

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	18-MISC-05
Project Title:	Disaggregated Demand Data Cleaning Workshop
TN #:	226165
Document Title:	Prompts for Written Comments
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Cody Goldthrite
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	12/21/2018 11:26:18 AM
Docketed Date:	12/21/2018

Prompts for Written Comments

On December 11, 2018, California Energy Commission staff held a public workshop entitled Disaggregated Demand Data Cleaning Workshop. The workshop discussed methods for collecting and processing data under California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Section 1353 (Section 1353). This document lists a number of outstanding questions from the workshop, organized by topic, on which Energy Commission staff is requesting public comments. Staff recommends you use the following questions as prompts for formal written workshop comments. Instructions for submitting comments are provided in the official workshop notice.¹ The deadline for all public comments is 4:00 p.m. Pacific Time on January 7, 2019.

Specific Topics

Energy Efficiency (EE) participation

Senate Bill 350 (De León, Chapter 547, Statutes of 2015) requires the Energy Commission to "assess the hourly and seasonal impact [of energy efficiency targets] on statewide and local electricity demand." Section 1353 requires utilities to report EE program participation at the meter level. Staff would like input on how to efficiently collect (or join with) participation data from both investor- and publicly-owned utilities (IOUs and POU's).

Question 1:

- a. Are the proposed fields in the *EnergyEfficiencyParticipation* table appropriate for evaluating meter-level impacts of EE participation on energy demand? If not, what changes do you propose?
- b. IOUs report EE participation data to the California Public Utility Commission's CEDARS database. Staff has proposed that IOUs might provide additional data necessary to link CEDARS data to meter-level energy consumption data under Section 1353, in lieu of reporting participation data directly to the Energy Commission. Is there an efficient way to join these datasets? For example, by IOUs reporting a mapping between CEDARS claim IDs and Section 1353 meter or premise IDs. If so, please describe.
- c. POU's report EE program-level data under Section 1311, but Section 1353 requires meter-level data. Which data from the POU's are sufficient for CEC staff to estimate EE impacts on demand at the meter level? What is the most efficient and effective way for the Energy Commission to combine POU's EE data with IOUs' EE data?

¹ The workshop notice, along with other related documents, is available online in Docket 18-MISC-05: <https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/Lists/DocketLog.aspx?docketnumber=18-MISC-05>

Billing

Staff is concerned about situations where it is ambiguous whether Section 1353 billing data contains all charges for a billing period. For example, if a utility reports only the delivery charges for a Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) or Direct Access (DA) customer then the Energy Commission would unknowingly have partial billing charges. The draft methodology currently proposes that utilities:

- Report which CCA or DA provider a meter is associated with, if any, and
- Include CCA billing charges when reporting billing charges.

However, staff is aware of other situations where ambiguous data may still occur. For example, if a utility bills on behalf of some CCA or DA providers but not others and may not have billing charge amounts for those it doesn't.

Question 2:

- a. During the workshop, staff suggested that a data flag indicating whether a bill is partial, in addition to the CCA and DA requirements above, would remove all ambiguity. Is this a reasonable solution?
- b. Please provide any other feedback on this proposal or alternate suggestions for resolving these billing data concerns.

Rate schedules

Many rate schedules include options and modifiers (e.g. CARE). The Energy Commission's goal is to be able to identify the specific tariff that a particular customer is billed under, including such options and modifiers. Currently, the proposed source data schema assumes that the rate schedule code includes this information, but this is not always true. Some utilities have suggested providing a data flag for each option and modifier in the billing consumption tables, while others have suggested that this data belongs in a separate rate schedule table similar to the one currently proposed.

Question 3: Please provide any feedback or suggestions on how to structure and collect rate schedules in a way that captures options and modifiers. Ideally, a solution will be appropriate for all utilities. However, staff will consider suggestions that handle rate schedules differently for each utility if necessary.

Unmetered consumption

The current source data schema proposes that utilities report unmetered consumption estimates in the *BillingConsumptionElec* table, leaving *MeterId* and any other non-relevant fields Null. Staff is concerned that this proposal will not be able to identify a geographic region for unmetered consumption if it is not associated with a *PremiseId*.

Question 4: An alternate solution is for utilities to report unmetered consumption estimates in a separate table that includes limited geographic fields (e.g. city, state, zip) and allows the utility to report whichever are known.

- a. Is this alternate solution the most reasonable approach for reporting unmetered consumption?
- b. Please provide any additional feedback or suggestions on how to structure and collect unmetered consumption.

Submeters

Staff defines a submeter as any meter which is behind another physical or virtual meter, and is aware that energy accounting errors, such as double counting, can occur in these situations. Staff would like input on collecting submeter relationships and avoiding accounting errors.

Question 5:

- a. Please propose changes to the proposed source data schema for collecting and tracking submeter relationships.
- b. Are there any other potential accounting errors staff should be aware of regarding submeters? If so, are any other changes required to avoid these errors?

General Topics

Question 6: Please provide any additional feedback or suggestions on the proposed source data schema, including which data fields should be reported and how they should be structured.

Question 7: Please provide any additional feedback or suggestions on the proposed ETL methods and transformation rules. Please attach a list of specific ETL rules that you recommend.

Question 8: Do you have any other feedback or suggestions which were not addressed in the prompts above?