

ORGANIZATION OF MISO STATES, INC.
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
November 10, 2004

Approved 12/9/04

Commissioner Susan Wefald, President of the Organization of MISO States, Inc. (OMS), called the November 10, 2004 Meeting of the OMS Board of Directors to order via conference call at approximately 2:00 p.m. (CDT) The following commissioners participated in the meeting:

Susan Wefald, North Dakota
Margaret Barnabee, proxy for Kevin Wright, Illinois
Steve Gaw, Missouri
Laura Chappelle, Michigan
Diane Munns, Iowa
Bob Pauley, proxy for David Hadley, Indiana
LeRoy Koppendrayer, Minnesota
Greg Jergeson, Montana
David Sapper, proxy for Bert Garvin, Wisconsin
Kevin Holtsberry, proxy for Judy Jones, Ohio
Glen Thomas, Pennsylvania
Gary Hanson, South Dakota

Kentucky, absent
Manitoba absent
Nebraska absent

Others present on conference call:

Bill VanderLaan, Illinois
Jack Dwyer, Iowa OCA
John Harvey, Iowa
Lisa Pappas, Michigan
Nancy Campbell, Minnesota
Burl Haar, Minnesota
Mike Proctor, Missouri
Marla Larson, Montana
Kim Joyce, Pennsylvania
Raksha Krishna
Tom Nicholson
Julie Voight
Johannes Williams

The directors and proxies listed above established the necessary quorum for the meeting of at least eight directors being present.

Approval of Minutes of the October 14 OMS BOD Meeting

David Sapper moved for approval of the October 14 OMS BOD Meeting minutes and Gary Hanson seconded. One correction was noted by Nancy Campbell; Matt Lacey's name was

omitted in the attendance roster. The Directors voted to unanimously approve the minutes as amended.

Approval of Minutes of the October 22 OMS Special BOD Meeting

David Sapper moved for approval of the October 22 OMS Special BOD Meeting minutes and Gary Hanson seconded. The Directors voted to unanimously approve the minutes as distributed.

Nominating Committee Report - Greg Jergeson

Greg Jergeson requested to present his report at this point in the meeting. (He had to leave the OMS BOD meeting early). Greg read the slate of 2005 Executive Committee Nominees to be approved in 2005.

- President: Kevin Wright, Illinois
- Vice-President: Bert Garvin, Wisconsin
- Secretary: Ken Nickolai, Minnesota (who will replace Leroy Koppendrayner)
- Treasurer: Steve Gaw, Missouri
- At-Large: Judy Jones, Ohio

- He also presented the 2005 Nominating Committee.
Susan Wefald, North Dakota
Laura Chappelle, Michigan
Greg Jergeson, Montana

- Slate of officers will be voted on December 9, 2004 at OMS Annual meeting in Carmel, IN.

Review of Actions of the Executive Committee on October 28

President Wefald indicated that there was much discussion at its October 28 meeting Executive Committee:

- Update from Randy Rismiller on Pricing Issues
- Discussion on the next dates of OMS comments in November and December
- Did Not Discuss the Attorney Solicitation Process - we'll get to it later this month.
- Speakers for the Annual Meeting are to include: the Market Monitor and the Market Readiness Advisor. We are also working on getting a FERC commissioner to speak.
- Update from the OMS Executive Director.

New Business

1. Action item

David Sapper moved that OMS, by November 12, file comments on the FERC's Notice of Inquiry on Financial Accounting Standards for Regional Transmission Organizations. Diane Munns seconded the motion.

- David Sapper indicated the document forwarded to OMS members by email was a product of a small ad hoc group* from Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Indiana and Iowa with help from Bill Smith.
- The committee generally followed the comments prepared by NARUC. The Base document was prepared with amendments that could be added seamlessly. The Base document received support from all members of the Ad Hoc committee. Optional language was not supported by all.

* David Sapper, Wanda Jones, Brad Borum, Bob Pauley, Kim Joyce, John Harvey

President Wefald read through the document requesting changes and asking for comments on each of the sections. A roll call vote was then taken to determine whether to file the comments with the FERC. Some states abstained and were given 24 hours to call in their votes.

Does your state support the NOI comments?

Illinois - abstained procedurally

Indiana - Yes

Iowa - Yes

Kentucky - requested voting extension* (later voted Yes)

Manitoba - absent

Michigan - Yes

Minnesota - Yes

Missouri - Yes

Montana - Yes

Nebraska - absent

North Dakota - Yes

Ohio - No

Pennsylvania - requested voting extension* (later voted Yes)

South Dakota - requested voting extension* (later voted Yes)

Wisconsin - Yes

Voting Outcome

8 - yes

1 - no

2 - absent

4 - abstained

OMS board members voted to file the NOI comments as amended. Bill Smith was directed to prepare the document (a copy of the comments showing amendments follows these minutes) and would take only editorial changes until noon on November 15 when it would be filed with FERC. OMS would give those states requesting extra time to vote the opportunity to notify OMS of their state's decision by noon on November 15.

2. Possible Action Item: MISO Advisory Committee Issues - Steve Gaw

Steve Gaw indicated there were no voting items on the November MISO A/C Agenda. Items for discussion include:

- Report from Load Shedding Task Force concerning emergencies, engineering capability.
- MISO budget - 2005
- State Access to Confidential Data - Dave Hadley will give an update
- Steve Beuning will be giving a report on metrics
- Bert Garvin on Finance Committee - may have comments for BOD by this Friday.

Treasurer's Report

Laura Chappelle presented the Treasurer's Report distributed by e-mail to OMS board members.

Cash on Hand

To date, the OMS has received \$600,000 from the MISO and are holding the remaining balance in an account at Bank One. As of October 31, 2004, the balance in the Bank One account was \$324,919.82.

Expenditures to Date

Total disbursements for October 2004 were \$19,480.89 Total disbursements for the 2004 calendar year are \$253,206.97.

OMS Budget

The OMS Budget has been included in MISO's final draft budget to be presented to the MISO Advisory Committee in November and the MISO BOD in December. We are anticipating that our expenses will increase substantially in December because of the OMS Annual Meeting. However, we may want to re-visit suspending or reducing the MISO monthly wire transfer of \$50,000 until we need the funding.

Laura Chappelle asked for counsel from the OMS Board on whether the directors should suspend the wire transfer of \$50,000. Maybe OMS should request reduction to \$20,000 to \$25,000 per month. President Wefald asked what should OMS reserves be? President Wefald suggested that they wait until December to determine what they are planning to do.

Bill Smith indicated that the OMS auditor wants OMS to file an IRS 990 as soon as possible for the calendar year June 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003 requesting a waiver of penalties. Since this request differed from what the board voted on earlier this year, Bill wanted to ask OMS directors for their permission to allow the auditor to file. The board agreed to allow the auditor to file for 2003 and stay with a calendar year fiscal year.

3. Action Item - Shall OMS take a position on the pricing issues that are before the MISO RECB task group? - Bill VanderLaan

Bill VanderLaan (substituting for Randy Rismiller) reported the following issues from the RECB Task Force meeting November 3:

On November 3, 2004, MISO's RECB Task Force held a meeting to discuss its RECB proposal. The bulk of the November 3 meeting centered on the discussion of issues raised by Task Force members during the October 18, 2004 vote where Task Force members rejected the motion to file MISO's RECB proposal on December 1, 2004. Ultimately, the RECB Task Force Chairman committed to seeking a 60-day extension from the MISO Advisory Committee to attempt to resolve the issues raised by Task Force members.

On November 4, 2004, the OMS Pricing Working Group ("PWG") held a conference call to discuss both the November 3, 2004 RECB Task Force meeting and to attempt to develop a proposed resolution for the OMS Board of Directors' consideration regarding MISO's RECB proposal. Among other things, the PWG determined that the RECB proposal does not comply with the pricing principles adopted by the OMS. Specifically, that MISO's RECB proposal fails to attempt to measure benefits from reliability upgrades and instead focuses only on the need for the upgrade. In this regard, reliability upgrades are not evaluated on a beneficiaries' basis, but rather on a cost-causer basis. The PWG also believes that MISO's RECB Task Force has focused the bulk of its energy on the issue of measuring benefits and beneficiaries from economic upgrades, and therefore has not given the issue of measuring beneficiaries from reliability upgrades sufficient attention. Finally, the PWG determined that the process of determining the beneficiaries of reliability upgrades would require complex analysis that could potentially protract an already long process.

Accordingly, the PWG submitted the following resolution to the OMS Board of Directors for their consideration. Specifically, the resolution acknowledged that the MISO RECB proposal allocated the costs of a reliability upgrades solely to the cost-causers and recommends that the Midwest ISO investigate and propose creative, workable and cost-effective methods for determining beneficiaries of reliability upgrades. The resolution also recommends that such proposals undergo stakeholder review within the appropriate Midwest ISO committees and working groups.

Steve Gaw moved and Gary Hanson seconded OMS accepting the draft resolution regarding the MISO RECB Proposal. After discussion and editing of the proposal to produce the following document, there was a consensus of the directors that the resolution should be filed with MISO. (Ohio did not have an official position, since the language had not been vetted). The proposal will be conveyed to Jeff Webb as soon as possible.

Draft OMS Resolution Regarding MISO RECB Proposal

WHEREAS the Midwest ISO's planning approach defines "reliability upgrades" to include transmission network upgrades needed for: 1) load growth; 2) requests for new or changed designated network resources; 3) requests for new point-to-point transmission service; and 4) requests for generation interconnection.

WHEREAS the Midwest ISO's proposal for allocating costs for reliability upgrades depends primarily on cost causers and/or requestors pay.

WHEREAS on January 12, 2004 the OMS adopted Principles for Allocating Transmission Upgrade Costs Associated with New Generator Interconnection that envisioned an allocation of reliability upgrade costs between both causers and beneficiaries of an upgrade.

WHEREAS assigning the entire cost of reliability upgrades to those requesting the upgrade and/or cost causer would unfairly burden the last request when all users of the facilities to be upgraded, including those contributing parallel flows, are cost causers.

WHEREAS assigning the entire cost of reliability upgrades to cost causers does not properly account for the benefits that others receive from the upgrades.

WHEREAS the OMS recognizes that any single best test of beneficiaries for reliability upgrades may be costly in time and resources for the Midwest ISO to implement.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the OMS both continues to recommend the Midwest ISO investigate and propose creative, workable and cost-effective methods for determining beneficiaries of reliability upgrades. The OMS is ready to assist MISO in achieving that objective.

Administrative Report - Bill Smith

FERC Rehearing Order issued:

- Confidential Data - has become a separate process
- FTRs for seasonal resources - FERC clarified that it had not meant to disqualify separate resources. (Point won in paragraph 157)

Virginia agreed to allow Dominion Resources to participate in PJM South (North Carolina has not yet approved Dominion in PJM South)

Securities & Exchange Commission is looking into the integration of AEP and Commonwealth & Southern. Possible precedential points. Bill Smith will be discussing this with NARUC legal staff next week. Diane Munns asked for Bill to send out more written detail of this issue. Bill sent an OMS memo to directors on 11/29/04 re: SEC Hearing

4. Discussion of new Stage 2 Process for Approving Position Statements - Susan Wefald The Board has approved Stages 1 and 3 of the Process for Approving Position Statements. New language has been drafted for Stage 2, which is highlighted in the

attachment. Some suggested changes are underlined that were suggested by the Executive Committee.

- President Wefald read the highlighted passages and asked for comments. She indicated the Executive Committee had reviewed the language and made some changes. Burl Haar, Minnesota, referring to Section 2, asked if the term "Board Members" should be broadened. Both Diane Munns and Susan felt it should be left as Board Members. Section 2 language would be changed to "OMS or Associate members"
- Kevin Holtsberry registered a complaint from Ohio. The set-up makes it very difficult for Ohio to ever vote on comments. Ohio meets Wednesday morning. Each item on their agenda must have 24 hours notice. President Wefald indicated this matter will be brought to the Board of Directors for a vote at the December meeting.
- The document with the changes proposed during the meeting follows the minutes.*

Announcements:

- RTO 101 is now ready. States that wish to schedule RTO 101 for their Commission and staff, contact Bill Smith. (RTO 101 is an OMS educational project funded by DOE.)
- OMS Executive Committee Meeting - Tuesday, November 30, 2:00 pm (central)
- OMS Annual Meeting December 9, Carmel Indiana in connection with MISO Meetings. Materials on OMS subsidies, hotel reservations and meeting plans will be sent today.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30 pm (central time.)

*** Organization of MISO States Process for Approving Position Statements for FERC and MISO (with changes proposed at meeting)**

Goals:

Approved 10/14/04

- 1) Help states form positions on issues
 - a. Perform thorough analysis of issues
 - b. Test differences and sharpen analysis through discussion of differences in order to gain better understanding of the issues
- 2) Express collective position of states to decision maker
 - a. Build consensus when possible
 - b. Allow parallel presentation of contrasting viewpoints

Stage 1 – Working Group Preparation of an Issues Document

Approved 10/14/04

Section 1- Assignment of topics to a Working group, or Working groups:

The OMS Executive Committee assigns all new topics to either an existing working group or to a new working group when needed. When a topic in an active docket has already been assigned to a working group, the Executive Director (ED) is authorized to make follow-up assignments. As time is of the essence in such cases, the ED shall timely make such assignments and shall immediately inform the Executive Committee. The ED may delegate this responsibility as necessary.

Section 2 - Review of OMS Work Plan by Executive Committee:

The ED shall include in his/her monthly report, or as necessary, a list of FERC and MISO (or other) actions expected in the coming 60 days that may require Working Group assignment. The Executive Committee shall review the list of action items provided by the ED each month and shall direct the ED to give early warning of possible assignments to OMS working groups. The ED shall inform the Executive Committee, via electronic mail, of the completion of such notifications.

Section 3 - Approving the Timetable for Issues Documents:

Providing the greatest possible lead time, the ED, in consultation with the president, will prepare a schedule which outlines a time line of when document issues must come to the OMS Board's attention. The schedule shall include the date that the Board decides issues that will be included in the document, the date that first (and second drafts when possible) will be shared with the membership, and the date that the board will be taking final action on the document.

The Board of Directors will approve the time line of when document issues must come to the OMS Board's attention. Board members are encouraged to note key dates and work to facilitate appropriate action by their Commission so that Board members can vote on the document.

The Board schedule will include a board meeting when Commissioners determine what issues will be included in the document, and give general policy direction to the working groups. Working groups are encouraged to develop "principles" or a short outline that the Board can consider as it advises on policy direction. *Exceptions: Sometimes proceedings that OMS wishes to comment on may have a very short*

timeline. In these situations, the board may not have time to take these all the above steps. In those situations, the board will determine how it wishes to proceed.

Section 4 - Preparation of the Issues Document:

Working groups, which are involved in the document, will encourage members to volunteer to write sections of the issues document. Assignments should be reported to the ED of OMS.

Working groups shall promptly set up their own internal schedule to review all sections of an issues document. The working group's internal schedule must coordinate with the Board's approved time line of when document issues must come to the OMS Board's attention. (see above) The ED shall track Working Group progress and, in the event he/she becomes concerned that progress is inadequate, shall first consult with the working group chair. If such consultation fails to resolve the problem, the Executive Committee shall be informed immediately.

Working groups shall strive for consensus. When working groups know there are strong differences that should be expressed on a specific issue in the document, comments reflecting two or more positions may be developed by the working groups.

All members of a working group shall have the opportunity to read a "draft" section of an issues document, and offer suggestions and changes at least once prior to submittal to the Executive Director for inclusion in an OMS document. If more than one work group is assigned to work on an issue, each working group must have an opportunity to read a "draft" section and offer suggestions and changes at least once prior to submittal to the Executive Director for inclusion in the OMS document. When two or more working groups have provided sections of the draft documents, the ED shall assure the internal consistency of the completed document, whether draft or final.

The chair or chairs of the working groups involved shall submit the document to the ED in a timely manner.

The ED will only include information in issues documents that follows the procedure outlined in this section "Preparation of the Issues Document." *Exceptions: There may be situations when short timelines, or other factors, do not allow all steps of this process to take place. The ED should then note, in an attachment to the draft document, which steps have not taken place in preparation of the document.*

Stage 2– Board Discussion of the Document, Including Proposed Changes.

Section 1

The Executive Director will submit to the Board, in a timely manner, the final version of a working group issues document. If all of the steps of the process outlined in Stage 1 have not been able to be followed, the ED should then note, in an attachment to the issues document, which steps have not taken place in preparation of the document.

Section 2

Board members or associate members may suggest language changes to the document at the Board meeting, and are encouraged to circulate them to membership, before the meeting, to facilitate good understanding of the language changes proposed. Since the Executive Director has the most up to date e-mail list, Board members are encouraged to send proposed changes to the ED for circulation, and are also encouraged to “track” all changes to a final working group issues document.

Section 3

The Board will decide how it wishes to discuss proposed changes to the document. For example, does it wish to proceed page by page or section by section through the document and have the presiding officer ask if there are any questions or suggested changes and discuss and vote upon suggested changes individually? Or does the Board wish to start with a “new” revised version of the document, which includes several changes?

Stage 3 - Voting Process

Approved 8/12/04

Section 1

All members are encouraged to vote on the final document rather than to abstain. If procedural reasons preclude a member from voting, members are encouraged to state this at the beginning of the discussion of the document.

Section 2

Members who have to abstain in the vote on the final document are encouraged to share their thoughts in the discussion of the issues, so that OMS members have as complete an understanding of the issues as possible prior to voting.

Section 3 - Voting on different points of view within a document

If discussion and study of issues documents brings forward more than one point of view on a specific issue *within the document*, board members may be asked to indicate which position they favor. The first priority will be to work to develop consensus language on these specific issues *within the document*. If consensus language can not be adopted, varying positions would be fully explained including the basis for any differences. The document will indicate which states favor specific positions. The goal of the document is to reflect differences in a positive manner in order to provide as much information as possible to the recipient of the final document.

Section 4

Only members present at the meeting, by proxy or in person, may vote on an issue document. States not present at the meeting may choose to sign on to the final document within a reasonable period of time, but may not propose any changes to the document.

Section 5

Some members may need time after the board meeting for procedural reasons to confirm their vote. The Board may grant members up to 24 hours to confirm their vote with the Secretary and the Executive Director, depending on the filing schedule.

Members who are granted up to 24 hours, may confirm or change their vote within that timeframe but may not propose any changes to the document. The final vote will not be determined until the members who have been granted up to 24 hours have confirmed their vote.

Stage 3 - Filing of Comments

If the final vote reflects that a majority of members wish to file the comments, the comments will be filed.

Organization of MISO States
Report of the Treasurer
Laura Chappelle, Michigan PSC
to the
Board of Directors
November 10, 2004

Report for October 2004

Cash on Hand

To date, we have received \$600,000 from the MISO and are holding the remaining balance in our account at Bank One. As of October 31, 2004, our balance in the Bank One account was \$324,919.82.

Expenditures to Date

Total disbursements for October 2004 were \$19,480.89 Total disbursements for the 2004 calendar year are \$253,206.97.

OMS Budget

The OMS Budget has been included in MISO's final draft budget to be presented to the MISO Advisory Committee in November and the MISO BOD in December. We are anticipating that our expenses will increase substantially in December because of the OMS Annual Meeting. However, we may want to re-visit suspending or reducing the MISO monthly wire transfer of \$50,000 until we need the funding.

TREASURER'S REPORT
Organization of MISO States (OMS)
October 31, 2004

10/31/2004
TOTALS

Commercial Checking with Interest

Beginning Balance as 10/1/04

\$ 294,335.09

10/15/04	Wire Transfer	50,000.00	
10/29/04	Interest Payment	<u>65.62</u>	
	Total Deposits		\$ 50,065.62

Checks and Charges

Date	Check #	Descriptions		
10/8/04		Refund of Iowa Unemployment Surcharge Tax	(13.79)	(1)
10/11/04		Paychex Inc.-Payroll/Taxpay Services	70.80	
10/14/04	1490	Travel Advance to MISO/PJM Mtg-Chicago-October/IA	275.00	
10/14/04	1491	Wisconsin PSC-October MISO Finance Committee Meeting/WI	387.52	
10/14/04	1492	Infomax Office Systems, Inc	170.66	
10/14/04	1493	100 Court Investors LLC/OMS Rent & Parking for Nov	874.21	
10/14/04	1494	InterCall- September Conference Calls	1,172.47	(2)
10/18/04	1495	September MISO Market Subcommittee Meeting/IA	222.65	
10/18/04	1496	September MISO Advisory & BOD Meetings /IA	278.57	
10/18/04	1497	Travel Advance for October MISO Advisory & BOD Meetings /IA	300.00	
10/18/04	1498	Travel Advance to MISO Mtg-October Mtg/IA	188.00	
10/27/04	1499	Bank One- October Credit Card Payment	1,982.40	(3)
10/27/04	1500	DWX Internet-November	35.00	*
10/27/04	1501	OMS Postage/ED	7.14	*
10/28-29/04		October Payroll (inc. Employer & Employee taxes)	13,530.26	
		Total Checks and Charges		<u>19,480.89</u>
		Net Activity		<u>30,584.73</u>

CHECKING ACCOUNT BALANCE 10/31/04

\$ 324,919.82

Notes: * Indicates that check was still outstanding at the time the Bank Account was reconciled.

(1) The Iowa Supreme Court nullified an Unemployment surcharge of .035% . OMS was refunded the amount paid in 2004.

(2) In addition to the regular Monthly OMS BOD Meeting & Executive Committee Calls, there were seven additional special conference calls or work group calls.

(3) Credit Card charges incl. travel expenses totaling \$1,446.20 for the Exec. Dir. & Office Manager, FERC Filing Fees (Copying & Shipping) of \$306.97, Federal Express Shipping Fee of \$11.93, and the Qwest Communication Bill of \$217.30 (Phone/fax charges).

OMS Executive Director Report

To Board of Directors November 1, 2004

FERC Activity

1. MISO Transmission and Energy Market Tariff – Docket Nos. ER05-6, ER04-691 and Grandfathered Agreements Docket No. EL04-104. On October 5, 2004, MISO filed its compliance tariff on the FERC's August 6 order. OMS filed comments October 26. FERC is expected to issue an order on rehearing before Thanksgiving. OMS has been watching four issues from the order.
 - State Commission Access to Confidential Data. OMS filed rehearing on September 3. FERC granted 120 days for additional discussion and an Offer of Proof. The Market Monitoring Work Group is conducting discussions with MISO and stakeholders aimed at a mid-December filing. The next call is November 4.
 - Market Readiness. FERC asked OMS to address readiness issues. In a comment filed October 26 on the compliance filing, OMS addressed its plans for future comment.
 - Control area functions issues are the subject of a settlement agreement filed October 5, 2004.
 - FTR allocation. OMS filed a rehearing on one issue with respect to seasonal resources on September 3. OMS addressed the same point in comments on the compliance filing October 26.
 - GFA's: The FERC acted on the ALJ findings on September 16. FERC's rehearing order should be issued soon. MISO is scheduled to file a report on administration of carved-out GFA contracts on November 15.
2. Through and Out Rates – Docket No. EL02-111-004, ER05-6
 - The Unified Plan and the Regional Pricing Plan were filed on October 1. OMS did not submit comments. FERC's order is expected during November.
3. Financial Reporting and Cost Accounting, Oversight and Recovery Practices for Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators, RM04-12.
 - On September 16, FERC issued a Notice of Inquiry asking comments on these issues. Comments are due November 9. An ad hoc task force under the leadership of David Sapper of the Wisconsin PSC is preparing draft comments for the consideration of the OMS Board at the November 10 Board meeting.
4. Reactive Power, Schedule 21, Docket No. ER04-961. MISO's compliance filing will be made November 1.
5. NESCOE filing, Docket No. EL04-112. Awaiting FERC action.
6. On November 30, MISO is required to file its 2005 operating budget with the FERC.

DOE Activity

1. National Interest Electric Transmission Bottlenecks (NIETB) proposed rulemaking. Comments were filed September 17.

2. DOE's Office of Electric Transmission and Distribution and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory have contracted with LECG Consulting for John Chandley to make one presentation of RTO 101 for each state commission. States may contact the OMS office with suggested dates if they want such a presentation.

Other OMS Activity:

1. States are reviewing drafts of the NRRI and the Brattle Group's report for the first 11 states that responded to the questionnaire on siting procedures. Three more responses have been received and are being put into report format.
2. We have signed an audit engagement letter with the firm of Ryun, Givens, Wenthe. The IRS Form 990 is ready for filing after consultation with the auditor.
3. Attorney proposals (13) were received on September 30. Commissioner Garvin will work with me to prepare recommendations.
4. On October 21, work group chairs and other key staff met in Carmel.

Public Relations

1. Pending speaking/meeting invitations:
 - None pending