



Equity and Market Support Working Group (EMSWG) Meeting #7

February 21, 2024 | 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM PT

Hosted by California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC)

Introductions



In the **chat**, please introduce yourself with your:

- Name and pronouns
- Organization

Meeting Goals

1

**Take Working Group
Member feedback on
the Draft EMSWG
Report**

2

**Address questions in
the Draft EMSWG
Report**

Agenda

Time	Topic
9:00	Welcome
9:05	Topic 1: Reactions to and General Feedback on Draft Report
9:25	Topic 2: Facilitator's Clarifying Questions
9:35	Topic 3: Purposes of Indicators
9:55	Topic 4: Reporting Participant Counts
10:05	Topic 5: Reporting Bill Impacts
10:15	Topic 6: Nonclaimable Savings
10:25	10-minute Break

Agenda (cont.)

Time	Topic
10:35	Topic 7: Reporting on Statewide Programs
10:45	Topic 8: Other Feedback on the Recommendations for the Equity Indicators
10:45	Topic 9: Definition of “Partnership”
11:15	Topic 10: Definition of “Partner”
11:25	Topic 11: Definition of “Type”
11:30	Topic 12: Definition of “Non-ratepayer in-kind funds/contributions”
11:45	Wrap Up and Adjourn

Topic 1: Reactions to and General Feedback on the Draft Report

Discussion Questions

- What surprised you about the report?
- What disappointed you about the report?

Topic 2: Facilitator's Clarifying Questions

On Page 16 under “Topic: Nonclaimable Savings”

“In working group discussions, members generally talked about nonclaimable savings in terms of savings that were expected to occur (and that the customer would experience), but for policy reasons, those savings are not able to be claimed by PAs. For example, nonclaimable savings can result if a customer installs an “expired” measure.”

Q. What is an example of an expired measure?

On Page 16 under “Recommendation #7: Nonclaimable Savings Data”

“It is not clear how investor-owned utilities (IOUs) should report benefits for Statewide Programs. Typically for Statewide Programs, IOUs receive credit for program benefits in proportion to their share of the budget. It is not clear if this same process should be followed for Equity and Market Support Indicators. Additionally, to report participant counts in Statewide Programs, it's not clear whether IOUs should report a proportion of participants based on their relative budget contributions, regardless of where the participant is actually located. There appear to be 15 statewide programs (out of 200 total programs) – one in Equity, six in Market Support, and eight in Resource Acquisition; they collectively will spend about \$530 million from 2024-27.”

Q. Do issues with reporting benefits for statewide programs affect only IOUs or all PAs?

Topic 3: Purposes of Indicators

On Page 11 under “Purposes of Indicators”

Working Group members largely agreed on the purposes of Equity Indicators. The purposes of Equity Indicators include:

1. Understanding the impact of Equity segment programs across PAs (12/12)
2. Ensuring accountability for dollars spent in the Equity segment (10/12)
3. Ensuring PAs make adjustments to Equity segment programs based on Indicator data (9/12)
4. Development of goals for the Equity segment (12/12)
5. *One WG Member added:* “Understanding the distribution of equity target participants by program, sector, and portfolio segment to improve equity-qualified customers’ access to the offerings in the EE portfolio (e.g., equipment, technical assistance, education, etc.)”

Q. Are these same purposes applicable to Market Support Indicators?

Q. Are any additional purposes appropriate for the Market Support Indicators?

Q. Should the report include a separate section on purposes of Market Support Indicators?

Topic 4: Reporting Participant Counts

On Page 14 under “Recommendation #3: Reporting Participant Counts”

“PAs, in consultation with the EMSWG or in another venue, should continue to discuss how to count multi-family and public sector participants to clarify who and/or what is meant to be captured and how to report. Any conversations about adjusting CEDARS should include Energy Division staff involved in overseeing CEDARS.”

Q. Anything to add to this recommendation?

Topic 5: Reporting Bill Impacts

On Pages 15-6 under “Recommendation #6: Reporting Bill Impacts”

“Working Group members did not reach consensus on whether one bill impact value should be reported for Equity Indicator #2, or if separate impacts should be reported for electricity and gas. Many members supported reporting one value given that the utility bill is one cost for a customer, but it should be clear that electric savings come from specific electric savings and rates, and the same for gas. PA Members agreed that one value is beneficial, but noted that in order to calculate a single number, PAs need to calculate them separately anyway so providing two values is expected to require minimal additional effort.

- Option 1: For Equity Indicator #2, PAs should report Electric and Gas bill impacts as one value
- Option 2: For Equity Indicator #2, PA should report Electric and Gas bill impacts as two separate values”

ZOOM POLL: Which option do you prefer? If neither option is preferred, is there another option you would suggest?

Topic 6: Nonclaimable Savings

On Page 16 under “Recommendation #7: Nonclaimable Savings Data”

“The PAs, in consultation with the EMSWG or in another venue, should continue to discuss nonclaimable savings to develop a shared definition and explore options to understand the extent to which nonclaimable savings are occurring within the Equity Segment.”

Q. Should the above recommendation be included in the report?

Break
(10 min)

Next Topic: Reporting on
Statewide Programs

Topic 7: Reporting on Statewide Programs

On Page 17 under “Recommendation #8: Reporting on Statewide Programs”

“The challenge of reporting on Statewide Programs are not unique to Equity and Market Support Indicators. Possible solutions considered by the Working Group include:

1. Provide a single, aggregated statewide value or count that is not separated by PA (5/12)
2. Leverage annual reports and impact evaluations to ensure that benefits are distributed across the state (3/12)
3. Consider how reporting aggregated values for statewide programs would impact goal development and accountability for statewide program goals (6/12)
4. None of the above. Further discussion is needed to clarify Indicators applied to Statewide Programs (3/12)

One Working Group member recommended providing data disaggregated by PA to see which areas of the state are being served.”

Q. What else should be added to Recommendation #8, if anything? Is there a conversation about reporting on statewide programs happening anywhere else?

Topic 8: Other Feedback on the Recommendations for the Equity Indicators

Discussion Questions

- Any general feedback on the Recommendations for the Equity Indicators?

Topic 9: Definition of “Partnership”

On Pages 18-9 under “Topic: Definition of Partnership”

MS Indicator #	Description
2	Dollar value of non-ratepayer in-kind funds/contributions utilized via partnerships (A, P)
20	Assessed value of the partnership by partners (A, P)

“The term "partnership" (used in Market Support Indicators #2 and 20) is defined as:

1. Agreement between at least two entities to engage in a mutually beneficial relationship within the context of EE products, services, education, and/or training
2. The partnership may or may not be legally contracted
3. In cases where a partnership is not contracted, PAs have other documents/materials demonstrating agreement to work together

PG&E suggested that the working group consider adding electrification and decarbonization to the "partnership" definition. Options include:

1. Adding building electrification and/or building decarbonization to #1 above.
2. Adding a fourth bullet: "Partnerships may focus on energy efficiency, building decarbonization, and/or decarbonization products, technologies, services, training and outreach.

PG&E also noted a concern that the definition above is overly broad. Suggested additional guidelines include:

3. Formal documented agreement (contract, MOU, or otherwise) of the partnership arrangement
4. The scope of the partnership work supports energy efficiency, building electrification, and/or decarbonization
5. All partners contribute resources (financial or otherwise) to the agreed upon scope of the partnership
6. The partnership agreement includes clear roles and responsibilities for managing the partnership work”

Q. Should any of PG&E's suggestions be added to the definition of "partnership"? What are the potential risks of having an overly broad definition?

Topic 10: Definition of “Partner”

On Page 19 under “Topic: Definition of Partner”

MS Indicator #	Description
1	Number of partners by type and purposes (Q,P)
18	Percentage of partners that have taken action supporting energy efficiency by type (Q, P)
20	Assessed value of the partnership by partners (A, P)

“The term "partner" (used in Market Support Indicators #1, 18, and 20) is defined as an entity engaged in partnerships including and not limited to educational institutions/organizations, governments, community-based organizations, advocates, suppliers, manufacturers, contractors (see "Type").

SCE suggested only keeping "an entity engaged in partnerships" and omitting the examples.”

Q. Should the examples be omitted from the definition?

Topic 11: Definition of “Type”

On Page 20 under “Recommendation #12: Definition of Type”

MS Indicator #	Description
1	Number of partners by type and purposes (Q,P)

Definition:

The term "type" (used in Market Support Indicator #1) should be used to describe the nature of a partner or partnership and includes and is not limited to:

1. In reference to the type of partner:
 1. Advocate
 2. Community-based organization
 3. Community choice aggregator
 4. Contractor
 5. Customer
 6. Educational institution/organization
 7. Government
 8. Lending agency
 9. Manufacturer
 10. Supplier
2. In reference to the type of partnership:
 1. Contracted
 2. MOU
 3. Informal

Suggested Edits:

- A. Remove "Advocate" as it is overly broad and could potentially overlap with all other listed types
- B. Consolidate "type of partner" to:
 - a. Community-based organization / non-profit
 - b. Contractor
 - c. Government / Public Agency
 - d. Other
- C. Consolidate "type of partnership" to:
 - a. Contracted
 - b. Informal (includes MOU, letters of collaboration, etc.)
- D. Clarify whether "Contractor" means building/construction contractor or consulting contractor

Q. Should suggested edits A, B, and/or C (on pages 19-20) be implemented?

Q. Should "contractor" be defined as a building/construction contractor?

On Page 21 under “Recommendation #12: Definition of Type”

MS Indicator #	Description
1	Number of partners by type and purposes (Q,P)

“Note that listing examples in the definition is not meant to limit the type of partner or partnership, as that can change over time. Additionally, it is not expected that PAs would report sub-counts for Market Support Indicator #1.”

Q. Is there any disagreement to this statement?

Topic 12: Definition of “Non-ratepayer in-kind funds/contributions”

On Page 21 under “Recommendation #14: Definitions of “Non-ratepayer in-kind funds/contributions”

“The terms "non-ratepayer in-kind funds" and "non-ratepayer in-kind contributions" (used in Market Support Indicator #2) are defined as:

1. "Non-ratepayer in-kind funds" refers to monetary contributions offered for free (e.g., through a grant)
2. "Non-ratepayer in-kind contributions" refers to goods, services, and other tangible assets that are provided for free or at less than the usual charge”

Q. Should "An entity paying for services on the PA's behalf" be added as a third bullet to the definition?

Wrap Up & Next Steps

Recap of the day

Meeting Objectives:

1. Take Working Group member feedback on the Draft EMSWG Report
2. Address questions in the Draft EMSWG Report

What to expect next

- We will be meeting on **February 28 from 9am - 12pm PT.**
 - *Please be on the lookout for any potential Homework between now and then.*
- Meeting #7 Summary will be posted by February 28.

If you have any questions, please contact sooji@common-spark.com.

THANK YOU.

Next Meeting: February 28 at 9am