Notes from IEA Task 34 Kick Off Conference Calls

Conference Call #1 (Jan 10, 2013) 8am – 10am MST

Attendees: US representatives: Karin Sinclair (KS), Sam Rooney (SR), Elise DeGeorge (ED), Andrea Copping (AC), Simon Geerlofs (SG), Jocelyn Brown-Saracino (JS); Switzerland: Markus Geissman (MG); Ireland: John McCann (JM); and, Germany: Johann Koeppel (JK)

The meeting convened at approximately 8am MT. Initially, representatives from the US, Switzerland and Ireland were on the call. The representative from Germany joined the meeting a little late. In the future, I will try to do a better job of learning the time zone of each participating member so that meeting notification will contain more comprehensive meeting time information. The agenda included the following topics:

1. Introductions – The participants in the table below introduced themselves and gave a brief description of what activities, especially related to land based and/or offshore wind, they are involved with in their countries. KS introduced herself as the US-assigned Operating Agent for this new Task.

2. Changes to Agenda – KS added 8c (budget)

3. Background of IEA Task 34 – KS described her understanding of the IEA Task 34 origination, and how it has evolved from the initial proposal to cover only offshore wind to now include land based wind. JM clarified that Jim Ahlgrimm, US DOE, initially introduced the proposal during ExCo 69 in Norway. This current proposal was approved, in principle, at ExCo 70. A refined proposal, to include more details on participating countries, focus areas, work packages, and, if possible budget, is on the ExCo 71 agenda for a vote in Vienna, Austria, on Feb 6. KS expressed her need for comments on the proposal, the revised work packages (discussed later in the meeting) and commitments for participation so that she can prepare the document for submittal to the ExCo no later than Jan 23. **ACTION ITEM: All parties should submit their input to Karin (Karin.sinclair@nrel.gov) by the end of the day Jan 14 so that she can integrate them and circulate the revised document to all participants by Jan 16.**

4. Discuss Comments on Proposal, as Approved in Principle at ExCo 70: KS asked each country representative to provide comments on the proposal, as currently written. MG – Who is the target group? Who should participate in this IEA Task? Should it be environmental organizations or wind energy, for example. This should not be a forum where the intent of the participants is to shut down wind development.
KS – Believes the specific work packages will help define who should be participating. Generally collaboratives that include a wide range of stakeholders result in an outcome that more parties can accept.

MG – doesn’t think these IEA tasks lend themselves to the format used by other collaboratives because the groups usually don’t meet very often.

JM – Suggested the establishment of a forum where wind energy developers and environmental groups can meet in a neutral space. He suggested that anyone doing research on environmental issues should want to access the information compiled by this Task. Since there is no other existing international technical forum on this topic, this should become the go-to resource for information.

MG – What does ‘environmental’ mean? Does this include noise, landscapes, etc?

KS – clarified that the intent is to focus on wildlife, and habitats, not the other topics.

MG – A primary outcome of this effort should be a best practices report, including methods. Also, a comparison of regulations would be useful.

JM – the scope of the document should be modified to focus on viewing good environmental practices as an enabler to wind development (as opposed to the current reference to impacts as barriers to development). The adoption of good environmental practices will ultimately reduce costs, by mitigating risk.

JM – with limited resources, we need to find a way to leverage efficiently. A suggestion would be to distribute the work effort, maybe set up a local task liaison group in each country, with subgroups formed for specific species. Division of labor may be beneficial, although the work effort is not well developed and the scope seems quite large. Proposed setting up a communication network within specialties. Perhaps we should look at other IEA Tasks and cherry pick what works well (ie Task 28, for example, has a cluster of networks).

KS – A best practice report would address current issues and help for future avoidance and mitigation.

JS – Agreed that the development of a network to share data (this may be the overarching goal), research, and best practices would be useful to all participants.

JM – It would also be helpful to first define where we are and what information gaps can be identified.

MG – Agrees with JM’s vision; this should be a center of excellence
KS – We need to define distributed wind to decide if there is interest in this topic for this proposal. KS explained the US definition of distributed wind. Small wind turbines are defined as 100kW or less, and are included in the definition of distributed. Small clusters of utility scale turbines are called community wind projects, and are also included in the definition of distributed wind.

JM – reminded us that ‘distributed’ is usually defined by interconnection rules. They are often characterized as ‘isolated’ projects or ‘one-off’ projects. Isolated projects operate under a different environmental regime; it is difficult to assess the cumulative impacts from these projects.

KS – agreed that in the US interconnection defines distributed.

NOTE: This question was brought up again during conference call #2. Due to the range of definitions, we are now asking for input from all countries on this. ACTION ITEM: Countries should provide explicit definition of distributed wind, so that we can clarify what we mean by ‘distributed’ wind in this proposal. This will be most important if the Task 34 participants decide to include ‘distributed’ in the work package.

JM – described his vision of the outcome focused on a communications, how this effort could become influential, using regular bulletins, having a clearinghouse for resources, best practices, and research. Creating a network would be useful; Task 28 data base of research is an example.
KS – mentioned a searchable database (WILD) that is hosted by NREL. Covers land based, offshore and marine hydrokinetic technology. Near-term modifications may include a notification feature – alerting users when documents are added that include key words of interest (country, technology, species, mitigation strategy, etc)

JK – suggested holding IEA Task 34 meetings in conjunction with expert or national meetings. For example, there is a national meeting scheduled in 2015 in Germany. IEA Task 34 may want to schedule its meeting in conjunction with this one.

JM – frequent video conferencing should be considered. For example, they could include expert speakers, and be held on a 6-week cycle.

5. Identify Charter Members, and Specific Interests (i.e. Offshore, Utility land based, Distributed land based) – see table below

6. Discuss proposed work packages – there was general agreement that the revised work packages make sense.

7. Develop tentative meeting schedule – we didn’t discuss this. The intent was to begin developing a schedule for meetings over the next three years. This will have to be deferred to another time when we have a better understanding of all the interested participants.

8. Next steps/timeline
   a. Revised proposal submitted for vote by ExCo 71: Near term activities that need to be accomplished (these are all ACTION ITEMS):
      1. Comments from participating countries on current proposal, including revised work packages, to KS by Jan 14
      2. KS to circulate revised draft to countries on Jan 16
      3. Comments from participating countries on revised draft back to KS by Jan 20
      4. KS to submit revised proposal to IEA by Jan 23
      5. ExCo 71 to vote on proposal Feb 6
   b. Schedule in-person kick-off meeting – KS proposed to host this meeting in Colorado, US, at the National Wind Technology Center in either late March or early April. ACTION ITEM – respond to the Doodle scheduler that you will receive in the next week or so.
   c. Budget discussion – this will have to be deferred to another time when we have a better understanding of all the interested participants
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Conference Call #1 Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Karin Sinclair</td>
<td>National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td>Operating Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Sam Rooney</td>
<td>NREL</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Elise DeGeorge</td>
<td>NREL</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Andrea Copping</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Simon Geerlofs</td>
<td>PNNL</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Jocelyn Brown-Saracino</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Markus Geissman</td>
<td>Federal Office of Energy</td>
<td>Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>John McCann</td>
<td>Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland (SEIA)</td>
<td>Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Johann Koeppel</td>
<td>Technische Universität Berlin</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting adjourned at 10am MT.

**ACTION ITEM: THOSE WHO WERE ON THE CALL, PLEASE REVIEW THE DRAFT NOTES AND LET KS KNOW IF THERE ARE ANY CORRECTIONS THAT NEED TO BE MADE. FINAL MINUTES WILL BECOME PART OF THE TASK 34 RECORD. PLEASE SEND ANY CORRECTIONS BY JAN 25.**
Conference Call #2 (Jan 10, 2013), 6pm – 8pm MST

Attendees: US representatives: Karin Sinclair (KS), Sam Rooney (SR), Andrea Copping (AC), Simon Geerlofs (SG), Jocelyn Brown-Saracino (JS); China: He Dexin, Yan Jing; and, Australia: Alicia Webb (AW)

1. Introductions – The participants in the table below introduced themselves and gave a brief description of what activities, especially related to land based and/or offshore wind, they are involved within their countries. KS introduced herself as the US-assigned Operating Agent for this new Task.

2. Changes to Agenda – KS added 8c

3. Background of IEA Task 34 – KS described her understanding of the IEA Task 34 origination, and how it has evolved from the initial proposal to cover only offshore wind to now include land based wind. This current proposal was approved, in principle, at ExCo 70. A refined proposal, to include more details on participating countries, focus areas, work packages, and, if possible budget, is on the ExCo 71 agenda for a vote in Vienna, Austria, on Feb 6. KS expressed her need for comments on the proposal, the revised work packages (discussed later in the meeting) and commitments for participation so that she can prepare the document for submittal to the ExCo no later than Jan 23. **ACTION ITEM:** All parties should submit their input to Karin (Karin.sinclair@nrel.gov) by the end of the day Jan 14 so that she can integrate them and circulate the revised document to all participants by Jan 16.

4. Discuss comments on Proposal, as Approved in Principle at ExCo 70: KS asked each country representative to provide comments on the proposal, as currently written.

   CWEA – Interested in both offshore and land based. Development in the South for land based and in the mountains; also interested in residential applications.

   AW – Australia doesn’t need environmental regulation for smaller wind turbines. They would support distributed wind (community-owned projects) but not the inclusion of small turbines.

   AW – The Australian government could potentially use regulations of other countries if we gather regulations information from around the world. They would likely take the most stringent components into consideration.

   CWEA – Environmental problems are not addressed in the North, where the population is low. They will be addressed in the South and with future offshore development. This Task is covering important issues.
KS – We may need to scale back later on if we don’t think we can complete work in the 3-year timeframe. This will be decided during the in-person meeting.

AW – Main focus in Australia will be birds and bats. Some species will be similar around the world and others will be specific to one country/area (i.e. wombat)

AW – Asked what a charter member is and expectations for commitments (time/resources). Will need to go to other organizations within the country to identify other participants and possible funding partners. However, AW will contribute as much data as she has access to.

KS – Commitments will be determined once the detailed work packages are agreed to. Fees for participation, based on experience with other IEA tasks, aren’t typically significant (JS – for example, fee was $10,000 US for recent task that focused on marine hydrokinetic). However, we will not be able to determine what the fee will be until we have better clarity on the number of participating countries and the work packages.

5. Identify Charter Members, and Specific Interests (i.e. Offshore, Utility land based, Distributed land based) – see table below

6. Discuss proposed work packages

AW- Alicia is keen to contribute to this task and help disseminate Australian data and research. (budget depending)

AW – Who will do most of the aggregating and sharing? Operating agent? Other countries?

KS – US has volunteered to serve as OA. Generally the bulk of the work being supported by the OA however I propose this be determined by the participating countries during the in-person meeting.

CWEA – discussed the importance of considering distributed applications within the Task. However, given that the approach is different, proposed to divide WP2 into subtasks (2.1, 2.2) to keep the different applications separate (ie utility scale and distributed wind)

KS – Proposed we wait to hear from more countries to agree on the scope of work and who is interested in the different applications before we can break up work packages.

China – Agreed to wait until we hear from more countries before breaking WP’s up.

KS – **Action item:** We need a written definition of ‘distributed’ wind from each country so that we can have a more informed conversation on whether it should be included in the work package.
7. Develop tentative meeting schedule – we didn’t discuss this. The intent was to begin developing a schedule for meetings over the next three years. This will have to be deferred to another time when we have a better understanding of all the interested participants.

8. Next steps/timeline
   a. Revised proposal submitted for vote by ExCo 71: Near term activities that need to be accomplished (these are all ACTION ITEMS):
      1. Comments from participating countries on current proposal, including revised work packages, to KS by Jan 14
      2. KS to circulate revised draft to countries on Jan 16
      3. Comments from participating countries on revised draft back to KS by Jan 20
      4. KS to submit revised proposal to IEA by Jan 23
      5. ExCo 71 to vote on proposal Feb 6
   b. Schedule in-person kick-off meeting – KS proposed to host this meeting in Colorado, US, at the National Wind Technology Center in either late March or early April. ACTION ITEM – respond to the Doodle scheduler that you will receive in the next week or so.
   c. Budget discussion – this will have to be deferred to another time when we have a better understanding of all the interested participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Karin Sinclair</td>
<td>National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td>Operating Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Sam Rooney</td>
<td>NREL</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Andrea Copping</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Simon Geerlofs</td>
<td>PNNL</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Jocelyn Brown-Saracino</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>He Dexin, Yan Jing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offshore/Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Alicia Webb</td>
<td>Clean Energy Council</td>
<td>Land based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting adjourned at 7:30pm MST.

ACTION ITEM: THOSE WHO WERE ON THE CALL, PLEASE REVIEW THE DRAFT NOTES AND LET KS KNOW IF THERE ARE ANY CORRECTIONS THAT NEED TO BE MADE. FINAL MINUTES WILL BECOME PART OF THE TASK 34 RECORD. PLEASE SEND ANY CORRECTIONS BY JAN 25.