Notes from Energy Efficiency Cross-Cutting Emerging Technologies Subcommittee Meeting #2

5/4/2016 10:00-12:00pm

Location: PEC, San Francisco

Meeting Co-Chairs: Edwin Hornquist, SCE; Mary Anne Piette, LBNL

Facilitator/Notes: NRDC

*Notes: Presentations are generally not summarized in these notes. Please see presentation slides on* [*www.CAEECC.org*](http://www.CAEECC.org) *website for context. Lack of attribution for meeting participant comments is intentional by agreement of Coordinating Committee.*

Main Session: Subcommittee Co-Chair Presentation on Statewide ETP Observations and Vision

*See slides.*

Question: You mentioned a new “systems” work focus going beyond just widgets. Is it “whole building systems” or smaller subsystems you are demonstrating…what does that look like?

Answer: The focus there is on tools and best practices with respect to systems. We’re creating data to anticipate problems that might come from these systems to improve how they are deployed.

Question: The ET group is doing a good job of ID’ing technologies with potential, but then when it goes to the products side of the IOU, there isn’t enough market for it (e.g., no supply to support the effort and no workforce). Nobody feels like it’s their job so it doesn’t really get done. Commenter proposed a solution that they would like to see in the BP, include an accelerated commercializing program – a dedicated SW program whose goal would be specifically to move the ID’d technologies and move it to the products side. Not only track this effort like IOUs mentioned, but create a program that actually DOES this. Could potentially be a resource program b/c if it’s an accelerated commercialization and take it from one side to the others, it would result in energy savings. This wouldn’t be for just one or two projects, but hundreds. Engage more with the market actors, distributors, customer awareness, retailers, etc.; TRC goal, but not 1.0 – recognize new technologies and hand-holding vendor community. NYSERDA does this through a program, which has $31 million dedicated and is a resource program. This could be on the ET side on portfolio or on the program side, but would need to be a carve out. Goal would be to pick 10 new promising technologies to do large scale deployment. Further goal would be to have 2 of those technologies be adopted into the portfolio the next time. Then can refine the process and create an ecosystem re: moving this as part of the general approach. Eager to have a conversation about this.

Answer: SW team – recognize there is a gap, may be a better mechanism to help better address this gap. However, they do have the TRIP solicitation that attempts to do this to a degree but needs to improve upon it. Also, you are talking about a resource program rather than a non-resource program.

Response: Thank you, and please note that consistent integrating the vendor perspectives on these technologies is critical.

Comment: This ET works needs a thoughtful, strategic approach to ensure commercialization, where all aspects of that success are integrated across programs, including C&S. Gave HPWH programs in Northwest. Noted that it is all about heavy collaboration between ET, C&S and voluntary program teams.

Comment: Need a strategic plan…all groups need to work together. Partnerships, etc. need to play a big role on this.

Answer: ET Team has been aware that they need to collaborate. ET standing meetings process is being changed in terms of format to encourage collaboration.

Comment: We have limited resources. So the question is “what can we do to look at opportunities…to deal with non-cost effective technologies that have potential.

Question: Do you feel the ET program has enough flexibility and ability to take risks and have quick failures?

Answer: Yes, there is flexibility etc.; need to ensure the right metrics are being measured.

Question: What are the metrics for NEEA ET program?

Answer: There are “stage gates” and they meet certain criteria as each stage and then at a certain point near the beginning they start counting savings. Share savings with utilities b/c they partner with them and eventually the IOUs take programs on as needed. Need to go through pilot/project stage to then get to the initiative stage where it essentially goes live as a program. They don’t get into market research until the initiative program stage. They do 5 year building stock assessment to assess the need and status of energy in the field. They also rely on the Regional Technical Forum for technical assumptions, etc. and also need test procedures for codes and standards. Use same metrics as we would envision, but do it all the long away, they are stage gated so not all of them will become an actual initiative.

Also wanted to note a gap in the portfolio, refrigerant phase out. CARB is about to eliminate R410a in a year and you need to take that into account in your program activities. This is an opportunity to go to not so good replacements that are easy drop in substitutes or better longer term natural refrigerants (CO2, etc). There is lots of redesign that will happen and this is a really critical juncture for C&S and voluntary programs to be looking to leverage the situation.

Question: When do you look at cost-effective?

Answer: Look at it during ET stage, looking at a pilot. The pilot needs to have the prospect of being cost-effective if not yet. Sometimes simple and cheap is another barrier for vendors who want to do more complex and expensive jobs. Also not a stand-alone, fully integrated.