California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee

Meeting #20

February 28, 2019, 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

PG&E’s Pacific Energy Center, 851 Howard Street, SF, CA 94103

Meeting Summary

Facilitator: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates, Ltd. & Ellen Zuckerman, Independent

On February 28, 2019, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) convened a quarterly meeting of the full CAEECC at Pacific Gas and Electric’s (PG&E) Pacific Energy Center in San Francisco. Twenty-eight individuals participated in-person, and fourteen registered to participate via webinar. A full list is provided in Appendix A: In-Person and Webinar Participation.

Meeting facilitation was provided by Dr. Jonathan Raab (Raab Associates Ltd) and Ellen Zuckerman (Independent). Meeting materials, including presentations, are provided on the CAEECC website at <https://www.caeecc.org/2-28-19-coordinating-committee-mtg->

In this document, some discussion is captured without attribution. In several instances, the affiliation of the speaker is identified, because their affiliation is relevant to the comment.

Following the presentations, key discussion points, clarifying questions or comments are listed, and relevant responses to questions are noted. Where multiple responses were given, these responses are listed as sub-bullets. Next Steps, at the end of this document, list all next steps discussed at the meeting.

**Session 1: Introductions**

CAEECC Facilitator J. Raab opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda (see link above, *Final Agenda*). He explained that the goals of the meeting are to:

* Discuss issues related to intellectual property and third-party providers.
* Provide updates on the CAEECC-hosted Market Transformation Working Group (MTWG).
* Provide an update on the third-party solicitation process.
* Discuss potential agenda topics for the June CAEECC meeting and the structure of the August CAEECC meeting on the Annual Budget Advice Letters (ABALs).
* Discuss a potential approach/timing for addressing CAEECC Disadvantaged Workers/Workforce Standards per D.18-10-008.
* Provide an update on the CAEECC Evaluation.
* Elect CAEECC Co-Chairs.

**Session 2: Intellectual Property**

***Sharing ratepayer funded data and intellectual property – Alison LaBonte, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *Session 2- Sharing Ratepayer Funded Data and Intellectual Property 2-22-19*).

Clarifying Questions and Key Discussion Points:

* A. LaBonte explained that she would like feedback and example use cases as it relates to two areas: (1) How new third-party contracts should be structured for data collection and reporting; and (2) How historical data should be used to inform new third-party program designs. She stressed that feedback on the first issue is more time sensitive.  
  + During the ensuing conversation, J. Raab recorded the identified use cases and related attributes for some use cases (see Appendix B).
* Erin Brooks, Southern California Gas Company: When we deal with requests for customer energy use data, our privacy/legal teams become involved, and there is an energy data request platform that must be used. When planning for programs, third-party implementers need to be thoughtful about the data they are requesting and whether or not the data they seek is truly necessary. The investor-owned utilities (IOUs) cannot just hand over data without knowing the data’s intended use.
* Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: Does gaining access to data for third-parties include Community Choice Aggregators (CCAs) and Regional Energy Networks (RENs)? We have faced resistance in the past when requesting data.  
  + A. LaBonte: It depends on which data and for what purpose.
* Marc Costa, The Energy Coalition: With AB 802 now in effect, a lot of large customers are required to publicly disclose and benchmark their energy use. Given that this data will be available publicly, does this impact the IOUs approach to data sharing?  
  + E. Brooks: The customer still has to authorize the release of data.
* Athena Besa, San Diego Gas and Electric: We are trying to understand the implications of the recently enacted *Customer Privacy Act,* which allows customers to opt-out of providing their data. There are a lot of new rules coming out as a result of this voter-enacted proposition.
* Alice Stover, Marin Clean Energy: We need to have technological platforms and build the necessary infrastructure to support the data that needs to be collected. This is a barrier that needs to be addressed.
* Dan Suyeyasu, CodeCycle: There is a big difference between the data third-parties are collecting and the data they are producing through their analytics. Third-parties are much more sensitive about the latter. These different scenarios may necessitate different approaches. Professors or researchers on intellectual property (IP) could provide a useful perspective on these issues. We must also be cognizant of a potential “chilling effect” that data reporting and tracking may cause. For example, some third-parties are not responding to the third-party solicitations because of IP concerns.  
  + A. Haubenstock: A chilling effect can happen even before a third-party participates in a program. The California Efficiency + Demand Management Council would be happy to convene a conversation with research and legal experts on these issues, per Dan’s recommendation.
  + Cody Coeckelenbergh, Lincus, Inc.: We are concerned about releasing data publicly that may benefit our competitors. Customers, especially some large customers and certain customer segments, do not necessarily want their data to be available publicly. These considerations could impact our customer relationships and introduce barriers to project implementation.
  + A. LaBonte: As we continue the conversation, I am hearing that we should consider the chilling effect and other factors/analyses that might drive/stifle innovation. I am also hearing that we should solicit input from researchers and experts in the field.
* E. Brooks: There are two types of data that warrant discussion: (1) Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) customer energy usage data; and (2) Other energy data (which includes information like the total number of measures installed). AMI energy data issues were heavily discussed and litigated in the smart grid proceeding, and that proceeding is the better venue for those discussions. We should focus the CAEECC conversation on the second type of data (i.e. the “other energy data”).  
  + M. Costa: Some of these issues may also be addressed in the demand response proceeding or in other relevant forums.
* Matt Evans, Southern California Edison: The IOUs can develop a list that outlines what data can be made available and the process by which that data can be requested by third-parties and local governments.  
  + E. Brooks: I agree with Matt that we can develop this resource. I also encourage stakeholders to review the comprehensive metrics that every Program Administrator (PA) reports on. We will report on these metrics on May 1st, 2019.
  + A. Besa: There is also a lot of data available in The California Energy Data And Reporting System (CEDARS) including GHG values and program levelized cost data. The CPUC Energy Division, through a consultant, may want to develop a primer or offer a training on the data available via CEDARS.
  + A. LaBonte: The point on CEDARS is understood, however, I don’t see this as serving the immediate need of addressing the third-party solicitation process and new implementer contracts. Let’s “parking lot” this suggestion and think about it on the side.
* Michael Campbell, Public Advocates Office: I am hearing two themes as it relates to data: (1) We need to elucidate the types of information that should be provided on a pre-bid basis so bidders have useful market data in order to propose solid program designs; and (2) We need to determine the data that must be reported on and tracked by third-parties and include these requirements in the third-party contracts so that we can evaluate program performance and feed information into the Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) process.
* A. LaBonte: We have some clear and timely needs now where we can leverage milestones/opportunities via the third-party solicitation process. This needs to be the front-running driver of next steps so that we do not miss this important opportunity to put in place mutual thinking together. Who should be involved in these conversations? We also need to be mindful of what is covered by the CAEECC and what is already being covered by existing working groups (i.e. AMI customer energy usage data).  
  + J. Raab: CAEECC can offer two options: (1) A CAEECC-hosted public workshop; or (2) A CAEECC-hosted Working Group.
  + A. Besa: A broader workshop or stakeholder meeting would be useful so that people can come to the table to provide input. It is critical that Evaluation, Measurement and Verification experts be part of the conversation.

**Session 3: Important Updates**

***Updates on the CAEECC-Hosted Market Transformation Working Group – J. Raab***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *Draft Update CAEECC-Hosted Market Transformation WG*).

Clarifying Questions and Key Discussion Points:

* Carmen Best, OpenEE: Is the intent of the proposed market transformation (MT) framework to be synergistic with resource acquisition program(s) and C&S implementation? Will funding be complementary?  
  + J. Raab: The intent is to be synergistic. The MTWG’s recommendations lay out a process to minimize and work through overlap, conflict, and transition issues.
  + A. Haubenstock: The MTWG’s recommendations establish conditions for collaboration and synergies. We do not delve into how the budget might overlap. This will hopefully come of out the collaborative conversations and process that the MTWG recommends.
  + Lara Ettenson, Natural Resources Defense Council: The intent is to be synergistic and holistically consider the attribution of energy savings. We have time to continue the budget conversation.
* C. Best: What about synergies with IRP process and capturing the load and carbon impacts of MT?  
  + L. Ettenson: The MTWG’s principles, guidelines, and strategies address carbon; and carbon impacts would need to be integrated into the market transformation initiative metrics that are ultimately established. The relationship with the IRP is still unknown, and we don’t have a clear sense of the venues where this will be resolved.

***Third Party Solicitations Update – Aimee Wong, Southern California Edison***This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *Session 3- 3rd Party Implementation Update 2-22-19*).

Key Discussion Points:

* A. Haubenstock: Have the IOUs considered coordinating their request for proposal (RFP) deadlines? There is concern that bidder responses are being dampened because the market cannot respond to multiple RFPs all at one time.  
  + E. Brooks: We are trying to coordinate schedules while also managing our 2019 and 2020 compliance deadlines.
  + L. Ettenson: The Procurement Review Group (PRG) is mindful of this issue and will continue to raise it.
  + Rebecca (“Beckie”) Menton, Center for Sustainable Energy: The IOUs should aim to align RFPs by sector. Additionally, the timeline should allow for at least 30-45 days for bidders to respond to RFPs.
* Sam Appel, BlueGreen Alliance: The “Update of EE 3P Solicitation Timeline” could be made more transparent by adding more detailed date information where possible, even if those dates are in flux. This information would also be helpful for the PRG.
* A. Haubenstock: We need more feedback on how the Request for Abstract (RFA) stage is going so that RFA stages moving forward can be more fruitful. For example, we need information on how the process has gone thus far, what has and has not work, what info the IOUs seek, and what could be improved.  
  + L. Ettenson: The PRG should talk about this.
  + Erica Keating, Southern California Edison: The Independent Evaluator’s report will provide aggregated information in response to some of these questions. Bidders can also request a meeting to receive feedback on their proposals, though the information that can be provided in these meetings may be limited.

**Session 4: CAEECC Planning**

***Section 4: CAEECC Planning – J. Raab***

This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *Session 4-CAEECC Planning 2-22-19*).

***Decision 18-10-008 October 11, 2018 (Issued 10/22/18) – J. Raab***

This document is available on the CAEECC website (see link above, *CAEECC Future Workforce Issues 2-21-19*).

Key Discussion Points on the Topics for the June CAEECC meeting:

The CAEECC agreed with the identified topics and suggested the following potential additions:

* Michael Campbell, Public Advocates Office: A discussion about the Business Plans and what the new Business Plan cycle and application will entail.
* R. Menton: Cost-effectiveness.  
  + L. Ettenson: While I agree with Beckie, we have received clear guidance from the CPUC not to address topics outside of CAEECC’s scope.

Key Discussion Points on the Structure of the August CAEECC Meeting on the ABALs:

* E. Brooks: The “Option 2” format is really the same as the “Option 1” format as it would be challenging to talk about cost-effectiveness results in isolation from the entire Portfolio.
* Laurel Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: An “Option 2” format that compares PAs sector-by-sector, side-by-side would interesting. Cost-effectiveness could be addressed separately.
* J. Raab: A decision on the meeting structure for the August CAEECC ABAL meeting will not be made today. We will discuss the meeting structure further at the June CAEECC meeting.

Key Discussion Points on the Potential Approach/Timing for Addressing CAEECC Disadvantaged Workers/Workforce Standards per D.18-10-008.

* J. Raab reviewed D.18-10-008 and the CPUC’s directive for the CAEECC to initiate a stakeholder process no later than July 1, 2020, to discuss and vet the potential for further application of the workforce standards. He requested input on when the process should be initiated and any issues that that should be covered.   
  + S. Appel: This conversation should take place after we have sufficient third-party RFPs to review.
  + L. Ettenson: I agree. This would allow us to evaluate if the RFPs are working as the full CAEECC intended and to recommend modifications if necessary.
  + Bernie Kotlier, Coalition for Energy Efficiency: I agree with Sam and Lara. Delay is not appropriate, and these issues have been dragging for decades. We should advance the conversation as soon as possible.
  + The CAEECC agreed to begin addressing these topics at its December 2019 meeting and to begin the work group process in late winter 2019/spring 2020. This timing would allow for sufficient review of the third-party RFPs. However, if a sufficient number of RFPs are available for review by June 2019, a meeting should be considered for that month.
* L. Ettenson: At the last CAEECC meeting the BlueGreen Alliance raised a question about whether or not third-parties know how to comply with the requirement to develop Disadvantaged Work Plans or if the IOUs know how to establish criteria to evaluate these Plans. Should CAEECC or another entity convene a process to provide guidance on this matter?  
  + S. Appel:The modifiable contractor term decision did not provide benchmarks or hard figures on the number of disadvantaged workers that need to be hired under a Disadvantaged Work Plan or any guidance on what constitutes a quality Plan. We need to convene experts to identify and disseminate best practices as soon as possible, especially given the timeline of the third-party solicitation process.
  + L. Ettenson: The CAEECC would need to get approval from the CPUC to take on this issue. If we get approval, then Sam and I suggest that two workshops be held. These workshops could be similar to the DEER Peak Workshops held in April 2018.
  + Jordan Christensen, CPUC: The CPUC’s decision only required CAEECC to speak on workforce standards. This issue would be a separate topic for CAEECC to take on and would require CPUC approval.
  + Subject to CPUC approval, the CAEECC agreed it would be appropriate to take-on this topic. If the CAEECC does not take this issue on, it was noted that another entity should.

Election of the CAEECC Co-Chairs

* The CAEECC unanimously agreed to re-elect L. Ettenson and E. Brooks as co-chairs.
* Elizabeth Gomez, Southern California Gas Company and E. Brook’s alternate, will serve as co-chair during E. Brooks’ maternity leave (from May through the summer).

**Next Steps**

* CAEECC Members:  
  + Fill out post-CAEECC meeting #20 evaluation survey by close of business (COB) on Tuesday March 3rd.
  + Review/comment on this meeting summary by Wednesday March 13th
  + Participate in evaluation interviews with CAEECC facilitators (March/April).
  + Provide additional feedback and uses cases to A. LaBonte.
* Facilitation Team:   
  + Develop CAEECC #20 Draft Meeting Summary (this document) for member review and finalization by Thursday, March 7th, 2019.
  + Hold evaluation interviews with each CAEECC Member in March/April.
* Co-Chairs/Facilitation Team:
  + Discuss the meeting structure for the August CAEECC ABAL meeting at the June CAEECC meeting.
  + Discuss w/ED whether any CAEECC follow-up activities on Data/Intellectual property is desired, and if so in what form and timeline.
  + Discuss w/ED whether any CAEECC follow-up activities on Disadvantaged Workers is desired, and if so in what form and timeline.
  + Tentatively schedule a discussion on Workforce Standards at the December 2019 CAEECC meeting and schedule the Work Group process to begin in late winter 2019/spring 2020. Schedule the discussion to begin in June 2019, if a sufficient number of RFPs are available to review.
* Program Administrators:  
  + Could develop a list that outlines what data can be made available and the process by which that data can be requested by third-parties and local governments.

**Appendix A: In-Person and Webinar Participation**

*Note: The list of attendees joining in person reflect actual participation as captured via a sign in sheet circulated during the meeting; the list of attendees joining via webinar reflect registration only. If individuals participated in the webinar but did not register, or registered but did not participate in the webinar, these last-minute changes are not reflected here.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Designated Member/Proxy on the CAEECC Attending in Person** | | |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| Calctp | Doug | Avery |
| CEDMC | Arthur | Haubenstock |
| CEE | Bernie | Kotlier |
| Center for Sustainable Energy | Stephen | Gunther |
| CodeCycle | Dan | Suyeyasu |
| County of Contra Costa / LGSEC Proxy | Demian | Hardman |
| JCEEP | David | Dias |
| MCE | Alice | Stover |
| NRDC | Lara | Ettenson |
| PG&E | Ryan | Chan |
| Public Advocates Office | Michael | Campbell |
| SCE | Aimee | Wong |
| SDG&E | Athena | Besa |
| SoCalGas | Erin | Brooks |
| SoCalGas | Elizabeth | Gomez |
| SoCalREN | Lujuana | Medina |
| The Energy Coalition | Marc | Costa |
| The Energy Coalition | Laurel | Rothschild |
|  | | |
| **CPUC Members Attending in Person** | | |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| CPUC | Jordan | Christenson |
| CPUC | Alison | LaBonte |
| CPUC | Christina | Torok |
|  | | |
| **From a CAEECC Member Organization but not a Designated Member or Proxy – Attending in Person** | | |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| SCE | Erica | Keating |
| **Designated Member/Proxy on the CAEECC – Participating Remotely** | | |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| 3C-REN/County of Ventura | Alejandra | Tellez |
| California Energy Commission | Michael | Kenney |
| Center for Sustainable Energy | Rebecca | Menton |
| Lincus | Cody | Coeckelenbergh |
| Redwood Coast Energy Authority | Lou | Jacobson |
| SCE | Matt | Evans |
| SJVCEO | Courtney | Kalashian |
| Small Business Utility Advocates | Ivan | Jimenez |
| WHPA Inc. | Elsia | Galawish |
|  | | |
| **CPUC Staff - Participating Remotely** | | |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| CPUC | Agatha | Wein |
|  |  |  |
| **From a CAEECC Member Organization (but not a Designated Member/Proxy) - Participating Remotely** | | |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| CA Energy Commission | Sara | Moore |
| County of Ventura | Leigh | Walker |
| SCE | Jose | Buendia |
| SCE | Jesse | Feinberg |
| SCE | Cody | Taylor |
| Southern CA Edison | Larry | Tabizon |
| The Energy Coalition | Pei-Chi | Chou |
| The Energy Coalition | Chris | Ford |
| **Other Participant/Stakeholder (but not from a CAEECC Member Organization or CPUC) – Attending in Person** | | |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| CAEECC Facilitator | Ellen | Zuckerman |
| Navigant | Kristin | Landry |
| OpenEE | Carmen | Best |
| Oracle | Charlie | Buck |
| Raab Associates | Jonathan | Raab |
| Strategic Energy Innovatoions | Lauren | Azzola |

**Appendix B – Data/Intellectual Property**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Use Cases** | **Value Proposition** | **Program Data/ Intellectual Property** | **Customer Usage Data** | **Source of Data** | **Aggregation/ Anonymization** | **Barriers** |
| # of Streetlights |  |  |  |  | By zip code |  |
| Third Party Bidding | Better program proprosals; making data available from 3P |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Performance | Better peformance, project design improvements |  |  |  |  |  |
| Customer Procurement Planning |  | Historical Participation Data |  |  |  |  |
| Customer Behavior/Technology Acceptance | Accelerating technology acceptance and behavior change |  |  |  |  |  |
| Climate Action Planning |  | # projects completed by year by sector |  |  |  |  |
| All Use Cases |  |  |  |  |  | Data sharing Platform |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes:  Critical to define uses and data request should be targetd and only what's necessary  Large customer Energy Star data supposed to be disclosed (but utility isn't responsible for enforcing).  Customer Privacy Act, individuals can opt out of having their data exposed.  Distinguish between data collecting vs. data producing  Certain data sharing requirements could have chilling effect on some implementers participation  Include academics in discussions around data sharing  Evaluate on contracting process, on case by case  IOUs could provide list of data already available, and how to request  Already Energy Use Data Advisory Group (might be better place to have that discussion); but other data not part of that process  What information should be provided on pre-bid basis to inform bids vs. post-bid; performance data/metrics on programs expected | | | | | | |