

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



FILED

12/27/18
11:12 AM

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of Its Proposals and Cost Recovery for Improvements to the Click-Through Authorization Process Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 29 of Resolution E-4868. (U39E).

A.18-11-015
(Filed November 26, 2018)

**PROTEST OF OHMCONNECT, INC. TO APPLICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS
TO CLICK-THROUGH**

John Anderson
Director of Energy Markets
OhmConnect, Inc.
350 Townsend St., Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: (415) 697-1271
Email: john@ohmconnect.com

December 27, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION2

II. EFFECT OF THE APPLICATIONS ON OHMCONNECT3

III. GROUNDS FOR PROTEST.....4

 A. GROUNDS FOR PROTEST COMMON TO ALL THREE IOUS4

 B. GROUNDS FOR PROTEST SPECIFIC TO EACH IOU..... 11

**IV. PROPOSED CATEGORY FOR APPLICATIONS, ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED,
NEED FOR HEARING, AND PROPOSED SCHEDULE 14**

V. CONCLUSION..... 15

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of Its Proposals and Cost Recovery for Improvements to the Click-Through Authorization Process Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 29 of Resolution E-4868. (U39E).

A.18-11-015
(Filed November 26, 2018)

**PROTEST OF OHMCONNECT, INC. TO APPLICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS
TO CLICK-THROUGH**

Pursuant to Rule 2.6 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, OhmConnect, Inc. (OhmConnect) respectfully submits this timely protest to Applications (A.) 18-11-015 (Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)), A.18-11-016 (Southern California Edison Company (SCE)), and A.18-11-017 (San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E)). The Applications seek Commission approval for cost recovery of each Investor-Owned Utility’s (IOU) improvements to the click-through authorization process, as ordered by CPUC Resolution E-4868.¹ Given the similar subject matter in all three Applications, and that all three Applications were filed in accordance with the same Ordering Paragraph 29 in Resolution E-4868, OhmConnect submits a single protest to all three Applications.

I. INTRODUCTION

OhmConnect does not object to the general authority sought by the IOUs in their respective Applications for improvements to the click-through process. Moreover, OhmConnect is extremely supportive of the click-through solution as a streamlined and simplified means of facilitating data sharing with third parties. Nevertheless, OhmConnect is concerned that certain components of the IOUs’ proposals (taken both individually and collectively) fail to meet Commission direction in Resolution E-4868, especially as the Applications relate to

¹ Resolution E-4868 (*Approves, with modifications, the Utilities’ Click-Through Authorization Process which releases Customer Data to Third-Party Demand Response Providers*), Ordering Paragraph (OP) 29, at pp. 105-106.

improvements to existing functionality, expansion to other (i.e. non-Demand Response (DR)) third parties, expansion of data elements, provision of a full data set synchronously, meter reprogramming, and costs, among other areas. OhmConnect's position is that the Applications do not go far enough towards enabling third-party (including Demand Response Providers (DRPs)) authorized data access, nor do the Applications fully address "the Commission's interest in expanding the click-through solution(s) to other distributed energy resource providers."² Below, OhmConnect presents grounds for protest that are common to each IOU's application, as well as grounds for protest that are IOU-specific.

II. EFFECT OF THE APPLICATIONS ON OHMCONNECT

OhmConnect is a third-party DRP founded in 2013 and headquartered in San Francisco, California. The company provides DR services to residential and small commercial retail electric customers in California pursuant to Rule 24/32. Specifically, OhmConnect's free software service notifies households of impending DR events and pays them for their energy reductions, without requiring purchase or installation of additional hardware. OhmConnect is registered to participate as a DRP in the wholesale electricity market operated by the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO).³ Furthermore, OhmConnect contributed to the development of the Demand Response Auction Mechanism (DRAM) pilots and is one of the largest residential companies to participate in these pilots.

OhmConnect has actively participated in Commission proceedings focused on both Demand Response programs and data access, including Rulemaking (R.) 13-09-011 and A.17-01-012 et al. (DR), A.14-06-001 et al. (Rule 24/32), R.14-10-003 (Distribution Resource Plans), and R.17-09-020 (Resource Adequacy (RA)). In addition, OhmConnect has integrated with the current click-through solutions of all three IOUs, and participated regularly in the Customer Data Access Committee (CDAC) meetings – i.e. the precursor for the Applications discussed in this protest. OhmConnect also submitted to the CDAC a list of eight recommended enhancements to the click-through process, which are discussed in each IOU's Application.⁴

² Resolution E-4868, at p. 68.

³ See list of CAISO Demand Response Participants, at <https://www.caiso.com/Documents/ListofDemandResponseParticipants.pdf>.

⁴ Application (A.) 18-11-015 (PG&E) Prepared Testimony, at pp. 2-6 to 2-7; A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at pp. 38-39; A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Tishmari Lewis, at pp. TL-5 to TL-8.

OhmConnect's sole means for accessing customer data to support its Demand Response program is through the click-through solution. Well-designed improvements to the click-through solution will assist OhmConnect and other third parties in meeting the goals of the Commission, especially the Commission principle that "[d]emand response shall be market-driven leading to a competitive, technology-neutral, open-market in California with a preference for services provided by third-parties."⁵ OhmConnect intends to actively participate in these Applications, providing a unique historical perspective that begins with the original Rule 24/32 implementation to present experiences integrating with the existing click-through solutions, in addition to its experience as one of the largest users of the platforms.

III. GROUNDS FOR PROTEST

A. Grounds for Protest Common to All Three IOUs

1. The IOUs decline to discuss the improvements suggested by participating members of the CDAC and as ordered by Resolution E-4868.

Ordering Paragraph 29 of Resolution E-4868 directed the IOUs to address in their Applications a set of improvements, including "additional functionalities for click-through authorization processes proposed in the Customer Data Access Committee."⁶ On May 4, 2018, in accordance with the agreed-upon deadline within the CDAC, OhmConnect submitted a list of proposed enhancements to the existing click-through solutions. On June 20, 2018, OhmConnect presented its proposals to the CDAC, and circulated on that same day the slide deck that was presented. The proposed enhancements included:⁷

- i. Improvements to the ongoing data delivery (e.g. meter data).
- ii. Functionality to provide the authorized third-party provider the ability, via application program interface (API), to inform the authorized provider more granular details regarding the status of the authorization/authorization ID.
- iii. Consistent login button with utility identification (e.g. utility logo) that DRPs/Distributed Energy Resources (DERs) can implement on their websites to initiate the OAuth process.

⁵ Decision (D.) 16-09-056 (*Decision Adopting Guidance for Future Demand Response Portfolios and Modifying Decision 14-12-024*), OP 8, at pp. 97-98.

⁶ Resolution E-4868, OP 29, at pp. 105-106.

⁷ See June 20, 2018 OhmConnect presentation to CDAC "Proposed Enhancements to the OAuth Click-Through Solution", at Slide 2.

- iv. Added enhancements to the sign-in page, such as the ability to sign-up for an online utility account or retrieve existing account credentials.
- v. Functionality to facilitate resolution of program enrollment conflicts as an optional part of the click-through flow.
- vi. Improved visibility into why a customer fails to complete the OAuth process on a case-by-case basis.
- vii. Lengthen lifespan of the refresh tokens to at least one year.
- viii. Transition of the revocation notification from email to a file (or push notification).

OhmConnect acknowledges that each IOU lists these eight enhancements in its Applications.⁸ However, many of the enhancements are summarily dismissed by each IOU as either out-of-scope, currently existing, or simply not proposed.

Each utility declined to seek approval for the use of a consistent login button that customers could confidently use to initiate the click-through process on a third party's website. In doing so, the IOUs contend that use of their logos would suggest an existing relationship, or would constitute an otherwise inappropriate use of their logos. However, OhmConnect believes the IOUs miss the point – the login button would be intended to show customers that they will be redirected once clicking on the button to access the secure and official IOU click-through solution. It is not intended to denote endorsement of a specific third party; rather it supports the specific authorization *pathway*.

PG&E and SCE both decline to discuss functionality to facilitate resolution of program enrollment conflicts because the disenrollment requirements vary and are governed by tariffs. However, no specific evidence was provided regarding the tariff changes that would have to be made, nor does OhmConnect believe that discussion of existing tariffs is out-of-scope if it would address “improvements to the authorization process that may have the effect of increasing customer enrollment in third-party demand response programs,”⁹ as ordered in Resolution E-4868. SDG&E, in its Application, does propose identifying to the customer that they may experience an enrollment conflict, but does not go so far as to propose a technical build-out that will facilitate customers' transition to their preferred DR programs at the same time.¹⁰

⁸ A.18-11-015 (PG&E) Prepared Testimony, at pp. 2-7 to 2-11; A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at pp. 38-39; A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Tishmari Lewis, at pp. TL-6 to TL-8.

⁹ Resolution E-4868, OP 29, at pp. 105-106

¹⁰ A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Claudio Pellegrini, at CP-10.

All three utilities appear to misunderstand OhmConnect’s proposed enhancement for the IOUs to provide visibility into why a given customer fails to complete the click-through process. SCE, for example, says that it “can’t speak to customer motivation”¹¹ while SDG&E says that “[t]here is no simple way to predict customer behavior and the reason(s) behind customer abandonment of an authorization.”¹² OhmConnect is not asking the IOUs to divine customer intent; rather, the proposed enhancement is intended to provide the third party with details about the *point* at which a customer did not complete the authorization. Generally, there are three main categories where a user may fail to authorize: (1) system error (e.g. the IOU site is down or unresponsive); (2) OAuth or site error (e.g. a technical error within the click-through process denied the customer a clean authorization process); or (3) user activity. Especially for the latter two categories, there are a variety of specific errors that can occur *which can in turn initiate a response from the IOU system to the third party*. For example, an OAuth or site error may occur due to:

- Invalid redirect Uniform Resource Identifier (URI). The Uniform Resource Locator (URL) sent in to be returned is invalid either due to changes on the IOU side, database failure or invalid formulation by the initiator.
- OAuth secret error. The handshake with OAuth had an error, likely due to mismatched keys.
- Login system down. The IOU subsystems to handle authentication are down so the process could not proceed.
- Account lookup error. The user was logged in but the IOU subsystem to find their account information had a failure so the process could not proceed.

Various user activities may also cause the authorization to fail. We detail this below, and include the appropriate response from the IOU system to indicate such activity:

- User timeout on page. A simple javascript that times the page out after N minutes and returns to the initiator with an error code indicating timeout.
- User exited window. A backend record (e.g. database or cache like Redis) would time out after N minutes and a “backend all” to the initiator would be made indicating the furthest progress made.
- User navigated away. Like the “user timeout on page”, a simple javascript hook can detect this and make a call to the initiator.

¹¹ A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 39.

¹² A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Tishmari Lewis, at p. TL-7.

- User chose not to proceed (e.g. incorrect password, declined terms and conditions, etc.). The page would redirect back to initiator with info about where the user canceled in the process. Additionally, there could be a button like “Forgot Password” or “Do Not Authorize” that triggers notification to the initiator because the process is about to be interrupted. In the case of forgot password, perhaps there is an email sent by the IOU which a user might click on but never pick up the OAuth process.

The Application process provides an opportunity for parties to help establish a record with evidence supporting a particular position related to each of these enhancements. OhmConnect disagrees with the IOUs’ decisions to refuse to address many of these enhancements in their Applications. The enhancements should be addressed, discussed, and vetted by the Commission and third parties, along with the IOUs. OhmConnect requests that the Commission provide all parties the opportunity to provide testimony and other input by keeping these items within the scope of this proceeding.

2. The IOUs have not sufficiently addressed the improvements suggested by participating members of the CDAC and as ordered by Resolution E-4868.

Beyond the enhancements dismissed by the IOUs and discussed in the preceding section, other enhancements proposed by OhmConnect that *were* included in the Applications appear to fall short of the intent.

SCE claims to include proposals for improvements to ongoing data delivery in its Application. However, OhmConnect believes that SCE vastly understates the extent of its data delivery issues. SCE twice cites that it has yet to receive complaints about its system, while only briefly acknowledging “some glitches in Click-Through data delivery”¹³ and “data delivery defects.”¹⁴ To the contrary, OhmConnect’s experience has been that SCE has demonstrated that its systems are not yet technically capable of regularly providing interval data. There have been several instances this past year where SCE did not send OhmConnect timely interval data for tens of thousands of its authorized customers. Furthermore, SCE has not provided OhmConnect customer data within two days for 55 percent of all customer authorizations, despite Commission direction that “[t]he Commission expects that in the overwhelming majority of cases, data will be delivered within two business days.”¹⁵ SCE also declines in its Application to provide all data

¹³ A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 23.

¹⁴ A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 30.

¹⁵ Resolution E-4868, OP 19, at p. 102

within 90 seconds, which OhmConnect opposes and discusses later in this protest. Like SCE, SDG&E in its Application also suggests that its data delivery is sufficient, stating that “SDG&E has determined that there are currently no immediate obvious improvements to recommend in the data delivery process that would provide significant value to ratepayers”¹⁶ without citing or detailing how it reached this conclusion. OhmConnect urges the Commission to consider in this proceeding the extent of the data delivery issues the third parties must manage, and solutions to mitigate these occurrences.

SCE seems to suggest that it does not need to provide any further consideration of a functionality to share details regarding the status of an authorization, noting that this was implemented in a November 2018 release. OhmConnect is concerned that DRPs have not had time to vet whether this update addressed the requested enhancement. Furthermore, while OhmConnect appreciates that SDG&E will “include the functionality to retrieve status of the authorization,”¹⁷ the corresponding Application Testimony simply says that it will be for “situations where the DRP stops receiving customer data.”¹⁸

SCE states that it already has the ability for a customer to sign-up for an online account. However, it then suggests it is for customers using guest access. OhmConnect is unclear, therefore, whether customers are in fact creating online accounts or just signing up for guest access. More clarity is needed.

SCE notes that it is “exploring the feasibility of [the] option”¹⁹ to lengthen the lifespan of the refresh tokens to one year. Both PG&E and SDG&E already provide refresh tokens for at least one year. OhmConnect fails to see why SCE cannot do likewise, and why SCE still needs to consider the option given that it was presented to SCE in May of 2018.

3. The IOUs decline to consider additional data elements without evidence that these data elements will not provide value to ratepayers.

OhmConnect is disappointed that all three IOUs decline to support various third-party proposals that would enable the provision of additional data elements. For instance, each IOU

¹⁶ A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Tishmari Lewis, at TL-5.

¹⁷ A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Claudio Pellegrini, at CP-10.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 30, at p. 39.

explicitly does not support providing machine-readable rate information.²⁰ SDG&E, in particular, submits that “third parties have failed to provide an adequate business purpose for this information to justify the necessity and ratepayer expense.”²¹ Even if SDG&E is correct that there has not yet been, in its subjective estimation, sufficient information presented, excluding this topic from the Application will in effect silence parties from supplying said evidence to the Commission. Furthermore, OhmConnect fails to understand why tools that will enable both third parties and the ratepayers themselves to better analyze their bills would not provide value.

In addition, none of the IOUs supports providing five-minute interval data.²² In justifying this recommendation, PG&E and SDG&E cite high costs, and all three IOUs claim wholesale changes to the existing infrastructure. SDG&E notes that the Commission, in D.16-03-008, determined that “[w]hile it is more than likely that the Commission would gain experience and information from working with 5-minute intervals, the additional expense of the 5-minute interval makes the 15-minute interval a more reasonable pathway.”²³ However, OhmConnect notes that this determination was made almost three years ago, and that it is possible that technology has improved such that these costs are now lower. Furthermore, and beyond the “experience and information” gained from 5-minute intervals, there is a business reason that CAISO-registered DRPs would prefer the more granular 5-minute interval data. While the CAISO allows subdivision of 15-minute intervals into 5-minute intervals, this subdivision may still mask overall resource performance if a resource was only dispatched for 5 minutes within that 15-minute interval. We therefore believe discussion of 5-minute data should be in-scope.

OhmConnect appreciates and supports SDG&E’s proposal to add three new data elements: gas usage, participation in Energy Efficiency (EE) programs, and historical rate information. We propose that PG&E and SCE also seek to provide these data elements. However, OhmConnect does not believe that the conversation around expanding the data set should end with SDG&E’s proposal – especially if the Commission determines that additional data elements may prove

²⁰ A.18-11-015 (PG&E) Prepared Testimony, at pp. 2-9; A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 26; A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Tishmari Lewis, at pp. TL-14 to TL-15.

²¹ A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Tishmari Lewis, at pp. TL-14 to TL-15.

²² A.18-11-015 (PG&E) Prepared Testimony, at pp. 2-27 to 2-28; A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 26; A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Tishmari Lewis, at pp. TL-15.

²³ D.16-03-008 (*Decision Addressing Budgets for Real-time and Ancillary Services during the Initial Implementation Step of Third-Party Demand Response Direct Participation*), at p. 20.

beneficial for other providers. More stakeholder input is paramount, and these Applications can serve as the appropriate venue.

4. Additional enhancements to the click-through flow will further improve customer enrollment.

As the Commission considers expanding the click-through solution to other third-party providers, OhmConnect strongly encourages the Commission to use these Applications as a venue for eliciting feedback from *all* providers regarding how to improve customer enrollment. For example, OhmConnect has considered a number of different improvements or data elements that it believes might be beneficial for the other providers eager to assist ratepayers in managing their utility bills, decreasing Greenhouse Gas emissions, or providing other value to the grid:

- Interval data sent in real-time.
- Dummy accounts to test the click-through enrollment flow.
- Customer awareness campaigns and training of IOU customer service representatives.
- Additional data elements, such as service account history, moving or relocation information, solar, storage, or electric vehicle installation, and claimed rebates.

The above list is not exhaustive, and has not yet been consulted on with other providers. We envision, through this Application procedural process, that other providers can provide additional innovative ideas and recommendations.

5. To protect ratepayers from excessive costs, and third parties from incomplete service, the stakeholders should develop a Service Level Agreement for use between each IOU and the provider receiving data.

OhmConnect has repeatedly encountered data delays and other issues related to the click-through solution that have negatively impacted customer enrollment and retention. These problems broadly run counter to Commission direction that “[d]emand response shall be market-driven leading to a competitive, technology-neutral, open-market in California with a preference for services provided by third-parties”²⁴ and to Rule 24/32, but the recourse available to third parties has not yet been defined. A Service Level Agreement (SLA) between the IOU and any provider that uses the click-through solution as a service would help to provide a level of protection for the provider. In general, a SLA has three pieces that allow it to be effective: the

²⁴ Decision (D.)16-09-056 (*Decision Adopting Guidance for Future Demand Response Portfolios and Modifying Decision 14-12-024*), OP 8, at pp. 97-98.

target (e.g. the desired service level), the notification (e.g. the communication plan if service is interrupted), and the penalty (e.g. the penalties for failing to meet targets). The SLA for the click-through solution, for example, could set targets that guarantee data transmission between the IOU and the providers, with provisions regarding 99 percent availability of the authorization systems, 99 percent availability of the file delivery service, 99 percent accuracy of the data contained in the files, 99 percent data delivery within two days, and additional provisions to ensure reliable, accurate, and consistent data transfer. The SLA should also include penalties in the event the IOU fails to meet the requirements of the SLA. Furthermore, the SLA should also consider provisions related to notification of down time, such as a requirement for 24-hour advance-notice of a planned outage, and email communication to the provider *and* the customer that authorized data was not delivered within the specified timeline. As an additional benefit, a well-designed SLA may support a movement away from specification requirements, such as “detailed user interface, appearance, and operations requirements, or specific screen pixel numbers,” as noted in PG&E’s Application, where PG&E also states that “such specification requirements to be useful, but limiting.”²⁵

B. Grounds for Protest Specific to Each IOU

1. SDG&E does not request funding to expand the click-through solution to other providers.

OhmConnect is disappointed by SDG&E’s decision to decline to seek authorization for expanding its click-through solution to other third parties. As justification, SDG&E first implies a preference for “[a] single proceeding [that] may allow multiple platforms to be consolidated to serve ratepayers in an efficient manner.”²⁶ It is unclear to OhmConnect why a different proceeding is necessary, given the Commission found in Resolution E-4868 that, when envisioning these Applications, “[c]larifying a pathway for expanding the solution to other distributed energy resource and energy management providers will alleviate procedural uncertainty and allow issues of customer data access to be discussed in a broader forum.”²⁷ Next, SDG&E claims that expanding the click-through solution would unduly preference companies

²⁵ A.18-11-015 (PG&E) Prepared Testimony, at p. 2-3.

²⁶ A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Raghav Murali, at p. RM-9.

²⁷ Resolution E-4868, Finding of Fact (FOF) 73, at p. 95.

that are able to integrate with its solution.²⁸ OhmConnect finds this logic baffling – if the click-through solution that SDG&E has built is too challenging for companies to utilize, then this suggests that the click-through solution that SDG&E has built is not well-constructed and does not meet industry standards. It is especially confusing that SDG&E acknowledges shortly afterwards that “the role of DERPs will invariably expand, creating a larger need for data.”²⁹ By SDG&E’s own words, there is a need for data. It therefore makes sense that other providers would benefit from using the existing click-through solution.

Furthermore, all three IOUs state that an expanded solution would enable the solution to be available to other DERs. Although OhmConnect surmises that this distinction is intentional given the Commission direction to file “a proposal to expand the click-through solution(s) to other **distributed energy resource** and energy management providers,”³⁰ we would caution the Commission against inadvertently limiting the third parties that are eligible to use the click-through solution. A third party whose services will assist a customer by utilizing data available and authorized via the click-through solution should not be precluded simply because an IOU does not believe it fits the definition of a DER. Providing the IOUs with that latitude of decision-making may hamstring innovative companies from entering the California market.

2. SCE does not request funding to provide the full data set within 90 seconds.

SCE cites “significant cost with unclear benefit” as justification for not providing the full Rule 24 data set within 90 seconds.³¹ Expanding on this claim further, SCE states that:

“It is unclear to SCE why DRPs need the full data set within 90 seconds when SCE provides the summarized data set for purposes of verifying customer eligibility with 90 seconds, followed by the full data set within two days and refreshed daily. SCE has not received any complaints about data arriving too slowly.”³²

OhmConnect disagrees with multiple assertions made by SCE in this statement, and thus does not believe that SCE has reached a reasonable conclusion that the Commission should not direct SCE to provide the full data set within 90 seconds. First, SCE seems to project, based on its assumptions, that the current summarized data set allows DRPs to verify customer eligibility

²⁸ A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Raghav Murali, at p. RM-9.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Resolution E-4868, OP 29, pp. 105-106, emphasis added.

³¹ A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 2.

³² A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 35.

for Rule 24/32 DR. OhmConnect disagrees, and does not believe that SCE should be allowed to dictate how a third party might verify customer eligibility. From OhmConnect’s perspective, the summarized data set is *not* sufficient to verify customer eligibility, because it does not include the data elements necessary to enroll the customer in the CAISO’s Demand Response Registration System (DRRS). OhmConnect also suspects that each individual DRP has unique criteria it uses to determine whether the customer meets program eligibility. Second, SCE seems to conclude that no changes are needed because no complaints have been received. OhmConnect questions the appropriateness of SCE’s inaction just because no party has yet to complain – for example, this implies to OhmConnect that SCE is not regularly monitoring its IT systems to identify issues, and instead just waits until a complaint is received. Given SCE’s apparent “wait-and-see” process, it is perhaps not surprising that despite Commission direction to deliver data within two business days³³, OhmConnect’s analysis has found that only 45 percent of customer data (i.e. the full data set) is provided within two days.

3. SDG&E is too narrow in addressing improvements to customer enrollment.

SDG&E witness Lewis states in Testimony that “SDG&E has implemented a communication plan to follow when a planned or unplanned outage occurs to the systems impacting the CTP.”³⁴ While OhmConnect agrees that a communication plan is important, it is concerned that the communication plan is the *only* improvement SDG&E cites to increase customer enrollment. For example, OhmConnect has provided to SDG&E, via the CDAC, a list of enhancements that it believes will increase customer enrollment. OhmConnect believes that this proceeding will illuminate additional enhancements to the click-through solution that will further improve customer enrollment.

4. SCE incorrectly claims that third parties lack incentives to safeguard customer data as compared to the IOUs.

In its Testimony, SCE suggests that “[a]lthough laws and Commission rules place responsibility on third parties as covered entities for ensuring that they follow Smart Grid privacy rules, they do not have the same incentive to safeguard customer data that utilities have.”³⁵ It is not clear to OhmConnect what specific incentive SCE references in this statement.

³³ Resolution E-4868, OP 19, at p. 102.

³⁴ A.18-11-017 (SDG&E) Prepared Direct Testimony of Tishmari Lewis, at p. TL-4.

³⁵ A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 15.

Nevertheless, OhmConnect is concerned that through this statement SCE is implying that third parties are somehow less secure or less responsible with customer data. While OhmConnect cannot speak for all parties, as an internal policy privacy and security of OhmConnect users' data is of paramount importance. Furthermore, we assert that any business that treats customer data must establish customer trust in that company's security practices in order to be successful. We do not believe it is appropriate for SCE to assume that the utility incentives to protect customer data are greater than any other company that has been entrusted by users to protect their information.

5. Further consideration is needed on cost allocations for residential meter reprogramming.

PG&E and SCE both discuss additional funding for meter reprogramming and registrations.³⁶ OhmConnect supports that PG&E and SCE seek to raise the cap in order to increase the total number of Rule 24 registrations. However, we are also mindful and supportive of Commission direction that "these [registration] targets should be dynamic ceilings that will rise over time and should not be reached."³⁷ Therefore, we are concerned that PG&E's plan to not "extend this waiver of the fees beyond this level or the approved budget, whichever comes first"³⁸ may catastrophically increase costs of customer enrollment for third parties and inadvertently freeze the market for third-party Demand Response (per PG&E Electric Schedule E-DRP, remote meter reprogramming costs \$41.90 per meter).³⁹ If the Commission determines that these Applications are the appropriate setting to discuss the allocation of registration and meter reprogramming fees, OhmConnect strongly believes that further discussion is warranted.

IV. PROPOSED CATEGORY FOR APPLICATIONS, ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED, NEED FOR HEARING, AND PROPOSED SCHEDULE

OhmConnect asks the Commission that the above grounds for protest, summarized below, are considered and included within the Scoping Ruling for this Application:

- Enhancements to the click-through solution and overall customer experience.

³⁶ A.18-11-015 (PG&E) Prepared Testimony, at pp. 2-26 to 2-27; A.18-11-016 (SCE) Testimony, at p. 43-44.

³⁷ D.15-03-042 (*Decision Approving Recovery of Costs to Implement an Initial Level of Demand Response Direct Participation*), at p. 26.

³⁸ A.18-11-015 (PG&E) Prepared Testimony, at p. 2-27.

³⁹ PG&E Electric Schedule E-DRP, at Sheet 2, available at https://www.pge.com/tariffs/tm2/pdf/ELEC_SCHEDS_E-DRP.pdf.

- Improvements to the delivery of data.
- Expansion of the click-through solution to other providers.
- Addition of data elements to the provided data set.
- Improvements to increase customer enrollment in provider programs.
- Creation of a Service Level Agreement.
- And other matters raised above.

OhmConnect believes that a hearing before the Commission may be necessary to address any disputed issues.

V. CONCLUSION

OhmConnect appreciates the opportunity to provide this protest to the IOUs' November 26, 2018 click-through Applications. We reiterate our support for a streamlined and simplified process by which users may authenticate and authorize data access to any provider of their choosing. However, we are concerned that each Application fails to holistically address the residual issues DRPs are experiencing with the existing solutions. Furthermore, we do not believe that the Applications fully meet Commission direction, including denying several improvements that would either make the click-through solutions more accessible to other providers, or increase enrollment in provider programs. Accordingly, we request that the Commission include the issues and recommendations identified in this protest within the scope of the three proceedings discussed herein.

Respectfully submitted,

December 27, 2018

/s/ JOHN ANDERSON

John Anderson
Director of Energy Markets
OhmConnect, Inc.
350 Townsend St., Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: (415) 697-1271
Email: john@ohmconnect.com