SGIP Governing Board Webinar Meeting
5/12/2011
1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., EDT

Meeting called by: John McDonald

Board Members: Jamshid Afnan, George Bjelovuk, John Caskey, Paul Centolella, Vint Cerf, Paul De Martini, Rik Drummond, Brent Hodges, Mladen Kezunović, Wayne Longcore, Brian Markwalter, John McDonald, Mark McGranaghan, Stephen Muchinski, John Nunneley, Perry Pederson, Todd Ryting, Bob Saint, Tariq Samad, Rich Scholer, Chuck Shih, Robbie Simpson, Matthew Theall, Scott Ungerer, Kenneth Van Meter (Bolded not in attendance)

Ex-officio Members: George Arnold, Ron Ambrosio, Steve Widergren, Marianne Swanson, Erich Gunther

SGIP GB Administrator: Erich W. Gunther


Thursday, May 12, 2011

Planned/Actual Call to Order (John McDonald)
1:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.
1:01 p.m. - 1:11 p.m. -Chair reminded members that CoS vote had yet to achieve quorum. Contact EnerNex with questions or problems voting. Suggest members go on website during the meeting and vote, and we will get an update as to how many voted at meeting’s end. Vint Cerf suggested that a roll-call vote could be taken if needed.

Establish Quorum (George Bjelovuk)
-Secretary determined via roll call that quorum was established.

Approval of Agenda (John McDonald)
-Chair noted that PAP05 was dropped from the main agenda and Letter of Intent with Korea was added to the main agenda at the 2:25 to 2:55 time slot. LOI with Korea has not been posted for 10 days as required and it would be posted after the meeting and be voted on electronically vote as has been done with votes in the past.

Chair requested approval of the Agenda, which includes approval of the items in the Consent Agenda

• Brent Hodges: Requested that item 1.2.3 (Bylaw Change 3) be removed from Consent Agenda to allow for further discussion. Chair so noted and it was added as the second bullet under New Business section of the meeting

• Paul Centolella: Requested that Bylaw Change #1 be removed from Consent Agenda to allow for further discussion. Chair so noted and it was added as the third bullet under New Business section of the meeting

There being no other changes, the Chair requested a motion that the Agenda as revised be approved for this meeting. Robbie Simpson so moved and Brent Hodges seconded. Motion to approve agenda was carried without further discussion or opposition.

Approval of March 29, 2011 Meeting Minutes (John McDonald)
-Chair requested whether there were any changes to the draft meeting minutes for March 29 previously circulated. There being no proposed changes, Chair requested a motion to approve the March 29 Meeting Minutes. Motion was put forward by Vint Cerf and was seconded by Bob Saint. Motion was carried without further discussion or opposition.
NIST Update (George Arnold)

Four Topics on what the SGIP should focus on:

- Observations about responses to FERC technical conference
  - Many areas with differing opinions
  - Input from a number of Utilities needs to be acted on. Their concern is that we are not giving sufficient consideration to reliability and implementability of standards
  - Inadequate representation by utilities because they do not have the resources to cover everything that is going on in SGIP. Need a more effective way for utilities to engage in those aspects of work most critical to them. Mostly this relates to reliability and implementability of standards.
  - Work is underway to look at enhancement to SGIP process to address these concerns. Need strong utility support for outcome of this work
  - CoS is an important element of process. Need to have everyone understand what it is and what it is not. It’s like a Physician’s Reference Guide
  - It intends to capture consensus information without making recommendations. It is information useful to stakeholders so that they can evaluate the standards for their uses.

- NIST Framework SP1108 Update
  - NIST has been at work to update the document and sections have been posted for comment on the TWiki
  - Expect to release an update for public review later this year, although it is going slower than anticipated, since issues such as PAP 18 needs to be resolved
  - Section on conceptual reference model which is morphing into a section on architecture. This work has not yet yielded a robust section. IEEE, IEC, ITU and others are having a role of architecture and we don’t see yet how all the work fits into out framework

- International Cooperation
  - EU commission has issued a mandate to the European standards bodies to undertake an effort very much like the NIST effort. They also are embarking into development of an architecture. There’s concern that they may be different than architecture in other parts of the world.
  - Several workshops involving many countries have as the selected topic looking at how standards and regulations for Smart Grid interoperability are dealt with across these countries. Several Governing Board members will be involved in moderating panels
  - The Letter of Intent with Korea: we’re still at the early stages of understanding how the SGIP and NIST will relate to that effort, so we are still a ways off from having a Letter of Intent agreed to by both sides. We need to increase our emphasis to avoid having divergent activities

- NSTC Smart Grid Subcommittee
  - Report is nearing completion, although release date is not firm yet.

Questions:

Vint Cerf: can George state if there are any notable conflicts in the NSTC report with the SGIPGB direction? Response: No. It supports the importance and direction that this work is taking

Vint Cerf: EU mandate was from which part of EU? Response: CEN, CENELEC, ETSI have formed a joint working group to coordinate efforts. It appears that ETSI has taken the lead in the architecture aspects. They see a strong linkage between the Smart Grid architecture and the work going in machine to machine communications,
which has a robust program within ETSI. We need to look at that.

Ron Ambrosio: that particular joint working group is expected to evolve into a more formal SmartGrid coordinating group for Europe based on the mandate from the Commission.

John Caskey: with respect to CoS, the introduction presents what the CoS is and what is isn’t. Have you looked at that and does it help to resolve the issues relative to the FERC work shop or hearing? Response: I think it does. What it is and isn’t will be in the eyes of the beholder. FERC’s has made multiple statements over time that they will NOT mandate standards. Need to see what people think when they see the CoS, and what it is or isn’t to them.

John Caskey: What would the next steps be? Do we need to describe it further, gave presentations at national conferences, or from FERC. How do we strengthen the approach?

Steve Widergren: Plenary officers have had extensive discussions on the CoS and how to get the concepts communicated to others in “marketing” communications to keep the message consistent and frequent.

Vint Cerf: Steve – your idea is timely and needs to be in multiple places, like the website and associated with the documents itself. I don’t know whether the SGIP has full and common agreement on what it is. We have to state clearly what it is and that it is not mandated. The SGIP only facilitates standards, to be used as a reference guide.

Mark Klerer: taking lots of items as feedback and trying to capture the salient points for communications. George’s analogy of the Physicians’ reference is excellent.

George Arnold: A clear consistent message is clearly important

John McDonald: Steve and Mark Klerer get with Mladen’s group and put strategy to address this

Steve: will do

Bob Saint: at a presentation later on today at UTC meeting, he will be saying what the CoS is about, but something more formal from SGIP would be useful as a supplement

Vint Cerf: George – FERC’s concerns about inadequate reliability consideration, we need to do something about that. And the other question about representation from utilities. Testing and certification needs to be a part of the former and so does interoperability demonstrations. In the Internet, there was an exhibition called Interop where vendors got together to demonstrate interconnectivity. DO we need to have deliberate demonstrations?

George Arnold: T&C Committee is assessing such work. Need to solidify the impact of the standards/requirements with regard to FERC/NERC reliability requirements that may get imposed on utilities; we are openly engaged with FERC and need to work on communications with NERC. Need to encourage NERC to play a more active role in our processes

Tariq Samad: perhaps we need a technical committee on reliability to gather these perspectives

Mark Klerer: Paul De Martini, Perry Pederson, Dave Wollman and I are working on such a proposal and hope to get to the Board before the next meeting

John McDonald: In addition to reliability, George mentioned implementation. Are both being addressed?

Mark Klerer: Yes, both are being addressed. After tomorrow’s phone call on that topic will share with utilities and then present it to the Board

John McDonald: Any other questions?

Mladen Kezunović: Reliability is requiring us to look at end-to-end solution, and that notion should be in the proposed mentioned by Mark
Rik Drummond: SGTCC has a committee to look at end-to-end reliability

Mark Klerer: short answer is yes, Reliability Committee will look at the overall impact of integration into the evolving grid

Steve Widergren: With so many ways to integrate, it is very difficult to develop a set of standards for that [loud static on phone]

GoToWebinar Question: Since the grid architecture itself is different in Europe, how can we align with European standards? [Shrinath Eswarahally] [shrinath.eswarahally@infineon.com] – not answered during call.

**ACTION:** Secretary to forward question to George Arnold.

1:40 p.m. – 2:10 p.m. (1:38 - 2:00 p.m., Q&A thru 2:13 p.m.)

**PAP 18/ZigBee/HAN Standards (Robby Simpson)**

Slides presented by Robby on Status of PAP 18

- SEP 1.x to SEP 2.0 transition – PAP 18 work is underway
- Presentation slides and audio uploaded to the TWiki. There were no resulting actions or motions.

**Oral presentation by Tobin Richardson, no slides**

- Managing the overall process is important
  - Technical Requirements document – PASSED membership vote
  - Application Specification - did NOT pass membership vote
- Zigbee Alliance has Board of Directors working various related issues
- Need quality folks on the PAP and work is time intensive
- Working to bolster that process and accelerate plans, even though it is a volunteer organization

**Questions:**

Vint Cerf: are there a number of distinct 1.x implementations and do they inter-work? With the SEP 1.x team interacting with others, such as home plug and Wi-Fi, will there be an increasing disconnect between 2.0 and 1.x? Worried about diversion in trying to get to a common set of standards. Response: Yes, there are over 100 certified products with respect to 1.0 that interact just fine; working with utilities to get over the early bugs and interoperability issues. Texas is a good example where this is happening.

Ron Ambrosio: the certification is for compliance with specification? Correct? Is there interoperability testing/certification? Response: Yes to both points

Vint Cerf: Potential divergence of the two protocol families if they are trying to accommodate multiple underlying transports. Response: There are concerns of 1.x vs. 2.0. Version 2.0 is meant to be a MAC/PHY agnostic direction. Semantic model comes from IEC and goal is to remain aligned. Share concerns that some manufacturers and others are pushing for continued evolution of 1.x while the effort with 2.0 is ongoing and moving in parallel. This is a potential risk for divergence, and there are trade-offs that need to be worked out.

Vint Cerf: it appears that PAP 18 will be looking at the gateway tactics, and this will be beneficial if we were trying to confine 1.x to its current MAC/PHY and encourage migration to 2.0. Don’t know if this would be acceptable to people producing 1.x devices

John Caskey: PAP 18 critical area to board, but difficult to digest this information w/out notes or slides, do you have any notes that can be shared to assist in digesting this information? Response: yes, of this is in progress/in process and will forward to the group.

Rik Drummond: would like to see some network architecture evaluation objectives
2:10 p.m. – 2:25 p.m.  
(2:14-2:25 p.m., Q&A thru 2:33 p.m.)

PMO PAP Internal Assessment (Wayne Longcore)

Slides presented by Wayne Longcore

- Four areas to be covered today
  1. Do not believe that there are any PAPS which are really “stuck in the mud”
  2. Some PAPs have issues with resources or finding stakeholder consensus
  3. Some PAP objectives and scope which were defined before the current processes were in place
  4. What we need to do as the Governing Board to aid the larger goals of the working groups

Some PAPS have issues through the process: too broad a scope which makes it difficult to have clear goals and objectives, such as Transmission & Distribution.

In other cases, the PAPs interface with international standards organization with their own processes, and they are worked with to streamline those processes. And in some cases there are too few experts that understand the subject. Lastly, in some cases, some stakeholder communities have not participated as much as the PAP leadership thinks is needed.

PAP 14 and PAP 8 have very broad scopes and the PMO has attempted to place boundaries around those PAPS, but that is worrisome because the PMO’s job is NOT to redefine PAPs. The Governing Board should redefine PAPs.

Some international organizations have fostered progress greatly, some not, and it has been difficult to reach consensus. In PAPs 6, 12 and 13, there are single individuals who can work on all the standards, but that individual has a “day job” which limits the time available for this effort.

Also, the time needed for reviews by SSOs, and lastly, key stakeholder communities (such as utilities) which are not available enough to provide inputs to key teams, such as PAPs 3, 4, and 9.
Summary:
- GB needs to encourage stakeholders to participate more.
- Need the GB to review the Monthly Reports and provide comments to Wayne
- GB should think about having meeting with the PMO focusing on progress of PAPS, including goals and scope of PAPS, and include the DEWGs to define clear objectives
- Subset of GB should meet periodically to review PAP status report and decide things like scopes that are too broad, etc. PMO should not redefine PAP scopes

Questions:
Tariq Samad: PAPs 3/4/9, seems like progress is being made, so am concerned that the characterization is inaccurate. They are making progress with some utility involvement. Wayne Longcore: not trying to single anyone out, just trying to highlight that broader involvement is needed and the timelines previously defined.
Tariq Samad: would like to have the pap timelines shown as well in this presentation
Wayne Longcore: That is found in the monthly report.
Tariq Samad: PAP 18 question about the IPR, etc, with regard to ZigBee: adopting ZigBee for the smart grid, what are the concerns? Robby Simpson: Each SSO has its own rules. Everyone should look into the rules for IETF, the IEC, etc. ZigBee Alliance has RAND terms for everyone. But this is personal opinion is that this is out of scope for the PAP
Tobin Richardson: this appears to be too broad to talk about here and should be taken offline. Not aware of any IPR issues that are outstanding.
Erich Gunther: This conversation could apply to any standard and should be taken offline
Tariq Samad: Yes, but it is an important issue

GoToWebinar question: Is there any attention to 2.0 to later version migration in the discussion? I didn’t hear any at the Nashville meeting [William Cox]
[wtcox@coxsoftwarearchitects.com] – not answered during call.

ACTION: Secretary to forward question to PAP 18 leadership, nada.golmie@nist.gov, anna@enernex.com

2:25 p.m. - 2:55 p.m.  
International (Mark McGranaghan)

- Letter of Intent with Korea

Off-screen slides were read by Chair (John McDonald) as a status update.
Draft LOI has been completed and has gone through all reviews. It will be posted after meeting.
Questions:
Matthew Theall: will this be a template for future LOIs with other countries?
John McDonald: yes, it is a starting point that can be tailored for each case
Matthew Theall: are there other countries?
John McDonald: yes, there are European ETSI; LOI with [garbled] going through legal reviews; Discussion with Japan; and discussions with China
Should see the ETSI letter soon.
Paul Centolella: Korea letter is a result of discussions with Korea, or a generic proposal?
John McDonald: Started with a template, but it has gone through many iterations with substantive input from the Korean group. Should see the ETSI LOI very soon. Please
review the LOI through all its contents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:55 p.m. – 3:25 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>FERC Filing Comments (Paul De Martini)</strong></td>
<td>Statements provided by Paul, no slides. Slides should be added to final deck uploaded on TWiki.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (2:33 - 2:43 p.m., Q&A thru 2:48 p.m.) | Governing Board positions: 24 individuals agreed (see document)            | Highlighted that
|               | • FERC should not adopt any technical standards as mandatory for use  | • FERC should provide clarity regarding interoperability policy objectives through several actions
|               | • FERC should provide clarity regarding interoperability policy objectives through several actions | 1. To determine reference definition of interoperability
|               | • FERC should provide clarity regarding interoperability policy objectives through several actions | 2. Determine a set of actionable interoperability principles
|               | • FERC should provide clarity regarding interoperability policy objectives through several actions | 3. Reference the NIST SmartGrid Framework document as guidance
|               | • FERC should not consider the first five families of proposed IEC standards at this time | • Important that there should be unified national interoperability standard
|               | In the reply comments, focused on three things: 1 – Highlight about SGIP being effective in advancement of interoperability and cybersecurity 2 – The SGIP maintains Transparency and inclusion 3 – SGIP supports backwards Interoperability | There were significant comments by individuals on the various portions of the responses, such as what FERC should actually do, participation in the standard creation processes, definition of various terms, the need to make sure this is not a US-centric operation, since we are in a global environment, participations costs, etc.
|               | **Questions:**                                                      | Paul Centolella: Previously, some folks have thought there should be a post-SGIP review process. Has that thought lessened? Have folks discovered that SGIP is a good place for consensus to be achieved? Paul De Martini: there does appear to be a conclusion that the SGIP and SSO processes are the right forum to address these concerns. Folks are open to idea that SGIP can address needs of the various parties. But this should be reinforced at other speaking engagements. |
| 3:25 p.m. – 3:40 p.m. | **SGIP Update (Steve Widergren)**                                  | See slides which were presented by Steve Widergren
| (2:48 - 3:14 p.m.) | Review of membership and requirements for voting, accomplishments, issues being worked, upcoming meeting schedule; GB Votes, SGIP Document Branding | • Review of membership and requirements for voting, accomplishments, issues being worked, upcoming meeting schedule; GB Votes, SGIP Document Branding
|               | • Reports from Committees and DEWGs                                 | • Reports from Committees and DEWGs
|               | **Questions:**                                                      | No questions/comments on slide topics. |
| 3:40 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. | **Other Business (John McDonald)**                                 | • Next F2F Meeting Length
| (3:14-3:20 p.m.) (3:27-4:01 p.m.) | Steve Widergren: Montreal information (no slide): 12-14 July, registration is now open on TWiki, “international smart grid standards” theme; focus on outreach; planning committee meets weekly; looking for additional sponsorships for receptions, meals, etc. Also, trying to coordinate with the Board that the first evening would be presentation oriented. Then Tuesday morning for a morning session. |
John McDonald: the GB members come to start with buffet dinner @600, then business meeting at 6:30-9:30 p.m. for beginning of GB meeting. Tuesday morning, start at 8:00 and go to 11:30 a.m. Would like feedback from the Board.

Brent Hodges: Favors this timing

John Caskey: Supports the idea

Mladen Kezunović: Supports the idea

Scott Ungerer: Supports the idea

Perry Pederson: Supports the idea – we always seem to run out of time at the end

George Bjelovuk: As folks make travel arrangements, make arrangements to start as early as possible to keep from going too late.

George McDonald: If we do not need to meet until 9:30 p.m. we can stop earlier. We should plan for a 6 p.m. start.

Question from public: How can people participate in that meeting? Response: Room will be set up for public attendance.

- BOP Changes

  - Proposed Charter Change 1

Paul Centolella: This clarification added “plenary” to “two consecutive meetings. This may jeopardize an organization that is very active but may fail to attend two such meetings for whatever reason and lose voting rights.

Matthew Theall: We had investigated the idea of giving organizations credit for other meetings and activities, but it would be extremely difficult to administer and track it.

Paul Centolella: Some meetings are done by webinar with automatic attendance monitoring, and other face to face meetings where attendance might be kept. Could announce at beginning of meetings whether it counts toward attendance for voting purposes.

  - Marty Burns: Comment as to how currently the records are kept
    - TWiki and phone records are kept and need to be correlated between Webinars and phone records, and personnel lists. A significant effort is done for these meetings. To have to extend this recordkeeping to other meeting would be a dramatic enhancement of recordkeeping work load to keep an accurate count.

  - Mark Klerer: This proposal was meant to make things easier. To add these other requirements might make it easier to lose voting rights.

  - Erich Gunther: it is already too easy to maintain rights

  - Paul Centolella: Do we know who has lost voting rights over time? How big is that issue?

  - Matt Theall: Some who have lost their voting rights do attend some other PAP meetings.
    - Personal opinion is that people who participate in some part should be getting some credit
    - Not clear as to how to track this in other meetings

  - Steve Widergren: Anyone who comes to him with such issues usually did not know they could have alternates, etc., to get credit. If people are having this issue we should look at it. We need wide participation

  - Erich Gunther: Voting rights are for wide plenary issues. People involved in narrow issues, should they be able to vote on wide plenary issues?

  - Paul Centolella: Should continue to figure out who has lost voting
rights and see if they should be restored

○ Erich Gunther: We make every effort
○ Should bring to the GB detailed slides on organization and people who lose voting rights. A report should show analytics as to who is losing or restoring voting rights
○ Steve Widergren: Agreed
○ John McDonald: We need to make sure we do not have minor wording errors that cause misinterpretations. To the BOPWG:
  ▪ The word “matters” seems to have been dropped in 2.1.7.6 after “technical and administrative.”
  ▪ In new 2.1.1.1.C “The right to vote…” a substantive portion of part F appears to have been dropped from the original text. Mainly, “obligation by participating membership organizations…”
  ▪ Propose that “C” be changed to address obligations and provide comments and review documents as well as vote on those documents
  ▪ Excellent job overall in consolidating earlier sections.
○ Matthew Theall: some of these comments were actually handled in another section as voting rules were consolidated in one place and removed from others.
○ Conclusion: it appears that the only missing word mentioned in “matters” in 2.1.7.6
○ Mark Klerer: Would like the BOPWG to investigate whether or not you have to be an SGIP member when voting in a PAP. I believe the rules require you to be a participating member.
○ Erich Gunther: But you do not need voting rights
○ Matthew Theall: Will take that back as an Action Item to the BOPWG because it is a good issue.
○ Paul Centolella: Extremely important that these items be very clear.
○ John McDonald: The clarity needs to be articulated to the membership also so everyone understands.
○ Matter tabled for later discussion after BOPWG addresses it.

○ Proposed Charter Change 3

Brent Hodges: We were elected as individuals, not as organizations. The new text should make that clear. The second sentence in the new text makes it more confusing.

Mark Klerer: Trying to cover a consultant who represents multiple clients, for example, representing a company for one PAP, but another company for a different PAP. The consultant can only vote as representative for one client.

Marty Burns: In PAPs, a person acts as an individual, while in the plenary voting it is for a company. Problem in tracking votes for a person representing multiple companies, when they are listed as one company.

John Caskey: We should vote on this.

Matthew Theall: Agrees. Any further changes should be sent to the BOPWG.

Motion to approve was put forth by Tariq Samad and was seconded by John Caskey. Motion was carried without discussion or opposition.

Closing Remarks (John McDonald)

-Results of CoS voting: 20 yes votes, passes
-Action Item to post Korea LOI followed by electronic vote
Next SGIPGB F2F Meeting:
7/11/2011, 6 p.m. EDT, Montreal, CA, and
7/12/2011, 8 a.m. – 12 p.m. EDT, Montreal, CA

Next SGIP Plenary Virtual:
5/26/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4:00 p.m.</th>
<th>Adjourn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Actual 4:01 p.m.)</strong></td>
<td>Motion to adjourn was put forth by John Caskey was seconded by Tariq Samad and carried without opposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix – Questions Log from GoToWebinar

Audience Question:
Q: Vint is online and on the call [vinton cerf] [vint@google.com] [Q: 1:00 PM] [A: 1:05 PM]
A: Thanks, Vint!

Audience Question:
Q: Mary Reidy is on the call and the webinar [mary reidy] [mary.reidy@us.ngrid.com] [Q: 1:05 PM] [A: 1:06 PM]
A: Thank you!
Q: is that correct? [Perry Pederson] [perry.pederson@nrc.gov] [Q: 1:06 PM] [A: 1:07 PM]
A: [PIN redacted]

Audience Question:
Q: George Arnold is on the call and the webinar [George Arnold] [george.arnold@nist.gov] [Q: 1:06 PM] [A: 1:08 PM]
A: thank you, George!

Audience Question:
Q: I am not sure that the speaker heard heard my name...can you confirm that I am recorded?...Thanks [mary reidy] [mary.reidy@us.ngrid.com] [Q: 1:08 PM] [A: 1:09 PM]
A: Mary, we only acknowledge the Board members. Otherwise, your attendance has been noted.

Audience Question:
Q: I am not sure that the speaker heard heard my name...can you confirm that I am recorded?...Thanks [mary reidy] [mary.reidy@us.ngrid.com] [Q: 1:08 PM] [A: 1:09 PM]
A: Mary, formal attendance is taken only for GB members. Attendance in the meeting is recorded automatically by your presence.

Q: Chuck Shih is on line but you don't seem to be hearing me. Is there a different pin? I can hear everyone else however. [Chuck Shih] [chuck@edgeholdingsllc.com] [Q: 1:08 PM] [A: 1:09 PM]
A: [PIN redacted]
Q: OK you have 1791 [Chuck Shih] [chuck@edgeholdingsllc.com] [Q: 1:09 PM] [A: 1:11 PM]
A: Chuck, there are two PINS for every call and we try every means possible to indicate to the board members which one to use. Sorry.

Q: Please make sure my attendance is also recorded. Thanks. [Chuck Shih] [chuck@edgeholdingsllc.com] [Q: 1:11 PM] [A: 1:13 PM]
A: So noted, thanks!

Audience Question:
Q: Thanks ... I really appreciate that... have a great day [mary reidy] [mary.reidy@us.ngrid.com] [Q: 1:09 PM] [A: 1:14 PM]
A: No problem. Thank you for attending.

Q: Thx [Chuck Shih] [chuck@edgeholdingsllc.com] [Q: 1:13 PM] [A: 1:26 PM]
A: no problem

Q: I used pin 1791 [Perry Pederson] [perry.pederson@nrc.gov] [Q: 1:06 PM] [A: 1:26 PM]
A: I hope you have the correct one now.

Q: I have a comment for Steve Widergren [vinton cerf] [vint@google.com] [Q: 1:29 PM] [A: 1:29 PM]
A: you can just speak up as a board member!

Audience Question:
Q: Is there a star code to go on mute (if a ‘phone doesn't have a mute button)? [Tariq Samad] [tariq.samad@honeywell.com] [Q: 7:17 PM] [A: 1:46 PM]
A: sorry, there are no "star codes" for this call.

Audience Question:
Q: One of the GB members needs to turn down the cell phone/email notifications....[Anna Grau] [anna@enernex.com] [Q: 1:30 PM] [A: 1:46 PM]
A: Thank you for the feedback!
Audience Question:
Q: Are there slides for Tobin’s presentation?[Ed Eckert] [ed.eckert@itron.com] [Q: 1:54 PM] [A: 1:54 PM]
A: Tobin was asked to provide comments. No slides were provided.

Audience Question:
Q: Are there slides on this (Tobin and PAP18)?[William Cox] [wtcox@coxsoftwarearchitects.com] [Q: 1:54 PM] [A: 1:55 PM]
A: Tobin did not provide slides. All the slides for today are at this link: http://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sgrid/pub/SmartGrid/SGIPGBMeetingsAndMinutes/2011-05-12_SGIP_GB_Slide_Presentation.pdf

Noted in minutes above

Audience Question:
Q: Since the grid architecture itself is different in Europe, How We can align with European stds?[shrinath Eswarabhally] [shrinath.eswarabhally@infineon.com] [Q: 1:25 PM] [A: 1:58 PM]
A: if there is an open question period, I will read this. otherwise I will send to George on your behalf (or you can as well).

Audience Question:
Q: Could you provide the link for PAP18?[Anna Grau] [anna@enernex.com] [Q: 1:58 PM] [A: 1:58 PM]
A: http://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sgrid/bin/view/SmartGrid/PAP18SEP1To2TransitionAndCoexistence

Noted in minutes above

Audience Question:
Q: will this presentation be available to attendees for download (.pdf)? [Adnan Jabbar] [adnan.jabbar@hydroone.com] [Q: 2:03 PM] [A: 2:04 PM]
A: presentation was posted before the meeting: http://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sgrid/pub/SmartGrid/SGIPGBMeetingsAndMinutes/2011-05-12_SGIP_GB_Slide_Presentation.pdf

Noted in minutes above

Audience Question:
Q: I will send that to them (PAP 18 issue). Thanks.[William Cox] [wtcox@coxsoftwarearchitects.com] [Q: 2:36 PM] [A: 2:37 PM]
A: No problem. I am not sure there will be an 'open' Q&A period. if so, I will bring this one up.

Audience Question:
Q: Please note that the connectivity week virtual meeting is at the same time that I will be briefing the risk management framework. I will not be able to participate in the virtual meeting -- Marianne[marianne.swanson@nist.gov] [Q: 3:01 PM] [A: 3:10 PM]
A: Thank you, Marianne, for the notice!

Audience Question:
Q: Will the Monday evening GB meeting be open to observers? Thanks.[William Cloutier] [cloutierw@dteenergy.com] [Q: 3:17 PM] [A: 3:20 PM]
A: The room will accommodate the public as usual.

Audience Question:
Q: Would the SGIP GB meeting on Monday be open for non-board members?[Ruben Salazar] [ruben.salazar@landisgyr.com] [Q: 3:19 PM] [A: 3:20 PM]
A: The room will accommodate the public as usual.

Audience Question:
Q: Will the minutes and presentation of this meeting be available for download?[Puesh Kumar] [pkumar@publicpower.org] [Q: 3:40 PM] [A: 3:45 PM]
A: Presentation is already here: http://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sgrid/bin/view/SmartGrid/SGIPGBMeetingsAndMinutes; minutes are uploaded after they are approved (subsequent meeting)

Q: Hi can you tell me who brought up the issue on ZigBee IPR? Was that Tariq?[Chuck Shih] [chuck@edgeholdingsllc.com] [Q: 3:50 PM] [A: 3:51 PM]
A: Yes.

Q: Thanks.[Chuck Shih] [chuck@edgeholdingsllc.com] [Q: 3:51 PM] [A: 3:51 PM]
A: No problem.