



**California Technical Forum (Cal TF)  
Policy Advisory Council (PAC) Meeting #11  
July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2016  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District**

**I. Participants**

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator  
Tim Melloch, Cal TF Staff

Rachel Huang, PAC Member, Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)  
Steve Galanter, PAC Member, Southern California Edison (SCE)  
Martha Brook, PAC Member, California Energy Commission (CEC)  
Hanna Grene, PAC Member, Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE)  
Jonathan Changus, PAC Member, Northern California Power Agency (NCPA)  
Jessica Francisco, PAC Member, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)  
Mike Campbell, PAC Member, Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)

**On the Phone**

Alejandra Mejia, Cal TF Staff

Peter Miller, PAC Member, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)  
Beckie Menten, PAC Member, MCE Clean Energy (MCE)  
Lisa Davidson, PAC Member, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E)  
Donald Gilligan, PAC Member, National Association of Energy Service Companies (NAESCO)  
Mary Ann Piette, PAC Member, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL)

**II. Key Decisions and Action Items**

**Q2 Progress Report on 2016 Business Plan**

- ACT: ACT: Cal TF staff to work with CPUC Staff to structure early feedback documents so that it is clear that the document does not represent additional regulatory mandates, and instead represents early feedback for collaborative discussion/WP developer consideration.
- ACT: Cal TF staff to draft “paradigm shift” proposal for new measure review, as well as continuing to refine the new Cal TF Staff – CPUC Staff Collaborative Measure Review process.



### Cal TF/CPUC Staff “Next Steps” Memo to David Gamson

- ACT: Cal TF Staff to clarify that the substance of the “Next Steps” memo is not necessarily endorsed by the individual organizations represented on the PAC.

### eTRM Update

- ACT: Cal TF staff to work with CEC to define how they would like to be included in the eTRM development process.
- ACT: As part of the “eTRM Work Plan” Cal TF Staff will address how eTRM development and approval would impact Potential study and goal setting/achievement. Need to address how yearly EM&V results will be incorporated into eTRM.
- ACT: Cal TF staff delay circulating eTRM RFP for review to give time for PAC members to consult internally about devoting resources to the eTRM RFP review.

### **III. Q2 Progress Report on 2016 Business Plan**

Tim Melloch and Annette Beitel, Cal TF—

#### PowerPoint Presentation

Discussion of new collaborative workpaper review process. CPUC Staff has been really helpful in both participating in and fine-tuning the process. Important to clarify with staff that early written feedback does not constitute “regulatory mandates” from the EAR Team.

- ACT: Cal TF staff to work with CPUC Staff to structure early feedback documents so that it is clear that the document does not represent additional regulatory mandates, and instead represents early feedback for collaborative discussion/WP developer consideration.

While the PAC appreciates the need for continuous improvements to the existing measure review process, PAs are under a lot of pressure to get new measures into the market and shift their portfolios in a much faster time frame. Instead of just making improvements to the current process, Cal TF staff should also develop a “paradigm shift” alternative. One possible option is shifting the



responsibility from workpaper development from utilities to Cal TF. Another option would be “interim approval” of measures prior to full vetting.

- ACT: Cal TF staff to draft “paradigm shift” proposal for new measure review.

Question about percentage of total workpapers that are going through Cal TF review and/or full detailed review by EAR team.

Discussion about opportunities for cost savings. PAs noted that significant cost savings would result from two changes: 1. reducing the amount of workpaper updates from DEER changes and 2. reducing the time spent on formatting data to conform to DEER requirements.

Need to continue preparing for a shift to savings measured at the meter even as we optimize the deemed framework.

#### **IV. Cal TF/CPUC Staff “Next Steps” Memo to David Gamson**

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator—

##### **Final Memorandum Draft**

Background briefing and overview of substance agreed to with CPUC Staff. Cal TF Staff still finalizing with CPUC staff, but high level points are in agreement. Per PAC recommendation, add language in memo that eTRM is replacement to DEER.

- ACT: Cal TF Staff to clarify that the substance of the “Next Steps” memo is not necessarily endorsed by the individual organizations represented on PAC.

#### **V. eTRM Update**

Annette Beitel, Cal TF Facilitator—

Opening Remarks: In-person PAC members provided with draft RFP for purposes of discussion during the meeting; they will be collected at end. It is critically important to maintain a “level playing field” by making sure reviewers clearly understand they should not share or discuss the eTRM with others outside the review team. The RFP is ready for circulation to reviewers. Cal TF



staff proposes a two-tier review: first by IT/reporting staff for PAC organizations who will be using the eTRM; then more broadly to other PAC organizations for policy/legal issue review. Reviewers will not be asked to sign a formal “NDA”, but will be asked to sign short statement that they understand their reviewing obligations, including the obligation not to share or discuss eTRM RFP outside the review team.

### PowerPoint Presentation

Clarification about who would manage and fund the RFP for the eTRM repository. Cal TF staff proposes to manage the RFP and funding would occur through co-funding agreements.

Discussion about role of CEC staff and other non-CPUC entities in reviewing eTRM development. PAC member request that CEC involvement/review is “parallel path” and does not add additional time to review process.

- ACT: Cal TF staff to work with CEC to define how they would like to be included in the eTRM development process.

Question about eTRM development and approval would impact Potential study and energy savings goal-setting/achievement. Need to address how yearly EM&V results will be incorporated into eTRM.

- ACT: As part of the “eTRM Work Plan” Cal TF Staff will address how eTRM development and approval would impact Potential study and goal setting/achievement. Need to address how yearly EM&V results will be incorporated into eTRM.

Warning from POUs that smaller PAs may continue to use smaller, older measures that the rest of the state may wish to retire.

PAC suggestions on eTRM pricing issues: 1. a “per user” pricing structure may be more cost effective than a flat fee; 2. minimizing customization would also help to control costs, and 3. Data storage needs to host the repository can also be a significant cost driver.

PAC suggestions on eTRM other items to consider for the eTRM RPF and implementation:

1. The eTRM documentation should include not only definition of data fields, but also explain how data linked i.e. provide a “data schema”,



2. Training requirement should be framed more broadly as “change management,” so it is both targeted towards technical and non-technical people, and also recognizes that change management. The eTRM vendor may not be the best consultant to provide the change management element – consider whether a change management specialist should be brought in during the transition.
3. Instead of allowing bidders to bid either for SaaS or solution that is built for Cal TF. If solution built for Cal TF, identify who will own. If solution licensed, need to carefully set forth terms of license.
4. Need to consider appropriate contract length for eTRM repository; should be at least 5 years.
5. Discussion about sequencing of review steps and need to include IT and other systems experts to review. Need to focus reviewers on appropriate content to be reviewed. All reviewer organization PAC members should commit to enforce reviewing focus, i.e. reviewers should focus on substantive issues, not line edits.
6. Final contract-holder should have preferred voice in RFP review, since they will be facing more of the risk
7. PAC Interest in including CPUC and CEC as RFP reviewer, and possibly as bid evaluators.
8. Preferred approach to structuring review is to allow everyone to see everyone else’s comments.

PAC members expressed support for Cal TF proposed “two tier” review structure. However, a PAC member requested that Cal TF staff delay circulating eTRM RFP for review to give time for PAC members to consult internally about devoting resources to the eTRM RFP review.

- ACT: Cal TF staff delay circulating eTRM RFP for review to give time for PAC members to consult internally about devoting resources to the eTRM RFP review.

## **VI. Closing**

Cal TF Staff will schedule another PAC meeting in September to update PAC on eTRM and other issues. PAC agreed the meeting should be held in San Francisco to allow ORA to participate.