CALIFORNIA
TECHNICAL FORUM

Subcommittee Tracking Sheet
Subcommittee Name: Best Available information
Meeting #1: January 29, 2015

I. Agenda Items for Discussion/Materials
- Review/refine initial subcommittee plan.

II. Meeting Attendees

Jenny Roecks, Cal TF staff
Alejandra Mejia, Cal TF staff
Annette Beitel, Cal TF staff

Pierre Landry, TF Member, Subcommittee Champion
Doug Mahone, TF Member
Tom Eckhart, TF Member
Steven Long, TF Member

Ryan Cho, SCE
Alastair Hood, Verdafero
Mark Gaines, Independent
Bhaskar Vempati, Enernoc

III. Key Issues Discussed

- Should a definition or a process for best available information (BAI) be developed? A definition with key characteristics of BAI could be developed, and the process would be how the BAI definition gets operationalized. BAI should be accessible, valid, and useful.
- Different standards for BAI may be needed for high impact measures versus lower impact measures. More important measures warrant more resources.
    - The definition of a “high impact measure” should be investigated.
- A key question that must be considered when determining the appropriateness of data is, how representative is the data of the population where the measure will be implemented?
- Developing examples of sources may be beneficial. This may take the form of a library of sources that will be considered reliable.

    - Sources may include
        - Other TRMs
        - E-Source
        - CEE
        - Energy Star
        - Conference papers
    - Even if a library of recommended sources is provided, sources become outdated or new sources emerge. Cal TF may want to develop a process for refreshing the list of sources to see what else is out there.
    - Sources listed in the library should still be investigated to ensure that the information is reliable and appropriate for the intended measure application. For example, the sample size of a particular source may be too small.
- A database listing relevant information about sources such as sample size, type of data, etc. may be too much effort to develop and maintain. An annotated bibliography may be easier and still effective.
- In evaluating BAI, one must consider primary and secondary data versus simulated data.
    - Measurement error in data collection makes the determination of reliability and validity difficult, even with primary data.
    - Perhaps guidelines should differentiate between empirical versus hypothetical.
        - The role of simulation in meeting BAI standards should be explored.
        - Assumptions could be arbitrary or based on a rule of thumb.
- Measurement theory should be considered.
- Guidelines are needed for
    - error bands around estimates or the degrees of precision
    - conservativism or optimism of estimates
    - documentation sources and judgments so that updates can be made when better information emerges, support validity of data
- Reliability of data could be deemed high, medium, or low based on collective expertise.
- Criteria to consider for determining whether something meets the best available information standard:
    - Cost
    - Age of information
    - Evaluability of the program/measure and what can be measured through evaluation
    - Geographic origin and California applicability
    - Sample size

    - Statistical significance relative to the targeted population
- Perhaps criteria should be determined by the magnitude of saivngs, from pilot-level up to statewide measure status.
    - It can be difficult to predict how impactful new measures will be

IV. Action Items

- ACT: Research the definition of a “high impact measure” and its origin
- ACT: Start cataloging potential sources of best available information that have been considered in California for developing ex ante values.
- Update paper; identify next questions.