

2010-2012 Reporting Summary Notes from Day 1

Topic	Utility Position	Position I represented at meeting	Notes/Next Steps
<p>Current Reporting Requirements Overview: (A) Monthly and Quarterly, (B) Accounting reporting (C) Annual Reporting</p>	<p>(A) Reducing quarterly tracking is the best way to save admin costs (B) Would like to not have to submit these, although they have good information (C) None</p>	<p>(A) I'm willing to streamline processes (B) Since these are authorized by decision D.01-11-066, they should continue unless told otherwise (C) Annual Report and Reporting Requirements Manual 4 continues since this is authorized by ALJ Ruling</p>	
<p>Streamlined data submittals: rather than having four sources of data, ED wants one source of data</p>	<p>Historically, the utilities have submitted their own reports and numbers. This process puts the number creation in the hands of ED and the utils will not stand by those numbers.</p>	<p>The data will be the utility submitted data, that will be processed through the utility E3, and will pass validation tests defined by utilities and ED, so the numbers should be exactly the same. If there is a reconciliation process that is needed to allow the utilities to stand by this process, that is fine with me. I constantly repeated "I do not want multiple sources of numbers floating around so everything between utility and EEGA must match."</p>	
<p>PIPs and Narratives: (A) How to track changes to PIPs over three years, (B) Usefulness of quarterly narratives</p>	<p>(A) Redlining PIPs would be burdensome. Better to have addenda or attachments that are posted to EEGA that highlight changes. Need to define what "triggers" are used to post addenda (B) Would like to remove quarterly narrative requirement all together. The new PIPs update process would address some of</p>	<p>(A) I represented that the current use of PIPs does not work because over time programs change, and someone who reads a PIP in 2011, must be able to know what has changed. We listed a few "triggers": Eligibility rules, Incentive levels, Fund shifts, Budget changes, Changes</p>	<p>(A) Redacted will find out from Planning Team or Statewide team if there are other "triggers" that warrant these addenda to the PIPs that should be posted on EEGA. (B) I need to know from Planning if there is strong opinion to keep a quarterly narrative.</p>

2010-2012 Reporting Summary Notes from Day 1

	<p>the updates in the current narrative structure. The main question from SCE (Don) is who reads this. Even if EEGA auto-generates narrative reports, SCE says they will still need to verify and QC the report</p>	<p>Program logic models, if program proposed to be eliminated.</p> <p>(B) I said there is interest internally to keep the quarterly narratives. I represented that I am interested in creating a function that auto-generates summary text reports for interested parties (SCE pushed back, just for the sake of pushing back, in my opinion).</p>	
<p>Standardized Tables of Commonly Referenced Information: (A) Goals, (B) CPUC Contacts (C) IOU contacts (D) Program ID</p>	<p>(C) Utils would like both the regulatory contact and the program manager name so ED contacts both folks at the same time</p> <p>(D) PGE, SCE, and Sempra all have different program numbering conventions</p>	<p>(A) The idea is that whatever the goals are for 2010-2012, they are housed centrally on a table in EEGA so the numbers aren't manually entered all the time by anyone</p> <p>(B) I offered to have our names and emails and work topics (who is working on commercial, residential for both evaluation and planning) on EEGA so the utilities will always know who the proper contacts are</p> <p>(C) So we don't have to request this via data request that is hard to find, our teams can go on EEGA and always find the current IOU contact list</p> <p>(D) Whatever the numbering convention, this way there is</p>	<p>A – Jeorge can start putting together tables</p> <p>B – Jeorge can start putting together table of contacts</p> <p>C – Utilities can start putting together tables of contacts, after Jeorge creates template for utilities</p> <p>D – Jeorge can start putting this together using the placement tables</p>

2010-2012 Reporting Summary Notes from Day 1

		a central table on EEGA where we all can lookup the program number and name in one central place	
PPM: Defining what the annual table looks like per D.09-09-047	Premature to discuss since AL just filed. They also said the planning team has multiple formats and were not sure which format to use.		We can start discussing the Annual PPM template in the fall
Reporting Costs: (A) admin cost /general cost reporting (B) ARRA cost (C) iDSM tracking (D) Having one source cost tabl (E) Non-resource cost (F) Fund Shifting 90-day requirements	<p>(A) They all say the “placemat” was agreed on with staff (not me) to be only used for planning purposes. Reporting at this level is too detail. If ED wants to be able to track the various “caps”, e.g., 10% of admin, the current quarterly cost structure is a good format. Also Anne Premo’s definition of costs is what they are using and the “Allowable Cost” from the 2006 ruling is out of date.</p> <p>(B) Do utilities ask on any application if customer received some ARRA funds: PGE – Yes, only on LGP forms and only one question. SCE, SDGE, and SCG do not ask this question. Utilities think this is better answered through an EMV study. Adding questions on forms adds cost.</p> <p>(C) Utilities have this information</p> <p>(D) Two cost tables are needed: one for cost effectiveness and one for cap tracking</p>	<p>(A) I didn’t know what guidance was giving, but I did say the expenditure reporting the last cycle was not good enough for my management and interested parties, so there has to be a middle ground, if the placemat is one extreme and the current quarterly report is another extreme. I also said repeatedly this discussion went nowhere so I moved on to other topics.</p> <p>(B) I acknowledged there are two options: EMV or add question to current forms before programs really roll out. The fact that PGE does this shows it’s possible.</p> <p>(C) Not a whole lot of pushback, but need guidance from Lisa and Jen Caron from iDSM on how costs are tracked between EE and DR</p> <p>(D) I still want to make sure</p>	<p>(A) Redacted needs clarification from management: Is the cap at the portfolio level or the sub-program level?</p> <p>(B) SCE (Laura Kimes) will follow up with DOE to see if the ARRA reporting requirements are finalized.</p> <p>(C) Redacted follow up with Lisa and Jenn Caron</p> <p>(D) George will work with Redacted to get clarification from management: what are the cost reporting needs. Clarification: At minimum this has to be at the sub-program level. In other words, not at the 12 Statewide program level. There must be the sub-programs of the statewide program. Then each local program has to be broken out and each third party has to be broken out. This is</p>

2010-2012 Reporting Summary Notes from Day 1

	<p>Tracking costs for no-resource programs like Emerging Tech is not impossible, it just adds costs and is somewhat manual</p> <p>(F) Need more clarification. PGE interprets fundshifting at 1 of the 12 + LGP levels not at the subprogram level. See next steps. But they proposed good ideas for what the 90-day report tracking should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Budget you start with •Donor program (Program A) •How much (\$15 million) and when it came in •Receiving program and how much and when they got it •Need of program that caused these shift •Did you have to submit an AL? What AL # •If under 15% or below per year does not require AL. •Any shifts at total level and sub-program •Is threshold at the program or sub-program <p>§What template was used to show fund shift for 2009</p>	<p>there aren't two different final numbers, but the utilities say the totals will add up between two tables, just not the number inside the two tables</p> <p>(E) Since this wasn't impossible, I represented that if ED management and Ayat want this, we might require it for ET, but I said I will mention that added costs before thinking of making this a requirement for ALL non-resource programs</p>	<p>consistent with each utility program ID from the program ID list George is creating.</p> <p>(E) Redacted needs clarification from management: what are non-resource cost needs</p> <p>(F) Redacted needs clarification from management: OP 43(e): How do you calculate the 15%? Is it 15% from giving or receiving program? Is it cumulative? If 5% in Jan, 5% in June and 6% in Sept, would you ask for the AL on just the 6% What triggers the AL? What are the categories as it relates to shifting" within and between" from OP43(e): There are 12 SW, Government partnerships are local.</p>
--	---	--	---

2010-2012 Reporting Summary Notes from Day 2

Topic	Utility Pushback ?	Utility Position	Position I represented at meeting	Notes/Next Steps
<p>Defining the Tracking Data: (A) Common Naming Convention (B) SPTdb Data Specification (C) Primary Key (D) Data Validation Tests (E) Minimum Data Requirements</p>	<p>A – B – Little C – Little D – Little E- Little</p>	<p>(A) SCE uses a similar naming convention and thinks the ED should use their tools. Sempra does not think that naming convention is such a difficult thing if it's a concatenation of different coded fields. PGE does not have the infrastructure to do this by 9/1/2010. (B) The data dictionary should have more text describing what each cell means. Also, ED should tell the utilities how to populate these cells, and provide values or codes to populate rather than leave the cell values open for interpretation, and thereby minimizing data entry errors. For example, the "units" field can reference a list of values to select from rather than leaving it open as text. Populating "cost" fields will need rules specifically for direct install. (C) Sempra uses three fields as their primary key → concatenate(EDNumber, SiteNumber, MeasureNumber). PGE and SCE will use a sequential numbering system as it's primary key, similar to Access autogeneration feature. (D) We should all be using the same Zip Code to Climate Zone mapping tables. Test if all fields that should be populated are nonblank. Test truncated values. Test if values are text values or not. (E) Sempra thinking of not collecting annual operating hours going forward. For additional Emerging Technology tracking,</p>	<p>(A) This was just to get the discussion going again. I expect SCE and Sempra to be able to use a useful naming convention come 9/1/10. I don't expect much from PGE but I do want them to think about coming up with something that isn't so arbitrary. I mentioned numerous times I do not want thousands of seemingly random measures names getting reported on 9/1/10. (B) These 61 fields are at minimum what I need to see reported by 9/1/10 (C) Should be part of internal data structure that flows through to reporting. Not just created for reporting to the Commission. (D) The SPT db 2010 team will come up with a definitive list of data validation tests that will be programmed into the system (E) ED wanted to bring these data collecting concepts up in the discussion and will later determine which are collected and therefore which data concepts can be easily provided. If something is not collected then we'll have to decide if it is that important to ask the utilities to start collecting.</p>	<p>(A) Redacted will start up this discussion again (B) Jeorge will have Eric Merkt update the SPT Data Dictionary based on discussion from the meetings and with more descriptive text. (B) Jeorge will start meeting with the SPTdb 2010 team: Darren Hanway (SCE), Lee Loveless/Kris Miller (Sempra), Dave Tam/Bob Ricci (PGE). (C) Jeorge should make sure SPTdb data dictionary clearly defines the primary key field based on this discussion (Sempra has their own method and SCE/PGE will use autogeneration). (D) Christine (PGE) and Lee/Kris (Sempra) will send Jeorge a list of their current data validation tests used (E) Jeorge will issue the spreadsheet discussed at the meeting in the form of a data request to determine which items the utilities collect. Then Jeorge can turn this into a data specification for reporting.</p>

2010-2012 Reporting Summary Notes from Day 2

		the question was asked how far back do you want to go. But all utilities seemed to understand what was being asked of the ET project ID tracking field		
EEGA Online: (A) Data Aggregation (B) EUL Decay (C) Dashboard	A – Some B - None C - None	(A) PGE/Sempra think the aggregation should be at the program sector level: res, com, ind, ag. SCE believes the aggregation should be at the sub-program level (CON: greater cost and burden, more E3s). Different ways to rollup measures: program, sub-program, building type, measure, Peter Lai’s measure group, or roll up all measures by technology like CFL and then roll up by program. (B) This is a reporting issue because utilities want to know on an annual basis, what credit can they take --> Issue #1: any measure in 2006, that is not alive in 2010, 2011, 2012, get 50% of savings: Say EUL was 3.75 years, for the fractional EUL after three years, do we apply the credit to the month? → Issue #2: Installed in 2010 with 90kwh (assuming EUL = 3), then get 45kwh in 2013-2015. QUESTION: What data source to use? (C) Utilities may have some ideas too. Tab idea is better than how EEGA is set up now	(A) As long as we define this as a group, I am happy. We’ll always have the disaggregated level, but it is more transparent if we define how to aggregate together with the SPTdb 2010 team.	(A) [Redacted] get clarification on the level of aggregation desired by the Planning Team. Clarification from Management: See Cost Discussion above (B) Jeorge and [Redacted] to find out which data source to use for 2006-2008 to apply the decay factor to. (C) Jeorge and Wayne to solicit more ideas from utilities EEGA users
Data Request/Response: (A) Data Request (B) Security	A – None B – None	(A) 1. More descriptive EEGAID: Sequence/ProgramID/Year. 2. Should improve categories: 1 st level → Proceeding information,, 2 nd level → 2010, EMV. 3. Improve the “back and forth” discussion capabilities on EEGA. Add field referencing older EEGA numbers. 4. Add		(A) Jeorge and Wayne will work on incorporating all these changes. (A) Jeorge and Wayne will put together a manual once EEGA is live. (B) Jeorge needs to get specific legal language from utilities re: PU Code 583

2010-2012 Reporting Summary Notes from Day 2

		<p>search and sort functions. 5. There should be a manual.</p> <p>(B) 1. If Sandy logs in and does something on EEGA, it still appears as if Beth was the one doing it. For security and audit purposes, EEGA should really be clear who is doing what. So if Sandy is online doing something, EEGA should be able to identify her and know she is the one making a change. 2. There should be a flag to submit responses under PU Code 583 3. Passwords should be automatically updated every 90 days. 3. Talk to Sempra's info protection specialist.</p>		<p>(B) Jeorge will talk to Lee about discussing EEGA with Sempra info protection specialist.</p>
<p>Frequency/Due Dates: (A) Quarterly or Bi-Annually and incremental v. cumulative (B) Installation Date Definition (C) Due dates and other due dates for things on EEGA (D) File Format</p>	<p>A – Strong B – None C – Strong D - None</p>	<p>(A) 1. All utilities prefer reporting inception to date. The use of the primary key will help alleviate any problems in the past about records dropping off. 2. Tracking data with customer information is the largest administrative cost. Reducing this to twice a year would be preferred by the utilities.</p> <p>(B) 1. Paid date and installed date is needed. 2. How utilities define installs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o SCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Get an invoice to pay a contractor or rebate, when that rebate gets the authority from the highest manager, then that is when SCE claims an installation. o January = installed o February = verified o March = got authority to pay 	<p>(A) Everyone in room thought inception to date was the best way to go. So subsequent tracking data will replace previous submittals. This is cumulative through the entire program cycle not just within a year</p> <p>(B) Data spec should know if utilities treat this differently so at least the same information is reported, even if the utilities define this differently. A claim can be consistent in reporting.</p> <p>(C) Unless Natalie Walsh or Peter Lai say other wise, the first submittal is still 9/1/10.</p>	<p>(A) Jeorge needs to find out if Bi-Annual reporting works for our needs.</p> <p>(B) PGE needs to clarify if their description of installation date is correct</p> <p>(B) Jeorge needs to make sure Eric Merkt updates SPT db dictionary appropriately according to these descriptions</p> <p>(D) Jeorge to create a home on EEGA for these report. Anne Premo and planning should just know to tell the utilities to deliver these reports to EEGA, as there will be a place for them.</p>

2010-2012 Reporting Summary Notes from Day 2

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ April = paid○ → Savings claim would show up in March○ PGE<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ January = installed○ February = verified○ June = Paid○ July = check issued○ → Savings claim would show up for July○ Sempra<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Posting date on SAP is most important. There is only one source of info for when they consider a claim.○ Posting date represents when highest authority approves an expense to get paid. Regardless of when the invoice check is actually cut or the customer gets paid.○ Install date is sometimes uncertain because it is reported by the customer○ January = installed○ February = verified○ June = approved for payment (posting date)○ July = check issued○ → savings claim would show up for June <p>(C) Utilities want to push the due date back further past 9/1/10. (D) Central table of due dates on EEGA.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

2010-2012 Reporting Summary Notes from Day 2

		<p>Would like all these report posted on EEGA even if there aren't official reporting requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The utilities shall submit the above Statewide LMT Program information in a Report by June 1 of each year (beginning in 2010). The Statewide LMT Program information shall be submitted to the Energy Division and the service list. (p. 144)○ Develop regular reports on IDSM progress and recommendations to the Commission. (Lisa Paulo)○ IOUs must provide annual progress reports to ED highlighting the status of the IOUs' WE&T program progress toward meeting its stated goals and objectives (p.222).○ COL # 72. Utility and local government partner work on Strategic Plan strategies can be tracked across program cycles until it is complete. When a local government accomplishes most of the strategies in the Strategic Plan, the utility administrator should consider whether that partnership should end. (p.362)○ Add requirements as time goes on		
--	--	--	--	--