**T2WG – Notes from Meeting 8, August 16**

Below are some quick notes on the discussion for each task and T2WG recommendation with requested action for T2WG stakeholders.

Please send additional comments by EOD Friday to get into Monday’s draft report; you’ll then have a chance to review/respond/edit the summary of proposals before the revised draft the following Monday. Please send any input to [t2wg@cadmusgroup.com](mailto:t2wg@cadmusgroup.com)

**Schedule**

* Friday, 8/18 – Stakeholders send notes on issues or positions that you want to make sure are articulated for specific tasks; especially for new discussion from 8/16. (We are also reaching out to individuals to request clarification on a few items); Cadmus will send survey to ask for positions on each proposals (you can be undecided)
* Monday, 8/21 – Cadmus delivers draft report and survey to ask for positions on each proposals (you can be undecided)
* By Thursday, 8/24 – Stakeholder send comments/edits on report
* Friday, 8/25 – Cadmus will host a call(s) if needed to discuss comments
* Monday, 8/28 – Cadmus delivers updated draft report
* Wednesday, 8/30 – Cadmus delivers final report

**Summary**

* **Task 1 (Standard Baseline Defintion)** – Ryan/PG&E shared his comments in the “[Task 1 Notes](http://t2wg.cadmusweb.com/Documents/Task%201%20-%20Code%20Baseline/T2WG_Task1_Notes-20170815.docx)” document and is working on v10 of the Standard Baseline definition (which will be similar to the [current v9 document](http://t2wg.cadmusweb.com/Documents/Task%201%20-%20Code%20Baseline/T2WG_Task1_Proposal-StandardPracticeBaseline_DRAFTv9_20170621.docx)).
  + **T2WG recommendation** is to adopt the new Standard Baseline definition with specific clarifications/decisions as needed to address outstanding issues.
  + **Action** – review the notes document and v9 definition; determine whether you support the statements as is or send specific concerns that you would like to address in the report.
* **Task 2 (Tiered POE)** – Ryan/PG&E presented [POE Questionnaire](http://t2wg.cadmusweb.com/Documents/Task%202%20-%20POE%20for%20Tier%201%20and%202/T2WG_Task2_POE-Questionnaire_DRAFT_20170815_wNotes.xlsx) (doc has new notes from 8/16) – we discussed the 6-question questionnaire (see Sample Questionnaire tab) and the affidavit language (see Affidavit Strength tab)
  + We discussed potential need for some rephrasing of questions in the questionnaire (e.g., to make less leading and less vague in some instances)
  + We discussed eliminating tiered affidavit language, so that we have a single affidavit statement for all tiers.
  + **T2WG recommendation** is to adopt this proposal with clarifications/decisions to address outstanding issues or points of disagreement.
  + **Action** – review the proposal and determine whether you support; send notes on concerns or suggested revisions.
* **Task 3 (POE for Repair-Eligible/Indefinitely)** – We discussed eliminating Task 3 as a distinct set of POE rules; rather, we acknowledge that repair-categories are eligible as accelerated replacement (AR) and expect them to meet the same POE requirements as other AR measures. We acknowledged that age is not an automatic disqualifier and there is no policy (nor should there be a policy) that disqualifies equipment as early-replacement if age > EUL.
  + There is disagreement on whether broken equipment should be eligible – T2WG will ask for clarification in the report.
  + There is disagreement on whether existing conditions should be allowable as a second baseline (e.g., if standard practice is repair-indefinitely) – T2WG will ask for clarification in the report.
  + **T2WG recommendation** is to propose that we don’t need distinct POE proposals for repair- measure categories. Rather, repair- categories are eligible for early replacement if they meet the Task 2 POE requirements; T2WG will ask for Commission decision on points of disagreement regarding broken equipment and second baseline.
  + **Action –** Determine position on above issues; send notes to support a position where there is disagreement
* **Task 4 (Small Business Definition)** – Proposals have not changed from the previous meetings so we did not discuss this much during the meeting; other than to confirm that stakeholders have no new information/arguments and have not changed positions.
  + **T2WG recommendation** is to have Commission select among the proposed definitions and provide additional clarification/guidance where requested.
  + **Action –** Determine position on existing Task 4 proposals; send any additional notes to support your positions.
* **Task 5 (ISP Guidance)** – Tim Xu presented the updated [ISP table (v4)](http://t2wg.cadmusweb.com/Documents/Task%205%20-%20ISP%20Guidance%20Document/T2WG%20ISP%20Table%20V4%202017%20(Tasks1&5&6)%20update_wNotes.xlsx) (doc has new notes from 8/16) based on feedback received.
  + We discussed broader goals to minimize need for and use of project-based ISP; we should be more proactive in identifying market opportunities and less reactive with one-off project-specific studies – we may need a transition period to get there
  + Where project-based ISP studies are needed, we need guidance on executing those studies and making that research available; need to take care in whether/how we apply project-specific results for other purposes
  + Tim Xu and Peter Lai will reconnect to discuss next steps and report back to the group
  + **T2WG report** will include an update on Task 5 discussions and roadmap to update ISP guidance (pending Tim Xu and Peter Lai discussion)
  + **Action** – Send any requests for Task 5-related clarification or decision from Commission; Review the ISP table and send us your feedback on the following:
    - Should Task 5 focus on revising the existing guide or resolving underlying issues and revise the guide later based on the outcome of this work?
    - Do you agree that we should minimize the use of project-based ISP studies? Can market-based ISP results studies be used for unique site-specific ISPs? Considering that currently there are not many market based ISP studies available, do we need to rely more on site-specific studies until more market based studies are available? If yes, do you agree with PG&E’s proposed approach for project-based ISP?
    - How do we deal with projects that trigger ISP studies? Do you agree with current PG&E proposal for this?
* **Task 6 (Custom Streamlining)** – Anuj/SCE presented a [proposed framework](http://t2wg.cadmusweb.com/Documents/Task%206%20-%20Custom%20Streamlining%20Materials/T2WG_Task6_Potential-Custom-Improvements-Proposal.docx) for moving forward on Task 6; group discussed need to share progress with Commission, select high priority proposals but address all proposals, and need to establish and commit to timelines to implement proposals
  + **T2WG report** will include an update on Task 6 discussions and roadmap to develop and implement custom streamlining proposals.
  + **Action –** Determine highest priority proposals; Send any requests for Task 6-related clarification or decision from Commission