AEIC Load Forecasting Workshop Series

Session 3: Pod Work Sessions, March 27, 2026

Virtual · Three concurrent pods · Workshop Results Report · Version 2, November 2026

One of seven documents in the 2026 series package. Session 0 is the series guide, not a meeting: it carries the outline, the background and how to read these reports.

The Finding

The work does not divide as cleanly as the structure built for it.

The pods were set up as three lanes: methods, tools, and data with the business case. Practitioners moved between them instead of settling into the one that matched their job title. A forecaster lives at the intersection. A curve is only as good as the pipeline feeding it and the tool running it, and a business case that cannot name the method it is funding will not survive a budget review. So the pods stayed porous for the rest of the series.

What This Session Was

Three facilitated virtual sessions, one per pod, taking the six categories Austin produced and turning them into scoped artifacts with named owners. This is where the series moved from stating needs to building things.

32 unique utility practitioners from 20 utilities. Sixteen confirmed volunteers.

Pod	Focus	Attended
A	Methods and Curves	32
B	Tools, Vendors and Benchmarking	20
C	Data Pipelines and Business Case	14

Those are 66 seats filled by 32 people plus AEIC and the research team, because half the room came to more than one session.

Who Was Represented

The 20 utilities in the pod rooms:

Ameren, APS, Arkansas Electric Cooperative, Caribbean Utilities, ComEd, Con Edison, Duke Energy, Duquesne Light, Eversource, Exelon, JEA, OGE Energy, Orange and Rockland, Orlando Utilities Commission, Santee Cooper, Southern Company, Tampa Electric, Tucson Electric Power, TVA and Xcel Energy.

Practitioners from JEA, OGE Energy, TVA, Xcel Energy, Con Edison, Tucson Electric Power, Duke Energy, Orlando Utilities Commission, Orange and Rockland and Exelon took part in more than one pod.

The National Laboratory of the Rockies research team sat in on Pods B and C.

The utilities that carried artifacts out of these sessions and reported out in Pittsburgh:

Pod	Focus	Utilities Carrying the Work
A	Methods and Curves	JEA, Con Edison, Arkansas Electric Cooperative, Oncor, Tampa Electric, Eversource
B	Tools, Vendors and Benchmarking	JEA, Con Edison, Alabama Power, Oncor, Eversource
C	Data Pipelines and Business Case	TVA, Ameren, OGE Energy, ComEd, JEA

What Was Discussed

Each pod worked its own scope.

Pod A took on method definition and curve development. The work centred on building a typical load year curve by customer class and on the definitions the industry uses loosely.

Pod B began the Tool Landscape Matrix, which grew to cover more than thirty tools. This was the quick win Austin asked for "within weeks," and it is the artifact that has travelled furthest.

Pod C went after data pipelines and the business case, and surfaced the most substantive challenges of the three.

Discussion and Gaps

Pod C named four problems that have shaped everything since, and they are stated here as the cohort stated them rather than as settled findings.

Forecast accuracy lags for behind-the-meter resources. For many utilities with only a single net meter, the forecast cannot see what it cannot meter, and the correction arrives after the decision.

Large load application risk runs in both directions. Local planning teams may submit applications that overestimate both size and timing. Forecasters reduce them and then carry the risk of being wrong either way. This creates real organizational tension and no utility in the room had a clean process for it.

The problem with new load drivers is data absence, not data quality. Historical profiles simply do not exist for most utilities. You cannot run quality assurance on data that was never collected. This distinction matters because the two problems have entirely different fixes.

Granular tracking is deficient. Utilities cannot compare forecast against actual at the resolution where the decisions get made.

Two further gaps ran across all three pods. DER forecasting complexity was named as unsolved by everyone. Organizational silos between finance and engineering were named again, having first surfaced in Austin, and again nobody owned them.

The business case was the hardest lane to staff. It was the piece most likely to unlock funding at a member utility, and the one practitioners were least confident stepping into, because it asks a forecaster to argue in the language of finance rather than method.

Actions and Where They Went

Action from This Session	Status
Scope each pod's named artifacts with volunteer owners	Done. Sixteen volunteers, artifacts assigned
Distribute input templates to the cohort	Done. Returned by members through the spring
Populate the tool landscape matrix	Done. Validated live at Denver, September 2026
Build the distribution forecasting business case toolkit	Done. Eight value levers, a calculator and a staffing model

Where This Feeds the Guide and the Workbook

These sessions produced the artifact set itself. The **Forecasting Methods Playbook**, the **Load Curve Development Guide**, the **Tool Landscape Matrix**, the **Vendor Capability Catalog**, the **Forecasting Driver Catalog**, the **Data Pipeline Reference Guideline** and the **Business Case Toolkit** were all scoped here and all sit in the **Practitioner Workbook**. The four practitioner problems named in Pod C became the backbone of the guide's **Practitioner Challenges** section.

Knowledge of one is the knowledge of all.

Association of Edison Illuminating Companies · Center for Operational Excellence

607 14th Street NW, Washington, DC · aeic.org · aeicopscenter.org