

Objective	Discussion/consensus	Action items
<p><u>Objective 1: From a technical and policy standpoint, identify the specific differences between current flexibility modeling efforts and those proposed for CES-21.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing models in the LTPP are relatively narrower and capable of fewer calculations and outputs than the proposed project (utility slides 5-7) • There are questions and gaps that the project could address, that may not be addressed by existing models (utility slides 8-9) • There are possible applications of the metric and standards that this project seeks to produce for the LTPP and RA proceeding (slide 11) • The PG&E collaborative review was conducted based on LTPP stakeholder modeling input about needs and gaps, and its recommendations relating to flexibility are consistent with the goals of the proposed project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We discussed objectives 1 and 2 concurrently, and I don't have down that the utilities needed to provide anything extra on this point. • However, I do ask that if anyone has corrections or additions to my bullet points in the prior column, please provide them.
<p><u>Objective 2: The Joint Utilities state that the LTPP and RA proceedings are "the most likely venues where the benefits of this project can be realized"; Objective 2 is to identify specific processes for incorporating results into Commission proceedings that can be built into the CES-21 project management process.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stated goal is for the project results to be incorporated into commission proceedings; realization of benefits depends on achieving this goal; so the project needs to make all reasonable efforts to make this more likely. • Some of this is likely implicit or assumed already; let's get more specific. While preserving flexibility, we want the goal of incorporating results to be 	<p>I have down that the utilities will suggest a list of more specific commitments that can be built into the project management process: while we don't know dates for the project progress or for the 2016 LTPP we can identify triggers <i>within both</i> at which point action will be taken. For example, the project managers can commit to providing input on the status</p>

	<p>reflected in the project process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slide 13 lists specific commitments from the utilities to help achieve this goal. • The specific timing of these commitments can be flexible based on progress of the project. 	<p>of the project as testimony once the LTPP is at that point. Also, when the project is at specific stages, updates can be shared with (and input can be gathered from) LTPP stakeholders. For example, once the base model(s) and inputs or assumptions are selected, this can be shared; workshops can be held at 1/3 and 2/3 of the way through; etc. Identify where you think you'll need input and how you'll get it.</p> <p>The utilities should specify ways they can help ensure the results of the project can be used by others past the project end date (since the project may end before stakeholders can take results for a test drive). Specify points of the project where these actions (trainings, etc) can take place.</p>
<p><u>Objective 3: Identify additional project implementation details that would benefit the MMATR cybersecurity project.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of this is to allow reasonable evaluation or tracking of the project; a baseline to compare it with; information that will allow everyone to be aware of critical points/red flags. • Slides 18-20 provide good additional detail on project milestones, deliverables, and reporting. 	<p>The utilities will provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A soft copy of the project plan, reporting timeline, and information in slide 20, integrated as possible with the Gantt chart project plan. (identify when these deliverables will take place) • Identify critical tasks in the project whose

		<p>failure would place other tasks/the overall project at risk; identify how these events will be reported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an explanation of how the decision to off-ramp a task will be made
<p><u>Objective 4: Identify strategies to address barriers to including net present value and quantitative benefits of projects.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are unaware of any way for the direction in OP15c to be carried out, without a specific methodology to use and given inherent uncertainty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The utilities will provide some quantifiable data points (cost of recent infrastructure cyber attacks, cost of outages, other quantitative points against which this \$33 million investment can be compared). This won't be construed as an approximation of NPV- just will be good data for us to have. • Energy Division will investigate a solution to this issue.