CAEECC-Hosted EE Filing Process Working Group

Meeting 1 of 2 with Energy Division

October 30th, 2020, 1:30-4:00

WebEx-Based Meeting

Draft Meeting Summary

Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab & Katie Abrams

On October 30, 2020 the CAEECC hosted the first of two meetings with ED some of its recommendations to better understand how to implement them, such that they can better advise the Commission on the WG’s proposal.

Thirty-nine MTWG Members (including Leads, Proxies and Ex Officio) participated in the meeting as panelists. Approximately 8 additional members of the public participated as attendees. A full list of meeting registrants is provided in Appendix A.

Meeting materials are provided on the CAEECC website at: <https://www.caeecc.org/10-30-20-ee-filings-process-wg>

# Meeting Purpose

J. Kalafut from the Energy Division provided an overview of the meeting purpose, excerpted below is slide 3 of her presentation:

* Informally discuss four key policy topics with stakeholders.
  + Questions and responses at the CAEECC meeting will be for discussion purposes only.
  + This meeting will NOT be for purposes of official record building on the CAEECC proposal in the EE proceeding.
* Energy Division is not looking for new consensus proposals on the topics below.
* Gain a deeper understanding of how to operationalize the proposal to achieve the desired outcomes of the CPUC, program administrators and stakeholders.
* Help Energy Division staff make an informed recommendation to CPUC decision makers.
* Parallel to this process we are considering changes related to Potential and Goals and Cost-Effectiveness.
* The resolution of these two separate but related processes will lead to a guidance decision that will inform the upcoming Business Plan applications.
* We look forward to the discussions today and November 9th.

She explained that the Commission has asked stakeholders to weigh in on alternative metrics to kilowatt hours, kilowatts and therms. For example, the Commission has asked if greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be a more appropriate metric – given the state of the grid and the state’s ultimate [GHG reduction] goals. A GHG metric could provide a better target, not just to achieve energy savings, but to achieve the right type of energy savings.

She also mentioned that the Commission has asked some questions around how the portfolio should be segmented into different buckets – for example, programs that have the primary purpose of achieving energy savings, and equity programs that serve disadvantaged communities. The Commission will be evaluating how these buckets address some of these costs-effectiveness issues about the Resource Acquisition (RA) programs, and whether it’s appropriate for RA programs to bear the brunt of CE for all types of programs.

She explained that staff is working to marry all of these issues in Potential and Goals and Cost-Effectiveness, and present an informed recommendation to CPUC decision makers, who will issue a guidance decision informing the upcoming Business Plan applications.

The slides are available on the meeting webpage (see link above, *ED Slides EE filing process 10.30.20 v3,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting).

# Agenda Review

J. Raab provided an overview of the agenda, facilitation ground rules, and WebEx logistics. He explained that there are three topics to cover in today’s meeting: zero-based budgeting and testimony, mid-cycle oversight, and planning for the November 9th follow-on meeting.

# Topic 1: Application Review: Zero-Based Budgeting & Testimony

In this section, the text in bold indicates questions and background provided by the CPUC to WG Members in advance of the meeting. CAEECC responses are provided in italics.

Before the meeting, the CPUC summarized the relevant section of the CAEECC proposal as follows

* ***“Program Administrators will justify the reasonableness of budgets, savings and cost effectiveness forecasts through detailed showings for current and proposed expenditures and zero-based budgeting exercises…” (p. 8)***
* **The proposal implies that this applies to two costs: program implementation costs (including third party implementer costs) and portfolio administration costs. (p.8)**

The CPUC provided the WG members with two sub-topics:

1. **Step-by-step process for the zero-based budgeting**
2. **Demonstrating the reasonableness of forecasts**

**CAEECC response to ED questions:**

*M. Campbell from Cal Advocates began by thanking ED for convening the discussion, and noted the uniqueness of a consensus proposal on a complex and potentially controversial topic, stemming from many discussions among stakeholders.*

## 1) Zero-based budgeting:

**a) Define the step-by-step process for the zero-based budgeting approach?**

*M. Campbell highlighted the need for PAs to present a just and reasonable basis for what is approved and put into rates. He explained that the Annual Budget Advice Letter (ABAL) currently is what establishes rates, but that process is not well-suited to the detailed evaluations of reasonableness that is needed to perform that function. He noted the proposed process is what is typical for Commission-approved programs, and is not controversial (has support of all relevant parties)*

**b) Are all programs / activities included (resource, non-resource, ESA, market transformation, etc.)?**

*M. Campbell explained that the CAEECC proposal is to include all activities within the Energy Efficiency application, which would include any non-resource programs that are part of the application. It would not include ESA or Market Transformation since both have separate applications. He explained that even if activities are funded through the same balancing account, there are times when the commission can authorize additional things to go into a balancing account or that type of thing for how that rate recovery would work.*

**c) For the included programs, how are the following categories of costs accounted for: labor, non-labor, capital, contract, admin, implementation, marketing, and sector-by-sector costs?**

*M. Campbell: CAEECC is not proposing modifications to pre-existing cost categories for PAs. Likewise, CAEECC is not proposing to further break down 3P implementer costs into sub-components; all 3P costs would be “implementation”. Implementers would not charge administrative costs, but PAs would show associated management costs of the 3P program as “administration”. CAEECC proposes working with the Commission on adapting tables/templates regarding appropriate levels of aggregation of costs.*

**d) Would the zero-based budgeting process apply to equipment / rebate / incentive costs?**

*M. Campbell: Yes, for programs managed by PAs, zero-based budgeting would apply to equipment, rebates, and incentive costs. As is currently the process, PAs would file an application showing how component costs add up. For third party (3P) programs, the cost justification would continue to be handled through the solicitation process. Again, as is currently the process, third parties must justify why the costs are reasonable, and the competitive solicitation process itself is price discovery process.*

## 2)How will testimony and exhibits demonstrate the reasonableness of forecasts considering historical performance, realization rates, impact evaluation adjustments, etc.?

*M. Campbell explained that PAs are responsible for providing sufficient evidence on the appropriateness of assumptions in their testimony and exhibits. Testimony and exhibits are more detailed than ABALs. The current process has no way of cross-examining witnesses to scrutinize facts since Advice Letters are not intended to resolve factual disputes. He provided an example about a PA proposing A widgets that cost B dollars, which will be paid through C mechanism, and which is appropriate based on D calculations. He explained that such a proposal could be reasonably adjudicated by an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ); that this type of thing is ‘bread and butter’ for the Commission.*

J. Raab then opened up the conversation to include questions from ED and additional comments from CAEECC members. Below is a summary of key questions and comments.

**Additional CAEECC Comments:**

* *L. Ettenson: How did ED evaluate applications when applications included implementation plans? Goal is more data to assess at the portfolio level, in a way that could be applied to a GHG or kWh metric.*
* *L. Medina: Counties, RENs, and PAs all want to be transparent in budget; don’t lose sight of shared goal of serving ratepayers efficiently. The justification would be provided in testimony. She noted that costs may look different across PAs, so caution against standardizing to the point of creating market gaps*

**ED followup questions**

* **J. Kalafut: you answered questions about application of the proposal to 3P and IOU programs. With the previous framework, there was a concern staff was too involved in the programs, so moved to 10 year business cycle. How would this proposal ensure that ED doesn’t get too in the weeds again?**
  + *M. Campbell: this issue highlights one of the motivators for moving to 3P, there’s skin in the game for implementers and competition to ensure the best value to ratepayers, unless there is a dispute about a program or cost*
* **A. Labonte: Comparatively-speaking, are there other proceedings that have a similar scale of detailed measure-level review?**
  + *M. Campbell: Commission rules state that the petitioning party has the burden of proof to demonstrate* that their request is reasonable. Interveners will review the request for reasonableness and may provide respond with challenges (i.e. difference of opinions between expert witness).
* **J. Allison: Recognizing that CalPA is very involved with many cases, including similar zero-based budgeting activities, and recognizing that this is very time consuming, do you think they would plat a similar role through this process, or might it be more through an ad hoc intervenor?** 
  + *M.Campbell: GRC applications are voluminous, as are DR, ESA, and SGIP applications. They are all handled in this manner and are bread and butter for us.*
* **P.Gruendling: do you see this requiring more ED staff oversight of program design? If so, staff would need to be more involved in understanding the program design and reasonableness of cost line items.** 
  + *M. Campbell: I cannot speak as ED staff, but my hope would be that this framework would liberate some resources and allow ED to focus on other issues. By having the discussion every four years, there would be time for ED to define your goals for what you want to be engaged in during the periods between applications.*
  + *B. Sanders: The proposal would shift more time and scrutiny up front, but then provide a break (no ABALs) for a few years, with a corrective process in the interim*
* **J. Kalafut: One of the reasons the commission moved towards a 10-year business cycle was to streamline review. How will this proposal ensure we stay out of an overly detailed review process?**
  + *M. Campbell: There’s a few ways the proposal addresses this. First is the move towards 3P implementation, which shifts the burden of delivering savings to the same organization in charge of program design. The 3P framework has a requirement for price discovery and competition for delivering energy savings across sectors. Second, ED could chose to spot check certain elements and periodically raise things with a judge.*
* **N.Strindberg: how much confidence can we have in 4-year portfolios given changes to codes, etc. Also, how will ED and stakeholders know about measure-level reasonableness of things like HVAC installation?**
  + *M.Campbell: The current process doesn’t allow for intervenors to look at many of the details that this new process would make more transparent. The ABAL process is so rushed as an annual process that you do not have the methods or mechanism to ensure there’s faith in the values. CAEECC’s perspective is that annual is too rushed, and anything more than four years starts to run into some of the issues that would require more staff. As for your question about installation costs, costs have be to reasonably justified; the applicant must present a basis for the proposal – be it invoices or some other basis. If intervenors, stakeholders, or the ED did not think it was reasonable then it could be disputed. However, the current process is largely assertions with no real opportunity to evaluate reasonableness.*

# Topic 2: Mid-Cycle Oversight

In this section, the text in bold indicates questions and background provided by the CPUC to WG members in advance of the meeting. CAEECC responses are provided in italics.

Before the meeting, the CPUC summarized the relevant section of the CAEECC proposal as follows

* **Requires that the program administrators file tier 2 advice letter describing corrective actions if the portfolio is not “on-target” to meet their four-year savings goals and/or cost-effectiveness thresholds. (p.**
* **The proposal considers a portfolio “off-target” when a program administrator is unable to demonstrate that they will meet their savings goals by 20% and cost effectiveness by 10%.**
* **Program closures would require an approved tier 2 advice letter. (p. 7)**
* ***“The program administrators’ EE Annual Reports will include sufficient detail on portfolio, sector and program-level annual and cumulative accomplishments and will also present a prospective overview in narrative format the will include future plans to meet and/or exceed their cumulative savings and cost-effectiveness requirements.”* (p. 6)**

The CPUC provided the WG members with three sub-topics:

1. **Cost Effectiveness and Energy Savings Triggers**
2. **Program Closures**
3. **Enhanced Annual Reports**

## Cost Effectiveness and Energy Savings Triggers:

**CAEECC Response to ED questions:**

*C. Malotte, L. Ettenson, and B. Sanders offered to speak to ED’s questions in this section, representing the CAEECC on its consensus-based proposal and presenting to the Energy Division (ED) the responses that the CAEECC developed at a planning meeting October 21st.*

1. **What data source are the triggers be based on, and how will reliability disputes be handled if unverified data is used?**

* *C. Malotte noted that the Annual Reports would be the main vehicle, using CEDARS, monthly, and annual reports. The PAs are obligated to file advice letters or new application for triggers – such as program closure, requesting additional budget, or portfolio not on target. In my view, the annual reports are a really good mechanism for gauging PA performance and expectations going forward. ED can track annual reports against the Cedars monthly, annual and quarterly reports, which will continue as usual.*

1. **If programs are underperforming and stakeholders do not feel remediation efforts proposed by the program administrator are satisfactory, what additional corrective actions will be considered? For example, would it be appropriate to propose adjusting budgets or closing programs based on underperformance triggers? How is the proposed stakeholder review process for trigger-based advice letters different than the current ABAL process?**
   * *B. Sanders: Before answering the question, I’d like to describe the process that would get us to this point to make sure we are all starting from the same foundation. First there would be an annual report, opportunity to identify challenges, propose solutions, report back, and reassess. If this anticipated approach does not yield successful corrective solutions then yes it could be appropriate to adjust budgets or close programs. The main differences from the ABAL process are: 1) The proposed process allows meaningful stakeholder engagement before reaching the point of submitting the ABAL, 2) the proposed process is focused only on the program with issues, 3) it allows for greater timeliness.*
2. **Would Energy Division or the CPUC be responsible for ensuring that the actions proposed by the program administrator to correct deficiencies are undertaken? If so, how?** 
   * *B. Sanders: CAEECC continues to support the existing regulatory role where ED/CPUC would approve corrective action (application and Tier 2 ALs) and then be responsible for ensuring implementation according to the approval parameters. Put simply, ED would still remain the backstop on major implementation problems in the same ED would still remain the backstop on major implementation problems in the same function they play today. How Energy Division does that depends on what guidance is provided to the PAs through dispositions or decisions. In addition, the PA role is to be the one to propose appropriate corrective action and then is responsible for implementation that is in accordance with ED or the Commission’s direction. The stakeholder and CAEECC role is to stay engaged on implementation, in concert with ED. Specifically, stakeholders would continue to play a “watch dog” function and the CAEECC would continue to provide open and transparent opportunities to engage on implementation issues.*

**ED Followup Questions**

* + **J. Kalafut: Did the proposal specify the exact criteria PAs would be measured against in the annual report?**
    - *C. Malotte read from the proposal: “on target is defined as PAs reasonably able to demonstrate its ability to meet savings goals plus or minus 20% and cost-effectiveness plus or minus 10% by the end of the four years”*
  + **J. Kalafut: Business Plans track sector level metrics, which are more market-based indicators of how well PAs are penetrating sectors or types of customers. Is that the type of performance indicators and criteria CAEECC envisions here?**
    - *C. Malotte: In my view, metrics are about tracking sectors. Triggers show when the train has left the track. There will be a robust stakeholder process for the enhanced annual reports, including presenting at CAEECC for stakeholders to comment*
  + **N. Strindberg: You mentioned Tier 2 AL and Application could be triggered. Can you explain that?**
    - *C. Malotte: To clarify, CAEECC’s proposal anticipates using an AL for remediation, but if it’s too off track then a new Application may need to be filed*
  + **J. Allison: If in year 2 cost-effectiveness is half of its expectation, would that be a trigger? Are triggers based on projections or current portfolio? Quarterly reports sometimes show a program is falling behind, but the hope is to get on track in Q4; if we keep waiting for next quarter, a program could be behind for a year or longer.**
    - *B. Sanders: Issues should be addressed through the annual report, with additional opportunities to engage through the quarterly and monthly report if things veer off track a little bit. That’s what the CAEECC stakeholder process is for – presenting current progress, soliciting advice from others, and getting the portfolio back on track. If that doesn’t work, there are stronger remediation actions.*
  + **A. Labonte: Please explain how the stakeholder process is different between ABALs and the proposal**
    - *L. Ettenson: First, the current process with ABALs had a tight timeline between having data and presenting it; it didn’t provide adequate data for brainstorming solutions. Second, the proposal includes more focused opportunities for stakeholder engagement on specific programs.*
  + **A. Labonte: How is the enhanced annual report different from the ABAL?**
    - *C. Malotte read from section 4.3 of the proposal: “PAs’ EE Annual Reports, submitted every May,2 will include sufficient detail on portfolio, sector and program‐level annual and cumulative accomplishments, including data on savings, budget, C/E, and other approved metrics to ensure accountability and public input on the progress of portfolio performance. The Annual Report will also present a prospective overview in narrative format that will include future plans to meet and/or exceed the cumulative four‐year energy savings goals and the fouryear C/E requirement, and other CPUC approved REN‐specific energy savings targets and non‐energy related metrics. The prospective overview will include any program adaptations, additional solicitations, or other strategies that may be necessary to help ensure attainment of the four‐year energy savings goals and the portfolio C/E requirement.*

*“As described in Reporting Requirements (see Section 7.0), the existing CEDARS and Annual Report submissions would be the primary tools with which the PAs would report their progress and accomplishments to the CPUC and stakeholders. In addition to the existing Annual Reporting requirements, each PA will post its Annual Report on the CAEECC website and provide semi‐annual datadriven updates on EE portfolio progress at the CAEECC, including (1) a high‐level overview of its Annual Report near the time that it is filed, and (2) an update on progress approximately 6 months after the filing (see Section 8.0).”*

* + - *L. Ettenson referred ED to section 8.3 of the proposal, on stakeholder engagement related to portfolio implementation. She summarized that the intent was to have meaningful presentations, performance metrics, indicators, etc to evaluate how portfolio is working. By identifying precursors that would require a trigger, there could be an earlier course correction. ED, stakeholders, and intervenors always have the opportunity to raise issues. NRDC in particular values the stakeholder process because it believes that dialogue enables the strongest strategy and implementation. The goal is to resolve issues before engaging in a litigious process.*
  + **J. Kalafut: For the stakeholder process, what is the proposed timeline? Currently we receive draft ABALs a month ahead, then there’s a workshop if they’re off track.**
    - *L. Ettenson: To clarify, the ABAL process doesn’t provide adequate time for stakeholder engagement. The CAEECC proposal would be for a Q2 annual report to start the review process. CAEECC would then identify issues and brainstorm solutions and present at the Q3 CAEECC meeting. In Q4, we would check in on whether the program has course corrected, or if a trigger is needed.*
  + **J. Kalafut: How would we know if a trigger is met? Is that a consensus decision?**
    - *C. Malotte: IOUs would be responsible for filing trigger*
    - *L. Ettenson: The process would reveal early indicators before triggers occur based on the quarterly CAEECC process. The hope is to avoid the need for many course corrections by doing due diligence in the application process.*
    - *C. Malotte: Programmatic tweaks are within a PA’s authority such as emphasizing one measure over another, whereas policy changes require more lead time*
  + **J. Kalafut: What corrective actions could be taken?**
    - *B. Sanders: The same types of corrective actions that a PA has today using ABALs would apply: using stakeholder feedback to determine if the corrective action is to change budget, go after market gaps, or fund shift or close programs if necessary. Specific milestones would provide opportunities for monitoring along the way.*
    - *L. Ettenson: To reiterate, the proposal does not suggest changes to ED’s regulatory authority with respect to budget oversight.*
  + **J. Kalafut: Do you envision that new programs can come online or corrective actions can be taken at any point in the four-year cycle, or does that always trigger a new application?** 
    - *C. Malotte: We didn’t formally discuss this, but my understanding is that if we follow the same requirements where program closure requires a Tier 2 AL, whereas adding a program that’s longer than five years or greater than $3M I think would also require an AL. This is the current process.*
    - *L. Ettenson: I anticipate the 3P process would be continuous rejuvenation of programs as needed regardless of the cycle.*

## Program Closures

**CAEECC Response to ED Question:**

**What is the standard level of review by Energy Division that is appropriate for advice letters from the program administrators to request the approval of a program closure(s)? What criteria should be used for this review?**

* *J. Raab summarized that CAEECC didn’t propose any changes to the program closure process; or discuss new criteria, but that CAEECC is open to a discussion if requested by ED.*

**ED followup questions**

* **N. Strindberg: Have you thought about whether you would batch program closure AL, or submit them anytime during the cycle?**
  + *C. Malotte: CAEECC has not discussed this, but the reason we’ve used ABALs is to look comprehensively across portfolio. We could work with ED to decide if it’s more appropriate to batch or individually.*
* **N. Strindberg: Does implementer community have a preference between standalone or batched Advice Letters?**
  + *L. Morris: On the one hand, batching them condenses the good or bad news. On the other hand, individual ALs allows for more real-time monitoring of progress, which is good in theory, but hasn’t worked out. Bundling could create negative implications; for example, if there’s a critical need to close a program. I would advise against setting hard rules.*
* **A. Labonte: Question of timing is important because if a program is closed, it opens an opportunity for another sector, PA or 3P to go after that opening. Has the proposal contemplated how to fill gaps, and whether batched or individual would work better to fill gaps? Do Joint Cooperation Memorandums (JCMs) go away entirely?**
  + *L. Ettenson: I don’t think we proposed JCMs go away*
  + *L. Morris: I recall proposing JCMs continue because that coordination annually adds value. The Working Group didn’t discuss this in detail, perhaps because it’s working well now, but there’s an open question on what the impacts might be as we move to more 3P programs.*
  + *B. Sanders: PAs need flexibility to close programs; if batching or specific timing is required it could have negative consequences.*
  + *J. Berg: The hope is that the proposal would allow PAs to foresee issues before getting to the point of needing to close a program.*
* **J. Kalafut: Program closure is often a contentious process. In the Business Plans, we clearly stated that ED will not be involved in opening and closing programs. ED sets metrics and PAs take steps to meet them. However, the proposal asks ED to engage in program closures. Without review criteria, ED will be challenged to objectively evaluate the advice letter and be consistent in it its evaluation of program closure. This point is concerning and may pose implementation challenges to ED.** 
  + *J. Raab explained that the Working Group (WG) did not discuss criteria, so any views expressed here would be unvarnished and not necessarily representative of the full WG.*
  + *There was additional discussion and a recommendation to take further discussion on this topic offline. N. Strindberg suggested considering a biannual and then annual meeting to review any program closures.*

## Enhanced Annual Reports:

**CAEECC Response to ED Question:**

1. **How would the CAEECC proposal for “enhanced” annual reports differ substantially from the current annual reports in substance?** 
   * *C. Malotte: Annual reports look at previous year, whereas Enhanced Annual Reports are forward looking. This was covered earlier in the discussion.*
2. **What kind of stakeholder review is performed on the annual reports? Is there a process envisioned for stakeholders to provide formal feedback on annual reports (besides the semi-annual updates at CAEECC)?** 
   * *L. Ettenson: Page 7 delineates the process. The goal is to balance stability for PAs and implementers with the need to review periodically. The main focus is if things get very off-track. This was covered in detail earlier in the discussion.*

[Note: Additional CAEECCC responses to Enhanced Annual Reports can be found above in response to ED questions in sections 4 (Portfolio Review and Oversight) and 7 (Reporting Requirements).

**ED followup question**

* **P. Gruendling: How will ED use the enhanced annual report in decision making mid cycle? What is the process for getting to a design and process that makes the enhanced annual report the central role? What exactly will the report look like? What will the stakeholder process look like?**
  + - *C. Malotte: CAEECC has not gone to the level of detail of discussing specific tables or a template. At a high level, CAEECC is proposing the enhanced annual report be similar to the existing annual report in its historical components, and forward looking on budget, savings and cost-effectiveness. As for the process: PAs would submit it to CAEECC to be reviewed in the stakeholder engagement workshop; don’t see need for formal commission approval - though ED could file a resolution or take another appropriate action.*

# Next Steps

J. Raab summarized that there is a second planning meeting on Monday 11/2 to discuss the 3rd and 4th topics submitted by ED (technical inputs and 2021 implementation). P. Gruendling and N. Strindberg offered to send additional questions by COB today or early Monday.

J. Raab asked if the discussion was useful. J. Kalafut said she would like to have all the questions in front of her so she doesn’t jump ahead, but found the discussion around the application review process, budgeting, and mid cycle changes particularly useful. J. Raab asked for additional feedback, and hearing none, requested ED and WG members email him with any additional feedback.
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