**CAEECC-Hosted EE Filing Process Working Group Meeting**

**Part 1 of 2**

**October 30th, 2020 -- 12:30-3:00**

**Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab & Katie Abrams**

**Background/Purpose:**

The Energy Division (ED) has requested CAEECC’s EE Filing Process Working Group discuss with ED some of its recommendations. Specifically, ED hopes to better understand how to practically implement these recommendations, such that they can better advise the Commission on the WG’s proposal. For reference, EE Filing Process Working Group documents can be found on the [EE Filing WG page](https://www.caeecc.org/ee-portfolio-filing-process-working). A second meeting will be held with ED on November 9th, 2020.

**Key Considerations/Caveats:**

* Questions and responses at this 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.

| **Time** | **Topic** | **ED’s Question to Address** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 12:30 – 12:45 pm | **Purpose/Goals for Meeting &**  **Agenda Review/Webex Protocols** | Energy Division (Jennifer Kalafut) &  Facilitation Team (Jonathan Raab) |
| 12:45 – 1:20 pm | **Application Review: Zero-Based Budgeting & Testimony** | Step-by-step process for the zero-based budgeting   * Define the step-by-step process for the zero-based budgeting approach? * Are all programs / activities included (resource, non-resource, ESA, market transformation, etc.)? * 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? * Would the zero-based budgeting process apply to equipment / rebate / incentive costs?   Demonstrating the reasonableness of forecasts   * How will testimony and exhibits demonstrate the reasonableness of forecasts considering historical performance, realization rates, impact evaluation adjustments, etc.? |
| 1:20 – 2:50 pm | **Mid-Cycle Oversight** | Cost Effectiveness and Energy Savings Triggers:   * What data source are the triggers be based on, and how will reliability disputes be handled if unverified data is used? * 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? * 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?   Program Closures:   * 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?   Enhanced Annual Reports:   * + - How would the CAEECC proposal for “enhanced” annual reports differ substantially from the current annual reports in substance?     - 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)? |
| 2:50 – 3:00 pm | **Wrap Up & Next Steps** | Debrief on how meeting went focusing on any improvements for the 11/9 meeting  Delineate next steps |