Track 2 Working Group (T2WG)	Thursday, May 24, 2018
Meeting Notes	3:00 pm to 4:00 pm
Update Meeting	Phone meeting

Thank you to those who participated in the phone meeting. Below are notes on the discussion for each task discussed during the update phone meeting on May 24, 2018. If you believe we might have mis-captured any items, please send corrections to t2wg@cadmusgroup.com.

Summary
Tasks 1-4: Staff provided an update on the current status and next steps for Tasks 1 through 4:

- **Recap:** T2WG final report on Tasks 1-4 was provided to Commission Staff for their review on September 7, 2017
- **Next step:** CPUC staff is preparing a draft resolution for management's review. Draft resolution is targeted for the Commission's meeting agenda in July or August of 2018
- **Discussions:**
    - Staff clarified that Resolution E-4818 did not require Staff to provide a resolution in response to T2WG recommendations, however, Staff believes that it's helpful to have a resolution to have items on the record.

Task 5 – ISP Guidance: Tim Xu provided an update on the work to-date, current status and next steps for Tasks 5:
- **Recap**: PG&E created, on its own, a statement of problem (SOP) and recommendations in 2016. E-4818 assigned T2WG to address "the development and application of Industry Standard Practice (ISP) determinations" and revise the current ISP Guidance Document, with no deadline. T2WG discussed SOP and recommendations in several in-person and phone meetings. PG&E created an Excel blueprint to summarize issues and needed updates. Final T2WG phone discussion for ISP Table was on November 14, 2017, to present and clarify the updated proposal, collect Staff's feedback on the proposal and collect stakeholders feedback regarding issues or potential changes to the proposals to address those issues. Cadmus collected written comments on the Excel blueprint from T2WG and shared with PG&E in January 2018. PG&E identified key areas for updating the guide based on feedback received.
- **Current status**: PG&E is collaborating with Staff to finalize the table of content (TOC). This might include addition of a chapter for custom project development, addition of new policy elements and clarifying applicability of the guide to both custom and deemed (workpaper) measures.
- **Discussions:**
    - Shawn Fife (SoCalGas) – Is anyone else involved in this process beside PG&E and CPUC?
    - Tim Xu – PG&E is the lead and has received inputs from stakeholders through T2WG meetings. He added that the stakeholder inputs will be represented in the update.
    - Tim Xu – CPUC has the ultimate responsibility for developing the IPS Guide document. PG&E is taking the lead to provide inputs to the document but CPUC is the party that owes the document
    - Staff clarified that public will have an opportunity to review and comment on the updated draft. The guide will be a living document – as we move forward, we expect other opportunities to further improve the document.

- **Next steps:**

- After Commission Staff and PG&E agreed on the TOC, PG&E will start editing/adding contents under each agreed upon chapter.
- Commission Staff will provide a draft version of the guide to all interested parties to comment.

Task 6 – Custom Streamlining: Staff provided an update on Document Exchange Timing Protocol, task 6 issues and next steps:

- **Document Exchange Timing Protocol**: Available at: http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/General.aspx?id=6442457214 (also sent by email on 5/24/2018).
  - Staff wants to streamline the custom review process. This protocol covers high level timing of exchanging documentation between Staff and PAs.
  - The goal is to improve the certainty of the review timing for the customers, implementers, and PAs.
- **Discussions:**
  - What happens after Step 2 if there is no response from Staff. Keith Rothenberg (CPUC staff consultant) – project is waived from any review.
  - Kris Bradley (Itron)– is the "5 weeks to review" a typo? Keith– No, if Staff doesn't receive the document for review on time, then Staff gets two additional weeks to respond to initial project submission.
  - Rod Houdyshel (SDG&E)– if we (PAs) need additional days and request that, does CPUC still get the 5 weeks? Keith – doesn't know the answer but clarified that there will be opportunities for everyone to ask for extension in special situations, but the goal of this document is to streamline the timing of the process.
  - Anuj Desai (SCE): Can you elaborate on timing of introducing the protocol (that is, launch the protocol)?
  - CPUC staff clarified that launching of the protocol will depend on 1) the process of automating it through CMPA and 2) SB 1131 proposed timeline. If Staff finds out that automation is a difficult and long process, CPUC will work with utility to have it launched at the end of the year. Staff also wants to avoid a situation that they have to revise the proposed timeline to match the SB 1131 timeline.
  - Staff asked stakeholders how much time they will need before CPUC launches the protocol.
  - Anuj (SCE) – We told Peter (CPUC staff) to give us 4-6 weeks to socialize this with stakeholders and they are ready to go with that amount of lead time.
  - Tim Xu (PG&E)– PG&E has a similar position (i.e., need 4-6 weeks to socialize this with stakeholders and they are ready to go with that amount of lead time).
  - Derrick Clifton (SoCalGas) – Can we comment on timeline before it goes to effect?
  - Staff – We have had two rounds of back and forth with PAs on this protocol and not planning to do that again. Idea is to provide certainty back to customer and a consequence of not providing timely response is that the project is waived. Staff is willing to do this to improve the process.
  - Who can stakeholder reach out to if we have questions? Contact Peter Lai with questions.
  - Patricia (CEDMC) – Since this was not discussed within working group process, can others comment on it?
  - Staff – This is timing of CPUC and IOUs interactions. Staff encouraged stakeholders to work with PAs to address comments/concerns. Staff clarified that providing feedback is important, but Staff think it must go through PAs.

- **List of Task 6 issues:**
  - o T2WG participants have identified 18 issues and opportunities to improve the custom *ex ante* review process.
  - o CPUC staff identified and proposed 6 prioritized top items and asked the group if they agree with the prioritization:
    - ▪ What information needs to be provided so incomplete packages are not submitted? (Issue 4)
    - ▪ What Standards need to be put in place so ineligible/inaccurate assumptions are not made for Project submissions? (Issue 5)
    - ▪ How do we set clear expectations? (Issue 6)
    - ▪ How can we improve project tracking timeline and progress? (Issue 9)
    - ▪ How can we use the EAR process to better communicate on Projects? (Issue 10)
    - ▪ How can we close the feedback Loop? (Issue 11)
  - o Staff also asked for stakeholder's feedback on how and when to reconvene the group to discuss Task 6? Is there a desire to reconvene the group?
- **Discussions**:
  - o Patricia (CEDMC) – There is a desire to continue, but looking at top issues, there are important but most important of all is the   process. We are interested to continue but want to start with higher-level issues: Scope and Methodology.
  - o Staff – agreed in clarify scope and methodology.
  - o Spencer Lipp (Lockheed) (and one other stakeholder) – Echoed CEDMC comment and stated that they are supportive of continuing T2WG. We need to make the process better and more functional for moving the projects. Looking at list of your issues, you are missing a big category: policy issues. We need to bring the policy up on the process.
  - o Josiah Adams (Ecology Action) – interested in participating in T2WG but stated that there are some missing issues in the top issue list. They support a process of collecting stakeholder inputs on list of issue.
  - o Rich Sperberg (Onsite)– Timing, there is no deadline on Tasks 5 and 6. He is not happy that they are moving to end of the year - this is a critical issue for implementers considering new solicitations are coming out in fall. He thinks the group will be participating in future T2WG meetings.
  - o Anuj (SCE) – We have solicitation timeline, rolling portfolio schedule and a T2WG schedule – We should be careful about any misalignment between technical guidelines and solicitation timeline and encouraged everyone to develop a timeline that is aligned with the solicitation timelines to some extent.
  - o Staff clarified that they we will discuss internally and provide response.

- **Action items:**
  - o Staff to send out a survey monkey to collect stakeholder preference on high priority issues.
  - o Staff to survey the group on the format of the meeting moving forward and preferences for future meeting.