

UMP Steering Committee Meeting

In Attendance:

- Chuck Kurnik (NREL) – **CK**
- Clover Lee (Cadmus) – **CL**
- Tina Jayaweera (Cadmus) -**TJ**
- Steve Kromer (SK) – **SK**
- Kosol Kiatreungwattana (NREL) - **KK**
- Mike Li (DOE) - **ML**
- Suzanne Stelmasek (ICC Illinois) - **SS**
- Jason Kupser (DTE Energy) - **JK**
- Nicole Luckey (ICC Illinois) - **NL**
- Linda Ecker (AEP) - **LE**
- Gene Rodrigues (ICFI) - **GR**
- Bill Newbold (DTE Energy) - **BN**

Action Items:

- Request SC approval of Chillers, Comm. New Construction and retrocommissioning by Friday, June 20th, 2014
- Any feedback to Chuck.

Agenda

- 5 min: Welcome & roll call
- 10 min: Project status & adoption update
 - Hawaii TRM Pilot

CK: Working through Hawaii PUC and the state's consultant, Cadmus will be looking at Hawaii TRM and looking at protocols that are applicable to UMP and make sure each of the measures are consistent of the UMP and if not, will make recommendations on how to do that. This is the first opportunity to see how protocols developed by UMP can fit into TRM. Outcome of this will be short guidebook to provide other states and regions on how to integrate to TRM. Any questions?

[None]

- Stakeholder Interviews

CK: Cadmus putting together interviews to interview industry stakeholders. Trying to find out from this interview process, what is the level of knowledge within an organization of protocols developed by UMP. We will also go through this with TAG members so they can help us with the interviewing of the stakeholders. Tina, anything to add?

TJ: If the steering committee members have a recommendation for one of those stakeholder organization that it would be worth us talking with please let us know. Please shoot Chuck an email about that.

- Recap of NEEP Summit

ML: NEEP had their annual summit a couple weeks ago, we did an evaluation workshop. We had a lot of positive responses, 60% of respondents regularly referred to UMP protocols in their work. It's a small sample, but better than none. In another question in the poll, only one person responded that what we did with protocols wasn't rigorous enough. This is a general note; we are headed in the right direction. Maybe Gene can share.

GR: The comment I am talking about and the opportunity that will come up on June 24, that carbon regulation became real and something we have to work with and UMP will be part of that. California has a day-long workshop planned to discuss EE issues, of which EM&V is something he's going to talk about at that venue.

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/NR/rdonlyres/5CF8F3A6-AA11-415C-8C96-6C37D4211F8E/0/June24EESymposiumAgenda.pdf>

- Updates from Steering Committee

ML: I was talking to folks at DCSEU, have been referring to UMP in their evaluation work.

- 20 min: Protocol acceptance process

CK: The first step is that the protocols are sent out to a broad range of stakeholders, including those identified by steering committee members, the stakeholder review is open for 1 month. Once the Stakeholder Review closes, the author and TAG receive comments then we create spreadsheet with all those comments and we determine if those comments were accepted, rejected, or accepted with modification. We have a final commenter review period and provide a new draft and give them 2 weeks to respond to edits. Most of the time they are satisfied, if not we contact reviewer to make changes everyone can live with. We are trying to make it as consensus based as much as possible. After comment response review, NREL team does a review and sends the comments back to the author and let the author review edits to make sure we haven't changed the intent, then sent TAG for approval, then SC for approval, then DOE for approval and finally we publish the document.

Status update of all protocols right now, shown in a table. Any questions from SC on progress we are making on protocols?

Steering Committee Approval

Consider the following:

TAG approval

Stakeholder Review

Tracked changes draft on SC website

For TAG approval, we send out protocols, (today we are concerned about Chillers, Commercial New Construction, Retro commissioning) and we heard affirmative response from 4 out of 8 TAG members, and we decided silence is acquiescence.

ML: We do have regular contact with the TAG, so we feel comfortable with this assumption.

BN: When I read this, are they assuming there is no wiggle room?

CK: When we develop these protocols, we did leave some space for wiggle room. One of the ways we are handling the Hawaii TRM pilot for example are our look into residential lighting. We learned from speaking to Hawaii folks that interactive effects was not part of their equation, they told us they did consider interactive effects, but their weather is consistent year round so decided not to include it. So maybe TAG could add more to this, look at the equation and think carefully about what they may or may not need in their situation. That is what we are considering.

TJ: I guess all I would say early on one of the discussions about the protocols is to recognize different resources utilities or other program administrators may have for evaluation. Protocols represent commonly accepted methodologies, but resources are sometimes constrained; we want users to have flexibility.

BN: In Michigan, we are not worried about interactive lighting stuff, but if we were it would take us some time to figure out what those would be and put it in the TRM, it could be a 2, 4 or 10 year process, and it's up to Michigan on what to do.

ML: We are totally comfortable with that. We just want to put together a top line recommended method on what that is. So there can be some clarity. We are still working on how to make this more user friendly and see how it plays out on the real world to get a better sense of what is working and what needs work.

BN: The good news is the evaluator is throwing it back in my face to show what they are adding next year, it is getting more rigorous.

CK: That's Navigant right, your evaluators?

BN: Yes it is.

CK:

Stakeholder review process, [Chuck showed table of sample comment response spreadsheets]
Chuck will also send out slide deck.

Tracked Changes Version

- Comparison of the following versions
 - Original sent to Stakeholder Review
 - Post TAG approval
- Visit the website

Steering Committee Approval

- Consider the following
 - TAG approval
 - Stakeholder Review
 - Tracked changes draft on SC website

- 20 min: What's next?

CK: Phase 3

- Adoption

CK: We are excited about Hawaii TRM.

- Are there other protocols that are missing

CK: Please consider and start dialog and get back to us.

- What existing protocols do we want to revisit, and on what time line?

CK: If the SC are interested in any updates or want to email CK to go through this it would be much appreciated.

Next Steps

Steering Committee approval of
Chillers
Commercial New Construction
Retrocommissioning

Requested by
Friday, June 20, 2014

- 5 min: Closing and next steps