



July 30, 2013

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bose
Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20426

**Re: California Independent System Operator Corporation
Interconnection Queue Quarterly Progress Report, Q2 2013
Docket Nos. ER08-1317-003, ER11-1830-000**

Dear Ms. Bose:

The California Independent System Operator Corporation (“ISO”) hereby submits its interconnection queue quarterly progress report for the first quarter of 2013 pursuant to the following orders of the Commission:

- *Order Conditionally Approving Tariff Amendment*, 124 FERC ¶ 61,292 at P 200 (2008);
- *Order Conditionally Accepting Tariff Revisions*, 133 FERC ¶ 61,223 at PP 97, 117 (2010).

If there are any questions concerning this filing, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sidney Davies

Nancy Saracino
General Counsel
Roger Collanton
Deputy General Counsel
Sidney Davies
Assistant General Counsel
California Independent System
Operator Corporation
250 Outcropping Way
Folsom, CA 95630
Tel: (916) 608-7144
Fax: (916)-608-7222
sdavies@caiso.com

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

California Independent System
Operator Corporation

Docket Nos. ER08-1317-003
ER11-1830-000

**CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION
INTERCONNECTION QUEUE QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT
Q2 2013**

Quarterly Reporting Period:
April 1, 2013 to June 30, 2013

Date: July 30, 2013

Deborah Le Vine
Director, Infrastructure
Contracts & Management
California Independent
System Operator
Corporation

I. INTRODUCTION AND DISCUSSION OF THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS GIVING RISE TO THIS REPORT

This report describes the ISO's progress over the period April 1, 2013 to June 30, 2013 in processing generator interconnection requests under the ISO's interconnection process.

The two primary sets of procedures under which the ISO is processing interconnection requests today are: (a) ISO Tariff Appendix Y, called the "Generator Interconnection Procedures ("GIP")¹; and (b) ISO Tariff Appendix DD, the "Generator Interconnection and Deliverability Allocation Procedures ("GIDAP"). The GIP applies to the transition cluster through cluster four, and the GIDAP applies to cluster five and subsequent cluster studies.

The GIP and GIDAP combined govern all interconnection requests in the clusters to which they apply, regardless of whether the proposed facility is a large generating facility or a small generating facility. Under either the GIP or the GIDAP, an interconnection request is processed under one of three tracks:

- (1) The cluster study process track, which serves as the primary processing method and the default interconnection process;
- (2) The independent study process track, under which certain projects can be studied independently if they are determined to be electrically independent from other projects in the cluster study (and demonstrate the ability to complete non-ISO development milestones (like licensing) sooner than typical development timeframes); and

¹ The ISO OATT, ISO Tariff Appendix Y can be accessed on the ISO's website at http://www.aiso.com/Documents/TariffAppendixY_Mar20_2013.pdf, and ISO Tariff Appendix DD can be accessed on the ISO's website at http://www.aiso.com/Documents/TariffAppendixDD_Mar20_2013.pdf.

- (3) The fast track process track, which is available for projects of up to 5 MW, when it can be determined, through a limited evaluation methodology, that the project can be interconnected with no upgrades or with *de minimis* upgrades.

As explained in later sections of this report, the ISO is also processing some previous interconnection requests under prior “serial” interconnection tariff processes.

Background Regarding the Quarterly Reporting Requirements

The reporting requirements giving rise to this report originate with the Commission’s orders approving the ISO’s 2008 GIPR Amendment and the later 2010 GIP Amendment. In 2008, the ISO revised its Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (“LGIP”) to change from a serial approach to a cluster approach. The ISO called this tariff amendment “Generator Interconnection Process Reform (GIPR).” The ISO refers to this revised LGIP as the “Cluster LGIP.” The Commission’s September 2008 Order accepting the GIPR Amendment included a requirement to file quarterly status reports on the ISO’s progress in processing interconnection requests under the cluster approach.² The Commission intended the quarterly reports to serve as a tool to evaluate how well the ISO’s cluster process is working.

In the December 2010 Order accepting the GIP (which the ISO now calls GIP Phase 1, after the ISO undertook another process called GIP Phase 2 in 2011), the Commission directed the ISO to include additional information within the quarterly status reports concerning the independent study process (“ISP”) and fast track process. For the ISP, the Commission directed the ISO to include information about the number of projects requesting interconnection through the ISP, the outcome of those requests, the complete length of time for recently completed ISP interconnection studies (from initial

² *California Independent System Operator Corp.*, 124 FERC ¶ 61,292, at P 200 (2008) (“September 2008 Order”). The September 2008 Order also required the ISO to file two comprehensive status reports, one pertaining to the transition cluster and one pertaining to the first cluster. The ISO filed its first comprehensive report on the transition cluster on January 31, 2011.

application through final approval), and the reason for any rejections of projects requesting ISP treatment.³

With respect to the fast track process, the Commission directed the ISO to include in its reports the size and type of generator interconnection requested under the fast track process, the proposed location of the generator, the number of requests that did not pass the screens, and which screens the generator developer failed.⁴

This report is the ISO's nineteenth quarterly report.

The ISO Continues to Refine Its Generation Interconnection Process

As the Commission is aware, since 2008, the ISO has worked with stakeholders to continue to refine its interconnection process. Most recently, the Commission conditionally approved the ISOs generator project downsizing initiative in December 2012, which provided a new one-time downsizing opportunity for customers with projects that are otherwise viable, but for the ability to reduce the MW generating capacity of the proposed facility.⁵ The ISO has completed the downsizing initiative and has provided the results to each project. The ISO is now in the process of amending each generator interconnection agreement ("GIA") to reflect these results. The ISO has also commenced a new stakeholder initiative called Interconnection Process Enhancements. The initiative has spawned into two separate paths, one for queue management and the other path for the remaining issues. The queue management topics have progressed and tariff changes will go before the ISO Governing Board in September for filing at the Commission shortly thereafter. For the remaining topics, the ISO posted a straw proposal for the Interconnection Process Enhancements initiative on July 18, 2013 and has

³ *California Independent System Operator Corp.*, 133 FERC ¶ 61,223, at PP 1, 97, 117 (2010) ("December 2010 Order").

⁴ *Id.* at P 117.

⁵ *California Independent System Operator Corp.*, 141 FERC ¶ 61,219 (2012). In that order, the Commission directed the ISO to make additional tariff revisions on compliance. The ISO's compliance filing is pending before the Commission.

scheduled a stakeholder meeting for August 8, 2013 to discuss the proposal.⁶

These efforts are part of a continual commitment by the ISO to refine and improve the process and to respond to the dramatic increase in interconnection requests in response to California's renewable portfolio standards ("RPS") policy, which mandates that Load Serving Entities satisfy their load requirements from 33% renewable energy sources by 2020.⁷

The Component Parts of the ISO's Interconnection Queue⁸

The ISO's interconnection queue consists of the following queue components:

- *Two legacy serial groupings⁹*
 - Component 1: certain projects that predated the serial study group. These requests were grouped together because, at the time the ISO made its 2008 waiver request which was a foundational step to establishing the Cluster LGIP, the associated interconnection studies for these projects had already been completed.¹⁰

⁶ Stakeholder materials related to the Interconnection Process Enhancements initiative are available on the ISO website at <http://www.caiso.com/informed/Pages/StakeholderProcesses/InterconnectionProcessEnhancements.aspx>.

⁷ SBX1-2 enacted by the California Legislature and signed by Governor Brown in April 2011 codified California's 33% RPS. Prior to this time, the 33% standard was a function of Governor Schwarzenegger's Executive Order S-21-09 signed in September 2009, which required the California Air Resources Board to adopt a 33% renewable energy requirement by 2020 to implement California's greenhouse gas law (AB 32).

⁸ The Commission's orders relating to queue reporting require the ISO to report on the cluster component of the ISO interconnection queue and the ISP and Fast Track processes. Nevertheless, the ISO has made a practice of including the legacy interconnection requests as well as requests in the SGIP serial study and transition cluster groups in its reporting, so that each report would cover the entire ISO generator interconnection queue.

⁹ In the listing below, Component 1 generally consists of that group of interconnection requests that are older in time than the interconnection requests under Component 2. However, this is not exactly so, as the groupings were also based on common characteristics (*e.g.*, studies that were already completed) that make collective treatment of the individual requests within the group more logical. This means that some interconnection requests that were older in time are part of Component 2 rather than Component 1.

¹⁰ *See, e.g.*, Q1 2009 Report at p. 1 for discussion of the ISO's 2008 waiver petition.

The governing tariff provisions for each project under this component depend on the date that the interconnection customer submitted its interconnection request. If that date was before July 1, 2005, the governing provisions are those set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix W, *Interconnection Procedures in Effect Prior to July 1, 2005*, also known as the “Amendment 39 Procedures.” If the submittal date was on or after July 1, 2005, then the applicable provisions are those set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix U, *Standard Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (LGIP)*.

- Component 2: projects known as “the serial study group.” These projects still needed interconnection studies to be completed at the time the ISO categorized interconnection requests and filed its 2008 request for tariff waiver that preceded the 2008 GIPR Amendment.

For all requests in this grouping, the applicable process is set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix U, *Standard Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (LGIP)*, which contains the procedures which immediately preceded the implementation of the Cluster LGIP.

- ***ISO Clusters governed by the GIP***

For the grouping of the cluster interconnection requests up through and including cluster four, the applicable interconnection procedures are set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix Y, *Generator Interconnection Procedures (GIP) for the Interconnection Requests*.

- Component 3: projects in the Cluster LGIP transition cluster. This component consists of certain requests received prior to June 2, 2008 that were transitioned to the Cluster LGIP.
- Component 4: the first cluster. This component consists of the first group of interconnection requests received during an open request window (June 2, 2008 to July 31, 2009).
- Component 5: the second cluster. This component consists of the second group of interconnection requests received during an open request window (October 1, 2009 to January 31, 2010).
- Component 6: the third cluster. This component consists of the third group of interconnection requests received during an open request window (March 1, 2010 to July 31, 2010).

- Component 7: the fourth cluster. This component consists of the fourth group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (March 1-31, 2011).¹¹

- ***ISO Clusters Governed by the GIDAP***

Clusters after cluster four are governed by ISO's GIDAP procedures, as set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix DD.

- Component 8: the fifth cluster. This component consists of the fifth group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (March 1-31, 2012).
- Component 9: the sixth cluster. This component consists of the sixth group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (April 1-30, 2013).

- ***Customers Governed by GIP Tracks Other than the Cluster Track***

- Component 10: Independent Study Process (ISP). ISP interconnection requests can be submitted at any time. This component tracks ISP projects received from the inception of the ISP on December 19, 2010 through June 30, 2013. It is important to note that the ISP is available to projects of any MW size. Accordingly, this component will be composed of both large and small generators. The independent study for these projects is done as energy-only. If an ISP project desires to have full-capacity deliverability status, then the deliverability study is done in the next deliverability study that the ISO performs as part of a cluster process in the Phase II interconnection study process.
- Components 11 and 12: SGIP Serial Study projects and SGIP Transition Cluster projects. On December 19, 2010, the effective date for revised GIP Appendix Y, there were 128 active projects in the queue for the Small Generator Interconnection Process (SGIP). The ISO sent a notice to all SGIP interconnection customers whose projects were eligible to remain in the SGIP serial process, to inform them that they had an option to move their projects

¹¹ Under the Cluster LGIP, the fourth cluster window opened on October 1, 2010 and was set to close on January 31, 2011. However, while the window period was opened, the GIP became effective. Under the GIP, a further fourth cluster window was opened during the month of March (March 1-31, 2011). All earlier fourth cluster applications received during 2010 are being processed together with the cluster track applications received during the March 2011 window period.

into the new SGIP transition cluster and be studied as energy-only in the combined Phase II interconnection studies that the ISO is conducting for LGIP Cluster 1 and Cluster 2.¹²

- Component 13: Fast Track Process (Fast Track). The Fast Track is available to projects up to 5 MW in size. Fast Track interconnection requests can be submitted at any time. This component tracks Fast Track projects received from the time the Fast Track process was revised on December 19, 2010 through the end of the reporting period. Currently the ISO does not have any Fast Track projects in its interconnection queue.

II. COMPOSITION OF CLUSTER INTERCONNECTION REQUESTS BY TECHNOLOGY

Component 1: The Pre-Serial Group

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the pre-serial group is as follows:

Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		WTR	G	NG	B	W
Steam Turbine	2		1		1	
Hydraulic Turbine	0					
Wind Turbine	2					2
Combined Cycle	3			3		
Combined Cycle/PV	0					
Combustion Turbine	1			1		
Total	8	0	1	4	1	2
B=Biomass; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; WTR=Water; W=Wind						

¹² See Appendix 8 to Appendix Y.

Component 2: The Serial Group

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the serial group is as follows:

Table 2							
Serial Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology							
Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		WTR	G	NG	B	S	W
Steam Turbine	9		1		1	7	
Wind Turbine	14						14
Natural Gas	7			7			
Photovoltaic	5					5	
Pumped Storage	1	1					
Total	36	1	1	7	1	12	14
B=Biomass; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind WTR=Water							

Component 3: The Transition Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the transition cluster is as follows:

Table 3						
Transition Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology						
Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		B	G	NG	S	W
Steam Turbine	7	1			6	
Photovoltaic	12				12	
Wind Turbine	5					5
Combined Cycle	4			4		
Combined Cycle/PV	0					
Combustion Turbine	0					
Total	28	1	0	4	18	5
B=Biomass; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind						

Component 4: The First Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the first cluster is as follows:

Table 4						
First Cluster Interconnection Customers						
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology						
Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		WTR	NU	NG	S	W
Steam Turbine	1		1			
Photovoltaic	7				7	
Wind Turbine	1					1
Hydraulic Turbine	1	1				
Total	10	1	1	0	7	1
WTR=Water; NU=Nuclear; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind						

Component 5: The Second Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the second cluster is as follows:

Table 5						
Second Cluster Interconnection Customers						
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology						
Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		G	NG	S	W	WTR
Steam Turbine	1	1				
Photovoltaic	16			16		
Wind Turbine	1				1	
Combined Cycle	3		3			
Combustion Turbine	1		1			
Reciprocating Engine	1		1			
Total	23	1	5	16	1	0
WTR=Water; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind						

Component 6: The Third Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the third cluster is as follows:

Table 6						
Third Cluster Interconnection Customers						
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology						
Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		G	NG	S	W	B
Steam Turbine	1					1
Photovoltaic	7			7		
Wind Turbine	0					
Combustion Turbine/PV	1			0.5	0.5	
Total	9	0	0	7.5	.5	1
B=Biomass; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind						

Component 7: The Fourth Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the fourth cluster is as follows:

Table 7							
Fourth Cluster Interconnection Customers							
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology							
Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		G	NG	S	W	WTR	Li
Steam Turbine	0	0		0			
Photovoltaic	39			39			
Wind Turbine	1				1		
Combined Cycle	1		1				
Combustion Turbine	1		1				
Hydraulic Turbine	1					1	
Battery Storage	1						1
Total	44	0	2	39	1	1	1
G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; Li=Lithium-ion Battery							

Component 8: The Fifth Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the fifth cluster is as follows:

Table 8							
Fifth Cluster Interconnection Customers							
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology							
Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		G	NG	S	W	WTR	FW
Steam Turbine	1	1					
Photovoltaic	9			9			
Wind Turbine	1				1		
Combined Cycle	3		3				
Combustion Turbine	2		2				
Hydraulic Turbine	0					0	
Other (CHP)	0		0				
Flywheel	0						0
Total	16	1	5	9	1	0	0
G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel							

Component 9: The Sixth Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the fifth cluster is as follows:

Table 9							
Sixth Cluster Interconnection Customers							
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology							
Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		G	NG	S	W	WTR	FW
Steam Turbine	1	1					
Photovoltaic	31			31			
Wind Turbine	4				4		
Combined Cycle	6		6				
Combustion Turbine	8		8				
Hydraulic Turbine	2					2	
Other (CHP)	2		2				
Total	54	1	16	31	4	2	0
G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel							

Component 10: Independent Study Process

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the independent study process is as follows:

Table 10							
ISP Interconnection Customers							
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology							
Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		G	NG	S	W	WTR	FW
Wind Turbine	1				1		
Total	1				1		

G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel

Component 11: The Small Generators (Serial)

The breakdown by technology of small generators interconnection customers is as follows:

Table 11							
Small Serial Interconnection Customers							
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology							
Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		B	NG	S	W	WTR	FW
Photovoltaic	34			34			
Wind Turbine	1				1		
Reciprocating Engine	2	1	1				
Total	37	1	1	34	1		

B=Biomass; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel

Component 12: The Small Generators (Transition Cluster)

The breakdown by technology of small generators interconnection customers in the transition cluster is as follows:

Table 12							
Small Transition Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology							
Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		G	NG	S	W	WTR	FW
Photovoltaic	28			28			
Total	28			28			

G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel

III. QUARTERLY PROGRESS IN PROCESSING THE QUEUE

Component 1: Pre-Serial Projects

Table 13		
Component 1 Projects - Amendment 39	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	7	8
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	1	3
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	3	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	1

Three pre-serial projects were withdrawn during Q2 2013. Of the remaining pre-serial projects in the queue, the remaining project designated as without a (GIA”) is in active negotiations and is expected to execute a GIA in the near future. The other seven projects are being actively monitored to ensure they adhere to the milestones set forth in Appendix B of their GIAs.

Component 2: The Serial Study Group

Table 14 Component 2 Projects - The Serial Study Group	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	26	28
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	10	11
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	2	0
Projects completed during the quarter	1	0

In Q2 2013, one project achieved commercial operation and two projects withdrew. Currently there are 36 active serial study projects which have not achieved commercial operation, and ten of those projects still need to complete the negotiation of their GIAs.

Component 3: The Transition Cluster

Table 15 Component 3 Projects - The Transition Cluster	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	19	20
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	9	13
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	2	1
Projects completed during the quarter	3	3

In Q2 2013, three projects achieved commercial operation and two projects withdrew. Currently there are 28 active transition cluster projects which have not achieved commercial operation, and nine of those projects still need to complete the negotiation of their GIAs.

Component 4: The First Cluster

Table 16 Component 4 Projects - The First Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	5	3
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	5	7
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

In Q2 2013, two projects completed the negotiation process, making a total of 10 active projects in this cluster.

Component 5: The Second Cluster

Table 17 Component 5 Projects - The Second Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	11	9
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	12	14
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

Two customers in Cluster 2 completed the GIA negotiation process in Q2 2013 and executed GIAs, making a total 23 active projects in this cluster.

Component 6: The Third Cluster

Table 18 Component 6 Projects - The Third Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	1	0
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	8	16
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	7	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

Seven projects withdrew from Cluster 3 in Q2 2013 and one project completed negotiations of a GIA making a total of 9 active projects in this cluster.

Component 7: The Fourth Cluster

Table 19 Component 7 Projects - The Fourth Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	3	1
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	41	54
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	11	2
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

Eleven projects withdrew from Cluster 4 in Q2 2013 and two projects completed negotiations of their GIAs making 44 active projects in this cluster.

Component 8: The Fifth Cluster

Table 20 Component 8 Projects - The Fifth Cluster under GIDAP	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	0	0
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	16	41
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	25	9
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

Twenty-five projects withdrew from Cluster 5 in Q2 2013. The Phase II study results are on track to be issued in Q4 2013 and GIA negotiations will commence after that.

Component 9: The Sixth Cluster

Table 21 Component 9 Projects - The Sixth Cluster under GIDAP	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	0	NA
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	54	NA
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	NA
Projects completed during the quarter	0	NA

The cluster six interconnection request window closed on April 30, 2013 and the projects are current being studied. Phase I results are expected in Q4 2013.

Component 10: Independent Study Process

Table 22 Component 10: Requests Within the Independent Study Process under GIP	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Active Projects as of beginning of Quarter	1	1
Interconnection Requests received	0	0
Number of Interconnection Requests that withdrew during the Quarter	0	0

There were no changes to the ISP projects during Q2 2013.

Component 11: SGIP Serial Study projects

Table 23 Component 11 Projects - SGIP Serial Projects	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	23	24
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	14	20
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	3	0
Projects completed during the quarter	4	3

In Q2 2013, four SGIP serial projects achieved commercial operation, three projects withdrew, and one additional project completed negotiations of a GIA making a total of 37 active SGIP serial projects.

Component 12: SGIP Transition Cluster projects

Table 24 Component 12 Projects - The SGIP Transition Cluster	Q2 2013	Q1 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	10	8
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	18	22
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	2	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

In Q2 2013, two projects withdrew and two projects completed negotiations of their GIAs, making a total of 28 active projects.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of this document upon all parties listed on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in the above-captioned proceeding, in accordance with the requirements of Rule 2010 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. § 385.2010).

Dated this 30th day of July, 2013 at Folsom, California.

/s/ Anna Pascuzzo
Anna Pascuzzo