**T2WG Task 6**

**DRAFT Recommendation on Dispute Resolution**

Draft Working Document - Issue Resolution (Triggers, Documentation, Process)

Special Review Request (SRR)

* Criteria/Triggers for SRR
	+ Implementer can demonstrate that the customer or customer’s agent take issue with a disposition and requests further review. Demonstration would consist of customer letters, emails or other communications stating customer disagreement
	+ Customer, Implementer and/or PA (program manager and/or customer care representative) believe that the disposition requires further review due to clearly defined issues such as inappropriate sample size, outdated supporting documentation, etc.
	+ Proposed discount of reduction to savings/incentive is greater than 10% of initial estimates
	+ Time elapsed since ED initiated pre or post-installation review has exceeded 1 months
	+ Disposition is the result of a policy change
	+ Disposition is the result of an ISP decision
* Documentation
	+ Implementer and/or IOU must complete a simple process and fill-out a document that includes the minimum information needed to be included in a review request and put into the queue:
		- Project name, ID
		- Project summary and savings totals
		- A list of supporting documentation from all parties used to arrive at the current disposition as well as an electronic copy of the project package to be used by the review committee
			* Implementer project package
			* IOU review documents
			* ED supporting documentation, case studies, etc
	+ Upon final disposition, ED must provide the following
		- Specific response to the motivating factor that triggered the request for special review
		- Documentation (case studies, data, calculations) supporting the point in question
			* Anecdotal evidence from one Subject Matter Expert may only be used for guidance to identify citable source documentation and not used as the sole evidence for a decision
* Timing and Process
	+ Special Review may be requested
		- After ED provides a show stopper (rejection) or disposition at the pre-installation or a disposition at the post-installation phase.
		- IOU(s) and Implementers have 2 weeks to raise objection based on the criteria outlined above
	+ Within two weeks of objection raised, all stakeholders (IOU, Implementer, ED) must schedule a project review meeting (to convene within 1 month of the objection) to discuss the project and key items at issue and come away with specific action items for clarifications, supplemental data, etc.
	+ IOU(s) and Implementers have 1 month (or otherwise depending on direction from review team meeting) after project review meeting to make the case for further review and provide reiteration of key data/information and/or supplemental data/information to support their claim
	+ ED has 2 weeks to review and respond to the project review team. The ED review is performed by an independent entity, such as CalTF, who was not involved in the original review.
	+ The ED provides a transparent calculation and/or clear rationale (such as citing specific engineering principles, data needs, or precedents) that address the issues raised by the Implementer and/or IOU.

Background and support/notes

* Discuss the current review process (perhaps using two examples of a disputed projects/measures)
* Develop a simple draft process for escalating, reviewing, assessing, and taking final action on the issue
* Key steps leading up to and potentially minimizing the need for Issue Resolution Protocol
	+ Include implementers in early conversations - before inspections
	+ Ensure all stakeholders have a Summary doc and supporting docs before sending a project through Issue Resolution