Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:02 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. 5 voting members, 0 non-voting members, 0 guests and 1 staff were present for a total of 6 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 Staff, this group acts primarily by consensus.				
CQM User Guide Working Group Voting Members				
Aire Rite AC & Refrigeration	Don	Langston	Contractor (Nonresidential)	A
AMS (American Mechanical Services)	Marc	Pickett	Contractor (Nonresidential)	P
Charles Segerstrom, Energy Efficiency Consulting	Charles	Segerstrom	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P
Richard Danks Consulting	Richard	Danks	Other Stakeholder	P
SDG&E (San Diego Gas and Electric Company)	Paul	Thomas	California IOU	A
Tre' Laine Associates	Pepper	Hunziker	Energy Efficiency Program Consultant	P
XCSpec	Janet	Peterson	Controls (Manufacturer or Distributor)	P
Aire Rite AC & Refrigeration	Bruce	Coleman	Contractor (Nonresidential)	A
Aire Rite AC & Refrigeration	Darren	Whetstone	Contractor (Nonresidential)	A
Aire Rite AC & Refrigeration	Joe	Zappa	Contractor (Nonresidential)	A
B2B Sales Excellence**	James	Graening+		A
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.

Approve Previous Meeting Draft Notes

May 23 meeting draft notes were distributed June 13 and reviewed by attendees. Revisions or corrections submitted were incorporated to produce final approved meeting notes which would be posted to the WHPA website.

ACTION Items

None.

New Business – Jan Peterson

None.

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.
WG Goal, milestones	Jan Peterson	WG members discuss and agree on 2017 goal and progress milestones
WG expanded membership & demographics	Jan Peterson	WG members to actively recruit additional members, especially building owners/facility managers, for development of realistic narratives
Review draft narrative developed by Jan Peterson and James Graening	James Graening	Review approach of developing a market segment customer and service provider initial meetings narrative
Comparison of 2016 Client Interview work product to James Graening structured first meeting questions & sequence/process	Jan Peterson & James Graening	Determine where the committee work product & James Graening structured meeting topics/questions overlap
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.

Working Group Goal Statement and Roadmap – Jan Peterson

Jan Peterson, XCSpec and Working Group (WG) Chair – the purpose for this working group was to develop either a customer communications questionnaire or a narrative example of the customer/contractor initial meetings intended to become part of a user guide for Standard 180. She thought that a fixed questionnaire would lead users to just follow "the script" and now really understand how the same basic sorts of issues and questions needed to be considered differently depending on the sort of building/use/market segment and degree of customer HVAC expertise and interest in more comprehensive maintenance.

The group looked at the document James Graening had developed for a first client structured meeting. The goals for that meeting were to:
- Develop rapport and trust
- Identify key issues/concerns
- Confirm the decision-makers with authority for contracts and budgets
- Determine the current approach to maintenance
- Gain agreement to a next meeting

First Structured Meeting Scripting - Levels of Questioning & coaching points
1. State the Agenda – offer thanks for scheduling time to meet; you'd like to learn more about their business/operation and responsibilities to see if there is a fit with their firm's services; share information about the service firm and briefly how they'd helped other clients; if there's a fit, set up a plan to move forward.
2. Describe Your Contracting Business (capabilities)
3. Question --- Listen --- Qualify – follow each question with "describe that…."

4. See further down in the notes………

Narrative First Draft of First Client Meeting

Jan Peterson proposed they develop a narrative based on the above structure rather than a fixed list of generic questions based on the flow chart groups of related questions developed the previous year. The flow charts were appealing because you could get a quick grasp for the issues/subject areas that should be address. But, a narrative could supply a realistic representation of the kind of interaction that would probably take place in a meeting. She asked for WG feedback.

Rick Danks, Richard Danks Consulting – he thought her proposal seemed to address an individual in sales looking for a job. Qualifying a prospective new client. A checklist of questions would yield a binary, limited response. In the real world of commercial maintenance, there would be a lot more of the "reading between the lines" needed. Also, that the service provider probably needed to make some assumptions about their client. The questioning process was necessary to fill in the gaps to know, not assume, some important delays about their responsibilities, maintenance approach, decision-making process & decision-makers and the like.

Bob Sundberg, WHPA staff – the reference to "assumptions" made him think about the need to determine several key understandings about a client which might be captured in a grid that could be included in the user guide. For any specific market segment or building type, Don Langston had expressed an interest to know how differently this narrative might go if the customer was 1) reluctant/price driven, 2) cooperative/interested in better maintenance practices and setting goals or 3) highly motivated to establish and track goals and progress as well as being receptive to new advanced technologies and maintenance practices. Three narratives could be developed for each market segment which reflected these three different attitudes and mindsets. This could be offered near the front of the user guide in the form of a grid/table for both the customer and service provider to review together.

Marc Pickett, AMS – agreed with the idea. He had yet to meet a client who didn't want preventive/predictive, better maintenance. The issue was, what would that really look like and how would you write that into a maintenance agreement (contract). Most owners didn't understand what it took to deliver that level of maintenance until you broke it out for them. That could include going to the standard itself on how to implement a maintenance program as well as showing them the current condition of their equipment and HVAC systems after an inventory and survey of the equipment condition. There would be real value to having a user guide with a realistic narrative.

The questioning/listening process really needed to address whether this potential client had any skin in the game. What were they willing to do to help gather information and move ahead with developing a maintenance program? Were they willing to get and share 1 to 3 years of building energy data? Several years of service/repair budgets and expenses? The previous several years maintenance program costs? Did they approach maintenance with ROI in mind or was it just considered an annual expense item? Were they willing to do some homework toward this effort?

Rick Danks – suggested that they be sure to establish the customer's approach to operations as well as the approach to maintenance. What were their conditioned space occupied hours? Did they run the AC with windows open? Did they do any sub-metering or have concerns about demand charges? Were time clocks and thermostats re-set and running accurately?

Bob Sundberg, WHPA staff – agreed with Rick that the standard really implied finding a balance between and addressing both energy efficiency as well as comfort in the occupied spaces. Both needed to be addressed. The user guide could certainly include the groupings of questions in the three flow charts as well as writing out a list of the generic questions to cover the topics/issues/information which the initial meetings needed to address. But, a narrative would make the questions more real for both owners/facility managers as well as for service providers/contractors. They could "walk-through" some of that meeting dialogue ahead of time and get a feel for what it was like to step through a more comprehensive approach to maintenance.

Jan Peterson thought that they were not yet at the point that a narrative could be authored for any specific market segment. They might need to develop a general, generic template which could then be adapted to several different market segment customers with different degrees of interest in QM. One really important outcome of that first meeting needed to be determining the degree of customer interest, that skin in the game. Why they want or don't want to collaborate to develop a better maintenance approach. To what degree did that customer respond to different parts of the overall value proposition for QM. That first 45-minute meeting might even be able to move a customer who was initially very reluctant and only, at first, interested in getting a bid against a list of equipment to a point where they considered building and cost issues and became interested in solving those problems.

Marc Pickett – agreed that attempting to gain that collaboration was a key goal for that first meeting. A customer wouldn't care what you know until they knew that you cared. He thought the group was moving in the right direction.

Rick Danks – he agreed with what was being said. He'd learned from his work on standards that the product didn't need to be perfect. It was important to get a working version out to industry and get good feedback to help revise and improve another version. Get it into actual use and plan on tuning it up later.

Jan Peterson – proposed their goal be developing a generic narrative draft for the dialogue of that first meeting. Showing how you might develop that collaborative relationship and working though the subjects of a questionnaire. She offered to put together that first draft.

ACTION: Jan Peterson offered to develop a first draft of the first meeting with a new client.

Pepper Hunziker, Tre' Laine Associates – she wondered whether they could begin tying the conversation around performance objective tracking into this initial client conversation? Asking how they liked to see the data or what kind of information was important to track? That way performance objectives could be a common thread, weaving it in throughout the work that was being done. She wasn't quite sure how that could be addressed. She wanted to see harmony across the different documents, to be well aligned with the original work products, find a way to make the language consistent, clear and applicable.

Bob Sundberg, WHPA staff – he thought that component could come up naturally during those initial discussions about their current approach, what they were trying to accomplish, what had been their goals and how were they determining whether they were being accomplished. He thought the whole questioning process was the place to get at program performance objectives and goals and the metrics currently used or which could be used to track progress. Jan Peterson – she suggested sending a first draft off to Pepper to see if she thought that program goal/objectives tracking was being brought up sufficiently.

Market Segment/Building & Customer Type
The group discussed which market segment to start with. The one for which they could invite an actual "owner" to participate and role-play their function as well as review the narrative the WG had drafted. National accounts, MUSH, owner occupied. Jan Peterson suggested the "small owner occupied" building type be their first target. It was the simplest one which the User Guide WG had addressed in 2016. That owner would be the most knowledgeable about their facility and be the only primary decision-maker. That owner would be most interested in all aspects of building use and operation as well as the ROI for any changes. They should, first, move the narrative along further before asking an owner to join one or two meetings to act as their sounding board.

Marc Pickett, AMS – he agreed and started thinking about a few candidates from their customer base. He agreed that they were typically the easiest owners to get time with and who knew their building and its operation better. He knew the numbers and felt the direct impact of high costs as well as system failures or suboptimal operation. He also offered to help Jan in putting together that first draft.

Agreement
1. Jan Peterson to make an initial narrative draft for a first client meeting from all the feedback she'd received and run it by Marc Pickett for feedback the week of June 19.
2. Jan Peterson would bring her draft to the Standard 180 Committee meeting in Long Beach and see input from committee members and other observers
3. Have the whole WG review the draft at their next meeting and provide suggestions for revision
4. Have Pepper Hunziker review to see if there was sufficient mention and tie-in with program performance objectives and tracking metrics

Closing Comments/Adjournment

Jan Peterson Chair – she proposed the group meet Tuesday July 11 at 10 am PDT. The date/time would work for Pepper, Charles and Marc.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 am PDT.

* * * * * *

Action Items and Key Decisions

June 15 ACTION: Jan Peterson offered to develop a first draft of the first meeting with a new client.

Agreement
1. Jan Peterson to make an initial narrative draft for a first client meeting from all the feedback she'd received and run it by Marc Pickett for feedback the week of June 19.
2. Jan Peterson would bring her draft to the Standard 180 Committee meeting in Long Beach and see input from committee members and other observers
3. Have the whole WG review the draft at their next meeting and provide suggestions for revision
4. Have Pepper Hunziker review to see if there was sufficient mention and tie-in with program performance objectives and tracking metrics