CAEECC Compensation TF Homework #1: Facilitator Synthesis

After Meeting #1, the Compensation Task Force participated in a homework assignment (HW#1) to redline a set of draft Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria for the Compensation Pilot as well as answer a few key questions. The following proposal takes in the comments and thoughts from the homework assignment and first TF meeting.

# Principles for the Compensation Pilot

*Comments compiled, and synthesized into a draft for review, discussion, and confirmation at the July 27 meeting for inclusion in the Compensation TF Report to be presented to CAEECC at its TBD October meeting.*

1. Keep it simple to administer and operationalize.
2. Make it flexible (both in terms of access and process for reimbursement).
3. Be open to and value diverse skill sets, including lived/living experiences.
4. Strive for replicability and scalability for the whole of CAEECC.
5. Be empathetic to existing barriers for participation in CAEECC and identify easy-entry, accessible solutions.
6. Compensate for pre- or post-meeting work, and time that is spent on CAEECC-related activities, based on past CAEECC norms for pre and post-meeting work.
7. Both individuals and representatives of organizations may apply. It is important that it is clear whether someone is representing themselves, or whether they are a representative on behalf of an organization (e.g. Community-Based Organization). Eligibility rules might be tailored differently for individuals and organizations.

# Intentions for Compensation

*Comments compiled, and synthesized into a draft for review, discussion, and confirmation at the July 27 meeting for inclusion in the Compensation TF Report to be presented to CAEECC at its TBD October meeting.*

1. Provide compensation to organizations/individuals who present financial need as a barrier to meaningful participation and contribution to CAEECC
2. Allow organizations/individuals to self-determine their financial need for compensation. Applicants will need to demonstrate financial need, but meet that requirement without cumbersome documentation.
3. Compensate at a standardized rate for each individual/organization that considers value of time, subject matter expertise (including lived and living experience and perspective).
	1. Recognize that some individuals may require financial support including but not limited to lodging, travel, food, family-care.[[1]](#footnote-1)
4. Not requiring baseline knowledge of energy efficiency to participate in the compensation program; however, applying participants must engage in on-boarding energy efficiency training to be provided by CAEECC. (Meaningful contribution will likely but may not require baseline knowledge of energy efficiency.)

# Eligibility Criteria for the Pilot

*Comments compiled, and synthesized into a draft for review, discussion, and confirmation at the July 27 meeting for inclusion in the Compensation TF Report to be presented to CAEECC at its TBD October meeting.*

1. Individuals/organizations not presently using Intervenor Compensation (I-Comp) funding; or for whom I-Comp Funding is not a feasible option.
2. Individuals/organizations who are not currently and have historically not been members of CAEECC
	1. The intentions of this pilot seek individuals/organizations that can bring historically underrepresented perspectives, specifically those of DAC, LI households, LI communities/census tracts, tribal lands, HTR customers, and those with “lived experience” to inform the justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion principles of CAEECC.
	2. Does not require an individual be formally engaged in an organization that does this work, only that they as an individual can offer such perspectives
3. Individuals/organizations with a demonstrated financial need in order to meaningfully participate. E.g. Participation would expose the individual/organization to a significant financial hardship.
4. Individuals/organizations should be non-financially-interested parties.
5. Individuals/organizations are actively involved and committed to a WG or stated engagement process and make meaningful contribution(s). Standard expectations of commitment and proxy representation apply.

# Questions Identified for Further Discussion

Below find a synthesis of individual responses to the Homework (see appendix). This is meant to be a straw draft, a starting point, but one that we hope reflects a synthesis of the many ideas provided in the Homework.

## Why should/shouldn’t there be a cap on the amount of compensation per organization/individual?

### Facilitator Synthesis

* Because of the real possibility that the funding source will be ratepayer funding or another funding source with similar requirements on expenditure, it seems prudent to establish some general criteria and structure to the compensation pilot so it can meet such requirements.
* Based on the intentions above, it seems the goal is to do this in a way that supports accessibility and does not create an onerous application or process that becomes a barrier unto itself.
* Compensation agreements could be relatively short-term or WG-specific. If an individual/organization is unable to fulfill the intentions of the program (above, e.g., does not provide meaningful contribution), that will impact their ability to apply for future compensation.[[2]](#footnote-2)
* No cap on individual/organization funding, but a cap on the pilot funding overall.

### Straw Proposals based on HW responses and some compensation models

Each approach below would include a way to budget, eligible activities, and would be incurred in a needs-based way vs. having a cap on overall compensation.

*A: Fixed hourly rate/General stipend*

* Relatively simple. Can consider and layer value of time, expertise/lived experience/perspective, operational/administrative overhead (for organizations).
* Hourly rate can be applied and/or a budget set for pre- and post-work + meeting time (e.g., $X per hour, with a budget per meeting or WG meeting series)
	+ Could be rolled up to a standard rate/budget/cap for a typical meeting inclusive of pre- and post-work + meeting time (e.g., $X per meeting)
* Additional requests for other related expenses could be on an approval-basis (e.g, request for compensation to cover additional costs named above)

*B: Applicant proposed hourly rate*

* Same as above, but rate would be per individual/organization based on current rate of compensation at their organization. (Drawback of this is that many CBOs are forced to underpay their staff, and have been trained in a philanthropic culture of under-valuing their time, so their compensation levels are depressed.)

*C: Applicant proposed budget*

* More contractual, where a scope of work and expectations is responded to with a budget by the applicant. (Drawback of this approach is that review could be challenging and time-consuming, and could create a higher burden for the applicant.)

## Why should/shouldn’t the TF develop explicit activities or requirements of participation to be met to receive compensation?

### Facilitator Synthesis

Responding WG members all generally agree there should be a set of eligible activities and requirements for those receiving funds through the compensation pilot.

**Minimum requirements:** At a minimum, applicants would be expected to meet all existing work group member requirements, commitments, and expectations, including contributing via pre- and post-work, attending meetings and being fully present, as well as sending a proxy representative if they are unable to attend.

**Additional expectations:**The additional expectation on those receiving compensation pilot funds is that applicants are expected to bring a perspective that is otherwise not included in CAEECC/WG discussions. Specifically, the pilot seeks to make CAEECC/WG accessible to those that can bring perspectives from DACs, low-income communities, and/or HTR customers. Their input and contribution of these perspectives is expected.

## What other questions do you think are important for the Compensation TF to consider related to eligibility, process, etc?

### Facilitator Synthesis

Summary of outstanding questions:

* Need to have a way to measure whether this pilot is successful, e.g., KPIs around process and outcomes. This will allow us to iterate/improve the process.
* How can we establish eligibility criteria and an application/review process that also gives discretion to WG members to ensure the intent is met?
* How do we navigate individuals that might have different sources for them to be compensated, such as their own regular work time, professional development budgets?
	+ *Facilitator follow-up question: Considering that compensation doesn’t actually add more time to anyone’s day (instead, it would add that an individual/organization would commit to engaging in CAEECC/WG) does it matter if they are paid for related work already, but don’t have time to prioritize CAEECC/WG? Also, what are the implications of asking or expecting CBOs (who are already quite underfunded) to use any existing professional development budget for participating in CAEECC instead of professional development for their staff?*
* How should the CAEECC Compensation Pilot handle individuals/organizations that are engaged in related WGs, e.g., DAC Advisory Group, ESJ Working Group, Low-Income Oversight Board (LIOB), etc. Is it sufficient if they are active in one of those groups such that they should not be compensated for CAEECC/WG work? Can CAEECC/WG leverage their input from those other WGs without their participation in specifically CAEECC/WG?
* What is our recruitment strategy to raise awareness of and engage diversity of participation and the perspectives sought?
* How do we define “expertise in Diversity, Equity, Inclusion?”
* Be clear in our terminology – there is a funding *source* (EE funds, other rate-payer funds, other sources, etc.) and there is a funding *implementation* *process* (who collects the funds, who pays them to whom, who manages the process of eligibility, etc.).

## Next meeting, we will *begin* to discuss implementation strategies based on these principles, intentions, and criteria. What are your initial, super raw, unbaked thoughts on implementation strategies?

### Facilitator Synthesis

* Consider a healthy level of delegation and discretion in implementation - want to avoid challenges of an overly formulaic approach
* Implementation requirements will be driven by funding source
* If we are using ratepayer or CPUC-overseen funds, we will need to think of the regulatory vehicle to get such a proposal before the Commission.
	+ *Facilitator follow-up: Would such a proposal also need to include details around administration, application, and dispersal process?*
* What are the cost-effectiveness implications of using ratepayer funds? It should be sufficient that the net benefits of wider participation are real. e.g, Representatives from DAC/HTR and ESJ communities can impact program participation by these underserved customers and would outweigh the nominal costs of compensation.

# Facilitator Synthesis Appendix

The following attachment (on the next several pages) is Homework #1 from which the synthesis above is derived.

CAEECC Compensation TF Meeting #1 Homework

**Due Date: Monday, July 11, 2022 at 5pm PT**

At Meeting #1, the Compensation Task Force entered breakout rooms to discuss the guiding question: *What do you think should be the eligibility criteria (for organizations/individuals) and what funding rules would you propose (i.e., appropriate activities, funding cap, etc.)*?

**Below are a set of proposals based on the notes/outcomes breakout conversations that the facilitation team developed. We’ve organized them into 1) *Principles for the Compensation Pilot* and 2) *Intentions for Compensation and Eligibility Criteria for the Pilot*.**

For this homework, please:

1. Review the proposed [Principles](#_9fu2alsg3z06), [Intentions](#_iei9pwylp1n9), and [Eligibility Criteria](#_z1fbioo511nr) and modify them with suggested changes or comments.
2. Answer the [Questions Identified for Further Discussion](#_he2hlwm6r3l8) with your perspectives.

We will use your homework responses to help consolidate and develop a second draft of proposals for Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria that we will present at Meeting #2 for feedback and discussion.

*\* Some comments from the breakout session included ideas on funding sources. Those are not represented in the proposed principles, intentions, or criteria, but were noted for future conversations on funding sources and are represented in the* [*Appendix*](#_1t3h5sf) *with all raw ideas from the breakout sessions, including points of divergence.*

# Principles for the Compensation Pilot

1. Keep it simple to administer and operationalize
2. Make it flexible (both in terms of access and process for reimbursement).
3. Be open to and value diverse skill sets, including lived/living experiences.
4. Strive for replicability and scalability for the whole of CAEECC.
5. Be empathetic to existing barriers for participation in CAEECC and identify easy-entry, accessible solutions.
6. Compensate for pre- or post-meeting work, and time that is spent on CAEECC-related activities, drawing from past CAEECC norms for pre and post-meeting work.
7. Both individuals and representatives of organizations may apply. It is important that it is clear whether someone is representing themselves, or whether they are a representative on behalf of an organization (e.g. Community-Based Organization)Eligibility rules might be tailored differently for individuals and organizations.

# Intentions for Compensation

1. Provide compensation to organizations/individuals who present financial need as a barrier to meaningful participation and contribution to CAEECC
2. Allow organizations/individuals to self-determine their financial need for compensation, without the requirement for cumbersome documentation
3. Allow compensation to reimburse varying needs including but not limited to lodging, travel, food, family-care[[3]](#footnote-3)
4. Compensate at a standardized rate for each individual/organization that considers time, expertise (including lived and living experience and perspective)
5. Do not require baseline knowledge of energy efficiency to participate in the compensation program; however, participant must in engage in on-boarding energy efficiency training to be provided by CAEECC.

# Eligibility Criteria for the Pilot

1. Prioritize/Target/Limit compensation to individuals/organizations not presently using I-Comp funding; or for whom I-Comp Funding is not a feasible option.
2. Prioritize/Target/Limit compensation to individuals/organizations who are not currently members of CAEECC
3. Individuals/organizations should be non-financially-interested parties.
4. Individuals/organizations are actively involved and make meaningful contribution(s). A minimum level of participation needs to be met.
5. Participation would expose individuals/organizations to a significant financial hardship.

# Questions Identified for Further Discussion

We welcome your thoughts inline to the questions proposed below. Please be respectful to your fellow TF Member thoughts and input your own thoughts where you find your name. We will discuss these at the next meeting.

1. **Why should/shouldn’t there be a cap on the amount of compensation per organization/individual?**
	1. Jim Dodenhoff, Silent Running:
	2. Alejandra Tellez, 3C-REN:
	3. Annette Beitel Future Energy Enterprises:
	4. Chris Malotte, SCE: See SCE response below.
	5. Constance Slider Pierre, TURN:
	6. Courtney Kalashian, SJVCE:
	7. Dan Suyeyasu, Code Cycle: There should be a cap on hours per event (inclusive of pre and post work). A cap will allow for less onerous review.
	8. Jenny Berg, BayREN: My response is based on the assumption that compensation will be from rate payer funds. As such, there is a high obligation to be good stewards of ratepayer funds. In my opinion, to do that there should be budgets, requirements for use, etc.
	9. Jesus Torres, CPUC:See comments under Stephanie Green.
	10. Kellvin Anaya, SCE: There should be a process for evaluating the request for compensation provided by each organization/individual. The requested compensation must be fair and reasonable. The organization/individual must demonstrate that their participation was productive and necessary for a fair outcome of the WG. A general basis for the compensation requested must be provided. The party responsible for administering the compensation will undertake a detailed review of the reasonableness of the compensation claim.
	11. Lucy Arnot Morris, PG&E:
	12. Lujuana Medina, SoCalREN:
	13. Nicole Milner, EcoServices: I do not think there should be an individual cap on the amount of compensation, it should be need based and the need of each individual may be different. There could be a general stipend, but for things like travel there may be some who need more help than others to be present in meetings, etc.
	14. Nils Strindberg, CPUC Energy Division: I think we need both a cap, because we need to be good stewards of ratepayer funds, if the source of funding is ratepayer funds, but I also think that to avoid spending almost no funds on this a floor is also appropriate to consider.
	15. Stephanie Green, CPUC:
	16. Ted Howard, SBUA: Agree with the comments that utilizing ratepayer funds requires conservative expenditure of those ratepayer funds. Consequently, a cap or similar mechanism for avoiding excess expenditures should be applied. One alternative is to pay each qualified participant a fixed sum per hour. Another is to sum the costs of lodging, travel, food, and family care. Another alternative is the economic concept of opportunity cost: pay the participant the hourly rate they would be paid for their current job, times number of hours missed from work, even if they will be compensated by their employer while away from work (and if unemployed pay them an average hourly rate).
2. **Why should/shouldn’t the TF develop explicit activities or requirements of participation to be met to receive compensation?**
	1. Jim Dodenhoff, Silent Running:
	2. Alejandra Tellez, 3C-REN:
	3. Annette Beitel Future Energy Enterprises:
	4. Chris Malotte, SCE: See SCE response below.
	5. Constance Slider Pierre, TURN:
	6. Courtney Kalashian, SJVCE:
	7. Dan Suyeyasu, Code Cycle: Participation in meetings would be a minimum requirement. Beyond that, it is hard to set requirements beyond documenting the time involved. The actions that are taken outside of meetings to bring useful insights to CAEECC or to the CPUC are difficult to define in advance and perhaps counterproductive to constrain.
	8. Jenny Berg, BayREN: Same response as my response to Q1. My sense is this pilot, if successful, could be replicated to other CPUC activities. As such, there should be some level of formality involved for ie what is eligible for compensation, etc.
	9. Jesus Torres, CPUC:
	10. Kellvin Anaya, SCE: The TF should develop activities or requirements of participation to be met to receive compensation. These requirements will aid organizations/individuals in determining compensation. This will mitigate administrative burden for all stakeholders. Organizations/individuals, with minimal documentation, should provide a showing of financial need to support the request. The organizations/individuals should provide a clear description of the contribution(s) made to help achieve the overarching process or goals.
	11. Lucy Arnot Morris, PG&E:
	12. Lujuana Medina, SoCalREN:
	13. Nicole Milner, EcoServices: If you stand for nothing you'll fall for anything. There has to be some sort of expectation laid out so that the TF can be held accountable. Minimum participation requirements, attendance and meeting deadlines.
	14. Nils Strindberg, CPUC Energy Division: If we are going to use ratepayer funds I believe we have to develop which activities would be funded and requirements to receive the funds. This should not be a blank check.
	15. Stephanie Green, CPUC: There sould be a scope of work on what is expected to participate, but it shouldn’t be merely task based (attending meetings). Providing insight on DACs and hard to reach population is as valuable to our discussions.
	16. Ted Howard, SBUA: It would be disrespectful (and invite abuse) to not have certain minimum expectations for valuable contributions which lead to a better understanding of how to engage DAC/HTR customers, as well as requiring active attendance and complying with requested input on issues raised.
3. **What other questions do you think are important for the Compensation TF to consider related to eligibility, process, etc?**
	1. Jim Dodenhoff, Silent Running:
	2. Alejandra Tellez, 3C-REN:
	3. Annette Beitel Future Energy Enterprises:
	4. Chris Malotte, SCE: See SCE response below.
	5. Constance Slider Pierre, TURN:
	6. Courtney Kalashian, SJVCE:
	7. Dan Suyeyasu, Code Cycle: I have significant confidence in the parties managing this taskforce and the related working group, such that there is likely wisdom in bounding some of the eligibility and process issues while giving a fair amount of discretion to the working group managers to implement the intent. Is that a permissible course of action?
	8. Jenny Berg, BayREN: If there are different sources for the individual to be compensated, ie do they work at a place that will compensate them for their time spent through regular time, professional development budgets, etc.
	9. Jesus Torres, CPUC: Comments under Stephanie Green.
	10. Kellvin Anaya, SCE: The Compensation TF should consider putting controls in place to avoid duplication of effort with other CPUC established working groups/forums (e.g. DAC Advisory Group, ESJ Working Group, LIOB, etc.)that may be addressing similar topics. Organizations/individuals should avoid engaging in duplicative participation.
	11. Lucy Arnot Morris, PG&E:
	12. Lujuana Medina, SoCalREN:
	13. Nicole Milner, EcoServices: Recruitment strategy to get the awareness out and diversity of participation.
	14. Nils Strindberg, CPUC Energy Division: No thoughts.
	15. Stephanie Green, CPUC: Ted Howard, SBUA: Eligibility should include consideration of individuals with “lived experience”, even if they are not currently employed with a CBO focused on JEDI issues, or their current position is not focused on JEDI issues.Also, consider Organizations representing ESJ target communities (e.g. DAC, Tribal lands, LI Households, LI Census tracts).
4. **Next meeting, we will *begin* to discuss implementation strategies based on these principles, intentions, and criteria. What are your initial, super raw, unbaked thoughts on implementation strategies?**
	1. Jim Dodenhoff, Silent Running:
	2. Alejandra Tellez, 3C-REN:
	3. Annette Beitel Future Energy Enterprises:
	4. Chris Malotte, SCE:
	5. Constance Slider Pierre, TURN:
	6. Courtney Kalashian, SJVCE:
	7. Dan Suyeyasu, Code Cycle:As noted under 3, I think a healthy level of delegation and discretion on the implementation process would be helpful to avoid the challenges of an overly formulaic approach.
	8. Jenny Berg, BayREN: I don’t have any.
	9. Jesus Torres, CPUC:Comments under Stephanie Green.
	10. Kellvin Anaya, SCE:
	11. Lucy Arnot Morris, PG&E:
	12. Lujuana Medina, SoCalREN:
	13. Nicole Milner, EcoServices: None at this time. I think once we flush out where the funding should come from and what the requirements are then it will be easier to think about.
	14. Nils Strindberg, CPUC Energy Division: I am not sure that I understand the question. However, one thing we need to consider is how the Commission could adopt a compensation strategy, what would be the regulatory vehicle, and how to get the proposal before the Commission.
	15. Stephanie Green, CPUC:
	16. Ted Howard, SBUA: Agree with Nils, and the strategy should include consideration of benefits versus costs, much as ratepayer-funded programs require a cost-effectiveness test, but this would be much less strict, and just for convincing ratepayer advocates the net benefits are real. The benefits of having representatives from DAC/HTR and ESJ communities participating should typically exceed the nominal costs of compensation, especially when including intangible benefits of increased EE program participation by these underserved customers.

# HW#1 Original Appendix

Below is the raw data from the breakout sessions. [View the Jamboard for the original collaboration tool](https://jamboard.google.com/d/1jVMB-vPz3HilE8ZBHXNVzEyKGDembns0uibr1G6H0-g/edit?usp=sharing).

1. Keep it simple
2. Make it flexible
3. Financial Need
	1. Don't want to lay down rules. Is it something about the org's finances that's prohibiting participation otherwise
	2. don’t require documentation
	3. for those without compensation, who are unable to participate
	4. Financial hardship to participate
4. Non-financially interested parties, who wouldn't be impacted directly based off the task force charge
5. Reasonable rates/stipends consistent with industry standards
	1. participation and contribution is of value
	2. ICOMP values people at their going rate. Should this take in people's different rates or flat fee?
6. This is a pilot, should be replicable
7. maybe don't set a cap; need to see who applies, and how much compensation they would need and then see what participation actually looks like
	1. be flexible, where you can, wait and learn from the experiences
8. If someone already has funding from somewhere else, would they be eligible for this funding?
	1. vote for no additional/cross-compensation
9. ICOMP based off job classification, but not necessarily needing that level of detail
	1. \*Reminder that this is not a solution for challenging ICOMP system
10. Not too many from one organization/perspective
11. Contribution and meaningful participation
	1. the WG report references "meaningful participation"; need to define that so that we aren't funding those who don't contribute.
	2. What about meetings that require pre- or post- work?
	3. barrier is intimidation from high technicality
	4. What does meaningful participation or contribution look like?
12. Various criteria (need, no COI, etc.) to be gathered/assessed via application/survey
13. baseline level of knowledge?
	1. Keep it broad at first
	2. Washington State: accounts for individuals with "lived experiences" to receive daily stipend for topic/task force
	3. how to ensure it's building to the whole?
14. Funding Proposal: Each PA required to recruit 3-4 orgs providing DEI and represent underrepresented groups and pay for it
	1. public purpose dollars should be spent to support the public (esp. when it's such a small amount)
	2. Agency nightmare for legal structure with PA
	3. Don't want to it to seem like PA is choosing the CBO or that the CBO is beholden to that PA
15. Eligibility: Not for profit reps; local governments; students;
16. Eligibility: not for profit org reps; local government staff/collaborations; students
17. Appropriate activities: Meeting preparation; meeting attendance; outreach to constituents to get input; follow-up; research.
18. Consider individuals (not just organizations) with "lived experience" in energy challenges
19. Consider travel & housing expenses; elder/child/family care foregone
20. Consider Organizations representing ESJ target communities (e.g. DAC, Tribal lands, LI Households, LI Census tracts).
21. Eligibility: 1. Regular attendance; 2. Constructive engagement.
22. Need based eligibility, application process, first come first served? Where will it be advertised so that new faces can serve
23. Unused ESA funds...decision stated no longer have rollover capability but cannot remember where it is allocated for
24. Cap per organization participating. Cap and guidelines built around organization not individual.
	1. I do not think a cap is needed, we can always review in the AL.
	2. I think there should be a cap and go with the stipend model. The hourly rates presented seem a bit high and the number of hours spent could vary
25. Create a budget and allow people to indicate what is needed during the application process, travel perhaps if having to fly, but if zoom not needed
26. Consider ESJ definition: eligible individual climate or environmental justice leaders, CBOs and under-resourced organizations located in and/or serving Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Communities, or others deemed eligible.
27. multiple ways, reimbursement, but also maybe somethings can be purchased on behalf of the person like plane tickets
28. The activities that are allowed should be explicit, ie prep time, meeting participation, etc. Time estimates could be developed that would be the basis for the stipends.
29. Not already compensated under ICOMP
30. Need based, and I almost think it should go to orgs and people who are not current CAEECC members or ex officio.
31. Customer and/or tenant participation would be great, independent of an organization.
32. Direct engagement with target customers "boots on the ground."
1. Family-care is inclusive of elder, child, or self-determined family care [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Facilitator Comment: Noting SCE's suggestion about administrator of funds reviewing the reasonableness of claims (which it sounds like would include an evaluation of meaningful contribution). Not sure if this is review after time spent but before distribution of funds, like iComp. There are critical access issues with that particular process (requires applicants to have funds upfront and be able to withstand time for review before dispersal.) Based on intentions above, proposing an oversight model that requires a bit less overhead, but also provides a mechanism to ensure funds are "run away" with. Welcome thoughts from WG members. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Family-care is inclusive of elder, child, or self-determined family care [↑](#footnote-ref-3)