

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
1325 G STREET, N.W., SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005**

ORDER

August 9, 2018

**FORMAL CASE NO. 1130, IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO
MODERNIZING THE ENERGY DELIVERY SYSTEM FOR INCREASED
SUSTAINABILITY, Order No. 19432**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. By this Order, the District of Columbia Public Service Commission (“Commission”) approves the recommendations of Smart Electric Power Alliance (“SEPA”)¹ to: (a) not conduct a full system assessment at this time; (b) form the following working groups in Phase 2 of the Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability (“MEDSIS”) Initiative – (1) Data and Information Access and Alignment, (2) Non-wires Alternatives to Grid Investments, (3) Future Rate Design, (4) Customer Impact, (5) Microgrids, and (6) Pilot Projects (*See* Attachment B); and (c) submit an application for free analytical support for the MEDSIS Initiative through the Electricity Markets and Policy Group’s “Analytical Support for Public Utility Commissions” program.² SEPA is directed to establish the working groups in accordance with the recommendations submitted; collaboratively develop charters, goals, and expected outcomes for each group that take into consideration the MEDSIS Vision Statement and the District of Columbia’s (“District”) energy policy goals with stakeholders; and submit quarterly working group status reports to the Commission detailing each working group’s progress. SEPA shall file a final working group report, including recommended Commission actions and next steps, for each group within one (1) year from the date of this Order.

II. BACKGROUND

2. The investigation into modernizing the energy delivery system in the District of Columbia was initiated in response to intervenors’ requests in both *Formal Case No. 1103*³ and *Formal Case No. 1123*.⁴ In consideration of intervenor requests, technological advancements in

¹ The Commission awarded Contract No. PSC-18-08 for Phases 1 and 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative to SEPA on June 5, 2018.

² Commissioner Beverly wrote a statement on this Order. *See* Attachment A.

³ *See Formal Case No. 1103, In the Matter of the Application of the Potomac Electric Power Company for Authority to Increase Existing Retail Rates and Charges for Electric Distribution Service* (“*Formal Case No. 1103*”), Order No. 17539, ¶ 120, rel. July 10, 2014 (“*Order No. 17539*”).

⁴ *Formal Case No. 1123, In the Matter of the Potomac Electric Company’s Notice to Construct a 230kV/138 kV/13 kV Substation and Four 230 kV/138 kV Underground Transmission Circuits on Buzzard Point* (“*Formal Case No. 1123*”), Order No. 17851, ¶ 19, rel. April 9, 2015 (“*Order No. 17851*”).

the energy industry, and changing consumer preferences, on June 12, 2015, the Commission, by Order No. 17912, opened this proceeding to identify technologies and policies that can be implemented in the District to modernize the distribution energy delivery system for increased sustainability; and, in the near term, to make the distribution energy delivery system more reliable, efficient, cost effective, and interactive.⁵ Additionally, as a result of the PHI-Exelon Merger approved by the Commission in Order No. 18148 on March 23, 2016, a \$21.55 million MEDSIS Pilot Project Fund Subaccount was created and the funds therein were directed to be used to support pilot projects related to energy delivery system modernization under consideration in *Formal Case No. 1130*.

3. On January 25, 2017, the Commission issued the MEDSIS Staff Report. After considering the comments filed on the MEDSIS Staff Report, on October 19, 2017, the Commission issued Order No. 19143, which included Staff's proposed Vision Statement for the MEDSIS Initiative and invited public comment on whether any guiding principles should be included in the Commission's vision statement; whether a full assessment of the current capabilities and characteristics of the District's current energy delivery system is warranted at this time; and, whether, and to what extent, a consultant would be useful to help move MEDSIS forward more expeditiously. On February 14, 2018, the Commission issued Order No. 19275, which adopted Staff's revised MEDSIS Vision Statement as the official "Vision Statement for the MEDSIS Initiative." In Order No. 19275, the Commission also recognized that several stakeholders favored the use of a consultant to establish and manage working groups in the MEDSIS Initiative. Therefore, on March 1, 2018, the Commission issued a Request for Proposals to obtain a qualified consultant. After engaging in a thorough competitive bidding process, the Commission awarded Contract No. PSC-18-08 for Phases 1 and 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative to SEPA on June 5, 2018.

4. On June 27, 2018, SEPA led the MEDSIS Technical Conference at the Commission wherein stakeholders were able to provide input on whether a system assessment was needed and what working groups should be formed in Phase 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative. SEPA compiled stakeholder input in a detailed Technical Conference Report which was filed in the *Formal Case No. 1130* docket on July 20, 2018.⁶ Based on stakeholder comments filed in the *Formal Case No. 1130* docket and stakeholder input provided at the MEDSIS Technical Conference, SEPA submitted recommendations to the Commission to: (a) not conduct a full system assessment; and (b) form six (6) working groups in Phase 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative.

III. DISCUSSION

5. In its recommendations, provided at Attachment B, SEPA concludes that a full system assessment should not be conducted at this time, asserting that "input from the stakeholders

⁵ *Formal Case No. 1130, In the Matter of the Investigation into Modernizing the Energy Distribution System for Increased Sustainability*, Order No. 17912, rel. June 12, 2015.

⁶ *Formal Case No. 1130*, June 27, 2018 Technical Conference Meeting Minutes, filed July 20, 2018 ("MEDSIS Technical Conference Report").

was clear that they felt there was sufficient information to proceed and that the working groups could determine what additional information was needed as the process continued.”⁷

6. With regard to what working groups should be formed in Phase 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative, the Technical Conference Report reveals that there was general consensus among stakeholders. SEPA recommends the formation of the following groups:

- (1) Data and Information Access and Alignment Working Group – which will initially address the alignment of the MEDSIS Vision Statement with the Working Group process to chart a common framework and roadmap.⁸ On an ongoing basis, the group will function to coordinate data and information in an accessible format with all stakeholders between all Working Groups, including utility data and information related to relevant, ongoing proceedings.
- (2) Non-wires Alternatives to Grid Investments Working Group – which will address Pepco’s interaction with specific technologies including, but not limited to, advanced control systems, energy storage, fuel cells, electric vehicles (“EV”),⁹ photovoltaic systems, smart inverters, and voltage regulation equipment as well as the rules

⁷ Attachment B at 1. During the MEDSIS Technical Conference, SEPA polled participants on whether they believed a full system assessment should be conducted; 56 of the participants voted “No,” five (5) voted “Yes,” six (6) abstained, and four (4) were unsure.

⁸ On July 31, 2018, the District Department of Energy and Environment (“DOEE”) filed a Motion for Limited Engagement of Consultants to provide a Roadmap in the MEDSIS Initiative. In the Motion, DOEE requests that the Commission engage “on a limited basis the United States Department of Energy’s Office of Electricity (US DOE) and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory’s (PNNL) grid architecture team led by Dr. Jeffrey Taft, to provide technical assistance to the stakeholders and Smart Electric Power Alliance (SEPA) to develop a roadmap for grid modernization in the District of Columbia.” DOEE indicated that the support would be provided at no cost to the Commission. *See Formal Case No. 1130*, Department of Energy and Environment’s Motion for Limited Engagement of Consultants to Provide a Roadmap, at 1-2, filed July 31, 2018 (“DOEE Motion”). On August 7, 2018, DOEE filed comments in furtherance of its Motion, stating: “[T]he creation of a roadmap can occur concurrently with, and not prior to, other actions the Commission, in consultation with its consultant [SEPA], is considering undertaking in this proceeding. . . The roadmap’s development is not intended to hinder any short-term projects.” *Formal Case No. 1130*, Department of Energy and Environment’s Comments in Furtherance of its Motion for Limited Engagement of Consultants to provide a Roadmap, at 2, filed August 7, 2018.

While the Commission reserves judgment on DOEE’s Motion until after the 10-day comment period for motions elapses (*see* 15 DCMR § 105.8 (“Responses to a motion shall be filed no later than ten (10) calendar days after a motion has been served.”)), we note that SEPA has recommended that a framework and roadmap be collaboratively developed as part of the Data and Information Access and Alignment Working Group. The Commission also notes that this Order directs SEPA to apply for free analytical support for the MEDSIS Initiative as discussed in paragraph 8 of this Order.

⁹ On April 27, 2017, Pepco filed an application for approval of a limited electric vehicle charging program in *Formal Case No. 1143*. On October 19, 2017, the Commission issued Order No. 19143, which, among other things, transferred the entire *Formal Case No. 1143* docket into *Formal Case No. 1130*. Subsequently, the Commission closed *Formal Case No. 1143*. As matters related to electric vehicles were transferred into *Formal Case No. 1130*, the Commission highlights that two of the recommended working groups (Non-wires Alternatives and Future Rate Design) will address electric vehicle issues including EV infrastructure, EV coupling with storage, EV rate design, and EVs and hosting capacity.

- concerning Pepco's need to consider these technologies in the utility's distribution integrated resource planning process;
- (3) Future Rate Design Working Group – which will deal with investigating rate design's impact on distributed energy resource (“DER”) adoption, evaluating alternative rate designs, including EV specific rates, and proper cost causation and realization;
 - (4) Customer Impact Working Group – which will address how increased DER integration impacts different customer types, particularly regarding customer equity, utility customer service, customer data privacy, and low-income inclusion;
 - (5) Microgrids Working Group – which will address microgrid development in the District, including newly constructed microgrids and retrofitted microgrids. The group will examine the benefits and costs of microgrids and produce recommendations to address microgrid ownership, operation, standards, and implementation; and
 - (6) Pilot Projects Working Group – which will finalize the parameters regarding pilot project governance, project selection, and management found in Section VII of the MEDSIS Staff Report. This group will not focus on producing actual pilot project concepts.

SEPA proposes a working group schedule with staggered start dates to ensure that each working group has the information it needs to inform its process. As such, SEPA recommends that the Pilot Project and Non-wires Alternatives to Grid Investment Working Groups start two months after the other working groups commence. SEPA also represents that stakeholders in each working group will help develop the group's charter, key goals and objectives, as well as expected outputs.

7. The Commission finds that SEPA's recommendations are reasonable and appropriate. The level of detail provided in the Technical Conference Report demonstrates that stakeholder input was thoroughly documented and we believe SEPA has considered the broad spectrum of stakeholder interest in the development of the recommendations. We also find that the recommended working groups will cover a wide range of important topics specific to the District's energy delivery systems and will answer many of the questions raised in the MEDSIS Staff Report and being considered across the energy landscape.

8. SEPA has also expressed interest in leveraging the Electricity Markets and Policy Group's “Analytical Support for Public Utility Commissions” program run by the United States Department of Energy (“DOE”), in partnership with Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory for free analytical support in the MEDSIS Initiative.¹⁰ The Analytical Support Program (“Program”) is intended to provide high-impact analytical support for state public utility commissions addressing barriers to the integration of solar photovoltaics within the U.S. electricity system. The Program provides the following broad “possible” topic areas: Distribution System and Resource Planning, Regulation and Utility Business Models, Rate Design and Ratemaking, Emerging Distribution Grid Technologies, and Solar/Hydropower Resource Planning and Assessment. The Commission believes that the MEDSIS Initiative could benefit from free analytical support; therefore, we direct

¹⁰ See <https://emp.lbl.gov/projects/analysis-support-state-public-utility-commissions>.

SEPA to move forward with the application process. The Commission's application is due by August 31, 2018.

9. Therefore, the Commission approves SEPA's recommendation to: (a) not conduct a full system assessment; (b) form the six (6) working groups outlined in ¶ 6 of this Order in Phase 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative; and (c) leverage DOE's free analytical support program for utility Commissions. The Commission adds that, to ensure transparency, SEPA should file quarterly progress reports for each working group. Further, SEPA shall file a final report for each working group, including recommendations for Commission action and next steps, within one (1) year of the date of this Order.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

10. Smart Electric Power Alliance's recommendations to: (a) not conduct a full system assessment; (b) form the six (6) working groups identified in ¶ 6 of this Order in Phase 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative; and (c) apply for free analytical support for the MEDSIS Initiative are approved;

11. Smart Electric Power Alliance is directed to collaboratively develop charters, goals, and expected outcomes for each working group that take into consideration the MEDSIS Vision Statement and the District's energy policy goals;

12. Smart Electric Power Alliance is directed to file quarterly working group reports detailing each working group's progress;

13. Smart Electric Power Alliance is directed to file a final working group report for each working group, including recommended Commission actions and next steps, within one (1) year of the date of this Order; and

14. Smart Electric Power Alliance is directed to submit an application for free analytical support for the MEDSIS Initiative through the Electricity Markets and Policy Group's "Analytical Support for Public Utility Commissions" program, run by the U.S. Department of Energy, by August 31, 2018.

A TRUE COPY:

BY DIRECTION OF THE COMMISSION:



CHIEF CLERK:

**BRINDA WESTBROOK-SEDGWICK
COMMISSION SECRETARY**

ATTACHMENT A

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER RICHARD BEVERLY

For me, the threshold issue in this case was whether we need a full system assessment to determine where and under what circumstances we can get the most bang for the buck in employing new technologies. After stakeholder engagement, the Smart Electric Power Alliance (“SEPA”) has advised that a full system assessment is unnecessary. That recommendation, among others, is embedded in a report that interested stakeholders have not seen until our decision to accept them in this order.

Although accepting the recommendations without any prior opportunity for stakeholder comment is certainly expedient, I want to reaffirm my commitment to giving interested stakeholders as much meaningful opportunity to comment as possible. Just prior to issuance of this order, the District Department of Energy and Environment (“DOEE”) filed a formal request that we consider engaging the U.S. Department of Energy’s Office of Electricity and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory’s grid architecture team to provide technical assistance to SEPA and MEDSIS stakeholders so that they can jointly develop a roadmap for grid modernization in the District of Columbia.¹¹ That request was supported by the Institute for Market Transformation, Greentel Group, Sierra Club, DC Water, Grid2.0, DC Climate Action, Solar United Neighbors of D.C., and D.C. Consumer Utility Board.

Some of the concerns raised by those supporting the DOEE motion may have been addressed by SEPA’s recommendations, but I think they should have a chance to review the recommendations, discuss the issue in working groups or elsewhere, and refresh their comments accordingly. I also think stakeholders should be able to bring any significant concerns they deem appropriate regarding the stakeholder engagement process to the Commission. Moreover, I strongly support having stakeholders involved in developing the roadmap for moving forward. This is an important matter that will affect all of us for decades and I want to make sure that no one is given short shrift.

¹¹ *Formal Case No. 1130, In the Matter of the Investigation into Modernizing the Energy Distribution System for Increased Sustainability*, Department of Energy and Environment’s Motion for Limited Engagement of Consultants to Provide Roadmap, filed July 31, 2018.

ATTACHMENT B



FORMAL CASE NO. 1130, IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO MODERNIZING THE ENERGY DELIVERY SYSTEM FOR INCREASE SUSTAINABILITY (“MEDSIS”) IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

JUNE 27, 2018 TECHNICAL CONFERENCE
WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

Smart Electric Power Alliance’s (SEPA) Recommendations

Based on the discussions at the technical conference and past input received in the MEDSIS initiative, SEPA provides the following recommendations responding to (1) the appropriateness of conducting a distribution system assessment; and (2) the appropriate working groups to establish in Phase 2 of the MEDSIS initiative, with an initial focus on the establishment of a working group to address viable non-wires alternatives to capital investments and a working group to define parameters for evaluating MEDSIS pilot projects.

System Assessment Recommendation

SEPA recommends that a system assessment not be done at this time. The input from the stakeholders was clear that they felt there was sufficient information to proceed and that the working groups could determine what additional information was needed as the process continued.

Working Group Recommendations

SEPA recommends the following six working groups with staggered starts as summarized in the table below. The summary, key questions that will be addressed and timing for each working group is provided below. The summaries include the scope and justification of each working group. This information is intended to serve as the beginnings of each working group’s work plan. The initial meeting for each group will entail defining the charter language, key objectives, and outputs for the group.

Table 1. Recommended Working Group and Schedule

	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May
WG1 Data and Info										
WG2 NWA to Grid Investments										
WG3 Future Rate Design										
WG4 Customer Impact										
WG5 Microgrids										
WG6 Pilot Projects										

Working Group 1. Data and Information Access and Alignment

- Summary:** A Data and Information Access and Alignment Working Group will cover the alignment of the MEDSIS Vision Statement with the Working Group process to chart a common framework and roadmap. The framework and roadmap will be the connective tissue that keeps the various working groups aligned and working toward a common goal. The Working Group will function as a forum to coordinate data and information in an accessible format with all the stakeholders between all Working Groups, including utility data and information related to relevant ongoing proceedings.

SEPA recommends a DIAA Working Group as there were significant number of stakeholders at the Technical Conference who appreciated the hosting capacity maps, restricted circuit map, solar heat map, and other system data that Pepco currently produces but expressed concern that the circuit level data needs to be consolidated and re-packaged so that entities and communities can easily use it to evaluate potential DER installations. Stakeholders also broadly expressed interest in ensuring the MEDSIS activities were coordinated with other similar PSC and DOEE efforts. SEPA recommends this working group be structured to last beyond Phase 2 of the MEDSIS Initiative as the need for transparent data and policy coordination does not cease when pilot projects are initiated. SEPA also recommends that this Working Group meet bi-monthly because the Working Group is tracking long-term proceedings, developments and data collection of the MEDSIS process as a whole.

- Key Question(s) to be Addressed:**

 - What is the system data available and how can it be packaged for all stakeholders to use?
 - What additional data is needed that is currently not available?
 - How to evaluate and make recommendations regarding data transparency related to grid modernization in the District?
 - How do ongoing interrelated cases and orders impact the MEDSIS working group process and initiative?
 - As the MEDSIS initiative progresses, is it aligned with existing related policies and regulations including City of DC Clean Energy Plan, other Pepco regulatory proceedings, etc.?
 - How will data be shared between pilot projects?
- Timing:** August launch. Every other monthly meetings. Recommended to be continued for the entirety of MEDSIS initiative.

Working Group 2. Non-wires Alternatives to Grid Investments

- **Summary:** A Non-wires Alternatives (NWA) to Grid Investments Working Group will address Pepco's interaction with specific technologies including, but not limited to, advanced control systems, energy storage, fuel cells, electric vehicles, photovoltaic systems, smart inverters, and voltage regulation equipment as well as the rules concerning Pepco's need to consider these technologies in the utility's distribution integrated resource planning process.

SEPA recommends a NWA Working Group to help ensure that grid upgrades fully consider DERs for meeting capacity and reliability needs prior to any grid infrastructure plans. SEPA has included electric vehicles (EV) in this working group explicitly to discuss EV charging and infrastructure as a DER when co-located with storage or used as a demand side management resource. Based on discussions at the Technical Conference most stakeholders suggested that previous efforts on EV managed charging program (FC 1143) would best be addressed both in this Working Group and in the Future Rate Design Working Group. SEPA has intentionally omitted microgrids from this Working Group as they will be considered in a separate Working Group.

- **Key Question(s) to be Addressed:**
 - Should Pepco be allowed to own DERs? If so, what are the conditions?
 - Should the utility have access to control DERs? If so, what are the conditions?
 - Are there locational benefits for EV charging in the District's jurisdiction?
 - Methodology/Framework to best value DERs as NWAs (*e.g.*, ancillary services, resiliency benefits, reliability, safety).
- **Timing:** October launch. Delayed start as the Data and Information Access and Alignment Working Group may inform priority discussion topics and agendas of meetings. Monthly meetings.

Working Group 3. Future Rate Design

- **Summary:** This working group will deal with investigating rate design's impact on DER adoption, evaluating alternative rate designs, including EV specific rates, addressing the basis for setting rates, and proper cost causation & realization.

SEPA recommends a Future Rate Design Working Group as current rate structures do not fully consider and address the inclusion of DERs on the energy delivery system and the value these DERs can provide. As rates design is an overarching topic that has a direct effect on the actual value realized by DERs, it must be addressed to achieve the MEDSIS vision. At the Technical Conference, 7 of the 8 breakout groups identified Future Rate Design as a priority working group.

- **Key Question(s) to be Addressed:**
 - What are the necessary adjustments to the utility's rates such that its business model will reinforce the vision for FC1130
 - Should locational rates be piloted? If so, what are the conditions?
 - Should time-based rates be piloted? If so, what are the conditions?
 - What is the ideal rate structure for achieving the end-state of the MEDSIS initiative? What are incremental steps that can be taken to progress towards the end-state?

- **Timing:** August launch. Monthly meetings.

Working Group 4. Customer Impact

- **Summary:** A Customer Impact Working Group will deal with how increased DER impacts different customer types particularly regarding customer equity, utility customer service, customer data privacy, and low-income inclusion. The working group will produce regulatory recommendations that ensure all customers benefit fairly from DER growth.

SEPA recommends a Customer Impact Working Group as the electric grid must result in a safe, affordable and non-discriminatory energy delivery system, per the MEDSIS vision statement. Achieving this end requires that the impact of grid investments fully consider the personal and community outcomes, not just the engineering outcomes. It is important to recognize that all DC ratepayers have equal access to the benefits of the DER pilots and programs and that all other MEDSIS working groups incorporate these considerations. At the Technical Conference, 6 of the 8 breakout groups identified customer impact as a priority working group.

- **Key Question(s) to be Addressed:**
 - Are revisions needed to the DC PSC Customer Bill of Rights?
 - How can low income customers benefit from DERs?
 - What do customers most need from Pepco?
- **Timing:** August launch. Monthly meetings.

Working Group 5. Microgrids

- **Summary:** A Microgrids Working Group will deal with the response to the growing interest in the development and use of microgrids in the District, including newly constructed microgrids and retrofitted microgrids to existing facilities. The working group will look at the benefits and costs of microgrids, including factors such as safety, reliability, and resiliency. The working group will produce recommendations to address microgrid ownership, operation, standards, and implementation.

SEPA recommends the Microgrid Working Group function as a stand-alone working group based on the number of comments in the earlier MEDSIS workshops and proceedings and the discussion that ensued around microgrid ownership at the Technical Conference. It was determined there are enough issues specific to microgrids to address that a microgrid specific working group is necessary. At the Technical Conference, 5 of the 8 breakout groups identified Microgrids as a priority working group.

- **Key Question(s) to be Addressed:**
 - What type of utility and microgrid developer partnerships should or shouldn't be allowed?
 - Who should be allowed to own and operate microgrids?
 - How will regulation be established for microgrids which vary in terms of size, generation source, arrangement, reliability, operation and ownership structure?
 - Are the Commission's current regulations adequate and appropriate to regulate the construction, operation, and maintenance of microgrid facilities?

- What statutory provisions or regulations adopted or proposed in other jurisdictions regarding microgrids should the Commission consider in the District?
 - How are costs recovered for microgrid projects? What are the different business models that address this cost recovery?
 - What are the potential benefits and foreseeable problems that microgrids present in the District’s current regulatory framework?
- **Timing:** August launch. Monthly meetings under the discretion of SEPA and the Commission to be merged with NWA to Grid Investment working group in the later stages of Phase 2 of the MEDSIS initiative. SEPA acknowledges the overlap in these two working groups and its intent is to manage, monitor and if it appropriate, to collapse the two groups at some point in the future.

Working Group 6. Pilot Projects.

- **Summary:** A Pilot Projects Working Group shall finalize the parameters regarding pilot project governance, project selection, and management. The initial proposed parameters are found in Section VII of the MEDSIS Staff Report. This Working Group will **not** focus on producing actual pilot project concepts.

SEPA recommends a Pilot Projects Working Group as pilots have been deemed a core element of the MEDSIS initiative. Ensuring the most impactful, innovative pilot projects are selected, and that these “demonstration projects” are scalable across the District of Columbia’s distribution grid is a necessity to achieve the MEDSIS goals.

- **Key Question(s) to be Addressed:**
 - What are the final parameters for MEDSIS pilot projects?
 - How will the pilot projects be evaluated? How do we measure pilot project success?
 - What is the scoring method for evaluating pilot projects?
 - How do we ensure pilots are scoped broadly enough that there are multiple stack benefits as opposed to single benefits?
- **Timing:** October launch. Delayed start as the Data and Information Access and Alignment Working Group outcomes may inform the pilot plans. Monthly meetings.

In Summary, SEPA is poised and ready to launch Phase 2 MEDSIS (Working Group Process) upon Commission order. The next immediate step in Phase 2 is to launch a website upon Commission order to recruit stakeholders to the various working groups recommended and provide a site where information and materials can be located and linked for use.