



**CQM Standard 180 User Guide Customer Communications Working Group
Tuesday September 26, 2017 Meeting Notes**

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 am PDT by Jan Peterson, XCSpec and Chair.

Roll Call

For this working group, 4 of 7 voting members in attendance would constitute a quorum. 6 voting members, 0 non-voting members, 0 guests and 1 staff were present for a total of 7 attendees.

P = Present at meeting A = Absent from meeting; if proxy has been assigned it will be noted below. Although Voting Members have been designated by the Chair, this group acts primarily by consensus.				
CQM User Guide CC Working Group Voting Members				
ASHRAE	Richard	Danks	Engineering Society	A
Aire Rite AC & Refrigeration	Don	Langston	Contractor (Nonresidential)	P
AMS (American Mechanical Services)	Marc	Pickett	Contractor (Nonresidential)	P
Charles Segerstrom, Energy Efficiency Consulting	Charles	Segerstrom	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P
Tre' Laine Associates	Pepper	Hunziker	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P
Western Allied Corporation	Mike	Gallagher	Contractor (Nonresidential)	P
XCSpec (Chair)	Janet	Peterson	Controls (Manufacturer or Distributor)	P
CQM User Guide CC Working Group Non-Voting Members				
SDG&E (San Diego Gas and Electric Company)	Paul	Thomas	California IOU	
CQM User Guide CC Working Group Non-Voting Guests				
Aire Rite AC & Refrigeration	Bruce	Coleman	Contractor (Nonresidential)	
Aire Rite AC & Refrigeration	Lydia	Doll	Contractor (Nonresidential)	
Aire Rite AC & Refrigeration	Darren	Whetstone	Contractor (Nonresidential)	
B2B Sales Excellence**	James	Graening+		
SDG&E (San Diego Gas & Electric)	Paul	Thomas	California IOU	
WHPA Staff (Non-Voting)				
BBI (Better Buildings Inc.)	Mark	Lowry	WHPA Executive Advisor/BBI COO	
BNB Consulting/WHPA Staff	Bob	Sundberg	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P (scribe)

** Organization is Not a Member of the WHPA; + Individual is NOT Registered with the WHPA; ^(P) after last name = Member/Registrant is Pending Approval from the WHPA Executive Committee

To avoid repetition, the name of the member organization will not be repeated in the body of the minutes past the first identification with the name of the representative participant.

Welcoming and Member Introductions

None.



**CQM Standard 180 User Guide Customer Communications Working Group
Tuesday September 26, 2017 Meeting Notes**

Approve Meeting Draft Notes

August 29 meeting draft notes were distributed September 4 and reviewed by attendees. No revisions or corrections were submitted. The draft meeting notes would be finalized and posted to the WHPA website.

September 26 meeting notes were distributed October 9. Approval by six of seven attending voting members was received via email vote along with approval of the WG work product. Finalized meeting notes would be posted to the WHPA website.

ACTION Items

Aug. 29 ACTION: Bob Sundberg would revise the decision-maker/responsible party & market segment/facility type matrix/grid to provide two initial columns. They would represent 1) facilities with in-house maintenance staff and 2) facilities which contracted maintenance services. Bob asked Rick Danks to provide a draft for the column where in-house staff provided maintenance services. Completed.

Aug. 29 ACTION: Bob Sundberg agreed to revise his draft narrative to include why this owner was willing to meet with the contractor – they’d not met someone who utilized a structured approach to identifying goals and outlining a maintenance program before. Tabled.

Aug. 29 ACTION: Jan Peterson and Bob Sundberg would work together to fold in the excellent table/matrix revisions suggestions. Completed.

New Business – Jan Peterson

September 25, WHPA email announced termination of committee and working group staff support effective October 31, 2017. C/WG teams needed to either complete and deliver 2017 work products for EC by then or decide how they would continue to meet and work as a self-supporting C/WG.

AGENDA

Topic	Discussion Leader	Desired Outcome
Welcome, Roll Call, Member Introduction, Approve Past Meeting Notes, Review Action Items, New Business, Meeting Agenda	Chair, WHPA Staff	Record attendees, welcome any new members, approve previous meeting minutes, review status of any open Action items, planned agenda and bring up any new business items for the WG to consider addressing.
WHPA/IOU announced termination of C/WG staff support	Jan Peterson	WG informed about elimination of staff support. Decide how the WG wants to proceed going forward.
UG CC WG 2017 Goals Implementation Plan	Jan Peterson	Revise Implementation Plan to include realistic objectives for remainder of 2017 effort.
UG CC work product	Jan Peterson	Review current draft of work product. Obtain WG member input about current draft of work product.
Confirm next meeting date/time, assign actions and proposed agenda and adjourn.	Jan Peterson, WHPA Staff	Clear understanding of member responsibilities for the next meeting. Next meeting date/time established or decision made to coordinate email reviews of final work product and email vote to approve and deliver to full CQM Committee for consideration.

WHPA/IOU announcement of changes in Committee & Working Group admin. support – Jan Peterson

Bob Sundberg, WHPA staff – the Sept. 25 email announcement was displayed for attendees to discuss. Committee support would continue after October 31 for the Executive Committee and new Streamlining (Stakeholder



CQM Standard 180 User Guide Customer Communications Working Group Tuesday September 26, 2017 Meeting Notes

Engagement) Committee through November and December. WHPA members who had questions, comments or concerns were requested to contact any of the four IOU team leads identified at the bottom of the emailing.

Don Langston, Aire Rite AC & Refrigeration – the IOUs were using ratepayer funding for the WHPA as a utility program. Many of the original WHPA founding members from the CEC, CPUC and utilities had, since inception, moved on to other positions. They were going through a re-evaluation process for what value was being delivered for the funding costs. Don had been asked to join this “Streamlining Committee” since he’d been involved with the WHPA during and since its formation. The committee had held one meeting. He was encouraged because he characterized the dialogue as “frank and open.” He thought the discussion at this first meeting was very productive.

Jan Peterson, XCSpec and committee Chair – given these large changes in the operation of the WHPA, she suggested that her WG be merged with the primary User Guide (T) Working Group by the end of October. The primary UG WG would move forward with chapter two, customer communications, after that point to refine and integrate it with the rest of the user guide work product.

Jan proposed that they look at the overall outline for the user guide and the sections which this WG has concentrated on. She thought that they needed to revise the WG objectives given the reduction in staff support which would end by October 31. Here WG members would be folded into the larger user guide WG effort after October 31.

Marc Pickett, CQM STD 180 User Guide (T) Chair – he agreed with Jan’s proposed plan. With the reduction in WG staff support, he also thought it made sense if they brought their efforts together under one WG since their efforts were so closely aligned.

Mike Gallagher, Western Allied Corporation – Standard 180 guideline revisions were underway at ASHRAE. He understood that the WHPA committee and work group work products were being produced in kind of an advisory role for ASHRAE/ACCA and the California utility program staff. From the announcement, he concluded that it seemed that the CA utilities just weren’t into supporting this effort any more. He asked Don to share any of those “open and frank conversation” comments with this group. He asked Don whether he believed the utilities were just taking a pause to re-evaluate or had HVAC fallen off their radar screen as an energy consumption and peak demand concern?

Don Langston, CQM Committee Chair – he thought that the utilities still considered HVAC energy reduction as being important. But, this move was more of a pause and re-evaluation. New IOU and state agency players didn’t understand the value which the WHPA had produced. What were the measurable goals and outcomes for the investment of ratepayer funding needed to be understood and confirmed. They needed to affirm what was being delivered for the more than \$1M of ratepayer money being invested. All on this call, except for Bob who is on the WHPA staff, were already participating as volunteers anyway. Kudos to him and the other staff members he’d worked with since day 1 and for the number of hours they’d put in above and beyond what they were compensated for. Don was also already participating on ASHRAE committees and with ACCA as a volunteer. They’d just have to see where this went in 2018.

Jan Peterson and Marc Pickett agreed to meet offline to work on merging the two working groups.

Review and Discuss Current Work Product Draft – Jan Peterson & Bob Sundberg

Jan Peterson, Chair – she suggested the group look at Section 2 of the user guide outline from the User Guide Working Group 2016 final report.

1. Introduction to and overview of Standard 180
2. **Selling Standard 180-based maintenance**
 - a. **The value proposition**
 - b. **Qualifying the customer**



CQM Standard 180 User Guide Customer Communications Working Group Tuesday September 26, 2017 Meeting Notes

c. The sales process

3. Making a maintenance program
4. Implementing a maintenance program
5. Measurement, data collection, and report making
6. Validating Standard

She proposed they review the current draft of their work product, identify revisions they thought could and should be made to turn it over to the full User Guide WG at the end of October where it could be worked on further until the end of the year.

She thought that the Standard 180 Background and current Work Product Background sections were fairly close to being finished. She thought this was also the case for the Purpose of the work product and Overview of the Process sections. She thought that the topic of clarifying roles and responsibilities was, probably, the weakest part of the work product to date. Some of the roles and responsibilities started to be discussed on page 6 – Understanding the Customer's Commitment, their Collaboration Factor. Bob modified the client perspective/building market segment matrix as suggested by the group to include two common types of responsible party/key decision-maker situations. First, where a building manager supervises its own in-house staff. Second, where most or all HVAC maintenance was contracted to one or more service providers.

Responsible Party – Key Decision Maker (s)		Market Segment – Facility Type			
		A	B	C	D
Most maintenance provided by facility staff	Maintenance primarily contracted	Owner Occupied Small	Owner Occupied Large	National Account, Multi-Location Chain	MUSH (municipals, universities, schools, hospitals, public facilities)
1. No maintenance plan or master task list, staff responds to complaints, breakdowns, supervisor might have little HVAC expertise and/or inadequate budgets for operations and/or capital expenditures/replacement	Skeptical, “run to failure” or minimal maintenance approach, low HVAC expertise, lowest bid/contract price approach, maintenance contract not linked to capital expenditure budget or eqpt. longevity				
2. Open to developing maintenance program goals & metrics, interested in HVAC system operation, status reporting, improvement	Open to developing maintenance program goals & metrics, interested in HVAC system operation, status reporting, improvement				
3. Motivated, interested to developing a more comprehensive maintenance program, continuous improvement, interested in advanced technologies	Motivated, interested to developing a more comprehensive maintenance program, continuous improvement, interested in advanced technologies				
4. Sophisticated facility management – monitoring, building automation/control, – seeks advanced technologies for preventive/predictive maintenance	Sophisticated facility management – monitoring, building automation/control, – seeks advanced technologies for preventive/predictive maintenance				

Bob Sundberg, WHPA staff, included the following continuum as another way which the owner/responsible party might more easily picture and describe their current perspective and approach to maintenance and how that might relate to other approaches. The continuum ranged from a “run to fail” approach where service was only called after major HVAC equipment failed all the way to facilities which used advanced technologies and some form of monitoring or building automation control. Bob transferred this approach continuum into the work product for the WG to consider including.





CQM Standard 180 User Guide Customer Communications Working Group Tuesday September 26, 2017 Meeting Notes

Pepper Hunziker, Tre' Laine Associates – she commented that the responsible party/market segment matrix/grid looked very similar to the one produced by the 2016 User Guide WG. She asked what the additional responsible party represented.

Bob Sundberg, WHPA staff – in previous meetings of this and the other user guide WG, Rick Danks had commented a number of times that only one way for maintenance to be delivered was being represented, contractor firm delivered maintenance under a maintenance agreement. He'd recommended they also include a column to represent the other very common situation where a facility had a supervised in-house maintenance staff. There were many variations and combinations in practice, but this, at least, represented the two most common situations. The in-house staff delivered maintenance was very common in public schools, health/clinic facilities and hospitals and many government and other public facilities.

Pepper Hunziker – she asked whether it would be possible to use the existing table/grid and add these other layers to it? She asked the group whether it was reasonable and prudent to update the original table with these additional layers of information.

Bob Sundberg – he answered that she and the WG could decide how a table/grid/matrix should appear in their user guide document. He'd only responded to how the table displayed at the previous meeting might be revised.

Jan Peterson, Chair – she stated that she was all for consolidation. But, she also asked Pepper, where did she think this table/grid might best fit, looking at the user guide outline?

Pepper Hunziker – she noted that in looking back to the finalized User Guide 2016 Report, she did not see the spreadsheet table she'd produced for that group. She was reminded that Dale Rossi, chair for that working group, had decided that they needed to transfer information from the spreadsheet table into text that could be included in the final report word document. The large, comprehensive spreadsheet could not be included in the word .doc in readable form.

Jan Peterson, Chair – she proposed they remove the responsible party/market segment from the work product document and make a reference to it as a separate document. It would be a great way to link the introduction to the 2nd chapter on developing a maintenance program through customer communication and maintenance program discussions. She'd work with Pepper and Bob to put a more complete table/grid into the document following the introduction. She suggested they move on to the work product topic – customer pain points and goals displayed in the three flow charts. She took responsibility for cleaning up those three flow charts for the final work product as well as some proposed additional detail for Step 3, Creating the action plan following the initial meeting or meetings.

Jan Peterson – she then walked the group through the first two flow charts regarding a customer's HVAC system issues and priorities and the various budgets/responsibilities/commitment to maintenance. The third flow chart dealt with establishing metrics for the client/customer goals. She proposed removing that from this document since Marc's WG was also dealing with goal metrics. That other WG could decide where in the final document they thought the more detailed references to metrics might best be located.

Bob Sundberg, WHPA staff – he suggested they retain the goal metrics flow chart in their Chapter 2 content. They didn't go into a lot of detail and could simply supply a few examples. The other user group could expand on that and go into greater detail. But, to not introduce metrics in that early customer communications seemed to him to be an omission of an important part of the collaborative dialogue.

Marc Pickett, AMS – he intended that the larger group would build on what was introduced in the customer communications chapter when they dealt with measurement, data collection and reporting later in Chapter 5. Some of the words used later might be changed in the later chapter depending on the goals discussed. But, he thought the concept of goal setting and establishing metrics to track goals was important to spell out in that early chapter.



CQM Standard 180 User Guide Customer Communications Working Group Tuesday September 26, 2017 Meeting Notes

Jan Peterson – agreed that it should be kept in Chapter 2 to provide an overview and some talking points for both parties. She believed that they still needed to provide some guidance for how to go about creating an action plan coming out of those first meetings. To suggest conducting an equipment survey and collecting relevant utility bills, actions for both parties to undertake. This should be a summary of what the service provider and customer had agreed upon with concrete next steps. She thought completing that final section would be the conclusion of what this working group intended to cover.

Jan Peterson – next, she addressed two other items which were part of their current 2017 goals implementation plan. Developing potential value propositions and discussion examples in the form of narratives. She proposed eliminating these two 2017 goals with the shorter timeframe deadline of October 31 for work products. She thought that dealing adequately with the topic of value propositions could easily take a year all by itself. That topic could be a key goal for 2018. There hadn't been very much action taken by members to develop narratives so she thought it was unrealistic to retain it as a goal.

Charles Segerstrom, Energy Efficiency Consulting – he thought there'd been far too much emphasis on perfection, expecting to provide highly refined, finished products in this user guide. He thought there was value in the group identifying what they thought needed to be done, even though their user guide might not develop that topic now. If a section focused on the topic "value propositions" was incomplete, he still thought it should be listed, even though the group couldn't work on it now. Developing value propositions as a topic was the primary reason he was willing to join this group. Either a placeholder or some partial draft would indicate the work which the group realized still needed to be addressed. Even if that part of the user guide wasn't completed vetted, was in a draft form, it would indicate the vision the group had for that topic.

Jan Peterson – she appreciated the input. Although there was no work or draft for the topic now, the user guide could have a placeholder for the topic with a "TBD" note identifying the intention to develop that chapter of the user guide in the future. Tackling the simpler owner occupied commercial building would certainly be less complicated than buildings with triple net leases of MUSH market segments.

Pepper Hunziker, Tre' Laine Associates – she'd located a copy of the 2016 CQM User Guide WG work product report and walked the group through the categories completed for the "owner occupied large and small, national accounts and MUSH public facility market segments. They chose the market segments which the WG members had the most experience with. The information had been converted from a spreadsheet format to text so it was no longer as visual. She suggested adding columns to the existing Customer Communications work product table to include the additional information, however Jan wanted to proceed. She encouraged the group to leverage work that had already been completed to enhance the current product.

Bob Sundberg, WHPA staff – from what he recalled when that spreadsheet was developed, it was intended to be a comprehensive study of four initial market segments. This customer communications matrix/table was only intended to address identifying two responsible party orientations/perspectives and the same four same market segments to address development of market segment narratives by members. This was only intended to identify possible combinations for initial discussion. It wasn't trying to take on everything that the 2016 work product had identified but rather to keep track of the initial discussion narratives which the WG would develop.

Jan Peterson, Chair – the 2016 User Guide work product looked like a lot of great work. The total spreadsheet might be somewhat overwhelming for users to try and view. Maybe, they could break it up and create a visual for each of the selected market segments to make it visually less intimidating. That's kind of what Bob was trying to do with his owner-occupied market segment narrative. Break out one segment at a time to give an example of how that dialogue might evolve with a given responsible party perspective. The WG might meet again around the middle of October to see how this might be integrated with the current work product.



**CQM Standard 180 User Guide Customer Communications Working Group
Tuesday September 26, 2017 Meeting Notes**

Bob Sundberg, WHPA staff – Marc’s WG was scheduled to meet October 10 and again October 24. He asked whether Jan about her plans for the work product of this WG. Did she intend that this WG would deliver a work product to the full CQM Committee for consideration before the end of October so that it might be considered by the Executive Committee at their November 8 meeting? Or, that the WG would deliver a work product to Marc’s User Guide (T) WG for work to continue it during November and December? Staff support for meetings and work product editing would end October 31 which was communicated by a recent WHPA email announcement.

Jan Peterson, Chair – she thought they could clean up the work product, as it now existed, and submit it to the full CQM Committee for review and approval before the end of October so that it could be considered by the Executive Committee at their November meeting. It could also be submitted to the User Guide (T) WG for further development and to fold this work product into their work product during November and December whenever that WG would meet. This WG would sunset its activity as of October 31 with most of its members already being participants of the User Guide (T) WG.

Marc Pickett, AMS – he agreed with Jan that with the shortened amount of time for staff supported meetings, it was a good thing to work on combining their efforts into one WG sooner rather than later.

2017 WG Goals & Implementation Plan revision – Jan Peterson
--

Goal #2: Develop Standard 180 User Guide Focusing on the Customer Communications				
Milestone	Owner	Deliverable	Due Date	Dependencies
1. Develop working group-approved Chapter 2 subsection: Introduction and preparation for the structured meeting	Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff	Draft Subsection	August 31, 2017	• Availability of Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff
2. Develop working group-approved Chapter 2 subsection: Clarifying financial roles and responsibilities (maintenance agreement energy and utilities, service/major repairs, and capital expenses) section	Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff	Draft Subsection	October 31, 2017	• Availability of Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff
3. Develop working group-approved Chapter 2 subsection: Identifying current maintenance approach, pain points, and goals section	Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff	Draft Subsection	October 31, 2017	• Availability of Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff
4. Develop working group-approved Chapter 2 subsection: Develop Two example narratives for specific market segments/building types and customer perspectives section	Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff	Draft Narratives	December 31, 2017	• Availability of Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff
5. Develop working group-approved Chapter 2 subsection: Identifying performance metrics section	Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff	Draft Subsection	March 31, 2018	• Availability of Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff
6. Develop working group-approved Chapter 2 subsection: Potential value propositions	Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff	Draft Subsection	September 30, 2018	• Availability of Chair, Working Group Members, and WHPA Staff

The group discussed plan milestones:

- They had already addressed Milestone 2.2 and 2.3 with the existing flow chart collections of topics to be discussed in initial client meetings.
- The current maintenance approach had been further developed with the new matrix and approach continuum.
- They discussed taking a vote to eliminate Milestone 2.4 which stated they would provide two example narratives. Charles Segerstrom commented that retaining even a narrative draft would indicate to WHPA stakeholders and others that this WG believed those were valuable elements for a user guide even if not fully



CQM Standard 180 User Guide Customer Communications Working Group Tuesday September 26, 2017 Meeting Notes

developed now. With that suggestion, the group agreed to modify Milestone 2.4 to state it would include one example narrative, not two.

- They also agreed to keep Milestone 2.7 which entailed development of eight narratives scheduled for completion November of 2018.

Jan Peterson summarized their agreement to:

- Retain the new simpler market segment matrix/grid, revise later within the User Guide (T) WG
- Fold the one example narrative into the work document
- Retain placeholders for the milestones already planned for 2018

Closing Comments/Adjournment

Jan Peterson, Chair – offered to revise the current work product and have it sent out to members in a couple of weeks for a final review and input before voting on it for approval. Once approved, it would be sent to CQM Committee voting members for their consideration. Their goal was to deliver an approved work product to WHPA staff for submission to the Executive Committee for consideration at their November 8 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:26 am PDT.

* * * * *

Action Items and Key Decisions

September 26 ACTION – Jan Peterson would incorporate member input and revise the current work product. She would have it sent out to members within a couple of weeks for their review and final input before putting it to a WG vote for approval.