Zoom Recording for SSDR QC Working Group

Meeting Date: **October 6, 2022**

Meeting Recording:

https://energy.zoom.us/rec/play/BFIKqarzduigpFpM8YrqGXxnSnuXjeQNV6cw_1D21dKQAmevQ YwsR0CaQNtp1yETCfWt24LGJ

SSDR QC Working Group Chat October 6, 2022

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:00:12**Good morning, everyone. We will wait, and just a few more minutes to make sure we get everybody on and connected.**

- 00:01:04Good morning, everyone. Um. We'll. Just wait a few more minutes until we hit critical last year. Maybe one more minute.
- 00:02:26Okay, Um, Hopefully, we've reached critical mass of twenty-five books on the line.
- 00:02:32Um,
- 00:02:34i'm going to stay up video today. I'm calling in from a from an Airbnb: So I don't have the best av setup. Um,

- 00:02:42but uh, so today our our main um main agenda item is to go over the results from the survey. Um. We'll use that to to sort of narrow our discussion a little bit on to um, you know which um
- 00:03:00you know, which proposals did really well by, you know which principles which didn't do so well figure out where the areas agreement and disagreement are. Um!
- 00:03:12Before we do that, I just wanted to remind everybody um that formal or or the written comments, I should say, are due October thirteenth. Um! And again, these should be sort of kind of your your final um resting resting place of your uh you know where where your support.
- 00:03:31Um, You know what your position is on the various proposals. Um, including the additional items such as how to handle um, you know. Adders um, and intercycle updates things like that.
- 00:03:45Um.
- 00:03:47So before
- 00:03:50um,
- 00:03:51before we dive into the survey results. Um, Are there any questions on the line.
- 00:04:04Okay,
- 00:04:07cool. Um: So
- 00:04:10yeah, I I think I just want to start by um
- 00:04:14shoot, and I still cannot share my screen. Um,
- 00:04:20But I think we can go over
- 00:04:22um
- 00:04:24some of the various results,
- 00:04:26Tom, do you have that image that I I send you?
- 00:04:29Do you know, if that
- 00:04:32happen to go out to the working group, or do you just have it that you could share on your screen
- 00:04:53technical difficulties to strike again? Um

Tom Flynn

00:04:58sorry, Eric. I was on mute. Um, I I have the image that you sent to me through Teams job.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:05:05Provide that to you somehow, or set up. Yeah, good. Are you able to just share your screen? Is that with that

- 00:05:14as a file or something?

Tom Flynn

00:05:20Can you see that?

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:05:21Yeah. Pretty small, though?

Tom Flynn

00:05:25Oh, boy, that got big. Oh, yeah, there it is. How do I make it get smaller again?

- 00:05:32Exactly.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:05:34There we go, hopefully. We can find a happy medium in there.

Unknown Speaker

00:05:39Yeah.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:05:41Okay, Um. So what I've done here.

- 00:05:45Um,
- 00:05:47I I ordered the principles.
- 00:05:51Oh, shoot! And we can't see the uh
- 00:05:53the names of the different proposals down below, but I've ordered them from
- 00:05:59uh sort of most disagreement to least disagreement. Um! So you'll sort of see, you know that the bottom one there best available information kind of ranges from from three, you know, in the threes. Um. Whereas if we go up to the top Um,
- 00:06:18Um,

Tom Flynn

00:06:22yeah shoot. I wish I could share my screen. Um. But, Tom, if you scroll kind of up to the top, I was just trying to show the order of the proposal calls. Oh, yeah, yeah, thanks. So It's Cd: Cdmc's. Then It' connects and Cliica and um,

- 00:06:40the demand side analysis. Josh's and then energy commissions last

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:06:44Yeah, and and those are That's the order that uh the survey was in just for reference. Um! And then but if we look at the top, there's you know quite a bit of variability, and so I thought it would be most helpful to kind of start where there's most variability um in in sort of the

- 00:07:03the average rankings.
- 00:07:05Um!
- 00:07:07And so, you know, I I think just
- 00:07:11you know, we we can sort of go through and and see, you know which scored the best, which are kind of in the middle, which are at the bottom end, and we can have folks, you know, both the proponents, and you know folks who who rated it one way or the other.
- 00:07:24Kind of um
- 00:07:26you know. Kind of talk us through their
- 00:07:29their their mindset about why they think something did well or or not as well. So we can start with use limitations, availability, limitations, and variability and output. Can you guys repeat the order of the proposals again, and you get a chance to jot it down.
- 00:07:46Yeah,

Tom Flynn

00:07:48Can Can you see that, Josh:

Josh Bode

00:07:51it's at the bottom? Okay. Got it perfect?

Tom Flynn

00:07:55Sorry the way we laid this out. It's not always obvious.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:08:01Okay, I just put it in the the chat there.

- 00:08:04Um,
- 00:08:06If if that helps um,
- 00:08:10yeah, let's see
- 00:08:14um, you know. So I it
- 00:08:16one of the things that's striking. I think of this first one. Um
- 00:08:22at two point one um
- 00:08:26uh said me the said my proposal. Um
- 00:08:31doesn't do all that. Well, um!
- 00:08:36Can somebody talk about? You know Why, either they thought this
- 00:08:40this did not
- 00:08:41do well, or is there any disagreement? Is there anyone who thinks that? Actually
- 00:08:46the Um said My proposal does, you know, does really take these things into consideration,
- 00:08:58Luke.

Luke Tougas

00:09:05Thanks. Yeah, I think. Um, you know probably one of the reasons why, if uh the Council is uh, you know, proposal scored low in a lot of these areas because it left a lot of

- 00:09:19read them to um. You know each individual D, our provider or utility, to decide how they how they want to account for these and um rather than having sort of explicit
- 00:09:32um rather than explicitly addressing a lot of these issues like you know, use limitations, availability, limitations and variability. It all goes down to, you know, placing the responsibility on the you know utility or to your provider to manage these things and account for these things, and how they,
- 00:09:51uh, you know, calculate their claimed qualifying capacity values. And again, you know, subject to a penalty mechanism. So
- 00:10:02I can understand Why, folks would. Uh you know some of these Um. As well as
- 00:10:09yeah, as well as they have in some of these categories. But I think
- 00:10:15that's the why? That's the reason why is that we haven't have not explicitly
- 00:10:20um address them. But you know One thing I've noticed is that, as I you know, Speaking for myself, as I've gone through

- 00:10:29all these proposals and rank them, is that you know the principles have been definitely useful. Um, but you know they don't necessarily tell the whole story, you know. And um
- 00:10:40obviously we'll be addressing. You know these things. The other kind of factors or elements that are um in our comments that are not necessarily addressed in the principles. And so um, you know. Nevertheless, it
- 00:10:52it's interesting to see where everyone is coming out on these, even if our you know the Council's uh proposal is coming out on the lower end of things. But so, anyhow, i'll leave it at that.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:11:03Sure. Yeah, thanks, Luke. Yeah, I agree. And you know, just a again. Um for everybody's benefit. You know, these are are really to sort of guide and and see where everybody's at. You know. These are by no means uh, you know, gonna be the the final determination of,

- 00:11:19you know, just to selecting one based on an average score or anything like that.
- 00:11:24Um, pop!

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

00:11:29Hi! This is Paul on behalf of Kleika, and people hear me. Okay,

- 00:11:33Yes, thank you.
- 00:11:42They um the requirements and the Dr. Maximum cumulative capacity. Buck addresses these those two issues,
- 00:11:51and so, when we did the poll, we pretty much left that blank for all the proposals, because we felt that this was not inherently in the Qc. Methodology, but was being addressed with
- 00:12:03the um the maximum. You know, the Drs maximum community capacity buckets that
- 00:12:08we think that will continue to be in place going forward, you know, in twenty twenty-four and twenty twenty-five, and beyond

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:12:18is that I sorry, I thought I recalled something about you know, re-examining whether the the humid of capacity buckets were still appropriate under slice of day, and all That is Is that correct, or am I? There are people that are suggesting that they remove

some of them. But I I I think, for Dr. You're still going to have to have a def, you know. Define of when you want Dr. Programs how many calls per month,

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

00:12:43or is required? How many hours per year. You know. What months do they have to be available if you want to count them for resource, adequacy,

- 00:12:52And so you know the Qc's. And it generally said, Well, what's the key? What's what capacity can we expect when we're most likely to call it? Need it for reliability?
- 00:13:02But
- 00:13:03that that number doesn't necessarily always address the fact that when is the program required to be available or it's use limitations.
- 00:13:12You know that's been handled in the th. Those requirements that are defined in the
- 00:13:17in the cumulative capacity bucket.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:13:21Okay,

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

00:13:22uh, Jack. So?

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:13:24Oh, sorry.

Josh Bode

00:13:28It is. Okay. Um. Just a clarifying question. I'm: kind of curious how many responses you got, and how you weighed cases where you got responses from multiple people in the same organization.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:13:38Um, we had, I think, eleven responses. I don't think we had any duplicates from the same organization,

Josh Bode

00:13:49and they're always equally. I'm: assuming right? Okay, let's just clarify them.

Luke Tougas

00:14:00Let me Thank you.

Unknown Speaker

00:14:02Yeah,

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:14:03Um, no,

- 00:14:17Nor if you're if you're talking, we still can't hear you.
- 00:14:41Okay? Well, I think. Oh,
- 00:14:44are you unmuted?
- 00:14:47I thought I saw in her
- 00:14:49unmute for a second. Do you still have a question in your
- 00:15:04Hmm.
- 00:15:06Seems like you're toggling on and off, but your hand went down so I would assume uh no no questions for now.
- 00:15:13Um!
- 00:15:17So I I I'll just make a comment on this first one, you know. I was surprised sort of at the the variability in the middle. Three proposals.
- 00:15:28Um, I I thought that they were actually all you know, whatever that ranking is. I I thought they were all pretty similar um based on, you know. There's sort of
- 00:15:40you know it more or less maintaining the the load impact protocol kind of as as the

- 00:15:46skeleton. Um! I recognize that that Josh's has the you know the bam and the pam and the two two metrics he proposed. Um, but I didn't really see how this fed into determining a Qc.
- 00:16:04Um or or capacity, um, you know, exposed to our X and d capacity
- 00:16:10um, And so I was wondering if there's somebody who, you know rated,
- 00:16:15you know these pretty differently, could talk about how they saw them as as very different proposals
- 00:16:28just to clarify. You're referring to the the first principle.

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

00:16:48Hi! This this is Paul, and for Kla. I also want to add on the voting.

- 00:16:54We kind of view the own connect,
- 00:16:56since it was proposing simplifications of the existing lip.
- 00:17:02We kind of didn't view it as A. New
- 00:17:05Qc. Proposal, so we actually didn't vote on it. We left them all blank,
- 00:17:11and apologies to Maria. If that was, you know how it affects this, the the scores on that. But
- 00:17:19we weren't sure what to do with with um
- 00:17:22that one I mean, we support the simplification process to manage, you know. Measurement evaluation costs, but we just didn't sure how to answer these questions.

Josh Bode

00:17:32So I just want to let people know on that one. Okay, thanks. And actually on a second, that uh overall. Because I think like the unconnect, you know wasn't really addressing these questions. It's obviously a different issue which helped to simplify some of the process. Uh, you know. So it's kind of didn't fit the creating criteria. It would be a good to, but it's sort of its own thing.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:17:51Um, yeah. Well, I I i'll say that, you know, even if it's not changing some of the items in the status quo. That you know. The status quo is is still

- 00:18:01a Qc. Methodology that that could still be ranked by all these these principles. We we didn't list it as one specifically, but I I think there's no you know no reason that

Josh Bode

00:18:12the status, quo or or system couldn't be rated along those. Yeah, I think that that the own community that directly say, hey, we want to keep the status cool right? So therefore we can look at this. It's a simplification of the protocols, which i'm fine with a whole bunch of stuff they put together. We just didn't fit into the integrating criteria right here. So it's hard to kind of grade

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:18:33or to score. Sure. Okay,

Lizzette Garcia

00:18:37Um! Is there anybody out there that that that and I concur with Paul and Josh. It was in as a personal opinion it was hard to assist

- 00:19:06changes or modifications to the They are protocols.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:19:13Okay?

- 00:19:15Um. So I I guess similarly. Um,
- 00:19:21uh, Well, I I guess maybe we can just go. Oh, Luke, you out of your hand up again.

Luke Tougas

00:19:27I I I think I you know I don't necessarily share that same opinion about the um connects proposal. I mean the way I looked at all these proposals is that is, I applied the principles to whatever the methodology is right, and so to the you know, even though i'm connect,

- 00:19:43was using, You know um the current protocols with with with some of us, and you know some changes to streamline them. That's you know,
- 00:19:57uh of my rankings, anyhow. So In other words, I applied

- 00:20:01these principles to the existing, you know. Approach with, you know, lips with this, you know, slowly streamlined

Unknown Speaker

00:20:09uh changes, you know, and so uh that

Luke Tougas

00:20:12to me I I didn't have any problems.

- 00:20:15It's been doing this.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:20:16Yeah, thanks, Luke. I think that was certainly our our intention. Um. So I I appreciate that. Um,

- 00:20:25yeah. But I guess if if folks didn't read it, folks didn't read it that's all right. Um, you know, these scores sort of just are are what they are again. Not a not a conclusive, you know. Um final decision or or anything. Um,
- 00:20:42But I guess we can move to the the second
- 00:20:45principle. Here and again a lot of variability kind of mirrors. The first
- 00:20:52um.
- 00:20:54But this is that you know the Qc. Methodology measures capacity when reliability needs are our highest.
- 00:21:01Um! Again, we saw um, said Mick, scoring sort of low on this. I My interpretation of that is that you know you're
- 00:21:12typically going to be measuring average load impacts and and sort of not doing any weather
- 00:21:18normalization.
- 00:21:20Um, We saw sort of the the same pattern among the the middle three again. That's um streamlined lips. Then um
- 00:21:33uh, I guess. Clicka, and then demand side analytics,
- 00:21:37you know. I'm i'm still curious if folks um
- 00:21:42can explain why why they thought
- 00:21:45you know of these three Why, they're sort of in that order.
- 00:21:49Um, you know, preferably from someone who rings them all
- 00:22:07quiet Thursday morning
- 00:22:10lid

Luke Tougas

00:22:12I actually it. Uh, I'm not going to give you exactly what you want. So I apologize. Now. Um, basically I I I mean, maybe this will person discussion. I I interpreted this principle the same way that you did, and and because of that I even gave my own uh uh a proposal, for

- 00:22:31whereas I gave a lot of the other folks five, because they, you know, admittedly had more. You know they all had a
- 00:22:39weather variability, you know. Element to it, you know. So that was something.
- 00:22:47So So because of that I gave fines, um, you know, for for the middle three if I recall correctly.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:22:54Okay, Thanks.

Luke Tougas

00:22:56Actually, I gave everyone else a five except for my own, which I gave it for. And so I felt like, uh all the others, you know, had that kind of weather adjustment um element to it.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:23:13Yeah, sure. Um. So So I don't understand why the lips, like like home connects would have such a a big difference with um dsa's uh proposal, because they both um, you know that that's that's kind of like not like giving a low score for that for the lips.

Luke Tougas

00:23:31You know um what it what it seemed to imply that a lot of folks believe that the lips do not do a good job of doing a accounting for weather variability, or or where the weather dependence, which

- 00:23:44is contrary to what I've heard from a lot of folks throughout, you know all these workshops.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:23:51Yeah, I I think that's what i'm getting at to. And and i'd be curious to hear somebody give me their sort of their read on it. You know why. Why, some of these are better than the others.

- 00:24:04Uh, Paul, I see I hand it.

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

00:24:07Yeah, yeah, I mean the

- 00:24:10the demand side analytics proposal. And this proposal are not that far apart. I mean, Josh is added to performance metrics,
- 00:24:19which,
- 00:24:20strictly speaking, Aren't. The Qc. But there are more performance metrics added to the process. And then, if you view home, connect is essentially the status quo,
- 00:24:31you know a lot of what clique is proposing is using a lot of the status quo that we have today, because it already develops these hourly values. So
- 00:24:42I would expect. You know those three proposals to be ranked very similarly, you know. And why we're getting, You know, this much variation. It's just. I I think it really just kind of depends on how people interpret the question,
- 00:24:57and they interpret it differently.
- 00:25:00Um, you know, on the reliability needs of the highest, I think I gave a slightly lower Sc. To to, to, to, to the Councils, because, you know, they put forth.
- 00:25:11You know these Qc. Values that are, you know it. It will, They said. They will do it shaped, but we don't really know exactly how they're doing it. I mean it doesn't specify, you know. Um. You know a a system reliability need It's just here it is,
- 00:25:26and I think I may have Slo ranked it a slightly lower than the other, you know. Then the then the then the um demand side analytics proposal on those. But i'd have to go back and look at what we actually did. So

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:25:43sure. Thanks. Uh Josh:

Josh Bode

00:25:47Yeah, I I don't know how how everybody else scored it, but I know, like one of the factors that kind of kicked in when I looked at that is in writing the proposal. I think we kind of went a bit extra

- 00:25:56trying to make sure that we accounted for it really documented how different resources vary not just for the one and two conditions, but additional so like. For whether or not we put in a time temperature matrix, as um, you know, Paul noted. But in the the Bam and Pam metrics and performance alignment metric and the bit alignment metric.
- 00:26:15So you know, It's like a a lot of the proposals, you know, specifically the ones that are saying this, and for back the load in bed. Protocols are similar. Um!
- 00:26:24But I do think, like the one that we propose is slightly different in terms of trying to add more transparency to how it resources? Very

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:26:33sure. Yeah. Um,

- 00:26:36Okay,
- 00:26:39Thanks. Okay. So let's see. Um. Oh, no, You're back.

ndeleanu

00:26:45Uh, I think. My, yes, we can hear you.

- 00:26:49Uh, I I I Just I think that all these proposals are kind of slightly different in what they're trying to accomplish.
- 00:26:57So uh, I think, as I said, the proposal
- 00:27:02is is there?

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:27:06I can hear you.

ndeleanu

00:27:09Uh, I think the the send back proposal is is very. I mean it scores highly on the simplicity which I really appreciate it, and

- 00:27:19but it can be made more sophisticated.
- 00:27:24It's combined with some other proposals to to wait like
- 00:27:29uh hours of most need, higher
- 00:27:32uh,
- 00:27:34as far as like more alarming with the
- 00:27:39with with that metric
- 00:27:42um like if you if you wait performance with
- 00:27:46more uh, if you have some requirements to
- 00:27:54at least some minimum standards for
- 00:27:58uh, the
- 00:28:00availability limitation uh the availability requirements, then it's not going to be
- 00:28:06as sophisticated as a full matrix of performance by number of hours,
- 00:28:14or estimated for four minutes, really by number of hours. But it get closer.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:28:23Yeah, thank you.

- 00:28:25Okay. Any more thoughts on this one. We probably got to keep going, anyway. So let's move on to ex-post's methods.
- 00:28:34Um,
- 00:28:36then, this one things get a little closer together. Um!
- 00:28:42Um! This is actually one where I was surprised, really surprised that the the sed me um proposal did not
- 00:28:51um score very highly. Um, it. It seems like that's pretty clearly defined to me um. So I was wondering if if somebody could say, you know, if they thought this one was,
- 00:29:05you know, if they rated it low, you know sort of why,
- 00:29:19and he gets to put a little more shape around that, I think,
- 00:29:22uh both Luke and my proposal. So you know the ones on either side. There. Um, we are really based around um, you know, sort of a a comparison in ex-post with with sort of ex anti commitments.
- 00:29:37Um, And so I you know I would have. I would have thought that the two on the ends would have scored much more highly, and the three in the middle, you know, having Haven't worked on some load. In fact, protocols like it can be pretty difficult in retrospect to say you know what actually was the the capacity value.
- 00:29:53Um, you know the exposed capacity of of a resource.
- 00:29:57Um,

Luke Tougas

00:30:01Eric, This is okay. It might be a matter of interpretation. Perhaps you know,

Unknown Speaker

00:30:06looking at this,

Luke Tougas

00:30:08you know, yesterday was doing the rankings. I had to think about a little bit, and um

- 00:30:14I mean I interpret it the way you did it in that, you know,
- 00:30:18or to mean that you know, uh or or refer to the the connection between the ex-post number and the Qc. Number, and you know, like you said that was the
- 00:30:32one of the fundamental bases you know of the Council's proposal was to to draw that, you know directly draw that connection. And so um yeah, I mean because of that, I definitely saw that as being a
- 00:30:45a five for the Council's proposal. But uh, um,
- 00:30:49perhaps others didn't interpret the principle in the same way.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:30:54Yeah, thanks, agreed. And

- 00:30:57any any of the other thoughts on
- 00:31:00you know. Why, Why, the like,
- 00:31:03you know the three.
- 00:31:05Yeah, any of the three sort of middle ones, I I guess, other than
- 00:31:10uh stream my lips Why, this sort of performed better,
- 00:31:21I I guess I can sort of see
- 00:31:24you know the the bam and the the Pam, you know, maybe
- 00:31:29sort of adding to this idea of of looking at ex-post performance, but at the same time I didn't see how those metrics actually. Um,
- 00:31:41you know, uh
- 00:31:44how they actually influenced ex-posts or capacity, or you know
- 00:31:50how how how those metrics could have sort of
- 00:31:55you've been. Um,
- 00:31:57how do I say this

- 00:31:59integrated into You know a sort of ex-post comparison relative to commitments.
- 00:32:22No thoughts on that from the group.
- 00:32:30Yeah, Josh,

Josh Bode

00:32:32I don't know if uh I want to speak too much here. But, uh, in general, you know there's two distinctions to be made. One of them is whether exposed is based on settlement or an evaluation approach right? Because that that is a difference. Um,

- 00:32:45and you know currently, the several methods are primarily heuristics. Right? So it's a key distinction that we have. No. This. This is the distinction in there that I notice is just simply the fact that, and I think it's less about exposed methods. But it's about having the trying to use the best method available when you're analyzing that,
- 00:33:04uh, but also just having a connection between the exposed uh and the exante. But I don't know how other folks interpreted that those are the two things that kind of jumped out for me when I was looking at scores.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:33:17Right? So I think you touched on a few things there. But one thing I heard about the the said me proposal is that it's um.

- 00:33:26It's explicitly tied to uh settlement as the method of um.
- 00:33:36Yeah, I guess as the method of um
- 00:33:39sort of ex post um load impact analysis.
- 00:33:43Um,
- 00:33:45So I could see that,
- 00:33:47you know, being a little less accurate. Um, you know, like you said a heuristic
- 00:33:53Um,
- 00:33:58but it I mean I guess it. It at least does include. Yeah, Anyway, I guess it. It does include explicitly sort of how to do it, which is sort of, I guess. Why, I was
- 00:34:10confused
- 00:34:13or curious, I should say,
- 00:34:19Okay,
- 00:34:21Um.
- 00:34:23So another one. I guess we can move on to the the next principle.
- 00:34:27Proposal translates capabilities into reliability value.
- 00:34:32Um, I I think here we're seeing a lot of the same power uh same patterns from above. Um.
- 00:34:40In this case, I think

- 00:34:43the sedmic proposal and the Cc. Proposal are a bit more distinct from one another. Um again. Probably i'm guessing because of this weather sensitivity,
- 00:34:54you know whether normalization question
- 00:34:57and
- 00:35:00is.
- 00:35:02And then um, you know a bit more difference between some of the the sort of
- 00:35:08middle three here.

Unknown Speaker

00:35:13Yeah.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:35:15So. And any thoughts on on why some of these perform better than others.

- 00:35:28Allen,

Alan Wong - SCE

00:35:31Eric uh Alan from Sc. I I think maybe I don't know if this is applicable for all parties, but we kind of took the approach like, Do we see something being demonstrated, uh, because otherwise everything in the proposal for the most part was sort of conceptual.

- 00:35:48So if you know, we didn't see certain
- 00:35:53uh principles being addressed directly. I think this is kind of consistent with the story that you know folks have as well. We just kind of assume that you know this. We get a higher score uh versus something that we didn't get, you know, seen or demonstrated. So
- 00:36:07um
- 00:36:09without getting into too specific of like, you know exactly why we scored a different way. I think that was one of the a potential factor that I came into play when we started scoring these.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:36:20Sure, Yeah, do I mean? Do you have anything to say about you know which you thought?

- 00:36:25Did you know? Did did do a good job of this? Um! Does it sort of align with with the averages that we see here, or that there any places that you you know, have have some disagreement.

Alan Wong - SCE

00:36:39Uh sorry. Just make sure. Uh, we're on the the translating the capabilities into reliability,

- 00:36:46the the reliability value. Right? Are we talking about?

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:36:50Yeah, correct?

Alan Wong - SCE

00:36:53I I think,

- 00:36:55in in my opinion, we we. We. We generally know when the net peak is, and when the greatest need of the system Grid is so. If
- 00:37:05this resource or this methodology
- 00:37:08was capturing. You know what value this uh potential Dr. Resources coming on or or existing resources
- 00:37:16can be valued during you know highest need, or during that peak.
- 00:37:21Um, And it's kind of sort of demonstrated that, you know it would get a higher score among the you know the rest of the proposals.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:37:33Sure. Yeah. Okay.

- 00:37:37Thanks, Allan.
- 00:37:39And
- 00:37:42okay.

- 00:37:45Um. Any other thoughts on on translating resource capabilities into a reliable reliability value
- 00:37:53before we move on to our next one.
- 00:38:00Okay,
- 00:38:02Um,
- 00:38:04let's see. So the uh
- 00:38:07um. The next principle is the methodology is transparent and understandable, and not a a ton of variability. Between these I will note. My own proposal did not score very well. Uh, I I hope that's
- 00:38:24not because the proposal itself was not understandable. Um, but uh, could could somebody um talk to me a little bit about? Why, they thought,
- 00:38:36and let's see Klika is in the middle there, scoring the highest Um! Why, they thought that was the highest score, or perhaps why the Cc. Proposal was the lowest performer for for this one
- 00:39:06sleepy crowd today.

ndeleanu

00:39:11So

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:39:13hey, Luke, go ahead.

Luke Tougas

00:39:15Yeah, thanks, sir. Um, I think for me in instances where you know proposals were maybe lacking in

- 00:39:25process,
- 00:39:26and how it would all work. I think there. You know that that affected my score, but also um. You know there were a few instances uh uh via the Cc's and clique is in particular that were I wasn't one hundred percent sure. What was being proposed.
- 00:39:45Um, I think is was the least easy for me to understand. Um, but uh um! And then and then the Cc's came second in that ranking. Um, but it would um it,
- 00:39:59I think what it is for me. Anyhow, this is just a purely a product of probably. How I think about things is that I felt like the uh the con like There's a lot of work that um, you know, attention devoted to the concept, but less
- 00:40:13and the actual. What implementation or how it would be applied. I think that's probably what I was thinking about

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:40:25Gotcha. Thanks. Yeah, that that that does help. Uh, admittedly, a little bit different from how I was approaching this. I I hope there's not too much confusion.

- 00:40:35Um around it. Um, I I think I I remember this, this proposal being included. Um, you know over concerns that the
- 00:40:44current process, you know not terribly transparent. Um, and that uh, you know some of the other options on the table. We're not, you know, very understandable in terms of um, you know. I think I I recall Elcc being sort of um
- 00:41:04uh characterized that way. Um.
- 00:41:09So you know, I I hope I hope this. You know these ratings have less to do with sort of like clarity of the proposal, and and more to do with like. How transparent and understandable would these proposals be to?
- 00:41:22Uh, you know the process and the the numbers that come out of them. How transparent and understandable would they be to You know market participants to our providers.
- 00:41:32Um,

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

00:41:48right. This is Paul, I mean, I I think another issue here is, how are you defined? Transparent, understandable? And then the

- 00:41:58the um
- 00:42:01on the Council's proposal.
- 00:42:03You know they provide numbers using their their expertise, but we really don't know exactly how they came up with it,
- 00:42:10so in that case it may not be very Tr. Is that viewpoint? It may not be
- 00:42:15transparent, understandable compared to you know, some of the aggression approaches.
- 00:42:20However, I've heard from. You know a lot of the Dr. Providers, you know, when
- 00:42:26values are submitted in April, and then they get finally get it approved and adopted by the Commission. The numbers can change,
- 00:42:35and that can affect even under the current process,
- 00:42:38and they don't get necessarily know why they change, and then from that viewpoint well guess what the you know. The The status quo is not very transparent and understandable.
- 00:42:47Two different perspectives of what transparent and understand what means.

- 00:42:52So it's all going to depend on how, what you're viewing that in voting needs. Because if you're looking at one way, you may vote differently, depending on how you're viewing. What is the the part of from what is transparent, understandable, mean?
- 00:43:07And then I think it was also pointed as what to variation here is very minor, and i'll leave it to Josh to go with. These are, uh, statistically, significantly different. Eleven votes. No, I agree there's there's not much.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:43:22Um.

- 00:43:24But I yeah, I I guess i'm actually surprised at the lack of variability here. Yeah, you know A again. You know the the three
- 00:43:34um sort of three in the middle here that are kind of based off of load impact protocols. Um, you know the the low impact protocols themselves have been a you know, one of one of the big topics of conversation has been, you know, the lack of transparency and and sort of understandability about
- 00:43:52You know how they end up getting their final results. Um, and you know, so I I would have thought those ones would have not scored as well. Um, but i'm i'm curious, you know, if somebody could could say, You know whether they actually do think
- 00:44:08you know they're
- 00:44:10They are transparent,
- 00:44:16I I guess.

Jennifer Chamberlin, CPower

00:44:20So. I'm surprised to see this as Well,

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:44:24yeah, I I guess you know, Re. Regardless of what the overall score is. I I was also surprised to see those some sort of be less than actually both the sediment proposal and the the C Ec. Proposal.

- 00:44:39Uh, Josh:

Josh Bode

00:44:41Yeah. Well, It's Court. It looks pretty high in this one actually compared to mine. But the uh, the other question that I think this jumping I mean one is the difference is that the the different overall? But um, I think it boils down to look. You know the Is it open? Is it out there? You know that people can replicate and follow it? Probably, you know, and

- 00:44:59when it comes to the loading platform it is important to distinguish between a handful of things, you know one of them. Is it already complicated? It's different than transparent so, or most of the
- 00:45:08complaints being very overly complicated, and the other part is more about the process than the actual um. You know protocols themselves. So I don't know how other people reacting, but to me that seems like a
- 00:45:20you know, like the distinction uh, you know, between uh transparency and the other factors tied around it. Because you can still simplify that process. Uh, you can simplify and cut some of the fat, you know. Um, and still keep the output, which is pretty clear in terms of what it produces, and it is public. Essentially,
- 00:45:40It's not a black box,

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:45:43sure. Yeah, I I guess I was looking at the you know entire process, you know. Uh, I I would characterize Pc. Staff Review, as you know, part of the methodology, right like it. It is part of how you end up with your final Qc. Value.

- 00:46:00Um, you know. So I I I guess I was looking at the whole package. Uh which is, which is why I guess I was surprised by these ratings.
- 00:46:13Um,
- 00:46:14okay, we're at nine hundred and fifty. I think we're doing pretty good. Oh, I see a hand from Gil before we move on.

Gil Wong

00:46:21Yeah, in my my transparent and understandable not necessarily the same thing.

- 00:46:29Uh a proposal can be understandable. Um as a methodology. But how exactly um! What goes into the the details may not be very transparent. It's one thing
- 00:46:44and
- 00:46:45a proposal, maybe transparent and understand understandable to one party. But it may not be so for others, so I think it may be subject to interpretation,
- 00:46:59and specifically for the Cec proposed, so I think, is a bit prescriptive in the modern approach, and we have not

- 00:47:11implemented that before. So people may have questions how we can no implement that Um! It's a new
- 00:47:23modeling approach, and given the new minutes of the of the
- 00:47:30the approach,
- 00:47:31and we are not so familiar with that, so it may not be perceived as transparent and understandable.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:47:43Yeah, thanks. Um, That's I. I appreciate that perspective. Um, you know. I guess i'll just say a little bit about where I was coming from for that um, which is, I I thought, to make it as transparent as possible. It would be useful to sort of

- 00:48:00um spell out in in sort of a lot of detail, exactly how this would be done, you know, so that there really no questions on the back end when when you go to to calculate it. Um, I understand that it's
- 00:48:13new, you know. So we don't exactly know what the the results are are going to be um.
- 00:48:19But but at least you know, I was striving for transparency, and exactly what was what was going to go down.
- 00:48:26Um,
- 00:48:28But anyway, that was that my perspective, Obviously not. Everyone needs to share that perspective. Um.
- 00:48:44So we move to the the next one. Um consistent and compatible with the Ra program. Um
- 00:48:52again. Now the Ra program uh for two thousand and twenty-five, and beyond is the the slice of day program. Um
- 00:49:01you know. Here we see
- 00:49:04uh
- 00:49:05Kika and and Dsa sort of at the at the head of a pack. Um, I I was
- 00:49:12a little confused. Why, the streamlined lips. Don't necessarily um score as well um,
- 00:49:21you know, especially compared to the the other two in the middle. There,
- 00:49:25um
- 00:49:26there any any thoughts on that?
- 00:49:31And
- 00:49:33thanks, Thanks, Tom, for dealing with these tech issues, and and I I apologize that I still have tech issues to work out. Uh Allen.

Alan Wong - SCE

00:49:43Yeah, I I think if Maria had just shown a table with twenty-four hours and values in it, she would have gotten on the higher score from from us, that that's just simply it. We didn't see it.

- 00:49:55So we assume that that was the case. Right? So

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:50:01okay, So So you think there's, you know, potential for compatibility, but but the proposal itself would need a little workshop to get there.

Alan Wong - SCE

00:50:13Um,

- 00:50:20you know, in the presentation and the write up it. It was left out. I don't know if it was intentional or not, but then it's just. You know. We We think that probably was the case, but we didn't want to assume that without seeing it. Um!
- 00:50:33Well, I I guess We' take a step at what what would have helped, probably for all these five proposals, if there was a consistent structure of like the minimum Um,
- 00:50:42you know, pieces they needed to address. That probably would have made the scoring, at least for us a little bit uh better. Um, because again, you know, we're going back to the the written proposals. If we didn't see it being addressed. Uh, we just couldn't assume that that was going to be
- 00:50:58what it was. You know it's consistent with the status quo in this case for the middle three that we're uh constantly constantly referring to.

Unknown Speaker

00:51:07So

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:51:10okay, thanks. We don't have home connect on the line, do we? Today? I don't think so.

- 00:51:16Didn't see them earlier. Um,
- 00:51:19Paul.

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

00:51:21Yeah, I I kind of come kind of come to the defense of uh home connect on this one. I mean, if

- 00:51:29if our proposals seem to be fitting with the Ra. And compatible, I mean. But
- 00:51:35Maria and home connector proposing is trying to eliminate some of the things that are not necessary for the Ra. Program.
- 00:51:43Um.
- 00:51:45So I would think that it would be. It would be. We would rank very consistent with the clickup proposal and the uh demand sign analytics proposal
- 00:51:54because I don't when I look to the list I don't think they were proposing to eliminate anything that was critical for the current Ra program.
- 00:52:01Um, you know they were trying to get rid of things that you know would be nice to have, but aren't necessary for the program.
- 00:52:08That How was, I was interpreting
- 00:52:11the right up
- 00:52:12so and again, you know that's one aspect. It will probably be talking about and written comments. More
- 00:52:20is, you know, and the bigger picture of you know the Dr. Applications that are being going to be reviewed next year. No measurement and evaluation is the cost of the program.
- 00:52:33So you're gonna take the benefits of avoiding capacity value which, with with the current avoided cost. Calculator has is much lower than it has been in the past,
- 00:52:42and if you're going to have increasing cost, then that makes it more difficult to develop Dr. Programs
- 00:52:48because they have to fast cost effectiveness test. So I think you know clique will definitely be coming on some of these proposals, and how we view them of what it does in terms of cost.
- 00:52:59And so home connects proposals To try to eliminate some things, especially if they can,
- 00:53:04if it can reduce cost, is, I think, very. It should be a very attractive to all the Dr. Providers, including the utilities.
- 00:53:12Sorry for my soapbox speech.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:53:16Yeah, no. I I think that's fair point. Good point.

- 00:53:20Uh Jeff:

Josh Bode

00:53:22Yeah, um on Correct's proposal. You know. It's not really at odds with the Dsa proposal or pause proposal because they can be pretty congruent that they're gonna be pretty congruent with a lot of other proposals as well. Right Um, they're complex. It's a complementary piece.

- 00:53:36So the one thing the the things that jumped out for me. I lay it out of the proposal, You know, I said, you know here's the current process, and here's the short coming to the current process. So, from my standpoint it's just some limitations that was being done there like, for example, keeping that forty-nine window right. If you look at the status quo rather than allowing for a resource at six hours of this pasturation to expand to those six hours.
- 00:53:58Uh, you know It's just a little tiny things like that made a little bit of a difference. But at the same time I look at the proposal which is really simplified, the protocols, and I think it's a complement, not a subset, or it odds with a whole bunch of local proposals.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:54:11Yeah, absolutely agreed. Oh,

- 00:54:15look

Unknown Speaker

00:54:21any one of the utilities to say that you know they don't know what this would look like, you know. Uh, I'm a little bit surprised by that, since they've been using the lips for as long as they have, and you know I'm connect was extremely clear about what changes they would make to the you know, to the reporting like what what would be eliminated, you know.

Unknown Speaker

00:54:40And so I think that all the utilities we need to do is

Luke Tougas

00:54:43um. Go back and look at their own load impact reports, and just look at the tables that are that can be used for our evaluation, and that's what they would be seeing.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:54:57Yeah, absolutely.

- 00:55:00Um
- 00:55:02Allen, Did you want to respond to that?

Alan Wong - SCE

00:55:04Yeah. So we're on consistent with and compatible with, the R. A program right and presumably. This is the new twenty-four slice uh slice of day reform

- 00:55:14framework. So again,
- 00:55:17if
- 00:55:18Connect had put out sort of how they intended to extrapolate
- 00:55:24the sort of single value um you know, approach that's in place today
- 00:55:29to fit the slice of day twenty-four um
- 00:55:32framework. They would have gotten a higher score so absent that we just kind of assume that you know theirs is compatible. So
- 00:55:41I hope that's clear. And um yeah,

Luke Tougas

00:55:44I would. I, I would argue this is something that is being addressed in the Ra. Proceeding right now, and granted this for the two thousand and twenty-four test year. But nevertheless, I mean the way. I I have always interpreted this is that, uh, or approach this issue is

- 00:55:59that it's going to be up to the Commission to decide how the lips are going to be modified, and I just when I was ranking this um i'm sorry modified to to form with a twenty four slice framework, and you know I I just when I approach this, I came in with that
- 00:56:17expectation,
- 00:56:20knowing that it's going to be up to them, and I think I've heard from them in the past, from the utilities as well. If I recall correctly that you know, if it's working with that, the lips can you know um work with the um.

- 00:56:33It's like the day framework, because they do. Do the you know, calculate the hourly load impacts, and so um it's it. It doesn't seem like a big stretch, you know, like to have. And so i'm surprised to hear people who are
- 00:56:45very, very experienced with these things, lips saying, You know that they don't understand how they could work with a slice of day framework.

Alan Wong - SCE

00:56:58Yeah, perhaps it's a you know. Communications issue um on both ends.

- 00:57:04Uh Again, we're not saying that it can't be done.
- 00:57:07It just wasn't shown so. Hence. Why,
- 00:57:11and Dsa's proposals were scored higher from us because they did show it and demonstrate it.
- 00:57:17So I don't know what to say. Um, it's pretty black and white to us.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:57:24Okay?

- 00:57:25Um:

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

00:57:28yeah, yeah, I mean, given clique, it didn't for own connect. We didn't rank any of them, because we just didn't know how to

- 00:57:36apply it.
- 00:57:37And so if I But if I was going to go back and boat, I would give it a high value, which I don't know one of eleven which would have bumped that up, you know, closer to four,
- 00:57:48but I didn't vote on it at all. So

Alan Wong - SCE

00:57:53okay, Yup. So that definitely is not only an Iou confusion on this part. So

Erik Lyon (CEC)

00:58:03well, um, I guess we can sort of circle back to that. But, um! Why don't we move on to our next

- 00:58:10principle here?
- 00:58:14Not a substantial um barrier to participate. Oh, did I skip one. Oh, no!
- 00:58:23So next one is not a substantial barrier to our participation in the Ra. Program.
- 00:58:29Um, here is where I think that the said Mac proposal really shines.
- 00:58:34Um!
- 00:58:37This is sort of what I was expecting to see for that
- 00:58:41um was a little more surprised to see uh such low scores for mine, because I was really trying to grease all as as many of the wheels as I could. Um! And and i'd really be interested to hear some perspectives about um,
- 00:58:59you know why. Why, that's the case. Um. And yeah, some. If somebody could
- 00:59:07give some thoughts on on, you know why some of these did well, and why some of these did not do so well.

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

00:59:25Hi! This is Paul again. I i'm puzzled on the score. That is it the well, not the lowest close it lower. But

- 00:59:34um, you know,
- 00:59:38demand side analytics. Proposal has two elements with the performance matrix that requires additional work to do, which wasn't included in mine. If you take out that you're very, very similar, so i'm kind of puzzled
- 00:59:51again. Why would mine come slightly lower? That that that kind of puzzles me. Um, It's a good question. Yeah, though, Josh has a hand, maybe a thought on that

Josh Bode

01:00:04all for those proposals are very simple scores, you know, there in the noise, in terms of the difference, and maybe somebody had a bad move or something went on into that. But it's clear like the semic proposals, treated as the one with the least barrier to participation.

- 01:00:18And so I don't need too much into the little variation. You know that you have in those. It's more about the the uh fact that, hey? You know It's uh the the the segment proposal, you know, I like the

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:00:31yeah uh, absolutely uh, Barbara!

Barbara Barkovich

01:00:35I was just going to say I raised this at the last meeting. The fact that I asked you if you had talked to some of the demand response. Providers about how easily they thought they could understand

Unknown Speaker

01:00:47your methodology, and they all said they would have to hire consultants. So I think what you're getting is that for anything that involves the load impact protocols or the regressions they're going to have to hire consultants. And they said that that was a barrier.

Barbara Barkovich

01:01:02I That's the way I interpret this.

Josh Bode

01:01:05Hmm.

Luke Tougas

01:01:06Yeah, this is Luke. I agree with that.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:01:11Hmm. Okay,

- 01:01:13Yeah, that's that's helpful. Um:

- 01:01:19Yeah, definitely seeing kind of a a trade off between, you know, like a especially looking at at Luke's proposal and and mine, you know um
- 01:01:30like, How do we strike this balance between wanting some kind of weather normalization, I mean, or are we willing to trade that away for for simplicity? Um,
- 01:01:41uh, in your help.

ndeleanu

01:01:44Yeah, I mean, I think your proposal is not. Uh, yeah, I I don't know. Maybe I was someone with a bad. But uh,

- 01:01:52if if if you take if you uh, I I think your proposal, if
- 01:01:57the party does not want to go through the weather analysis.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:02:04That's that is true.

- 01:02:06I think that's a good point.
- 01:02:09Um, did I? I? I let me just repeat back to you what I I thought I heard you say, just to make sure I got it right, but
- 01:02:18that for the most part, if you don't do any weather normalization, my proposal is virtually identical to Luke's proposal.

ndeleanu

01:02:31Yeah,

- 01:02:34I think looks. I think it's something I propose a little more explicit.
- 01:02:38Okay?

Unknown Speaker

01:02:40Oh,

ndeleanu

01:02:41kind of being a more contract based

- 01:02:45it's kind of this:
- 01:02:47The contract
- 01:02:50capacity is good to see.
- 01:02:54Uh, and then it's just a performance mechanism to validate that. Basically
- 01:03:03so that that, like explicit thing, is more simple and is
- 01:03:08here is what is in other Marcus.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:03:15Yeah.

ndeleanu

01:03:16The difference there?

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:03:20Yeah, Absolutely. Absolutely. Thanks.

- 01:03:22Um.

Unknown Speaker

01:03:25It's

ndeleanu

01:03:26the like, the the post analysis. If you don't do the weather normalization, it's the same.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:03:33Right? Yeah. So

- 01:03:36So there is, you know, the the option for complication which might require some consultants. Um, but it's, you know, not necessarily a requirement. I think that's a good point.
- 01:03:51But I I did sort of frame a lot of this proposal around the most complicated case.

Unknown Speaker

01:03:57Oh,

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:04:09any other thoughts on um

- 01:04:13uh barriers to
- 01:04:16participation in. Ra.
- 01:04:30We're not a um, Tom. Can you scroll down a little bit? Is that possible here?
- 01:04:37Maybe we can get all the way to the bottom, and we can see. Oh,
- 01:04:43okay,

Aimee Wong (SCE)

01:04:45Um, hey, Eric,

- 01:04:47hey? Is that Amy?
- 01:05:00With energy division, since um, they may be trying to validate some other things. So I I wasn't really quite sure when this question asks like a barrier to all a if it was like a barrier to
- 01:05:18the actual calculating, you know, based upon the proposal, or if it was a barrier from an energy division or tiso perspective.
- 01:05:31So um I kind of have that approach to that; that, as you know, whatever the proposal is, and and method is to to calculate the Dr. Qc.
- 01:05:45That the Iso, or and or energy division is going to want to do their own validation, and if that was something that they would also be able to, i'll say either.
- 01:06:02Well, you know, recreate, or perform, or or validate um someone's calculations.
- 01:06:09And so, if if that method was something that they couldn't do, I also thought of that, or saw that as a barrier to, if that makes sense

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:06:23sorry, and i'm not sure if I entirely followed. But what the the piece that you're saying, you're not sure if they could do that's on the part of

Aimee Wong (SCE)

01:06:40we um calculable. Sorry I don't know that's a word, but it has. They have to also be able to verify or somehow verify

- 01:06:54the numbers that are being submitted like they're not just gonna take it at face value. And so I think that they're you know,
- 01:07:04from that perspective they want something that is easy and understandable, and if it's not easy and understandable to them, then it could be uh, also seen as a barrier to already.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:07:18Okay, sure. Yeah, I think we initially conceived of this one as sort of a a barrier from the perspective of the Dr. Provider, whether that's a third party or or Iou provider. Um.

- 01:07:33But I suppose that could also be a barrier.
- 01:07:37Um, nor

ndeleanu

01:07:46I. My hand raised. Still.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:07:48Okay,

- 01:07:54Were there any other any other thoughts on that one?

Unknown Speaker

01:08:02Okay.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:08:05Um.

- 01:08:11Yeah, Let's see. Okay. So uh, we can move to the next one um.
- 01:08:17And And by the way, we're we're really getting into the the territory where a lot of these are are getting closer and closer together, You know there's sort of less variability in the responses down in this region. But um! The
- 01:08:30Tc. Methodology
- 01:08:32can be, or the Qc. Can quickly be determined or updated.
- 01:08:40Here's Here's another one uh where Sed Mac sort of led led the pack as expected uh another one where I was surprised to find myself at the bottom of the back and and sort of the the lip based methodologies kind of right right in the middle. There.
- 01:08:58Um,
- 01:09:03I think these sort of you know. Make sense especially given that. Um
- 01:09:11the conversation we we just had um sort of on. You know the use of consultants, and you know how much time.
- 01:09:20Um, these
- 01:09:22you know, time and and independent review. Each of these
- 01:09:25proposals um require.

Aimee Wong (SCE)

01:09:30Well, I I feel like fundamentally right. Um, this is Amy

- 01:09:37um. Fundamentally all of these, you know, if using in ex post or recent performance.
- 01:09:47Um calculation at the end of the day requires meter data, and we know that needed data. Meter data is,
- 01:09:59you know,
- 01:10:01sometimes not available for thirty to forty-five days after, you know, uh some sort of performance or event um based upon a customer's billing cycle.
- 01:10:16So it
- 01:10:19I think my struggle with this was like
- 01:10:22how we define recent or quickly, or you know those types of like, you know words. Because if
- 01:10:32if we're okay with waiting, you know forty-five days to sixty days afterwards to like to to calculate it, and that is considered quickly or recent. And um, you know, I I think

- 01:10:48again, I going to maybe, what Zooke said earlier on there is a little bit of, I think subjectivity in terms of like A. You know how people interpret some of these questions.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:11:04Sure. Yeah. And you know just my my response to that is that it's It's really all all relative, all relative to one another. I I don't think there is a proposal out there that could, you know, really solve the meter data time lag

- 01:11:19um,
- 01:11:21you know. But you know, I I think,
- 01:11:23to to use the the status quo as an example. You know It's it's like, you know,
- 01:11:30takes. I don't know the better part of a year, right if we, if we start doing evaluation plans in December, and are sort of just now getting Qc. Values out there, you know. That's what like nine ten months um, you know, versus
- 01:11:46you know. Do you press press a button once you get that latest refresh of
- 01:11:50of meter data, and you know, get your results. Um, you know. So. And anyway, that's that's all to say. I don't think there is one, you know, any specific
- 01:12:01kind of um objective measure of of what quickly means. But it's. How do they compare relative to each other? And you know what what's required for
- 01:12:11this market to function.
- 01:12:15Does Does that help at all?

Aimee Wong (SCE)

01:12:22Um, yeah, thanks.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:12:26Sure.

- 01:12:27Um. I saw a hand up, I thought, but maybe somebody put it down. Um,
- 01:12:35Okay, Um,
- 01:12:39all right. So we can move on to our
- 01:12:43our next um principle. Actually, um, Tom, would you mind scrolling up to the the previous one, real, quick,
- 01:12:51or actually sorry, even when one of both. Uh, yeah, consistent, compatible. I did. I realized I I meant to say something earlier about this that I I forgot
- 01:13:03um,

- 01:13:04you know, which is that I I recognize both Luke and my proposals are, you know, sort of a divergence from this status quo, and and how we do uh qualifying capacity right with this like really um
- 01:13:23with a focus on sort of X. Anti. You know Rigor and Xanti oversight.
- 01:13:29Um,
- 01:13:31and you know I I
- 01:13:34I think it's sort of just a a policy decision whether we stick with that, or whether we, you know, go in a different direction. Um,
- 01:13:44I don't know, Luke, Do you have any any thoughts about that? Um, you know, as as it proposed. It scored at the bottom with me for sure. Yeah, exactly. Um. I mean the way I I interpreted that um, or

Luke Tougas

01:13:59you know so much of interpretation when I was debugging the proposal, I think you know, at the very end I put some language that was not admittedly not very. You know, substantive, that basically just said,

- 01:14:12You know the um, the the values, you know, the the Qc. Values that were, you know, approved by the energy division
- 01:14:21would be used, you know, would be developed either on an hourly basis, or whatever you know what it consistent with. Whatever the you know prevailing ra framework was, and they would be, you know, plopped into, you know, all into the supply plans as necessary in into the you know Lsc's your monthly uh,
- 01:14:41you know already, reporting and all that sort of thing. So I
- 01:14:45I I naively probably believe that that was good enough, you know, because, of course, that was based on my own interpretation of you know what would be important to you
- 01:14:55to say, you know, to demonstrate that it would be compatible with the Ira framework, and and maybe you have a point in terms of how the
- 01:15:03you know um how a year in my proposal would it envisions the use of penalty potential penalties, and that, would, you know, be a different That, would, you know, represent some change to the
- 01:15:17um to how things work. I I don't know if I see that as a change to the Ra. Um, you know uh, uh your process, or anything like that, because you know it wouldn't affect the reporting or any other thing like that. Uh: So yeah. But but obviously others, you know, saw that differently.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:15:38Yeah. Okay.

- 01:15:40Thanks. Yeah. Sorry. I I just wanted to touch on that before I I forgot um,
- 01:15:45And unless there are any thoughts on on that, we can get back to to where we were.
- 01:15:50Um, yeah, Tell me if you could scroll this back down.
- 01:15:55Um, let's see,
- 01:16:01I think. Oh, are we on the last one?

Josh Bode

01:16:06I think we're in the grand total.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:16:08I think we still have a best available information, including recent performance.

- 01:16:14Um, this one again. Not a whole lot of variability. Um,
- 01:16:21I I think.
- 01:16:22Uh again, what i'm sort of
- 01:16:25what I was sort of surprised by is um,
- 01:16:31you know, in in the the incentive based proposals, you know, particularly Luke's, that that scores pretty low because it it seems like a
- 01:16:41a Dr. Provider can use, You know, the most, you know, recent and best of available information. Um, you know, particularly, because there's very little time lag here.
- 01:16:53Um, but you know, maybe some of these other proposals folks think are streamlined enough that that we can do that as well. Um! So curious to hear what people's thoughts are on that.

Luke Tougas

01:17:08But this is Luke. I I thought that anything that utilizes the lips is going to be, you know, should be a low score, because you know it could be because, as we've said many times, and seems to be acknowledged. You know pretty much across the board that you know there is a pretty significant lag between the data used in the

- 01:17:28actual, You know,
- 01:17:30effective
- 01:17:32data of the Qc. Values.
- 01:17:34I was surprised.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:17:39Yeah, me, me as well,

Unknown Speaker

01:17:42and

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:17:43any other thoughts on that. Is there other thoughts that I sort of disagree with that perspective

- 01:17:59right?

Luke Tougas

01:18:03If you don't mind, i'd love to put the question out there. To anyone who's interested in commenting on this, I love to know Why, like the Dsa proposal, gets the highest score there, because I didn't see any difference from any of the others in terms of

- 01:18:16the frequency of
- 01:18:20No, That's not the frequency, but but
- 01:18:24of how recent You know of the sorry i'm searching for the word here for how frequent or how recent the data are, you know, that are used?

Josh Bode

01:18:40Oh, well, I think we're mixing up recently of the updates and process with whether or not you are really incorporating some of the best available information, right? Because, like the

- 01:18:51so you know, like again, I company here from my side, supposed to sit there and say, Hey, you know you're uh. There's no reason to streamline or allow for frequent more frequent updates. In fact, it's. Still, he said, Look, you should allow for more. If we

can up this in terms of enrollment. Um! But I think the distinction there is. You can interpret it as also being like, hey?

- 01:19:09Some of these proposals explicitly. Say you need to connect the uh values you provide to actual performance right? You need to show that connection, so you can interpret it two ways. And I suspect this how people read that question, because it sounds like you read it as uh speed, which is that question above and timeline.
- 01:19:27Uh. Whereas when I read, look for this, say we're, what are you incorporating when you make that value? And it's explicitly kind of tied in the information sitting standards. You're going to include snap back and spill over effects, and you know, decay that kind of stuff.
- 01:19:42So maybe it's just a question of how people interpreted that particular item,

Unknown Speaker

01:19:46Right?

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:19:52Yeah, I think I I mentioned this before, but you know, Luke, and your proposal you used um

- 01:19:59uh, you know, settlement methods for um for performance, you know. And it could be that that you know that is not the best available information. Uh, even if it is, you know, relatively quick and and recent.
- 01:20:15Um. So maybe that's you know. It sounds like that might be one of the things people are referring to.

Luke Tougas

01:20:23Yeah, yeah, it could be the absence of the weather normalization, you know. Uh, that's that's uh

- 01:20:29thirty to score.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:20:33It could be

- 01:20:35okay. The this has been, I I think, a very productive conversation, and you know, I I hope folks uh sort of take what they heard today, and you know, use that when they're developing um
- 01:20:48developing their written comments. Uh, you know you've heard a lot of different perspectives about how people are approaching these things. Um,
- 01:20:56I do. Um. I do want to make one offer um, you know, and and this is sort of an idea that I had previously and shared previously. But um wasn't initially going to propose again. Um, but that we basically redo the survey.
- 01:21:15Um, you know it. It sounds like maybe some people uh approach the the questions differently. Um! And maybe we'll have some convergence and sort of how we're looking at these questions. Um, Some folks skipped some of the ratings and some of the proposals. Um, again. I think
- 01:21:34you know, even even a very status quo based proposal like home Connect, you should be able to rate it on all these things, you know we could even add that the status quo as um as an option. Maybe maybe that's, you know, a helpful thing just for people to

Josh Bode

01:21:51you know, for reference. But it, eh, Eric? Does it make sense for people to rerate all of them, or to just be rate on it, because it seems like the only category that people had a bit of a challenge quite originally home connect

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:22:10principles. Um. And And so I I think probably the cleanest way would just be to do

- 01:22:18the whole thing over. You know you're welcome to give the same ratings. You have those all um you know, written down somewhere. But uh, Are you planning to send out these

Josh Bode

01:22:29uh to the group?

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:22:31Um, yeah, we can send out these these ratings. Thank you.

- 01:22:35Um. But I just wanted to make that offer. I i'm not gonna force this uh on the group, because I know It's an extra commitment, but I just wanted to see what folks thought of that. Uh, Barbara,

Unknown Speaker

01:22:47I think we have not achieved consensus on the interpretation of these different principles, and so without that I don't know the redoing it accomplishes much.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:22:59Okay, I mean, I think that in order, if you wanted to do that, and I don't know how worthwhile it would be, You would have to reach an agreement on how to interpret each of the principles. Or you're going to have the same problem all over again.

- 01:23:13Sure, yeah, I was thinking, Maybe we we closed some of that gap today. Um, and you know maybe not the entire gap. But
- 01:23:21um,
- 01:23:23yeah. But but if if if we don't think that's worth if the juice is not worth the squeeze. That's okay. Um Gil,

Gil Wong

01:23:31If we are going to redo the survey, are we going to push out the deadline for written comments.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:23:39Um, I think we would not, and we would probably not um have another chance as a working group. Um to discuss the results. Um, but they would, you know, sort of give us as we're writing sort of a a more final picture of of where stakeholders are coming from.

- 01:23:59That's sort of how I would imagine it. Um,

Gil Wong

01:24:04Okay, Thank you,

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:24:06Paul.

Paul Nelson (CLECA)

01:24:09Yeah. I mean,

- 01:24:11I I don't see a hard added value. I to trying to rerank these. I mean, we have the discussion you got the feedback,
- 01:24:19I think. More important is the written comments and out,
- 01:24:23You know people want to address principles. And in the written comments I think because you get the
- 01:24:29a better interpretation of what's important to them.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:24:41Yeah, yeah,

- 01:24:43yeah, it's fair. We. We're on a tight schedule, so we probably wouldn't have time to do that. Um, Okay,
- 01:24:50uh, Barbara, I see your hand is up again. I I was wondering if we could have a few more days. I mean, the thirteenth is really soon.

Unknown Speaker

01:25:02It's a week from today, and I was wondering if we could at least get until the following Monday.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:25:08Um,

- 01:25:10I don't have our schedule up. Um,
- 01:25:14Um,
- 01:25:16let's see.
- 01:25:17Are you? Do you have that available to you?
- 01:25:25Oh, I might actually
- 01:25:29let's see. Oh, I I do. Okay. So we are
- 01:25:33at the sixth
- 01:25:36Um.
- 01:25:40I mean,
- 01:25:41I think I would be okay with extending the um the deadline slightly. I mean. We'll still be drafting the report starting next year, but or next week. Excuse me um, but
- 01:25:56you know we have have plenty to do on on background and introduction. And Seth, before we get to summarizing stakeholder viewpoints.
- 01:26:04Um,
- 01:26:08you know I I will know that we did. Um,
- 01:26:12you know. Start the written comment period, September twenty, seventh. But I I think extending it to a Monday would probably be okay.
- 01:26:21What day of the week. Is that the thirteenth? Is that A.
- 01:26:24Is that a Thursday? Thursday? Yeah.
- 01:26:38Oh, there it is, I see. Okay,
- 01:26:41um
- 01:26:43time. Do you have have thoughts on that.

Unknown Speaker

01:26:48Um,

Tom Flynn

01:26:50I think what's

- 01:26:52most important is that we um get
- 01:26:57really good, comprehensive, written comments
- 01:27:01from everyone. Um! And if that means um delane, when we get those a few days in order to um get some really good comments from everyone. Um, i'm. I'm totally fine with that.
- 01:27:17What was suggested the seventeenth.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:27:20Um, yeah, whatever the following Monday

- 01:27:29that i'm fine. With that i'm fine with that as well. Yeah,
- 01:27:33you know. Let's Let's say that this the stretch goal remains the the thirteenth. But if if the folks need the rest of the week in the weekend, you know we, we're, we're not gonna not include your comments. Because of that

Tom Flynn

01:27:49we can. We can send just to make sure we capture everyone who is not on this call today. We can send out another email.

- 01:27:57Um
- 01:28:01providing the
- 01:28:03seventeenth if it's needed.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:28:12Yeah, that works for me.

Luke Tougas

01:28:19Thanks. Guys.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:28:22Yeah, absolutely. Um:

- 01:28:25Well, I think that was the the main uh, you know, agenda. Item, that's the meet of the the meeting that we wanted to cover.
- 01:28:34Um.
- 01:28:35So i'm just taking one last look at the
- 01:28:39the um
- 01:28:41schedule. We have one more working group meeting coming up. Um.
- 01:28:47And I think, Yeah, we'll we'll take your written comments. Um, We are planning on um, you know, really doing our best to summarize stakeholder positions,
- 01:29:00as some of you requested. Um, you know, after seeing the interim report

- 01:29:06um. And so yeah, we'll we'll be wrapping up next or two weeks from now. Um, But then, yeah, we'll we'll take all your written comments, and and we'll run with them
- 01:29:16um
- 01:29:18any any final housekeeping or agenda items that you have, Tom. Otherwise, i'm thinking we can probably break early
- 01:29:28any questions from the working group.

Gil Wong

01:29:37Okay, the last meeting will be on the twentieth. So is the agenda to discuss written comments.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:29:49Um, we haven't put together an agenda for that yet I don't think

- 01:29:53um,
- 01:29:55but uh, I I think I suspect there will be a sort of, you know, kind of,

Gil Wong

01:30:09or Eric You're on mute.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:30:11Oh, how did that happen? Um,

- 01:30:17yeah, I I don't. We don't have a an agenda written up yet for that last one. I think we wanted to um
- 01:30:24to to keep it on there, just for, you know, to kind of conclude the working group.

Tom Flynn

01:30:31Tom, do you have anything on that?

- 01:30:42In case we um identify some things that we need to discuss as a working group before uh the Cdc team really goes off, and and um uh off to the side and and focuses on drafting the report.
- 01:31:01Yeah, I don't. I I don't see any specific items at this point. Um it, you know it could be as simple as just clarifying the remaining steps in the timeline. If there's any question about that Um, and what you know clarifying when stakeholders will have an opportunity to comment on the draft report, so on and so forth.
- 01:31:19Um! It could be as simple as that, if that's even needed.
- 01:31:24I think it would be good just to keep it on the calendar just in case,

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:31:28yeah, and and we'll probably have a little bit more um outline of a of a draft report that we can sort of

- 01:31:35uh walk through and and make sure everybody is. Um, you know. Concerns about uh, you know, eh? Eh? Bringing up stakeholder positions again. But uh, you know, just to make sure everybody has a good understanding of what to expect in the final report.

Gil Wong

01:31:54Thank you.

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:32:00Okay,

- 01:32:02um. With that I think we can adjourn.

Luke Tougas

01:32:08Thanks. Guys

Erik Lyon (CEC)

01:32:09All right, Thanks. Everybody.

Gil Wong

01:32:11Chapter One.