**T2WG – Tasks 1-4 – Status for 6/26/2017**

* The table below summarizes the status for each task/topic within T2WG Tasks 1-4.
* The “Feedback” column indicated the feedback we are looking for before we take a vote on each topic.
* The “Vote” column indicates how we plan to take a vote on each topic. We will likely conduct voting through Survey Monkey.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **STATUS** | **FEEDBACK – send questions/comments in by Wednesday, 6/28** | **VOTE** |
| **Task 1 – Standard Practice Baseline Definition** |
| **Definition** | On 6/21, we posted the revised version (v9) of the Standard Practice Baseline on the web: [StandardPracticeBaseline\_DRAFTv9](http://t2wg.cadmusweb.com/Documents/Task%201%20-%20Code%20Baseline/T2WG_Task1_Proposal-StandardPracticeBaseline_DRAFTv9_20170621.docx) (“Task 1” folder of <http://t2wg.cadmusweb.com/>) | Please send any questions or suggested edits by EOD, Monday 6/26 to be addressed in the final iteration. | We will ask each stakeholder to vote on the final version (v10): * 1. Accept as is
	2. Accept with modifications (specify)
	3. Do not accept (specify why)
 |
| **Task 2 – Qualification & Documentation for <$100k***We are collecting some additional content this week to complete a draft proposal for the group to vote & comment on. The following indicate current status, where we are expecting additional feedback, and what we will ask you to vote on for each of the five topic areas to Task 2.**See 6/14 email “T2WG - Task 2 - notes from 6/14 phone discussion on Task 2” for the last discussion on this item.*  |
| **2-1 Tier thresholds** | We have discussed the possibility of a “super low” tier for small projects that should not require the same rigor as $20k projects, for example. However, we do not have a proposed threshold for a “super low” tier, and some stakeholder prefer not to add complexity with a fourth tier level. | Send any proposal you have for this threshold value (or whether we . | *The vote on whether to add/change tier levels will be part of the proposals for the qualification/documentation requirements for projects <$100k* |
| **2-2 Evidence for equipment viability** | See 6/14 email for layout of current proposal; *we are waiting on additional recommendations regarding specific operating data evidence for the medium tier.* | Send any additional proposals or comments on existing questionnaires. | We will ask each stakeholder to vote (accept/accept with mod/no accept) on the proposed approach. |
| **2-3 Evidence for program influence** | Current proposal is to assess influence through a questionnaire. Two draft questionnaires were included in the draft report, and *we are waiting on an additional proposal*. | Send any additional proposals or comments on existing questionnaires. | We will ask each stakeholder to vote (accept/accept with mod/no accept) on the proposed approach. |
| **2-4 Questionnaire administration** | Current proposal is self-certification for low tier and an IOU-administered survey for medium tier; *we are waiting for a more detailed description of what the IOU-administered survey could look like (though that could be developed more in Task 6)* | Send any additional proposals or comments on existing questionnaires. | We will ask each stakeholder to vote (accept/accept with mod/no accept) on the proposed approach. |
| **2-5 Affidavit** | The group has proposed a simple statement that requires signatures from the customer and project developer but that does not include a statement on the penalty of perjury. It is unclear exactly where or on what document the language is used, but that can be clarified in the topics on specific documentation requirements (e.g., POE doc requirements) and/or in Task 6 discussions on custom process. | Provide any specific language that you would like to see in the affidavit. | We will ask each stakeholder to vote (accept/accept with mod/no accept) on the proposed language. |
| **Task 3 - Qualification/Documentation for Repair-Eligible/Repair-Indefinitely***See 6/14 email “T2WG - Task 3 - notes from 6/14 phone discussion on Task 3” for the last discussion on this item.* |
| **Qualification & Documentation** | The group has agreed that an equipment’s age (e.g., if age > EUL) should not preclude that equipment from qualifying as Accelerated Replacement; evidence must show that the equipment can be repaired and would be repaired. There are proposals to “pre-qualify” classes of equipment AND to examine qualification on a project/measure basis.* 1. Paden/SCG presented a proposal for project/measure qualification.
	2. *We are waiting on an additional proposal for project/measure qualification.*
 | Provide any comments on Paden’s proposal | We will ask each stakeholder to vote on: * 1. Whether the program should offer each of the two pathways for qualification (pre-qualification vs. project/measure qualification)
	2. Level of agreement with final proposals on qualification/documentation requirements.
 |
| **Task 4 – Small Business Definition***See the “Task 4” folder for notes from the last discussion, including a summary comparison of the proposals.* |
| **Definition** | We presented 4 distinct proposals, where the primary difference between the proposals was the maximum energy/demand levels for small business qualification. We have had quite a bit of discussion on these proposals including the reasons for support or concerns about each proposal (all of which have some level of support or concern). | Send any additional proposals or arguments/data to support existing proposals. | We will ask each stakeholder to vote on level of agreement with each proposal. |