

Ex Ante Alternatives: Evaluating the Status Quo



CALIFORNIA

TECHNICAL FORUM

ANNETTE BEITEL
SEPTEMBER 3, 2015

Longstanding Commission Goals for Ex Ante Process



2

- Collaborative
- Transparent
- Well-Documented
- Uses Best Available Information
- Balances Accuracy, Precision, Timeliness, Cost, and Certainty

Longstanding Commission Goals Compared to Status Quo



3

- Collaborative
 - Only PAs and CPUC staff involved in measure development
 - ✦ Process is adversarial rather than collaborative
- Transparent
 - Virtually impossible for third parties to understand process and end product
- Well-Documented
 - Extensive Cal TF staff DEER documentation work has yielded very little clear documentation
 - Most information in DEER cannot be traced to sources, nor are values reproducible
- Uses Best Available Information
 - Ex ante consultants frequently request more data collection
- Balances Accuracy, Precision, Timeliness, Cost, and Certainty
 - DEER is very complex – result is false precision, not increased accuracy
 - Measure review timelines are not adhered to
 - Measure values are not fixed from cycle to cycle – over a dozen changes to DEER this year alone

State Policy Goals for Energy Efficiency



4

- Use credible, statewide consistent values for forecasting and planning
- Increase inter-agency and regional coordination
- Efficiency as a resource
- **Double energy efficiency savings by 2040**

State Policy Goals Compared to Status Quo



5

- Use credible, statewide consistent values for forecasting and planning
 - POU's were unable to continue using DEER-based framework
 - ✦ Too complex, opaque, hard to use and understand
- Increase inter-agency and regional coordination
 - CEC uses EnergyPlus for Title 24 and CPUC uses DOE-2.2 for DEER
- Efficiency as a resource
 - Efficiency can't be a credible resource if IOUs and POU's use different savings
- **Double energy efficiency savings by 2040**
 - Won't happen if it takes years to introduce new measures into the portfolios (e.g. LEDs)