

Roll-up Work Group Call Summary

July 11, 2011

Attending: Dave Whiteley, Denis Bergeron, Jim Busbin, Fred Plett, Syed Amad, Bob Pauley, Wil Burns, Marya White, Jeff McKinney, Bruce McKinnon. **Facilitator:** Margaret Pinard

Lessons learned document

- Jim Busbin reviewed his comments on behalf of the PAs on the Work Group's initial draft. His comments using one section as an example were intended to highlight the premise for the lesson (issue statement) and what was learned. Would like to work together to move toward a common document.
- Intend to put it in a separate Section or Appendix in the Phase I report – placement to be decided by EIPC
- Schedule -
 - Initial draft of outline expected by July SSC meeting
 - EIPC has a proposed schedule for drafting and finalize the report which will allow for significant input by RUWG and SSC; the schedule will be distributed prior to the July SSC meeting

Discussion

- Fred P. – should include petition “in” in addition to petition “out”; Jim agreed
- There was substantially more to the original draft including a comment on differences between regions on the 890 process, which will have to be added in the new format going forward.
- Jim – look for areas where there could be education about the reasons for differences which are allowed by the approved processes.
- Wil B. – agree that the RUWG needs to flesh out the initial draft as Jim has. The outcome is intended to feed back to PAs. Saw the report having 3 buckets:
 - Lessons specific to an EIPC ‘Round 2’ type process
 - Differences in regional processes and the data
 - What we learned about the limitations of the CRA model (e.g. how it treats storage, EE, DR)
- Jim B. agreed with that framework
- Dave W. urged the group to consider solutions or suggestions for improvement; identify the problem but also why it matters, noting that in some cases it may not have made a difference in the study, and that should be included. Need to avoid making this a catch-all for observations.
- Wil B. agreed and suggested that we also include the work-around solutions that were developed, which would serve to document what was done. Should focus on the major issues only.
 - Lessons learned on model and model inputs make more sense to be taken up by the MWG if they are interested.

NEXT STEPS:

- The RUWG agreed to proceed with the format proposed by Jim B.
- The Schedule plans for an expanded Phase I report outline in July and a full draft for review by the SSC at the September SSC meeting
- Wil Burns, Denis Bergeron, and Fred Plett volunteered to take the draft with Jim's format and continue to add the other lessons contained in the RUWG version
- Wil Burns will also provide an update at the July SSC meeting.