

**IESO Stakeholder Advisory Committee  
Minutes of Meeting  
October 28, 8:30 am  
Toronto Congress Centre**

**Advisory Committee Members in Attendance:**

Mr. John Witjes, Vice-Chair (representing Public Service Consumers) – Chair of meeting  
Mr. Bruce Campbell (representing IESO)  
Ms. Julie Girvan (representing Residential Consumers)  
Ms. Ersilia Serafini (representing the Environmental sector)  
Mr. Mark Schembri (representing Commercial Consumers)  
Mr. Mike Humphries (representing Embedded Industrial Consumers)  
Mr. Adam White (representing Wholesale Consumer Market Participants)  
Mr. Daniel Whyte (representing Generators)  
Mr. Gary Wight (representing Marketers/Brokers)

**Advisory Committee Members Calling in by Phone:**

Mr. Richard Horrobin (representing Generators)

**Absent:**

Mr. Brian Bentz, Chair (representing Distributors)

**Presenters:**

Mr. Ted Leonard  
Mr. Ken Kozlik  
Ms. Karen Backman  
Mr. Darren Finkbeiner  
Mr. Peter Sergejewich  
Mr. Brian Rivard  
Mr. Neil Campbell

**IESO Board Members in Attendance:**

Ms. Roberta Brown  
Mr. James Hinds – Chair  
Mr. Dave Cassivi  
Mr. Robert Chiarelli  
Ms. Angela Ferrante  
Mr. Rudy Riedl  
Mr. Howard Shearer  
Mr. John Wiersma

**Agenda Item No 2: Introduction – Mr. John Witjes**

Mr. Witjes announced he would be chairing this meeting as Mr. Brian Bentz was unavailable. He welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. He acknowledged the IESO Board of Directors, thanking them for their attendance.

Mr. Witjes mentioned the nomination for the vacancies on the Stakeholder Advisory Committee is now closed and the IESO Board will be filling them shortly.

**Agenda Item No. 3: Senior Management Update – Bruce Campbell**

There are no action items from the last meeting.

(a) IESO Response to latest Market Surveillance Report

The briefing note is available on the web at: [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3 MSP Recommendation.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3_MSP_Recommendation.pdf)

Mr. Campbell mentioned that the second recommendation touches on some items that are part of ongoing stakeholdering efforts.

(b) Update on asset backed paper

Mr. Ted Leonard reviewed the background on the IESO securing Canadian Asset-Backed Commercial Paper. The IESO held \$1.4-million of asset backed paper of corporate investments, \$23.1-million of real-time market investments, and \$35-million of transmission rights (TR) market investments.

Mr. Leonard stated that a restructuring plan went through Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) and was approved in January, 2009. The IESO has now received the restructured notes and continues to hold them. The estimated market value on the real-time and the transmission rates investments is at 45 cents on the dollar and the corporate investments at 22 per cent.

He added for 2010 in the business plan, that the assumption is that there is no market-related investment income to be recognized in 2010 which is based on the conservative assumption that there is no capital appreciation in the value of the ABCP notes.

Mr. Leonard responded to a comment from Mr. G. Wight that any appreciation in the notes that are held in the TR market will remain in the TR market.

(c) Advanced closure of the coal plants and reliability assurance

The briefing note is available on the web at: [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3-Reliability Assurance Coal Replacement.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3-Reliability_Assurance_Coal_Replacement.pdf)

Mr. Campbell explained that after the most recent 18-month assessment came out; the IESO received updated information from Ontario Power Generation with respect to closing two Lambton and two Nanticoke units in the fall of 2010. He added that that this does not appear to cause any reliability concerns and more details are in the briefing note.

(d) Smart Metering and Meter Data Management & Repository (MDM/R)

The briefing note is available on the web at: [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3\\_smartmetering-MDMR.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3_smartmetering-MDMR.pdf)

Mr. Campbell stated that the IESO is working with the local distribution companies and the MDM/R is processing over 100,000 meters a day and is increasing quickly. He acknowledged Mr. Paul Ferguson with Newmarket – Tay Hydro who is a leader in this area and who now have all their residential customers completed.

(e) Public Sector transition to market prices

The briefing note is available on the web at: [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3\\_Public\\_Sector\\_Transition-MarketPricing.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3_Public_Sector_Transition-MarketPricing.pdf)

Mr. Campbell mentioned there has been a considerable amount of education done with the Public Sector, in combination with the LDC's, to ensure awareness of that change and he is confident that the change will go smoothly.

(f) Summer market experience including surplus generation

Mr. Kozlik's presentation is available on the web at: [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3g\\_Kozlik.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3g_Kozlik.pdf). He added that the slides on the Industrial sector demand are representative of those industrial consumers who are connected to the IESO grid and are therefore only indicative of the situation in Ontario.

A question was asked by Mr. Humphries regarding the predictability of wind and when wind assists with the hotter days. Mr. Kozlik responded that traditionally on hot days in the summer when peak conditions occur, there is not a lot of wind. He added that the predictability of wind is in the yearly energy that wind produces.

Mr. Schembri asked if there was correlation between wind contributions and baseload generation surplus issues. Mr. Kozlik responded that there are definitely relationships and cited the example in March and April when there were strong wind days and at the same time

the nuclear fleet was being asked to manoeuvre. He added that the IESO is working with the OPA to ensure that the future contracts will have financial drivers on wind producers to not produce at surplus times.

Mr. Campbell responded to a question from Mr. Horrobin on further efforts to address the existing wind generation in terms of managing surplus baseload generation. Mr. Campbell stated there was a range of resources that contribute to this and that the IESO was working with the OEFC and OPA on the non-utility generation (NUG) contracts. He was not aware of anything specifically being done on the existing wind contracts at this time. (Note: Subsequent correction from Bruce Campbell – discussions are underway with OPA to determine what flexibility could be available under the existing wind contracts.)

Mr. Horrobin followed up and asked if there would be a 60-day forecast for surplus baseload generation, in addition to the 30-day forecast that the IESO is currently producing. In response Mr. Kozlik acknowledged that this could be helpful although there would be more risk in longer forecasts.

In reply to Mr. Schembri's question on how to forecast embedded wind generation, Mr. Kozlik stated the IESO is installing a centralized wind forecasting tool. The IESO will be working through to what degree we need to observe generator outputs on the distribution system. Mr. Kozlik mentioned that most of the embedded facilities will come under the FIT and are a few years away. Mr. Campbell added that the centralized wind forecasting would cover all of the major wind investment, whether embedded or not. In responding to Mr. D. Whyte's question, Mr. Kozlik stated that currently wind generation is predominantly on the bulk system however this will be changing.

(g) Eastern Interconnection Planning Collaborative (EIPC) Proposal

The briefing note is available on the web at: [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3\\_SAC-EIPC.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3_SAC-EIPC.pdf)

Mr. Campbell explained the proposal is in response to a U.S. Department of Energy initiative to take a general look at planning of Eastern Interconnection. He added that the IESO is not one of the main partners and being a part of this will provide access to all of the results, which will be of value. The IESO involvement is not expected to take a lot of time and resources.

(h) Other

IESO 2009 Customer Satisfaction Survey

The memo to Committee members can be found at:  
[http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3\\_Customer\\_Satisfaction\\_Survey.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item3_Customer_Satisfaction_Survey.pdf)

Mr. Campbell added that the customer satisfaction survey will begin shortly and encouraged all stakeholders to participate. A summary of the results will be posted on the web.

#### Settlements Audit

Mr. Campbell stated that every two years the IESO does a comprehensive settlements audit and this year it was for the January to June period. The results of the audit were positive and there were no concerns raised by the auditors.

#### IESO roles on the Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Mr. Campbell informed members that the responsibility for the executive contact related to the Committee has been transferred to Mr. Terry Young. Ms. Candice Trickey will be responsible for ensuring the processes around the Committee and stakeholding in general, are effective and integrated. He added that he will continue to be the IESO member of the Committee.

#### Business Plan

Mr. Campbell updated members that the OEB application for the IESO annual fee review will be submitted next week. The IESO is not asking for any increase in fee and propose that the fee level remain at its current level.

#### **Agenda Item No. 4: Maximum Adjustment Period for settlement statements – Ms. Karen Backman**

Ms. Backman's presentation can be found at: [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item4\\_Maximum\\_Adjustment\\_Period\\_Proposal\\_for\\_SAC-presentation.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item4_Maximum_Adjustment_Period_Proposal_for_SAC-presentation.pdf)

The paper on the subject is available at: [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/consult/consult\\_se85.asp](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/consult/consult_se85.asp)

Ms. Backman stated the IESO is asking the Stakeholder Advisory Committee to recommend whether to proceed with a maximum adjustment period.

In reply to a question from Mr. Humphries, Ms. Backman replied that the estimated \$57 million was more or less equally balanced. About 54 percent of these adjustments were charged to the participant (paid to the market) and 46 percent were paid by the participant (charged to the market).

Ms. Backman then responded to Mr. Humphries concern regarding the large \$32 million adjustment – the concern being if another such large adjustment comes along, would a participant escape because of a maximum adjustment period. Ms. Backman explained the large adjustment was due to a meter registration error which is the cause of the majority of these long duration settlement adjustments. She added that the IESO has a very effective, efficient meter registration process in place, including a number of tests that meter service providers have to

perform. In addition, an audit process assures compliance to market rules and any time an adjustment occurs, the IESO reviews policies and standards to improve processes.

Mr. Schembri inquired if a large mistake (that went beyond the sunset clause) was made by a regulated entity, how would that be settled and where would the money come from.

Ms. Backman explained that, for example if the error had been in existence for over five years and if the sunset clause is set at two years, the 3 years that fall outside of the sunset clause would not be adjusted. The IESO would not apply a settlement adjustment beyond that two-year period.

Ms. Backman answered Mr. G. Wight's question that the IESO does not have a recommended adjustment period going to the Technical Panel and is looking for input on this from the Committee. She added that the IESO will be doing further benchmarking with other ISOs to try to determine the optimum period.

Ms. Serafini asked about the number of changes put in place to try to capture the source of these errors. Ms. Backman replied that the IESO has put in a number of process changes. For example when an error occurs within the meter registration process, the IESO reviews and fine-tunes the process so that these types of errors are eliminated or reduced. The IESO has in the past implemented enhanced quality assurance procedures and a new monitoring process so they do certain types of meter registration errors do not recur.

Ms. Backman responded to Ms. Serafini's follow up question that the IESO has not seen any trends in a decline or influx of errors over the past seven years.

Further explanation of the \$32 million error was asked by Ms. Girvan. Ms. Backman clarified that it was a meter multiplier error that occurred in 2004 and was in existence for a little over two years. The error resulted in an adjustment where the market paid the participant and then charged the remaining participants.

Mr. D. Whyte stated he was surprised it has taken this long to move forward. He added that the IESO should move this forward as quick as possible.

Mr. Schembri asked if the implementation of smart grids and the increased complexity of the residential systems would result in increased errors. Ms. Backman replied that with the right processes and tools in place those types of errors should be caught quickly and would not fall outside of a sunset clause.

Mr. Humphries questioned the audit cycle on meter registration. Ms. Backman answered that the IESO audits 10 per cent of our meters every year (for a 10 year cycle) however, many of the errors happen during the commissioning phase of a meter when it's first installed. The IESO is looking to enhance the commissioning phase and remove it from the audit process.

Mr. Witjes then reminded the Committee that the IESO was looking for input from generators, distributors, transmitters, wholesale consumer market participants and broker/marketers and asked those members to provide feedback on a maximum adjustment period and, if possible, on how long that might be.

Mr. Horrobin responded that having the maximum adjustment period is supported by Bruce Power as well as a number of generators and that a two - to five-year range would be reasonable. He added that the generators would like to see some benchmarking as to what is best practice for the period, and then a recommendation back to the SAC.

Mr A. White responded that he still needs further discussion on this with his membership. He questioned if there has been any investigation into the probability of events occurring.

Ms. Backman responded that a trend is that most of the errors are meter registration errors which is why the IESO is focusing in on the meter registration process. Mr. White added a suggestion would be to have a grandfather period to give customers an opportunity to do the due diligence on their part.

Mr G. Wight from the Marketer/Broker community supported Mr. D. Whyte and Mr. Horrobin to go forward with the adjustment period, provided it is benchmarked for best practices in the three- to five-year period.

Ms. Girvan added that residential customers ultimately pay rates through the distribution customers and looks forward from the feedback from the distribution representatives on the Committee.

Mr. Witjes concluded that comments have been received from the members representing the market participants that are here today. He added that Mr. Brian Bentz through the Electrical Distributors Association, will be providing feedback to the IESO, and other Committee members can provide comment by November 6th back to the IESO on this issue.

Mr. Dave Butters from APPrO added input to support the generator community. The generators see this as a good initiative, in the two to three year range, and harmonized with the significant trading partners. It is important to understand how this lines up with the International Financial Reporting Standards before moving forward on this. Another point to consider is intergenerational equity - when people leave the system or come onto the system; how does that get managed.

Mr. Paul Ferguson from Newmarket-Tay Hydro added some comments from the Distributor perspective. The meter registration error discovered in 2004 occurred in 2002 at the time of market opening and activities around market opening have an impact on that registration error. Newmarket – Tay has recently commissioned a number of new metering points through the new registration process and it is significantly different than at market opening, to the point where there was an actual load test to verify the metering. In addition, Mr. Ferguson added

that the Ontario Energy Board, in the Retail Settlement Code, is looking at, for distributors, shortening the billing error adjustment period.

**Agenda Item No. 5: Alternative Technologies Program - Mr. Darren Finkbeiner**

Mr. Finkbeiner's presentation can be found at:

[http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item5\\_SAC\\_New\\_Tech.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item5_SAC_New_Tech.pdf)

Mr. Finkbeiner explained that the IESO was looking for input from the Committee as to their views on the proposals for alternate technologies.

Mr. Witjes asked what historical approach has been used in integrating new technologies via the IESO. Mr. Finkbeiner responded that past technologies have been familiar to the IESO, slower to implement which gives more time to understand the technology, and no critical mass.

Mr. Campbell added the anticipated pace of change is going to be much higher than in the past.

Mr. Finkbeiner responded to Ms. Girvan's question regarding budget development that there are no budgets established at this point and every trial will have its own situation and characteristics. Some trials would not need a budget because they would be market-based. Mr. Campbell mentioned the trial parameters would be visible and open for comment before the IESO made the commitment to the project.

Mr. Finkbeiner answered Mr. A White that the technologies may be connected to the IESO controlled grid or may be connected to distributors. In reply to another question, Mr. Finkbeiner confirmed these technologies would have private sector proponents and public sector proponents. When asked if they would have a contract with the OPA, Mr. Finkbeiner replied they may.

Mr. A. White commented that he was uncomfortable lumping in the participation of sophisticated dispatchable loads (that have services that they are prepared to invest in) versus fringe technologies that are not known. Mr. White added that he would like to see an upper bound in terms of total expenditure. Mr. Finkbeiner responded that the trials would be realistic trials where there presents a barrier and that technology exist in other jurisdictions. He stated that the IESO is not looking at subsidizing the development of these particular resources. The technologies would be for IESO procured services, not for OPA initiatives.

In response to Mr. A White's question on how these technologies are different from traditional connection requests, Mr. Finkbeiner answered that traditional technologies have been in place for some time and are not new to the IESO.

Mr. Schembri commented that Loblaw's participated in the IESO TDRP program and that the IESO taking a leadership role and it was the right thing to do – which is to manage resources. He asked how the IESO would go through the process of advancing technologies and who

internally would approve the resources associated with it? Mr. Finkbeiner replied these particular details still need to be defined which would need further comments.

Ms. Serafini added that this is a prudent, thoughtful approach to integrate new technologies and the principles outlined are the right ones. She reinforced the need to see what the approvals process looked like before any new technology actually went to trial.

Mr. D. Whyte made a comment that a sponsor of a technology or a facility or an asset pays for the analysis of the system impact and asked why a supplier of a new technology would not finance the project to convince the IESO that the technology is worth buying. Mr. Finkbeiner responded that this is about the IESO learning to be comfortable and accepting of that particular technology. The IESO is not trying to test commercial viability, it is testing for technological viability. Mr. Campbell added that there is a distinction between what the IESO needs to learn and the kind of assessments done on an ongoing basis. The learning is needed so the IESO can determine the rules for the technology going forward.

**Agenda Item No. 6: FERC order directing NYISO to develop solutions to loop flow – Mr. Peter Sergejewich**

Mr. Sergejewich presentation can be found at:

[http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item6\\_LoopFlow.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item6_LoopFlow.pdf)

Ms. Serafini asked if the IESO would be coming back to the Committee with a full cost/benefit for each of those three options. Mr. Sergejewich replied that a cost/benefit analysis is to be undertaken by the joint design team. The costs and benefits would be looked at on an integrated basis - entire package of solutions.

In responding to a question from Mr. Humphries on the down side of not being in phase with other jurisdictions, Mr. Sergejewich said the IESO has not looked at all of the possible situations. He added that some of the down sides could be fewer opportunities for trading between jurisdictions, impacts to the number of imports into Ontario and disadvantaging some of the traders in our market.

Mr. A. White questioned market participants providing three-part offers; energy, reserve and regulation. Mr. Sergejewich answered that three-part offers were not necessarily a requirement. The design team had not yet detailed how regulation services or operating reserve would be traded across the interties. Mr. White added that he saw domestic end-use customers, market participants offering regulation service as an intermediate step with this integration. Mr. Sergejewich responded that it would be a contributor because it would allow greater amount of sources of regulation within the Province.

Mr. White also supported Mr. Humphries comment about Ontario keeping up with the other jurisdictions.

In reply to Mr. A. White question on the resources required, Mr. Sergejewich replied the IESO has not yet determined this. Our level of participation needs to be looked at in terms of the rest of the IESO priorities. Mr Kozlik added that the other jurisdictions already have locational pricing and Ontario does not. Considering the priorities that the IESO has establish associated with supporting the Green Energy Act and supporting our own improvements such as EDAC, it is extremely unlikely that the IESO could keep up with the illustrative NYISO schedule.

Mr. G. Wight asked if the linked wheel concept was considered in the analyses. Mr. Sergejewich responded that this would be looked at as will all other transaction as the details of each option are developed.

Mr. Sergejewich confirmed to Mr. D. Whyte the solution addresses primarily a market risk and not a reliability risk.

Mr. Humphries asked the importance of this to the IESO and Mr. Campbell responded that the IESO does not have all the answers and this is why it was brought to the Committee. The IESO would like to get a sense of how important or what risks do the members see and what businesses could be affected by this kind of development in the jurisdictions around Ontario.

Mr. McCuaig from the floor asked if the phase shifters would be in service by 2010 and Mr. Sergejewich replied that the IESO does not have any indications of why they would not be.

In concluding the discussion, Mr. G. Wight noted that the Marketer/Broker constituency is supporting this as an important issue. He added the volumes that interchange between the markets makes this important and want to be kept updated.

**Agenda Item No. 7: Global Adjustment discussion – Mr. Brian Rivard**

Mr. Rivard's presentation can be found at: [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item\\_7-Electricity\\_Pricing.pdf](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/pubs/consult/sac/sac-20091028-Item_7-Electricity_Pricing.pdf)

Mr. Schembri inquired if any of the adjacent markets are transacting under a hybrid market or are they truly a HOEP market. Mr. Rivard responded that all the adjacent markets have capacity markets in addition to a spot market, but not a hybrid market. They all need additional mechanisms like a capacity market or bilateral contracting to recover some of the capacity costs.

Mr. Schembri inquired that it would appear Ontario electricity costs are more than other jurisdictions when the global adjustment is factored in. Mr. Rivard replied that the prices in other markets need to have the additional costs around capacity payments or charges for renewables, debt retirement issues added in. Ontario prices tend to fall in between different regions.

Mr. G. Wight emphasised the point that global adjustment has risen dramatically of late and is not a manageable item for a consumer and would like to see some constructive action to try and put more of these particular costs into HOEP.

Mr. Horrobin commented that the report does not deal with the growing cost of global adjustment and inquired what specific plans and timelines the IESO has in terms of providing a more efficient price. Mr. Rivard responded that the IESO should be making sure that the wholesale market price is efficient by sending the proper signals. In terms of plans and timelines, Mr. Rivard added that the IESO is prioritizing all the various issues within the resource constraints and approaching the Committee within the coming year as to what the best way of tackling all these issues are.

Mr. A. White commented that the HOEP does, to some degree, reflect the efficient wholesale price. The global adjustment has been in place for some time and the current pricing should not be a surprise. As well, Ontario's economy should not be a surprise as it has always been cyclical. Mr. White does not support changing HOEP in an artificial way to restore customer's contracts or ease the job of retailers and marketers.

Mr. Mike McGee from Energy Profiles Limited commented that approximately 50 per cent of the market are large commercial/industrial customers who pay HOEP, who receive a retail bill, are embedded in LDCs, and do not receive the global adjustment. Instead they receive the Provincial Benefit which effectively is the global adjustment one month delayed. This is inappropriate as it disconnects the adjustment from the month in which it is incurred, and creates price instability. He stated this disconnect needs to be addressed. Mr. Rivard replied he is aware of this and that it is hoped this timing issue will be resolved with a global adjustment allocation.

**Agenda Item No. 8: Market Power Guidelines for the Market Surveillance Panel – Mr. Neil Campbell**

Mr. N. Campbell recognized Mr. Jack Lubek of the Market Assessment Unit at the IESO who is retiring and thanked him for his support of the Panel since its inception.

Mr. Campbell's presentation outlined the Market Surveillance Panel's general evaluative criteria and monitoring process. The Panel has drafted a document on the Monitoring of Bids and Offers in the IESO-Administered Electricity Markets which is open for public comment until November 18th and feedback was solicited from the Committee and other interested market participants. Also in the presentation Mr. Campbell reviewed the stakeholder feedback on and planned changes to Panel Reports.

Mr. Humphries asked if the price guarantee concept of the OPA contracts are clouding or facilitating some of the issues discussed. Mr. N. Campbell responded that there are a number of different kinds of contracts with materially different features. The Panel has looked at most of the contracts in previous reports including a detailed review of the efficiency implications and

incentives in the contracts. In a number of areas, contracts or regulated structures reduce opportunities or incentives to exercise market power. However, some contracts are of concern as they have counterproductive incentives. Mr. N. Campbell cited the NUG contracts as examples of contracts that are inefficient.

**Agenda Item No. 9: Other Business**

None

**Agenda Item No. 10: Wrap Up and Adjourn – Mr. Witjes**

Mr. Witjes announced the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for December the 9<sup>th</sup> and advised members that we need to look at sufficient agenda items to have the meeting.

Mr. Witjes thanked Mr. Guy Springgay with the IESO for the preparation of the meeting and assistance with chairing the meeting. He also thanked the members and the IESO Board for his opportunity to chair the meeting.

Mr. B. Campbell thanked Mr. Humphries for his participation on the Committee as an outgoing member.

The meeting was adjourned.