

ENERGY DATA ACCESS COMMITTEE Q3 2016 MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 21, 2016 1:00 – 4:30 PM

**Sierra Madre Conf. Room SCE Energy Education Center
6090 N. Irwindale Avenue. Irwindale, CA 91702**

Meeting Minutes			
Time	Topic	Lead(s)	Notes
1:00 – 1:15	Welcome and Opening Remarks	Natalie Martinez/ Linda Carrasco	SCE will open: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety message ▪ Roll call ▪ EDAC purpose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting called to order at 1:05PM ▪ 14 EDAC Committee members in attendance (9 in person and 5 by phone). 2 committee members were absent. (See Appendix for details) ▪ Brian Goldman will permanently replace Zita Kline on the EDAC Committee representing ORA. 			
1:15 – 1:30	Public Comments Period	All	Open comment period for non-member participants.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No public comments were made within the reserved period. 			
1:30 – 2:00	Old Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Report out on IOU Q2 EDAC Meeting action items ▪ Report out on Energy Division Q2 EDAC Meeting action items 	Frank Kao Linda Carrasco Amy Reardon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Re-cap of action items from Q2 meeting ▪ EDAC page corrections on the CPUC website ▪ Provisioning other data sets vis EDRP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academic Researcher Commonly Requested Data 	Natalie Martinez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data elements commonly requested from IOUs ▪ Note: Address caveats and anomalies
<p>Report out on IOU Q1 action items</p> <p>Data Request Logs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SoCalGas has updated the log to include withdrawn requests under the cancelled category and add reasons under the request description. <p>Energy Division updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CPUC EDAC web landing page corrections has been completed. ▪ After additional discussion, it has been determined that that the EDRP process may not be a right fit to accommodate provisioning of other data requests. <p>Academic Researcher Commonly Requested Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academic Researchers have expressed interest in wanting to understand data variables that are available in each IOUs databases (i.e. Data Dictionary). ▪ Requests for data can vary drastically based on the type of research. Without specifics, it is difficult for IOUs to provide this type of information which is complex and may be considered proprietary. ▪ IOU currently provides data explanations for requested data. ▪ Proposal for improvement is to have closer collaboration and earlier engagement with the IOUs data custodian in the request process to provide validation on what data elements is available will help 			

minimize many of the concerns.

- Another consideration about publishing this information includes concerns regarding the types of information that the IOUs may be collecting and sharing. The IOUs are required to have a Privacy Notice and publishing data definitions may trigger more requests from customers to not share their data.
- The Local Government representative stated that they understand and respect the challenges laid out by the IOU's but in general there is a push for more transparency, especially at the local government level with the Smart Cities and Open Data efforts, and that there have been a number of surprising positive results that those efforts have produced so they would encourage the IOU's to be as transparent as possible. This was also supported by other stakeholders.

ACTION ITEM:

- **IOUs to provide a general list of data elements that a smart meter collects and review at next EDAC meeting.**
- **SCE to prepare a list of commonly requested data elements based on completed Academic Researchers requests for review at next EDAC meeting.**

1:55 – 3:00	<p>Local Government Matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cory Downs Sub-Committee briefing ▪ Q&A 	Cory Downs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update on LG subcommittee matters
-------------	--	------------	---

Local Government (LG) Sub-committee Briefing

- Cory Downs reported that the LG Subcommittee was working on documenting the scale of omitted, comprehensive or consistent data being provided to local governments. The LG Subcommittee has conducted a statewide survey but was unable to gain sufficient participation to convince EDAC members of the reach of omitted, comprehensive or consistent data being provided to local governments.
- In an effort to examine the problem in more detail the LG Subcommittee proposed to conduct data requests for a representative sample of CA cities. To this goal, CSE worked to select 29 jurisdictions that are representative of all CA cities but IOU's were cautious in committing staff time to conduct the sample data requests due to the fact that in the IOU's own evaluation they let the sub-committee know, for the first time, that 100% of EDRP requests fulfilled to date have had some data omitted due to aggregation rules. Industrial sector being the most impacted.
- Due to the fact that no data requests have been comprehensive the subcommittee no longer sees the need for additional analysis of sample jurisdictions to validate that the aggregation rules results in LGs getting incomplete data but did raise the fact that there would still be value in the effort being completed to determine how the privacy rules impact different types of local governments and may make the request again later in the process.
- Representatives from City of Santa Cruz and The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments called in to the meeting to express their concerns that IOU's have not been able to adequately respond to their questions about getting partial data due to current energy data access aggregation rules as it prevents them from conducting necessary updated to their Climate Action Plans and full disclosure by the IOUs.
- Due to different aggregation rules prior to EDRP (15/15), historical comparisons may be challenging as many LG's may not be aware of the changes in the aggregation rules.
- Partial or incomplete data may cause LGs to over or under estimate GHG reductions and provide inaccurate projections of savings.
- LGs are requesting access to complete, comprehensive and consistent data without violating the energy data access privacy rules.
- LGs are asking that the IOUs to provide disclosure when partial data is transmitted due to the aggregation rules. All IOUs have indicated that this is currently the procedure. Local Government staff informed the IOUs that the current disclosures did not properly highlight this fact as not all Local

Governments understand that they are receiving partial data due to privacy rules.

- Discussion needs to occur at the higher level between PUC and the California Air Resource Board regarding existing energy data access rules resulting in cities unable to measure correct savings verses the need for full disclosure for the purpose of accurate information for GHG and Climate Action Planning.
- PG&E commented:
 - PG&E can provide historical data under the current aggregation rules to provide apples to apples comparison; however, the omitted data that failed aggregation would still not be provided.
 - PE&E differs from the other IOUs in providing consumption reports using the 15/15 public aggregation rule, rather than the non-public data aggregation allowed under EDRP (15/20 or 5/25 for industrial), to allow LGs to use the Green Communities community report data in their public reports.
- The LG subcommittee suggested adding additional status in the data catalogue to indicate when a request has been fulfilled but data was omitted (i.e., “complete but data was omitted”). The IOUs reported that in accordance with the EDRP program the requests are completed. Adding an additional status for this specific scenario would have IT impacts and associated ratepayer expense. As a no-cost solution, the IOUs agree to note in the description of the completed datasets that data was omitted due to failure of aggregation rules.
- Cory Downs stated that more transparency to the Commission is needed and highlighted that if data was more accurately labeled it would have provided the LG Subcommittee more visibility to identify the scope of the problem earlier. This may have avoided the need to conduct the statewide survey or representative sample because every data request would have included the note about data being omitted.
- Amy Reardon from CPUC Energy Division stated that this information was of possible interest to the CPUC and other stakeholders. She will request in writing to include this request status pertaining to “complete but data omitted” be implemented with the IOUs’ third quarter 2016 data catalog update advice letter filings.
- It was suggested that the LGs could pass a local ordinance requiring customers to report consumption data for climate action planning for the jurisdictions that need this data. There was a follow up conversation about how this method will be considered. However, it possess much more work, cost and effort with all CA jurisdictions vs. the four IOU’s.
- The LG subcommittee will continue to pursue short, mid and long term solutions. Suggestions currently includes: aggregating data across customer classes, LGs or IOU’s securing data releases from customers, working under NDA’s, working with business licensees process to require data sharing, enacting statewide comprehensive benchmarking and requesting a change in the CPUC privacy rules. Due to time constraints, the topic will be discussed in the upcoming subcommittee meetings.
- It was suggested that if Local Governments want to see short term changes they should petition the PUC directly.
- LG sub-committee (led by Cory Downs) will continue to work towards a proposal on behalf of LG and identify solutions that the IOU’s can implement now on their own as well as make recommended solutions to the CPUC for modification of current aggregation rules within the context of customer privacy.

ACTION ITEM:

- **IOUs to include the language “complete but data omitted” with the IOUs’ third quarter 2016 data catalog update advice letter filings.**
- **Sub-committee will reconvene to work on short, mid and long term solutions. Cory Downs will continue to coordinate/facilitate the meetings.**
- **Amy Reardon of Energy Division to explain methods to petition the Commission to modify the Energy Data Access decision.**
- **SDG&E to explore different aggregation rules and scenarios and discuss at Q4 EDAC meeting.**

3:15- 4:15	New Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AB802 Building Benchmarking Data Access ▪ Q&A ▪ Round Table 	Erik Jensen All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data access issues related to the building benchmarking section of AB802 ▪ Open discussion
<p>AB 802 Presentation Points of Interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary of high level requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requires IOUs to maintain energy use data for all buildings to which they provide service ○ Requires IOUs to provide energy use data to a building owner, owner’s agent, or operator on request ○ Requires the Energy Commission to create a program to benchmark and publicly disclose energy performance information for certain buildings ▪ Tentative Program Timeline ▪ Proposed process flow ▪ Covered and Disclosable Buildings definitions and statistics ▪ Violations and enforcement <p>AB802 Q&A Discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can Green Button Connect (GBC) be used as a vehicle to deliver the AB802 data? GBC relies on customer authorization and making a choice to share data with 3rd party/building owners. Building owner will need to have the technical set up and register and be certified with utility. This is not a practical solution as it puts responsibilities and costs on building owners. ▪ Mapping meter to buildings continues to be an obstacle for the IOUs. IOUs system is set up to measure usage by meter, not by building. Meter association with a particular building can change over time without IOUs knowledge. CEC has indicated that meter to building mapping is not a mandatory requirement for the AB802 effort. ▪ SoCalGas has indicated that in their effort to work with City of LA on a potential ordinance for benchmarking, there are challenges with address matching. The list of addresses provided by the city did not match well with SCG internal records. Both parties are working diligently to resolve this issue. ▪ Suggestion for AB802 to incorporate the building characteristic (i.e. age of the building) matched to building energy use. These type of additional data will be very useful in determining the potential for upgrades and energy saving needs. <p>ACTION ITEM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None <p>Round Table No new items were presented at round table</p>			
4:15 – 4:20	Q4 2016 Meeting Planning	SDG&E	Discussion of date and location for Q4 EDAC meeting
<p>Proposed Dates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential dates will most likely be within the first 2 weeks of December. ▪ SDG&E will send out a survey in early October to get consensus on selecting a day that will work best for committee members. <p>ACTION ITEM: SDG&E will send Doodle Poll and confirm date in October.</p>			
4:20 – 4:30	Adjournment	All	Final wrap-up and action items.

- Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

APPENDIX

EDAC Committee Members Attendance Record

NAME	ORGANIZATION	In Person	Call	Absent
EDAC Members				
Amy Reardon	CPUC – Energy Division	x		
Andrea Gough	CEC	x		
Barry Hooper	LG – San Francisco			x
Brian Goldman	ORA		x	
Christopher Vera	SDG&E	x		
Cory Downs	LG – Chula Vista	x		
Jody M. Lawler	SCG	x		
Karen Notsund	Energy Institute at Haas		x	
Lee Tien	EFF		x	
Lena Lopez	PG&E	x		
Maria Stamas	NRDC		x	
Gabriela Sandoval (on behalf of Mark Toney)	TURN	x		
Michael Murray	Mission Data			x
Natalie Martinez	SCE	x		
Stephanie Pincetl	UCLA	x		
Timothy Treadwell	Energy Center		x	