

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	25-EPIC-01
Project Title:	Electric Program Investment Charge 2026–2030 Investment Plan (EPIC 5)
TN #:	273225
Document Title:	FieldTaskOra Comments - FieldTaskora – AI-Verified Field Evidence to Reduce Undergrounding Costs and Repeat Inspections
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	FieldTaskOra
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	10/26/2026 6:15:34 PM
Docketed Date:	10/27/2026

Comment Received From: FieldTaskOra
Submitted On: 10/26/2026
Docket Number: 25-EPIC-01

FieldTaskora â€™ AI-Verified Field Evidence to Reduce Undergrounding Costs and Repeat Inspections

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

FIELDTASKORA

PG&E EPIC 5 Innovation Challenge

Prepared for	Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) - internal EPIC 5 innovation intake
Technology partner	FieldTaskora Limited (proposed vendor/co-developer)
Project duration	18 months
Proposed demonstration	Northern California utility undergrounding field work
Requested EPIC budget	USD \$1,729,000 (proposed)
Total resource value	USD \$1,879,000 including \$150,000 proposed in-kind contribution
Prepared	27 October 2026

Basis and status

Based on PG&E's supplied 7-page Innovation Challenge form. Financials, goals and resourcing are proposed planning assumptions for sponsor review, not approved costs or guaranteed performance. PG&E site access, security, eligibility, sponsorship and any US employment authorization must be confirmed before implementation.

Executive proposal overview

FieldTaskora proposes a controlled 18-month technology demonstration that helps field crews record, validate and close quality evidence while undergrounding work is still accessible. The key research question is whether AI-assisted, human-approved evidence completeness checks materially reduce documentation-related QA defects, repeat site visits and project closeout cost while maintaining PG&E safety and cybersecurity expectations.

The pilot would be designed with PG&E’s undergrounding QA stakeholders, one or two willing delivery contractors and a proposed 20-40 field-user group. A matched baseline and an independent evaluation would test the effect on cost per mile, QA completion time, re-inspection journeys, emissions and field adoption. The project is deliberately an incremental evidence workflow that complements existing PG&E systems rather than replacing them.

The 18-month budget supports a dedicated three-person FieldTaskora delivery leadership team—Pat O’Connor (project and commercial lead), Mark Kuch (technical lead) and Alisha Mah (US product and field adoption lead)—alongside engineering specialists, cyber assurance, hosting, analysis, training and reimbursable demonstration costs. It includes two temporary Northern California project accommodation allowances for Pat and Mark and associated site logistics, subject to immigration, tax, procurement and cost-allowability review.

Investment and value in one view

EPIC requested	Vendor in-kind	Total project value
\$1.729M	\$0.150M	\$1.879M

The budget is an upper-bound planning case for a full-time 18-month cross-border demonstration, not a pre-approved PG&E estimate. Reduced on-site presence or a narrower pilot can be costed at stage-gate review. No ratepayer savings or deployment commitments are represented as achieved.

Proposed measurable success criteria: at least 30% fewer evidence-related QA findings, at least 20% faster construction-to-QA-closeout cycle time and at least 15% fewer avoidable repeat inspection trips, measured against comparable work packages. These are targets to validate or revise with PG&E baseline data; they are not current product results.

Important: This is the PG&E internal Innovation Challenge form, not the CEC 2025 Research Concept Proposal Form. PG&E’s EPIC intake owner should confirm who is permitted to submit and the form’s actual topic-area dropdown before filing.

SECTION 1 | IN SHORT

Proposal name

Enter a short title for your proposal (100 characters maximum).

Field-verified QA evidence to lower undergrounding cost per mile and cut repeat truck rolls

Summary

Provide a one-sentence summary of your solution (150 words maximum).

We propose an 18-month Northern California demonstration of FieldTaskora’s AI-assisted, supervisor-approved field evidence platform on selected PG&E undergrounding projects, capturing GPS-linked, time-stamped photo, voice and checklist records and testing completeness against agreed QA and closeout requirements while work is accessible, to validate whether the approach reduces missing evidence, repeat inspections, re-excavation risk, closeout delays, cost per mile and associated vehicle emissions, and to produce a replicable deployment model for PG&E and other California utilities.

1. EPIC 5 Research Topic Area

Identify the EPIC 5 Research Topic Area to which this proposal relates most closely.

Recommended PG&E selection: Strategic Initiative 5, “Building community resilience from prevention through recovery”; Strategic Objective 13, “Cost-Effective Grid Hardening for Long-Term Climate Impacts”; Research Topic Area 5.1, “Prevent: Understanding & mitigating risk to communities & customers.” This is the closest fit because the initiative addresses lower-cost undergrounding methods. If the dropdown differs, request the exact list from PG&E and choose the matching grid-hardening/undergrounding area; the secondary fit is Strategic Objective 12, RTA 2.2 on optimising the cost and scope of grid upgrades.

SECTION 1 | WHAT PROBLEM ARE WE TRYING TO SOLVE?

2. Specific concern or gap addressed

In your own words, describe how the problem currently shows up in our operations and hinders us from meeting our objectives. If possible, contextualize the impacts in terms of TNS KPIs. (see Enterprise Plan on a Page TNS KPIs here).

PG&E’s proposed 10-Year Electrical Undergrounding Plan, filed 30 September 2026, contemplates approximately 5,000 miles of underground distribution construction during 2028-2037 and approximately \$16.6 billion of nominal capital expenditure. Its cost per mile, construction quality and timely QA clearance are directly relevant to the True North Strategy aims of affordability and preventing catastrophic wildfires.

Underground construction creates inspection points that are difficult or costly to revisit once a trench is backfilled. For field documentation, a practical risk is that required photographs, measurements, location details, records or signatures are incomplete or difficult to reconcile with the approved QA checklist. When gaps are only discovered after site demobilisation, corrective actions may involve further reviews, additional contractor visits, project closeout delays or, in severe cases, renewed access to completed works. These are potential failure modes to be measured; PG&E has not yet supplied a verified incident rate or cost baseline.

The proposed investigation would quantify the frequency and financial impact of evidence-related QA gaps on selected PG&E projects, then test whether real-time, AI-assisted completeness checks with human sign-off reduce repeat visits and closeout friction. This aligns to affordability, safety, field execution quality and timely wildfire mitigation, without implying that all QA failures are evidence-related or that faster documentation alone changes underlying construction integrity.

3. Problem size

Quantify the size of this concern or gap. Quantification should include a financial estimate of the size of the problem, alongside any non-financial quantification (e.g. annual cost of conventional methods, reliability challenges, safety performance).

The addressable infrastructure programme is material: PG&E’s proposed EUP sets out approximately \$16.6 billion nominal construction capex (\$11.4 billion present value) over 5,000 miles. The public plan indicates an indicative 2028 unit cost of approximately \$3.05 million per mile and annual planned undergrounding of 250 miles in 2028, increasing to 625 miles from 2034, subject to approvals and execution.

The size of the specific evidence/closeout problem has not yet been established using PG&E records. During project mobilisation, the parties will calculate: gap cost per mile = (avoidable re-inspection trips × fully loaded trip cost) + (evidence-triggered re-dig events × event cost) + (avoidable QA/closeout labour hours × loaded hourly cost) + (substantiated schedule-delay costs), with double-counting removed. Annual gap cost = validated gap cost per mile × annual eligible miles.

For illustration only, a 1% recoverable friction on a \$3.05 million/mile baseline would equal approximately \$30,500/mile, or \$7.6-\$19.1 million annually across 250-625 miles. This is a sensitivity assumption, not evidence of actual PG&E losses. Non-financial metrics include QA defects per work package, hours to accept evidence, repeat site trips, vehicle miles, safety exposure and community access disruption.

SECTION 2 | WHAT SOLUTION ARE WE EXPLORING?

4.1. Detailed Description of the Technology

What is the technology you propose to evaluate through an R&D project? What makes it novel compared to technology we are currently using or evaluating?

FieldTaskora is a mobile and web platform for structured field task execution, evidence collection and accountable review. The proposed utility-specific development combines guided inspection/checklist steps; photographs, video and voice notes; location and time metadata; an integrity/evidence audit trail; AI-assisted association of evidence to required work steps; and a reviewer workflow where authorised people accept, reject or request clarification. Records can be exported to agreed formats and, subject to PG&E review, interfaced to existing document-management, GIS or project systems.

The innovation to test is not simply digitising a form. It is timely assessment of whether the evidence needed for a particular construction hold point is present, relevant and reviewable before a crew closes the workforce, while preserving human accountability and traceability. The demonstration would develop PG&E-specific checklist mappings, work in low-connectivity field settings, test AI false-accept/false-reject rates and establish a verifiable chain of evidence.

FieldTaskora's current staging product and non-utility proof-of-concept engagements provide a starting platform; field-grade offline operation, location/integrity controls, required integrations and utility-scale cybersecurity remain explicit validation and build tasks. Product performance and readiness are to be verified during mobilisation rather than represented as independently certified.

4.2. Vendors

Is there a particular vendor whose technology offerings you are interested in, or is your proposal vendor-agnostic? Leave blank if agnostic.

Named vendor and proposed co-developer: FieldTaskora Limited. PG&E would retain ownership of its standards and selection of participating contractors. The project would allow PG&E to compare measured results with its incumbent evidence-management and QA methods.

5.1. Assumptions about how the solution can address the problem

What are your assumptions about how the technology can help address the problem stated above? Structure your statement as a hypothesis: "We hypothesize that using [technology] for [PG&E use case] will lead to [measurable improvement to the problem statement]."

We hypothesise that using FieldTaskora's AI-assisted, location-linked field evidence capture and real-time completeness checking for PG&E undergrounding QA hold points and closeout will reduce evidence-related QA findings by at least 30%, reduce the median time from construction completion to accepted QA documentation by at least 20%, and reduce avoidable repeat inspection truck rolls by at least 15%, compared with matched projects using current methods.

The demonstration will also assess whether total evidence/QA process cost per mile declines after software, training, review and support costs are included, and whether avoided vehicle trips create measurable net CO₂e reductions. These are proposed research targets subject to adjustment after baseline discovery, not guaranteed results.

5.2. Exploration of alternatives

What experience do we have, or what assessments have we conducted, around this proposed technology or approach? Were alternatives considered? Optional: if so, why is this better than known alternatives?

FieldTaskora has been developed on a staging platform and has been explored with a US construction contractor on document/estimate workflows and with an Australian building inspection organisation on structured inspection records. These are relevant early product learnings, not utility deployments or measured QA savings. Customer names should only be disclosed with permission.

Alternatives to be benchmarked include: (1) existing contractor photos and PDF checklists collected for later review; (2) generic mobile-forms/evidence repositories; (3) digital design validation tools that address engineering design rather than as-built inspection evidence; and (4) drones or remote inspection technologies where conditions permit. FieldTaskora does not replace physical QA inspection or engineering judgement. Its testable differentiation is a requirement-to-evidence coverage check at the point of work with named review decisions, auditability and minimal disruption to current devices and systems.

6.1. Explanation of estimated benefits

Assuming your hypotheses about the technology are proven and PG&E operationalizes the technology into a standard, scaled solution, what benefits could we achieve? Frame benefits in terms of (A) net savings / affordability benefit to ratepayers, clarifying whether the savings accrue to expense or capital budget or both, and (B) other reliability, safety, environmental or equity benefits related to the problem statement, if deployed at scale. Include your calculation methodology.

(A) Affordability and capital/expense effects. Measure baseline evidence-related re-inspections, re-digs, documentation labour and defensible delay costs per eligible mile. Gross annual savings = baseline avoidable gap cost per mile × validated percentage reduction × eligible miles per year. Net annual savings = gross savings less incremental licence, support, integration, supervisor review and training costs. Most avoidance of construction rework and capitalised closeout labour would affect capital cost; inspection, records and audit efficiencies may affect operating expense, subject to PG&E cost classification. Ten-year NPV discounts annual net benefits at PG&E's approved financial rate and avoids double counting time and trip costs.

As an illustrative scale check, 0.1% and 0.25% net improvement on \$11.4 billion of programme present-value capex represent approximately \$11.4 million and \$28.5 million respectively. The comparison is directional and assumes eligible deployment and no overlap with savings already included in PG&E's business case; it is not a forecast.

(B) Safety, environment and resilience. Calculate avoided transport emissions from verified repeat trips avoided × mean round-trip mileage × fleet-specific CO₂e/mile, adding avoided machinery fuel only where independently established; subtract additional project travel and computing emissions where material. Track reduced field exposure, traffic management and disturbance; improved evidence traceability; and whether earlier QA acceptance contributes to energisation readiness. Report impacts separately for any participating disadvantaged/vulnerable communities.

6.2. Magnitude of estimated affordability benefit

Select the rough order of magnitude for the projected affordability benefit (net savings) NPV over 10 years, assuming the technology is successful and scaled up.

\$10-50M NPV over 10 years (conditional scenario; approximately \$11-29M under 0.1%-0.25% net-capex sensitivity; subject to PG&E baseline validation, adoption and discount assumptions).

7.1. Potential barriers / risks to successful technology demonstration and validation

Identify the most significant barriers that drive risk to successful technology development and demonstration. Consider uncertainty about the technical performance of the product, availability of the technology or capable vendors to co-develop it, barriers to appropriate demonstration sites, and similar factors.

Key risks and mitigations: (1) no established PG&E QA/rework baseline - secure data access and agree measures at a month-3 gate; (2) unconfirmed contractors and workfronts - require PG&E-led site selection and written participation; (3) cybersecurity, data handling and integration - design a restricted pilot with export and human review, then pass PG&E security acceptance; (4) low-connectivity, PPE, ruggedness and evidence quality - test onsite before scaling; (5) false AI judgements - label the output as decision support and require authorised inspector approval; (6) work visas, contractor onboarding, liability and insurance - resolve before US work commences; (7) early-stage vendor delivery capacity - support with scoped specialist resources and formal acceptance gates.

No ISO 27001 certification, US data residency or specific production availability should be claimed without written verification. Any incomplete prerequisite can trigger a narrower proof-of-concept or no-go decision.

7.2. Estimated likelihood of successful technology demonstration (%)

Enter your best estimate, as a number between 0 and 100, for the percent chance that the technology demonstrated in this project would perform successfully according to the value hypothesis.

65

8.1. Effort to operationalize and scale the demonstrated solution

Assuming your hypotheses about the technology are proven and PG&E decides to adopt it, what would need to be done to operationalize, standardize, and scale the technology? What are the risks and complexities of achieving the path to full production internally within PG&E, including policies and cost?

Stage 1 - controlled demonstration: approve the cyber, privacy, integration and safety operating model; map selected utility QA standards; and prove performance across diverse Northern California sites and contractors.

Stage 2 - PG&E implementation: appoint a standards/process owner; procure an enterprise deployment; establish permissions, retention, audit and evidence acceptance policies; map contractor templates; integrate with approved GIS, asset/work-management and document systems; train supervisors and vendors; and deploy region by region using adoption and exception dashboards. Independent reviewers retain formal authority for hold-point clearance.

Stage 3 - replication: publish an appropriate non-confidential methodology and measured outcomes, allowing comparable grid-hardening or above-ground inspection workflows to be tested by other California utilities. Scaling costs would comprise user/team or enterprise licences, support, hosting, cyber assurance, training and integration; pricing and user volumes must be tendered and are not implied by FieldTaskora's current small-team AUD price sheet. Risks include operational change management, procurement, data ownership, interoperability, accessibility and workforce adoption.

8.2. Support and commitment so far

What support or commitment for this project has already been obtained from (1) the TNS initiative owner, (2) the project sponsor, and (3) the owner of the path to production?

(1) TNS initiative owner: not yet identified or committed.

(2) Project sponsor: not yet confirmed. PG&E Continuous Improvement Consultant Kevin Sun shared the Innovation Challenge material through FieldTaskora's US contact; this is an introduction, not a sponsorship or procurement commitment.

(3) Production owner: not yet appointed. The proposed next step is a meeting with PG&E's undergrounding programme, QA/closeout standards and EPIC teams to appoint an executive sponsor, identify a host workstream and agree an authorised decision path.

8.3. Estimated likelihood of successful scaling (%)

Assuming the technology performs successfully as hypothesized in the demonstration, enter your best estimate, as a number between 0 and 100, for the percent chance that this technology will be successfully transitioned to production and scaled into PG&E operations, delivering the magnitude of estimated benefits you selected under Magnitude of estimated affordability benefit.

60

SECTION 3 | TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION & DEPLOYMENT (TD&D)

9. TD&D project objectives

What are the 1-3 most critical things that this TD&D project will aim to achieve?

1. Prove or refute a measurable reduction in evidence-related QA defects, repeat visits, avoidable rework and net cost per eligible undergrounding mile against a defensible matched baseline.
2. Quantify the change in field safety exposure, closure time and transport emissions using verified trip/vehicle logs, PG&E-approved fleet emission factors and independent validation.
3. Deliver a utility-ready workflow and decision package: agreed checklists, a reviewed audit/evidence model, security and integration specifications, training materials, operational ownership options and a quantified expansion business case.

10. TD&D project activities

In the approximate sequence that they would occur, what are the major actions that would be taken to achieve the objectives listed above? Where relevant, provide a sense of the scale of the activity (for example, if a critical project activity is recruiting customers for a technology pilot, approximately how many customers will be needed to move forward?).

1. Months 1-3: select PG&E sponsor, sites and 1-2 contractors; confirm contracts, work authorisation, cyber/data rules, acceptance criteria and 10-20 comparable historical work packages; establish measurement baseline.
2. Months 2-4: work with 2-3 PG&E QA experts to translate prioritised undergrounding hold points and closeout rules into controlled, versioned digital templates.
3. Months 3-5: configure mobile/offline capture and human-review checks; implement agreed metadata, exports and security controls; conduct field usability testing.
4. Months 4-5: train approximately 20-40 crew users and 5-10 PG&E or contractor QA reviewers, subject to PG&E approval; agree the parallel-process design.
5. Months 6-14: demonstrate on approximately 4-8 active work packages, provisionally 10-25 route miles, selected for differing field conditions; continue normal mandatory QA.
6. Months 6-15: review monthly QA findings, trip records, closeout durations, AI review accuracy, cyber exceptions and operator feedback; make controlled revisions.
7. Months 14-18: independent data validation, net cost-per-mile and CO₂e analysis, security/operations handover, scale economics and final technical and ratepayer-benefit report.

11.1. Community-specific benefits during demonstration

Does your project have the potential to be deployed in and deliver benefits to specific communities during the EPIC-funded demonstration phase (prior to scale-up)? Some TD&D projects will have the ability to deliver geographically-specific benefits to communities from the project's technology demonstration. Others may improve operations or outcomes that are not tied to any specific communities or locations on the grid. In your answer to this question, please describe whether the project TD&D scope could deliver beneficial outcomes in specific locations and communities during the demonstration phase.

Potentially yes. If PG&E selects live undergrounding sites serving high fire-threat or outage-exposed Northern California communities, the demonstration could reduce repeat contractor trips and disruption around those workfronts, while producing a stronger construction evidence record. Benefits might include fewer unnecessary access interruptions, less traffic management, avoided vehicle emissions and improved predictability of QA completion. These are measured outcomes to test, not guaranteed reductions in community outage risk.

Site selection should give appropriate consideration to disadvantaged/vulnerable communities and tribal interests where relevant. Any required community engagement, consent or local partner arrangements would be designed with PG&E and comply with the rules applying to a PG&E-administered EPIC project.

11.2. Flexibility on selecting customers and deployment sites

Describe your project's flexibility on selecting customers and/or deployment site locations. What are the constraints for appropriate deployment locations / customers?

The software is intended for standard field phones or tablets and can be configured for varied undergrounding workfronts, so the specific county and contractor are flexible. Selection constraints are: work accessible during the scheduled demonstration; willing contractors and authorised inspectors; a suitable comparable historical baseline; site-safe photography and information handling; connectivity/offline conditions within validated limits; acceptable safety and privacy procedures; and agreed authority to use the completed, de-identified data for research. PG&E will select and authorise sites; no third-party customer recruitment is assumed.

12. Estimated TD&D project duration (months)

Enter your expected timeframe, in number of months, to conduct the full scope of this TD&D project, including final reporting time at the end of the project.

18

PROJECT EXECUTION MODEL

13. Innovation Accelerator

Would you consider the Innovation Accelerator a fit for the execution model of this project? This is not a binding choice, but it will prompt our IA team to review your project for fit. IA projects must deliver 10x+ value and must explore a customer or stakeholder gap or product design need. IA projects also involve staffing an Entrepreneur in Residence (EIR), which requires EIR labor cost to be paid through EPIC or other PG&E funds.

No - a standard EPIC technology demonstration is the preferred model. We are open to PG&E assessing Innovation Accelerator suitability if a sponsor identifies a compelling product-design gap and can justify the additional Entrepreneur-in-Residence costs. No EIR cost is included in the current budget.

SECTION 4 | INVESTMENT REQUESTED

14. Estimated budget for R&D project (\$)

Enter your estimated budget requirement to run the full scope you envision for this TD&D project. If a portion of this total may be funded through other budgets or cost sharing from a vendor or site host, exclude the cost-shared portion here and describe it under Cost sharing opportunity.

USD \$1,729,000 requested from EPIC 5, representing the rounded net requirement for an 18-month, multi-site technology demonstration. The full proposed delivery value is USD \$1,879,000, including a provisional USD \$150,000 FieldTaskora non-cash contribution (Q15). The supporting cost model is in Appendix A. All figures are in US dollars and are budgetary estimates pending PG&E scope, procurement, rate, travel, payroll, immigration and eligible-cost checks.

The funded scope includes the project-specific allocations of Pat O'Connor (programme delivery), Mark Kuch (technical architecture/engineering) and Alisha Mah (US user adoption/project operations); specialist development and integration; QA subject-matter mapping; secure hosting and independent evaluation; and controlled field deployment. Two temporary Northern California project accommodation allowances for Pat and Mark are included for 18 months each, only to the extent required for their assigned onsite delivery and eligible under the final award rules. Personal or non-project costs are excluded. Any PG&E internal staff costs or separate EIR costs are not presumed included.

15. Cost sharing opportunity

Describe any potential opportunities to leverage external funds (outside of PG&E) or alternative PG&E program budgets to offset the EPIC 5 portion of the cost of executing the project.

FieldTaskora proposes, subject to its board approval and PG&E acceptance, a USD \$150,000 non-cash contribution consisting of a USD \$65,000 in-kind licence/use valuation for pre-existing platform intellectual property, USD \$50,000 of reusable core-product engineering performed outside the grant-funded workplan and USD \$35,000 of non-project commercialisation and general product enablement. These amounts are not included again in the requested reimbursable costs and would be evidenced separately where cost-share rules permit.

Additional offsets may include uncompensated contractor participation or PG&E operations/continuous-improvement staff time, but none is currently committed or deducted from Q14. The EPIC funding request will be reduced if PG&E confirms other eligible cash or in-kind contributions.

ADDITIONAL DETAILS | FORM FIELDS

Who is submitting this idea? The PG&E-internal form should be filed by an authorised PG&E employee or nominated sponsor. The proposed vendor input is prepared for PG&E by FieldTaskora Limited, coordinated by Mark Kuch (CTO), Pat O'Connor (project/commercial lead) and Alisha Mah (US product and field stakeholder lead). PG&E should determine whether "Yourself" is appropriate for its submitting employee.

Suggested tags: undergrounding; grid hardening; QA/QC; wildfire mitigation; construction closeout; field inspection; field evidence; artificial intelligence; ratepayer affordability; cost per mile; repeat truck rolls; emissions; PG&E EUP; RTA 5.1; Northern California.

APPENDIX A | PROJECT BUDGET (USD)

Planning case - 18 months. Fully budgeted founder assignments and two temporary US field placements. The costs below are estimates of project services, required travel and professional delivery infrastructure, not guaranteed award eligibility or fixed employee take-home pay.

Category	Budget line / basis	USD
Personnel	Pat O'Connor - project director, 18 months × \$12,500	\$225,000
Personnel	Mark Kuch - technical director, 18 months × \$14,000	\$252,000
Personnel	Alisha Mah - US product and pilot lead, 18 months × \$11,000	\$198,000
Personnel	Employer/contract administration and payroll load (17% on \$675,000)	\$114,750
US deployment	Temporary furnished project accommodation - 2 staff × 18 months × \$3,250	\$117,000
US deployment	Local vehicles, insurance and routine travel - 2 staff × 18 × \$1,200	\$43,200
US deployment	International mobilisation, essential flights and relocations	\$28,000
US deployment	Site visits, regional travel, field expenses and accommodation overflow	\$48,000
US deployment	Immigration/work authorisation and tax advisory for cross-border assignments	\$28,000
US deployment	Project-related health coverage and employer administration provision	\$26,000
Technology	Specialist software development and field/offline functionality	\$180,000
Technology	Utility QA rules, integration and metadata mapping specialists	\$75,000
Technology	Secure cloud hosting, storage, monitoring, licences and support	\$70,000
Technology	Independent cyber/privacy assessment and remediation allowance	\$85,000
Technology	Mobile devices, field testing and security equipment	\$22,000
Pilot & evidence	Crew training, onboarding, usability and helpdesk resources	\$38,000
Pilot & evidence	Independent research, cost and emissions evaluation	\$65,000
Pilot & evidence	Project legal, insurance, procurement and compliance	\$35,000
Pilot & evidence	Approved contractor participation and field disruption allowance	\$46,000
Pilot & evidence	Stakeholder/community coordination and workshops	\$12,000
Direct cost subtotal		\$1,707,950
Contingency (~10% of direct costs)		\$171,050
Total proposed project value		\$1,879,000
Proposed FieldTaskora non-cash cost share		(\$150,000)
EPIC 5 amount requested - Q14		\$1,729,000

Budget treatment and commercial assumptions

- Pat, Mark and Alisha are assumed to be fully dedicated to this project for 18 months. The monthly figures are preliminary gross project service allocations, not confirmed employment agreements or net salaries. Any actual tax, employment, pension, fringe-benefit or employer-of-record charges will be reviewed with advisers; the 17% provision is a planning assumption.
- Two separate furnished field residences have been assumed for the full 18 months, at \$3,250 per person per month including ordinary utilities. This is a planning allowance benchmarked above published unfurnished Sacramento asking rents to allow flexibility, furnished terms and Northern California site mobility. PG&E may require travel-policy caps or shorter authorised stays.
- Visa/immigration counsel must confirm lawful US work authorisation before Pat or Mark conduct onsite productive project work. A business visitor or ESTA entry is not a substitute for an appropriate work-authorised status. Costs for personal partners/dependants, permanent housing, leisure travel and unrelated living expenses are not included.
- Founder personnel costs, accommodation, travel, cloud use and consultants must be supported by timesheets, invoices, allocation methods and an approved project cost policy. The proposal excludes double-billing of ordinary FieldTaskora subscription pricing alongside project-funded pilot hosting.
- PG&E internal labour, incremental EIR staffing (not selected) and large-scale post-pilot enterprise rollout are outside this request unless explicitly introduced and separately funded.

APPENDIX B | STAGE-GATE GOVERNANCE

Months	Gate	Required evidence
0-3	Foundation and sponsor	PG&E sponsor, qualified baseline, site access, contracting, security and lawful staffing confirmed.
4-5	Technical/site readiness	PG&E checklist prototypes, offline tests, reviewer acceptance and safety signoff.
6-9	First live study	Initial work packages, validated QA metrics, model accuracy and operating feedback.
10-14	Expanded field proof	4-8 work packages where available; monthly control review and intervention tracking.
15-18	Independent evaluation	Validated savings, emissions analysis, scale/no-scale decision, final report and technology handover.

Deliverable controls: all AI-assisted flags require an authorised human decision, and PG&E retains its existing safety/quality approval process. A baseline-led gate after month 3 will determine whether the initial scale and budget are still justified.