California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee-Hosted Working Group on Energy Efficiency Filing Processes

Tuesday, October 22,2019 - 9:30-4:45

Natural Resources Defense Council, 111 Sutter St, 21st floor, San Francisco, CA 94104

Draft Meeting Summary

Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates, Ltd. & Meredith Cowart, CONCUR

On October 22, 2019, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) hosted a Working Group (WG) on Energy Efficiency (EE) Filing Processes, which met at the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) in San Francisco. Twenty-four WG Members (including Lead, Alternate, Ex Officio and Resource Members) participated in person. Approximately thirty additional members of the public participated in person or via webinar. A full list of meeting registrants is provided in Appendix A.

Meeting facilitation was provided by Dr. Jonathan Raab (Raab Associates Ltd.) and Meredith Cowart (CONCUR Inc.). Meeting materials, including presentations, are provided on the CAEECC website at: <https://www.caeecc.org/10-22-19>.

In this document, the majority of the discussion is captured without attribution. In some cases, the affiliation of the speaker is identified, because their affiliation is relevant to the comment. Presentations are summarized only if the presenter did not use a PowerPoint presentation (see link above).

Following the presentations, key clarifying questions or comments are listed and relevant *responses to questions* are noted in *italics*. Where multiple responses were given, these responses are listed as sub-bullets. Next Steps, at the end of this document, list all next steps discussed at the meeting.

**Session 1: Introductions, Agenda Review, and Goals for the Day**

The CAEECC facilitator J. Raab launched the meeting and went around the room for introductions. He then explained that the primary focus of this meeting is to lay the ground work for this WG, including reviewing and adopting a set of goals and groundrules; determining the WG scope; sharing the history of the current process; discussing what elements of the current process stakeholders like (and hence what to preserve) and don’t like (and hence want to change); and discussing a framework for evaluating proposals for alternate EE filing processes. Then the group will discuss the two straw proposals put forth by the Public Advocates Office first in plenary and then in break-outs, and put forth any additional proposals or proposed modifications to the straw proposals. At the end of the meeting, members will identify the next steps needed to get ready for the second EE Filing Processes WG meeting on November 20, 2019.

J. Raab then read an anti-trust disclaimer per the request of Matt Evans, Southern California Edison (SCE).

**Session 2: Goals and Groundrules**

J. Raab reviewed the Goals and Groundrules for the WG proposed by the facilitation team. He noted that these Goals and Groundrules are very similar to those adopted by the Market Transformation Working Group. Members did not have any comments or suggest any changes and all agreed to abide by them (see link above, *WG Goals and Groundrules (8.29.19)*).

**Session 3: History/Experience with Current EE Filing Processes**

***History of the Rolling Portfolio Process, L. Ettenson (NRDC):***

L. Ettenson offered a short history of the development of the current EE Filing Process (the Rolling Portfolio process). In 2012, The Utility Reform Network (TURN) and NRDC jointly identified the need for changes to the existing EE filing process, in order to improve or eliminate issues such as funding cliffs, inconsistent guidance, timeliness, etc. The two organizations conducted a round robin listening tour to a broad array of stakeholders and proposed a Rolling Portfolio process to the CPUC, which was further fleshed out over the course of two days of stakeholder workshops. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) adopted numerous elements of the stakeholder proposals. However, significant staff turnover at the CPUC (including the ALJ), led to some significant changes from the original proposals. NRDC agrees with the Public Advocates Office that the current process is not working as originally intended or to reflect changes in EE in CA and should be revised to do so.

***Rolling Portfolio Schedule and Bus Stops, E. Brooks (SoCalGas):***

E. Brooks reviewed the Rolling Portfolio schedule and explained the purpose and function of Bus Stops (see link above, *Bus Stops (9.12.19)*). She explained that there are Bus Stops for updates to EM&V, DEER, Potential and Goals (bi-annual adoption), and ABALs. Once a Bus Stop occurs, the current values are approved by the CPUC and these values are used by PAs to develop PA programs and by the CPUC to evaluate those PA programs until the next Bus Stop occurs (although updates to some values are ongoing). If the CPUC misses the bus stop, then pre-existing values remain in place. Implementation Plan (IP) development is also ongoing, although there are no Bus Stops associated with IPs.

E. Brooks noted that because ABALs are submitted and reviewed annually, this cycle has given the parties the sense that there is a yearly budget review -- although the original intent was for ABAL review to be ministerial, review has proven to be more complicated than the original stakeholder proposal set it out to be.

Clarifying Questions and Comments on Portfolio Schedule and Bus Stops:

* The avoided cost updates, although not an official Bus Stop in the Rolling Portfolio process, are also approved by July 1 each year and this approval acts as a de facto Bus Stop.
* Do Bus Stops apply to Work Papers?
  + *My understanding is that Bus Stops apply only to CPUC staff, so Work Papers don’t have Bus Stops*
* Initially there were delays in meeting the Bus Stops, but at this point there is much more stability than when the process began
* It is also critical to understand baseline changes, which is one of the main reasons why projected savings differ from actual savings
* The original vision for the annual ABAL process anticipated a steady state between filings. Long term funding/budgeting would be approved in the BPs, so ABALs would be relatively ministerial but allow for an adjustment in cost recovery. It didn’t anticipate that there would be policy, process, and procedural issues that need to be addressed annually.
* Did the Decision to move to third party (3P) implementation create an additional challenge?
  + *3P implementation was anticipated at the high level, so although that shift may have caused some delays, that doesn’t get to the crux of the issue here.*

***Experience with Current Processes, D. Buch (Public Advocates Office), R. Chan (Pacific Gas and Electric [PG&E]), L. Rothschild (The Energy Coalition [TEC]), J. Berg (Bay Area Regional Energy Network [BayREN]), and P. Franzese (Energy Division [ED], CPUC)***

Several WG Members provided their perspectives on the current process, and what they like (and hence want to preserve) and don’t like (and hence want to fix/change). D. Buch, R. Chan and L. Rothschild provided presentations, which are available on the CAEECC website (see link above: *Public Advocates Office—BP/ABAL (6.4.19)*; *PG&E Benefits & Challenges*; and *The Energy Coalition-Likes & Dislikes (10.15.19)*) and summarized below. J. Berg and P. Franzese offered discussion points, which are also summarized in the table below. WG Members and members of the public offered additional input, which are also captured in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What Members ***like*** about current processes aka benefits (and want to preserve): | What Members ***don’t like*** about current processesaka challenges (and want to change): |
| **Multi-yr portfolio funding and guidance:** allow for funding predictability (no funding cliffs; cost recovery budget clear) (PG&E) (Public Advocates Office) and eliminates the stop/start of programming (BayREN)  **Implementation plan process** a huge improvement over PIP process (TEC)  **Bus stop framework** enables predictable incorporation of new information (PG&E) (Public Advocates Office)  **Communication on next years’ budget to implementers** (TEC)  **Transparency and data access** [P&G study, CEDARs, eTRM] (TEC)  **Relationships between PAs and stakeholders established** (BayREN)  **Level of detail required in budget review** is appropriate (but annual review is too frequent) (SoCalREN)  **ED shift from program level to sector level review (CPUC)**  Process works to **strike balance** between budget forecast accuracy and the length of time required to develop and review a budget forecast (PG&E) | **ABAL timing/approval**: Not enough time to develop ABALs, year-round ABAL work, bus stop/change implementation difficult to accomplish, meaningful stakeholder input difficult to accomplish, lack of certainty for implementers, small businesses prevented from participating (PG&E, Public Advocates, TEC)  **Bus stop/change implementation timing:** compressed (PG&E)  **Could improve communication** from IOU PAs on budgets and goal setting (TEC)  **Could improve transparency and data access** (TEC)  **Measure level forecast:** not precise yet time consuming (PG&E)  **BPs lack detail** (forecasted budgets, savings, CE), thus **ABALs require non-ministerial review**, which is time-consuming & difficult to resolve (Public Advocates)  **Uncertainty about what needs to be included in ABALs** causes timing issues and leads to need for non-ministerial review (CPUC)  **PA forecasts not born out to be reasonable**, leading to need for further scrutiny (CPUC)  **Stakeholder (CAEECC) process** results in more regulatory churn and protests, not less (BayREN)  **Annual savings and CE metrics** constrict ability to plan to longer time horizon (PG&E)  **Process doesn’t allow for reflection** (TEC) (Public Advocates Office) (NRDC)  **Increasing inability of LGPs (BayREN) and other non-resource programs (CSE) to participate in EE**  **Complexity of measure forecasting** leads to implementer uncertainty (Cascade Energy) |

**Session 4: Working Group Scope, Key Questions, and Guiding Principles**

***Scope and Key Questions***

Following the discussion on what is working with the current EE process, and what needs to change, participants reviewed and offered changes to the Scope and Key Questions listed in the WG Prospectus (see link above, *Prospectus for CAEECC-Hosted EE Portfolio Filing Processes WG (8.28.19)*).

Some of the significant changes to what was in scope vs. out of scope included:

* Terminology changes such as substituting the more general term of “interim filings” for “ABALs”, and “stakeholder engagement including CAEECC” instead of just “CAEEC”
* Adding another in scope issue: “Regulatory process including roll of ED staff, Commission, timing, etc.”
* Clarifying the bus-stop that would be in scope as those that are “Inputs into the filings” and “possibly multi-years goals”

Some of the significant changes to key questions in addition to reflecting some of the language changes from the scope discussion included, adding the following new questions:

* What changes to stakeholder engagement including CAEECC’s role in BP and any interim filings review if any?
* What are the regulatory processes including role of ED staff, Commission, timing, Bus Stops, that would ensure more transparent and predictable implementation of EE?

See the full redlining of the scope and key questions in *Appendix B: Working Group Scope, Key Questions, and Principles in redline*.

***Guiding Principles***

L. Ettenson noted that during the stakeholder process that led to the development of the Rolling Portfolio process, several Guiding Principles were developed (see link above, *Original Guiding Principles Rolling Portfolio (9.12.19)*). J. Raab asked Members to consider whether these principles are relevant and should be used to guide or evaluate any new EE Filing Process options proposed. Stakeholders agreed that it is worthwhile to check any new proposals against the overall guiding principles (those in the left-hand column) to see how they stack up, but the right-hand column is probably too detailed for our purposes.

**Session 5: Options for Improvement – Public Advocates Office Straw Proposals**

D. Buch provided a review of the two straw proposals to improve the EE Approval Process developed by the Public Advocates Office (see link above, *Prospectus for CAEECC-Hosted EE Portfolio Filing Processes WG (8.28.19)* and scroll to “Attachment A*”*). Following his presentation, WG Members posed clarifying questions and further discussed these options and other potential options for improvement.

Clarifying Questions and Comments on History of Current EE Filing Process – Posed to or Answered by Public Advocates Office:

* Currently ABALs contain the budgeting information that parties need – where would that information be held in your current proposals?
  + *We think Business Plans should look like very robust ABALs. However, if it’s not possible to forecast out to 10 years, then maybe this cycle should be shorter. We may therefore be more favorable to our Option 2, but we would appreciate Member’s opinions and feedback on this point.*
* How would Goals be included in your current proposals?
  + *We think Goals should not be established in a Business Plan application. Rather, the application should ask, Does the pre-ponderance of evidence show that this forecast will be met cost effectively? A multi-year Goal could make sense in this scenario.*
* The benefit of Business Plans is that they offer long term funding certainty at a high level, and we don’t want to step away from that.
  + *Given that 10-year forecasts are unreliable, but we want to create longer-term funding certainty, would having longer term funding but resolving budgeting issues on a 4-year basis be workable?*
  + *Public Advocates Office: That would work for us*

Clarifying Questions and Comments on History of Current EE Filing Process – Posed to or Answered by PAs:

* How can we reconcile the idea of a 10-year Business Plan given the challenge of developing a meaningful forecast with so much uncertainty around 3P programs?
  + *By the end of 2022, the 60% 3P requirement will be implemented, so that uncertainty should fall away.*
* In 3P RFPs, how long are the contracts?
  + *There is no requirement, so this can vary by RFP (or even in response to the same RFP). Right now, 3 years is a common contract length because of the 3P ramp up, but after 2022 it may become more varied.*
* If there is a shift to 4-year EE applications (Option 2), how can we accommodate contracts that are longer than 4 years?
  + *They may be cut off at the end of a cycle.*
* It would be helpful to have guidance from the CPUC regarding how a new process (and any Business Plans) would factor into the Strategic Plan.
  + *The Strategic Plan is not very current, so may not be relevant at this point.*

**Session 5: Options for Improvement – Break-Out Groups**

Following the presentation of the Public Advocates Office’ straw proposals, and ensuing discussion, WG Members formed two breakout groups (See *Appendix C: Breakout Groups*), to propose and discuss any additional straw proposals and/or refine the proposals made by the Public Advocates Office.

Neither group recommended entirely new options—and both opted to further refine the Public Advocates Option 2 (tabling Option 1 for now). The refinements are summarized at a high level below, and captured in more detail in the table updated during breakout groups and in plenary following the breakouts (see link above, *Options From Break-Outs 10-22-19*, under “Documents Posted After the Meeting”).

At a high level, the following refinements were proposed:

* An EE Budget Application filed every 6 years (Group 1) or 4-6 years (Group 2).
* Both groups proposed that the EE Budget Application be a robust budget filing a long the lines proposed by Public Advocates Option 2:
* Interim filings be made every 3 years (Group 1), while Group 2 provided 3 potential options: A) every 2 years (to sync with other bi-annual regulatory processes), B) mid-cycle, or C) only when certain triggers are met.
* Group 1 also discussed the option of maintaining the use of a high-level Business Plan, to be updated every 8 -12 years (exact timing to be considered, as it should sync with the timing of the EE applications), at least in the near term. At the close of the session, the group questioned whether the use of Business Plans should be sunset once the existing BPs end in 2025.

In plenary discussion following the break out groups, the WG Members as a whole agreed that:

* These new processes could feasibly be implemented by 2023 (file by end of 2021, approval by end of 2022, and implementation by 2023). They noted that at this point, new Goals will be approved and the shift to 60% 3P contracts will be implemented, providing new information about programs and budgets.
* That the Budget Application should show both program level and measure level detail; and added the caveat that will need to use a combination of forecasts (for life of cycle) from PA-run programs, committed 3rd party contracts, and placeholders for 3rd party new contracts.
* That we should separate implementers contract cycles from portfolio approval process—so no cliffs for successful implementers.

**Session 7: Next Steps Planning**

At the end of the meeting, the following Next Steps were identified:

1. Two sub-working groups will further refine the Public Advocates Office Straw Proposal Option #2 (including suggested changes from the break-outs and subsequent plenary discussion) over the next month (before the next November 20, 2019 EE Filing Process WG meeting). The sub working group members (and any co-leads), frequency and timing of meetings, and work products/focus are as follows:

**Sub working group #1 on** Business Plan/Budget Application and Interim Filings**:**

***Co-Leads:*** Dan Buch and Athena Besa

***Members:*** Jesse Feinberg***,*** Dan Suyeyasu***,*** Alejandra Tellez***,*** Alice Havenar-Daughton***,*** Jenny Berg***,*** Ryan Chan***,*** Lara Ettenson, Laurel Rothschild***,*** Erin Brooks***,*** Raghav Murali***,*** Don Arambula***,*** Peter Franzese, andAlison LaBonte

***Frequency and Timing:*** Two phone calls over the next 2-3 weeks.

***Work Products/Focus:*** Co-leads will flesh out a straw proposal on items 1 and 2 below, and work with facilitators to develop an agenda for the two sub working group 1 phone calls. The sub working group will further develop the proposal to be passed on to sub working group 2 for further additions related to the regulatory review process.

1. Frequency of Business Plan/Budget Application and Interim Filings
   1. 4 vs 6 for Business Plan/Budget Application (diagram that includes bus stops and other important milestones)
   2. How often would the interim filings be and/or what would the triggers be
2. Content of Filings
   1. Business Plan/Budget Application
   2. Interim filings

**Sub working group #2 on Roles & Responsibilities, and Regulatory Process:**

***Members:*** Lara Ettenson***,*** Greg Wikler***,*** Erin Brooks***,*** Laurel Rothschild***, Dan Buch,*** Peter Franzese, and Alison LaBonte

***Frequency and Timing:*** One phone call about one week before the November 20, 2019 EE Filing Process WG meeting

***Work Products/Focus:*** Add to the straw proposal developed by sub working group

1. Regulatory review processes
   1. Role of stakeholders
   2. Role of CPUC
   3. Timeframe for assessing goals
   4. What are the process changes that would improve the transparency and predictability of EE implementation?
2. In addition to the next November 20, 2019 EE Filing Process Working Group meeting, a third WG meeting will be held in conjunction with the Full CAEECC February meeting (in first or last week of February) in San Francisco to avoid various black-out dates.

**Appendix A: In-Person and Webinar Participation**

*Note: The list of WG Leads/Alternates joining in person reflect actual participation as captured via sign in to the meeting; the list of other participants attending in person and attendees joining via webinar reflect registration only. If individuals participated but did not register, or registered but did not participate, these last-minute changes are not reflected here.*

**Participants Attending in Person:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| **WG Lead/Alternate - Seated at the Table** | | |
| 3C-REN/County of Ventura | Alejandra | Tellez |
| CEDMC | Greg | Wikler |
| Center for Sustainable Energy | Raghav | Murali |
| CodeCycle | Dan | Suyeyasu |
| County of Ventura, 3C-REN | Alejandra | Tellez |
| CPUC | Alison | LaBonte |
| CPUC | Peter | Franzese |
| MCE | Alice | Havenar-Daughton |
| MTC/BayREN | Jenny | Berg |
| NRDC | Lara | Ettenson |
| PG&E | Ryan | Chan |
| Public Advocates Office | Dan | Buch |
| San Diego Gas &Electric Company | Athena | Besa |
| Small Business Utility Advocates | Ted | Howard |
| SCE | Jesse | Feinberg |
| Sheet Metal Workers Local 104 | David | Dias |
| SoCalGas | Erin | Brooks |
| SoCalREN | Lujuana | Medina |
| The Energy Coalition | Laurel | Rothschild |
| **Other Participants Attending in Person (including Alternates not seated at the table, Ex Officio, Resource, Facilitation, and Members of the Public)** | | |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| CleaResult | Peter | Calvin |
| Center for Sustainable Energy | Stephen | Gunther |
| California Energy Commission | Anne | Fisher |
| California Energy Commission | Brian | Samuelson |
| Cascade Energy | Siva | Sethuraman |
| CONCUR | Meredith | Cowart |
| County of Ventura, 3C-REN | Erica | Helson |
| DA Consulting | Don | Arambula |
| DA Consulting | Larry | Cope |
| Google Nest | Serj | Berelson |
| GreenNet | Eric | Taylor |
| Home Energy Analytics | Lisa | Schmidt |
| Oracle | Charlie | Buck |
| Oracle / Opower | David | Siddiqui |
| PG&E | Rob | Bohn |
| Raab Associates | Jonathan | Raab |
| SCE | Matt | Evans |
| SCE | Paul | Kubasek |
| Silent Running | James | Dodenhoff |
| SoCalGas | Elizabeth | Gomez |

**Participants Attending Remotely:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **First** | **Last** |
| **Other Participants** | | |
| ACCES | Arleen | Novotney |
| California Energy Commission | Cynthia | Rogers |
| California Energy Commission | Brad | Williams |
| City of Chula Vista | Cory | Downs |
| City of Chula Vista | Coleen | Wisniewski |
| CLEAResult | Chad | Ihrig |
| Community Action Partnership of OC | Christine | Baginski |
| County of San Mateo | Kim | Springer |
| EEM Advisors | Brian | Haines |
| Frontier Energy | Nancy | Barba |
| Frontier Energy/BayREN | Lacey | Tan |
| Gemini Energy Solutions | Anthony | Kinslow II |
| Greenbank Associates | Alice | Sung |
| greenNet | Michael | Thompson |
| I'm in Control | Kirk | Oatman |
| JouleSmart Solutions, Inc. | Dennis | Quinn |
| Leidos | Nicole | Cusick |
| Mark Wallenrod Consulting | Mark | Wallenrod |
| SCE | Gary | Golden |
| SDG&E | Elaine | Allyn |
| SDG&E | Evan | Frank |
| SF Department of Environment | Kathleen | Bryan |
| Western Riverside Council of Governments | Anthony | Segura |
| Willdan | Craig | Owens |

**Appendix B: Working Group Scope, Key Questions and Principles in Redline**

***Scope:***

**In Scope:**

* Changes to EE application and any interim filings-- frequency, timing, scope, content, level of detail/granularity, criteria, triggers, and approval processes
* Additions to and/or elimination of requirements in BPs, any interim filings, and implementation plans
* Changes to Stakeholder engagement including CAEECC’s role in BP and any interim filings review
* Closely-related policy changes (including accounting or reporting changes) important to improving the process, including:
  + Accounting (including multi-year, annual or multi-year commitments) or reporting changes, and ???
* Closely-related bus stops important to improving the process (i.e., aligning bus stops to new process), including:
  + Inputs into the filings
  + Possibly multi-years goals
* Regulatory process including roll of ED staff, Commission, timing, etc.

**Out of Scope:**

* Reporting requirements (not closely related to filing reports)
* Procurement process
* Other stakeholder processes (such as Procurement Review Groups), and
* Current policy that allows budget authorizations to “roll forward” by specifying that the most recent funding authorization will stay in place until the Commission approves a subsequent budget application
* Policy changes not directly connected to process improvements or oversight requirements, including (but not limited to):
  + Cost-effectiveness;
* Bus stops that are not directly connected and therefore not in scope, including (but not limited to):
  + See above for what’s in scope on bus stops

|  |
| --- |
| ***Key Questions:*** |
| 1) What processes and procedures should remain the same? |
| 2) What processes and procedures should change? Specifically: |
| A. EE Budget applications: |
| A1. Frequency and duration of filings |
| A2. What should be included in application, including any supporting testimony? |
| A3. What should be the review and/or approval requirements? |
| B. Any interim filings |
| B1. Frequency and duration of filings |
| B2. What should be included in application, including any supporting testimony? |
| B3. What should be the review and/or approval requirements? |
| 3) When should any recommended changes be implemented (e.g., as soon as possible (2021) or once the transition/3rd party roll-out is further along (2022 or 2023)? |
| 4)  What CPUC related guidance or policies (e.g., accounting or reporting changes) might need to be addressed prior to or in conjunction with implementing any new framework (e.g., in a CPUC rulemaking)? And do any of these need to be addressed before a new framework should or can be finalized? |
| 5)  To the extent applicable, are there any improvements that should and could be made informally during the transition to new processes (e.g., in any refiling of business plans under the current regime, or any pending filings)? |
| 6)  What Changes to Stakeholder engagement including CAEECC’s role in BP and any interim filings review  if any? |
| 7) What are the regulatory process including roll of ED staff, Commission, timing, bus stops that would ensure more transparent and predictable implementation of EE? |

***Guiding Principles:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Guiding Principles of a Long-Term Rolling Program Cycle Model** | **Desired Outcomes of an Improved Regulatory Process Supported by a Long-Term Rolling Cycle Model** |
| **Manageability**  (simple, streamlined, and predictable) | 1. **Reduced and streamlined administrative and regulatory burden, extended program operating period.** |
| 1. **Regulatory predictability:** (e.g., eliminate start/stop, pre-determined schedule to enable stakeholders to organize resources, etc.) |
| **Effectiveness[[1]](#footnote-1)**  (in program participation, in energy savings and in procurement planning) | 1. **Robust EE industry**: (e.g. improve the viability for participation by stabilizing and simplifying program offerings, build demand by attracting high performance implementers, contractors, installers and other market actors; ensure predictability, continuity, reliability and confidence by enabling flexibility for continuous improvement and delinking contracts from CPUC regulatory processes, among other strategies etc.) |
| 1. **Enhanced customer experience:** (e.g., increase ease of customer participation; design programs and service delivery mechanisms to better engage customers; address needs and align with customer decision-making processes; etc.) |
| 1. **Maximized energy savings/energy demand reductions.** |
| 1. **Improved confidence in EE savings and maximized EE savings potential in resource planning to ensure the most cost-effective investment decisions.** |
| 1. **Alignment between Strategic Plan and other CPUC and state long-term energy efficiency regulatory goals, policies and procedures.** |
| **Accountability**  (of ratepayer dollars spent and effective implementation) | 1. **Cost-effective use of ratepayer funds** |
| 1. **Transparency:** (e.g., in planning, accounting, and reporting) |
| 1. **Legitimize EE as a resource** |
| 1. **Improved program feedback mechanisms and EM&V through adaptive management strategies** |

**Appendix C: Break Out Groups**

**Breakout Group 1 –**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **First** | **Last** | **Category** |
| Dan | Suyeyasu | CodeCycle |
| Raghav | Murali | CSE |
| Dave | Dias | SMW |
| Lujuana | Medina | SoCalREN |
| Jenny | Berg | BayREN |
| Ryan | Chan | PG&E |
| Elizabeth | Gomez | SoCalGas |
| Lara | Ettenson | NRDC |
| Alison | LaBonte | CPUC |
| Larry | Cope | DA Consulting |

**Breakout Group 2 –**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **First** | **Last** | **Category** |
| Laurel | Rothschild | TEC |
| Greg | Wikler | CEDMC |
| Alejandra | Tellez | 3CREN |
| Alice | Havenar-Daughton | MCE |
| Athena | Besa | SDG&E |
| Jesse | Feinberg | SCE |
| Ted | Howard | SBUA |
| Peter | Franzese | CPUC |
| Don | Arambula | DA Consulting |

1. At least one entity required the following addition to “Desired Outcomes” listed under the “Effectiveness” principle to fully support this document: “**Improved Implementer and Portfolio Performance:**  Reduce or eliminate avoidable interruptions and postponements in program implementation.  The continuity of a rolling portfolio model will improve implementer and portfolio performance, thereby allowing greater focus on customers.” As this feedback came in after the discussion period for this document, this supplementary concept is noted here. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)