? I
24 thought that was just the amendment.

25 MS. MCQUADE: No, we voted on that.

1 MR. BREIDENBAUGH: So, with that change, I
2 would switch my vote to in favor.

3 MS. MCQUADE: And we've got it on the
4 record. That's all I need.

5 MS. CUMMINGHAM: I already noted it on our
6 tally. I just wanted to remind everyone that
7 notational ballots are due February 10th. So, you
8 still have a week to get those in.

9 MS. MCQUADE: Urge anybody else who has
10 voted no to do the same thing and to get actively
11 involved in Phase 2.

12 MS. CUMMINGHAM: There are still 14
13 outstanding votes.

14 MS. MCQUADE: So, if you haven't voted,
15 please vote; and feel free to submit comments whether
16 you vote yes or no or abstain because those comments
17 then go with your vote, they go to the Commission and
18 they give me information when I get asked questions
19 because I promise you I will.

20 MR. PRITCHARD: This is Alan Pritchard. I'd
21 like to get in the queue, please.

22 MS. YORK: Go ahead, Alan.

23 MR. PRITCHARD: Just clarification, Rae. If
24 I understood what you said, any vote that's in
25 notational ballot, then members can change their vote?

1 MS. MCQUADE: I just got that word from Bill
2 Boswell. He said that unless we've specifically noted
3 in our bylaws or certificate, until the vote is
4 determinative people can change their votes and it's
5 not determinative yet. Just like the vote we took on
6 R07020 is not determinative. So, those people that
7 asked for notational ballot will get them but we're
8 going to send notational ballots to every EC member
9 and they're going to be able to change their vote if
10 they want to.

11 MR. PRITCHARD: Just wanted to make sure I
12 understood.

13 MS. MCQUADE: Yeah, makes my life a little
14 more complicated.

15 MS. YORK: I got Roy, Ed and then you Bill.

16 MR. TRUE: Roy True, Aces Power. I guess
17 the way that we're characterizing Phase 2 for DSM-EE
18 I'm wondering whether or not we should look to split
19 that group because it doesn't sound like we're going
20 to get to the Efficiency EE part of that until a long
21 way down the road, if we're talking about same
22 committee doing this work. So, I'd just like to make
23 the suggestion that we might want to look at splitting
24 those two up.

25 MS. MCQUADE: We can do that when we do the

1 scoping and indicate that, you know, when we've looked
2 at all these and scoped in Phase 2, this one is
3 getting priority, we're focusing on this, we're going
4 to get it done, these that we called Phase 2 are now
5 moving to Phase 3.

6 MR. TRUE: I think that it be appropriate if
7 you want to do it at that time. I'm just thinking the
8 ISO -- we limited the discussions to the ISO
9 footprint. We're talking about how you handle energy
10 efficiency within ISO footprints, or are you talking
11 about retail as well? I believe it encompasses all of
12 that. I'm just concerned that with the way the
13 discussion is going just for us to work on the
14 additional technical specs, that we're not going to
15 get the back half of this group, the EE part until
16 much further down the road and so we may want to look
17 at splitting out developing a scope.

18 MR. GOLDBERG: Matt Goldberg. I have
19 another question: Where are the other nonISO/RTOS on
20 developing? EE is a nationwide issue.

21 MS. MCQUADE: The Retail folks are busily
22 developing the business practices to mirror the
23 business practices that support the ISO/RTO footprint
24 area. So, that's where the Retail folks are right
25 now; but they've got all the similar work facing them.

1 MS. YORK: Bill Gallagher.

2 MR. GALLAGHER: I just want to mention that
3 Lou Ann Westerfield had sent around a copy of her
4 notational ballot expressing the same concerns that I
5 think we just alleviated here. Someone may want to
6 reach out to her and let her know what happened here.

7 MS. MCQUADE: Aaron just volunteered. Thank
8 you, Bill.

9 MS. YORK: Tent cards are down. So, we're
10 going to move on to Item 9A, that's Order 890; and I'm
11 going to call on Paul.

12 MR. SORENSON: No change.

13 MS. YORK: Thank you. Go ahead, Paul.

14 MR. SORENSON: The biggest thing in
15 Order 890 is to continue on with the Network
16 Integration Service on OASIS, but it's being pushed
17 off to deal with Item C, at least for the next two-day
18 meeting. Hopefully to put that to bed, but -- and we
19 have no plans other than future work to be determined.
20 I think network service will take us easily into
21 summer.

22 MS. YORK: So, the next two days you're
23 meeting predominantly for rollover rights?

24 MR. SORENSON: Assuming, yes, you sent it
25 back to us, which we fully expect.