

Energy Collaborative Analysis Initiative Leadership Committee

Meeting Summary – April 3, 2007

Sixteen people attended the second Energy Collaborative Analysis Initiative (ECAI) Leadership Committee meeting on April 3, 2007, in Washington, D.C.

(A full list of members and additional information on the Leadership Committee can be found at http://www.nrel.gov/analysis/collab_analysis/leader_comm.html)

Darrell Beschen of Planning, Budget, and Analysis (PBA) at DOE's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) provided opening remarks; and Ron Benioff, from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), facilitated the meeting.

Beschen reinforced that the collective energy analysis approach has already produced several great ideas and that the initiative has a rich endorsement from EERE's front office. He emphasized that the ECAI is a joint effort and follow-up activities from the workshop need to continue progressing.

1. Agenda item: Next Web forum (see Attachment 2 at http://www.nrel.gov/analysis/collab_analysis/pdfs/2007/040307_wf_planning.pdf)

Brian Levite reported that the next Web forum is on portfolio analysis. Possible presenters include someone from EPA, NYSERDA (Paul DeCotis), EERE (Sam Baldwin), and NREL (Thomas Jenkin).

The forum structure is designed to inform others about what the group is doing – but only half the time is for presentations and the other half should focus on discussions.

The group discussed how Leadership Committee members can help spread the word about the Web forums through their organization's newsletters and Web sites.

The Clean Energy States Alliance (CESA) leadership will work with their membership to attend and participate/comment as part of the audience and not just as presenters.

The group discussed inviting a speaker from a large company such as GE to demonstrate the nongovernmental way of doing portfolio analysis. The group decided to hold off on inviting an industry representative.

2. Agenda item: Communication activities

Paul DeCotis and Jennifer DeCesaro will provide the next feature story, outlining their current portfolio analysis.

The group also discussed the possibility of implementing a Wiki on the ECAI site to facilitate discussions on Geographic Information System (GIS) issues. Other groups (Kohl Gill and Charles Drummond) had experienced some sensitivities with hosting a Wiki on a government-operated site and went with a third party. NREL will see how this can be addressed.

3. Agenda item: Workshop 2006 activity updates (see Attachment 3 at http://www.nrel.gov/analysis/collab_analysis/pdfs/2007/040307_wshop_act_summ.pdf)

The group had a round-robin discussion regarding individual activities.

Topic B. Group (led by DeCotis and DeCesaro) tried a pilot project related to a survey. There was not huge interest, so they are abandoning the effort. Lesson learned – the survey needed more attention to its structure.

Topic C. Models will be discussed at next workshop (big interest in NEMS)

Topic D. Same as Topic C.

Topic E. Skip Laitner is working on an inventory of models

Following the reports, the group agreed they need to re-evaluate and focus the collaborative on what parts are really working and where the collaborative input is adding value.

3. Agenda item: Workshop 2007 planning (see Attachment 4 at http://www.nrel.gov/analysis/collab_analysis/pdfs/2007/040307_wshop07_prelim_agenda.pdf and Attachment 5 at http://www.nrel.gov/analysis/collab_analysis/pdfs/2007/040307_wshop07_expert_teams.pdf)

Workshop dates were discussed. The group is looking at a Thursday and half-day Friday schedule. Doing two full days also was discussed. NREL will check with the venue and send out an announcement regarding dates end of April.

While the first workshop was about priorities, the group now needs to focus on the “nitty gritty.” This is an opportunity for sharing “substantive” results.

Group discussed how to increase the breadth of participants – while there is extremely high-quality state participation, they’d like to increase quantity. The question was asked on whether states could participate remotely? Also, can we hook on to NASEO or NARUC meetings? NREL will check into this.

The group has identified six topics and identified expert teams. Members questioned whether the sessions all have to have the same structure. Consensus was that teams could decide.

Group also thought that some topics might cover too much ground – team members may need to narrow focus. For instance, one topic looks at social science and how the mechanism is applied to models. An NSF working group is 3-6 months away from having results on a related study. We should examine how can the session help build on what else is going on in this area.

****Important point to remember: Think about what the tangible products are from each of these sessions.**

The workshop planning team was to have a “special topic” during the event. Team is looking for a few good leadership committee members to “guide.”

Possible topics include stochastic analysis – also, how do we respond to uncertainty. Climate scenarios were another possibility.

We may want to “key up” the topic the night before to “feed” on – use a panel discussion and fewer presentations, speakers. Focus on results of analysis, technique? Needs to be broad and of a general nature (climate change, carbon)

Another possibility: Large-scale deployment of renewables – what are the policy implications, technology status, etc.

The committee will discuss further offline or at the next meeting.