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Draft Meeting Summary

Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates.; Dr. Scott McCreary, CONCUR.; &

Katie Abrams, CONCUR

On June 24, 2021, the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) convened a quarterly meeting of the full CAEECC via WebEx. 159 individuals participated, including representatives from 22 CAEECC Member organizations. A full list of meeting registrants is provided in Appendix A.

Meeting facilitation was provided by Dr. Jonathan Raab (Raab Associates), Dr. Scott McCreary (CONCUR) and Katie Abrams (CONCUR). Meeting materials, including presentations, are provided on the CAEECC website here: <https://www.caeecc.org/6-24-21-full-caeecc-mtg>

Following the presentations, key clarifying questions or comments are listed and relevant *responses to questions* are noted in *italics*. Where multiple responses were given, these responses are listed as sub-bullets. Public comment, and any responses given, is primarily included in Appendix B (Chat Log) and Appendix C (Q&A Log). Next Steps, at the end of this document, list all next steps discussed at the meeting.

**Introductions**

At the beginning of the meeting, CAEECC facilitator J. Raab opened the meeting, and reviewed the agenda and WebEx “housekeeping” protocols. The focus of the meeting is for Members to receive and discuss Working Group Updates, the Third-Party Solicitation Process, the May 2021 CPUC Final Decision and related Filing Outline Template/Guidance, Equity and Market Support Metrics Working Groups (WGs), Implication of Final Decision on CAEECC, and Conflict of Interest Policy.

**SESSION A: IMPORTANT UPDATES & CAEECC DISCUSSION**

***Underserved Working Group (UWG)***

Katie Abrams, associate UWG facilitator, provided an update on the UWG. This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Combined 6/24 CAEECC Mtg Slides 6.23.21,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”).

There were no Clarifying Questions or Comments on the UWG update presentation.

***3rd Party Solicitation Process***

Brandon Sanders, SCE, provided an update on the investor-owned utility (IOU) third party (3P) solicitation process. This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *3rd Party Solicitation Process slides 6.17.21,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on SCE’s presentation:

* L. Rothschild, Energy Coalition: What is the timing for the Catalina statewide solicitation being led by SCE?
	+ *B. Sanders, SCE: The CATALENA (California Analysis Tool for Locational Energy Assessment) solicitation is currently in the work scope development phase.  The IOUs are in discussion with the Energy Division regarding the overall scope of information that the program should include.  I am hesitant to share a timeline because the scope discussions are taking significantly longer than anticipated.  Once we are back on track we can report back but this solicitation is for a new program and not a part of the IOUs effort to outsource 60% of EE programs to third parties. [Note Brandon acknowledged during the mtg that he would need to check with his team for a response; this information was provided to the Facilitation Team after the mtg and now available to the Public]*

**SESSION B: EE Filing Processes & Potential & Goals Policies**

***ED Presentation on Final Decision***

Nils Strindberg, CPUC, presented an overview of Energy Division’s (ED’s) recent Final Decision on EE Goals Policy Track and Modification of Portfolio Process Decision (D.21-05-031). This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *ED Presentation on Final Decision 6.17.21,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on ED Presentation on Final Decision:

* J. Raab, facilitator: Might the September full CAEECC meeting be a good time to discuss the segmentation test run in the Biannual Budget Advice Letters (BBALs)? Not sure the WGs are the best place because focus of WGs is defining metrics (not segmentation definition or approach)
	+ *N. Strindberg, CPUC: Agree with suggestion to add this to next full CAEECC mtg 9/2, however timing might be too tight with BBAL submittal*
	+ *J. Raab, facilitator: if not the September full CAEECC mtg., when and how would we get the PA's to work with CAEECC? Do we have a special meeting just on that?*
	+ *E. Brooks, SoCalGas: I think we'd probably be open to having the discussion either at CAEECC or elsewhere to inform the application*
	+ *A.LaBonte, CPUC: A corollary benefit for meeting on metrics development for MS and Equity is the discussions around definitions, which will come up in process of developing metrics*
* M. Campbell, Public Advocates: What review and criteria is used for two-year ABALs? Do PAs understand what they need to submit - is there benefit to discussing so individual parties are consistent rather than using their judgement?
	+ *N. Strindberg, CPUC: We’d use the same criteria that was adopted in 18 05 041 for the ABAL review. The time horizon would be different. Instead of a one year, we'd be looking at a two year, but yeah, I'm glad to talk to you [Mike] more about that and your team offline with our team*
* B. Sanders, SCE: SCE hopes to have ED present at the WGs. Concerned getting close to anti-trust issues considering cost-effectiveness requirements for one of three segments, so want CPUC to be present so it’s clear that ED is involved in those discussions or that those discussions are happening at the direction of the Commission

***ED Presentation & CAEECC Initial Feedback on Filing Outline/Template Guidance***

Alison LaBonte, CPUC, presented an overview of Energy Division’s (ED’s) recent Final Decision on “Assessment of Energy Efficiency Potential and Goals Modification of Portfolio Approval and Oversight Process” (D.21-05-031). This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *ED Presentation on Attachment A Revisions 6.22.21,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”). Related, she shared the *Attachment A ED Redline & Comments 6.22.21*, also posted to “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”.

Clarifying Questions and Comments on ED Presentation & CAEECC Initial Feedback on Filing Outline/Template Guidance:

* G. Wilker, CEDMC: Can you clarify what you mean by risk mitigation under third party solicitation (slide 35)?
* *A.LaBonte, CPUC: We have made significant changes to this area since the Decision made May 20th – see redline version posted to the meeting page. There's not a mandate on non IOU program administrators, but there's also nothing stopping non IOU program administrators to propose doing third-party solicitations themselves*
* *G. Wilker, CEDMC: This speaks to a broader issue that we don't have time to talk about today, which is a tendency in the past solicitation processes for the PAs to put a 100% of risk burden on the third-party implementers, but at least the CPUC identifies the issue of more equitable distribution between PAs and third-party implementers*

Jonathan requested suggested changes to the Biz Plan Filing Outline/Template Guidance and 4-yr Application Filing Outline/Template Guidance, but there was no CAEECC member feedback.

***PA Presentation & CAEECC Initial Feedback on Filing Outline/Template Guidance***

Brandon Sanders, SCE, presented an overview of Energy Division’s (ED’s) recent Final Decision on EE Goals Policy Track and Modification of Portfolio Process Decision (D.21-05-031). This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *PA Presentation on Filing Outline 6.17.21,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on PA Presentation & CAEECC Initial Feedback on Filing Outline/Template Guidance:

* B. Sanders, SCE: raised two issues for CAEECC feedback: 1) First discussion issue: There's quite a bit of discussion on where the largest portion of the application should be. Should it be focused on the overall eight year plan? Or, should it be focused on the detail and the four years? PAs are split. For SCE, intent is 4 years; the 8 years is to ensure have funding commitments for years 5-8, which could be accomplished with less materials and rigor
	+ *L. Medina, SoCalREN: our vision is we don't want to see it bogged down in a long pleading document, but more-so we envisioned this as strategic documents that not only provide an authorization for our budgets, but also provided the deep quantifiable rationality of why ratepayer funds should be allocated in the different segment categories. I want to make sure this applies to all PAs and is not IOU-centric*
	+ *M. Campbell, Public Advocates: Agree with SCE that focus should be on the 4-years.*
	+ *A.LaBonte: We want the template to include input from all PAs. Also, we want the meat to be in the 4-year application, which is where we’ll be holding PAs accountable to budgets and program level metrics.*
* B. Sanders, SCE: 2) Second discussion issue: Will this be 100% in testimony (pleading) format or will a portion be in a (non-testimony) attachment?
	+ *L. Medina, SoCalREN: We envision a pleading document that has testimony on compliance with the Decision and with state policy and legislative goals and objectives. Attachment 1 would be the Strategic Energy Efficiency Biz Plan, about 30 pages, that’s an executive management plan to understand where you see your portfolio going in the long-term and how it feeds into the four year portfolio. And then, attachment two would be the four year portfolio budget requests, which would go into the zero-based budget details.*
* J. Kalafut, CPUC: We can take responses as a followup to the meeting if members or stakeholders need time to reflect.
* B. Sanders, SCE: Planning on getting input once PAs drafts are more finalized. Participants can send feedback directly to me [Brandon Sanders].
* J. Berg, BayREN: PAs were directed to come up with the template, so they’re not being exclusive.
* J. Raab: Is the 9/2 meeting too late for stakeholders to provide input on the template?
	+ *A.LaBonte, CPUC: It will be in ED’s hands then. If these templates align with higher-level guidance, the goal of the templates is to provide standardization, so would like to better understand the nature of the feedback we’d receive from stakeholders. On 9/2, we’d only be able to accommodate formatting type changes*
	+ *J. Kalafut, CPUC: If non-PA stakeholders have input on big missing sections, that's great feedback to provide now, or send your feedback to Brandon. And then, even as we finalize the templates in the coming months, once the applications are filed, that is an opportunity to bring up additional issues. This will be an ongoing process. This isn't the last opportunity to ask questions about what the next application process is or what the applications will look like.*
* G. Wilker, CEDMC: Brandon, you mentioned that you were going to incorporate comments on the guidance from attachment A into the template. When will stakeholders have an opportunity to review an incorporated refined version of the template?
	+ *B. Sanders, SCE: We’ll incorporate it into the outline. We just received that this week and we'll incorporate that into the outline to make sure that it's in sync. I'll take that back and consider with the PA team, how best to make sure that stakeholders have an updated version of our outline and spreadsheets to comment on.*
	+ *L. Medina: To the question about stakeholder engagement: what we don’t do in regulatory proceedings, we can perhaps provide a matrix showing feedback/lessons learned/best practices*
* J. Dodenhoff, Silent Running: Non-CAEECC Member Comment: Business Plan information needs to provide 3rd Parties sufficient detail to reasonably assess sector and segment opportunities for the purpose of future solicitations. (i.e. from my perspective the "Shiny document" was of greater value to me than the testimony format)

J. Raab summarized next steps as follows: CAEECC Members and other stakeholders can provide feedback electronically to ED (Nils) and/or PAs (Brandon). CAEECC can also facilitate a call if needed, before 9/2 to discuss filing template issues. Finally, if there are any lingering questions that ED wants CAEECC's feedback on, we can roll those into the September 2nd meeting.

***Equity & Market Support Sector Metrics WG(s)/Workshop***

Jonathan Raab and Scott McCreary, co-facilitators, provided an overview of two proposed new WGs on Equity and Market Support Metrics. This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Equity & Market Support Metrics WGs Prospectus 6.10.21,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”).

Clarifying Questions and Comments on Equity & Market Support Sector Metrics WG

* L. Jacobson, LGSE: Clarify intersection between Equity and UWG?
	+ *L. Ettenson: They’re related but different. The Equity WG comes from the Decision and focuses on how stakeholder and ED staff can assess the reasonableness of how PAs segment and create yardsticks by which we assess whether a program is going to support the demographics we're trying to reach in equity. By contrast, the UWG focuses on whether there’s adequate data to assess whether people are getting served at all, and assessing the very limited data that's available to us, to understand how the current programs are reaching those constituencies. And so they're related in that sense, but not directly, because we're not talking about what makes a good equity program in the UWG*
	+ *L. Jacobson, LGSE: I see UWG as a sub-set of Equity, so without having a clear definition of what underserved looks like, perhaps, let's say, with disadvantaged communities or other defined metrics and outcomes of that particular working group, I feel like we might miss some key areas to delineate outcomes within. The same thing with market support, meaning that if folks are not receiving or not accessing services equitably, could we then truly define a comprehensive set of objectives and outcomes with the current conversation in the working groups in relation to this decision without first having a good understanding of where those services are being delivered or not being delivered?*
	+ *L. Ettenson, NRDC: We have some preliminary data to inform that, but much of the data that we've been receiving has been somewhat inconclusive for the underserved. So I'm not sure how much more we can glean from that, but we should know more on July 12th, which is before the July 15th launch of the working group, and maybe that should be a part of the conversation on July 12th.*
	+ *S. McCreary, facilitator: We have been coaching the research teams, literally as recently as this morning, as they refine their reports. And as Lara suggests, the timing works out rather nicely, because that underserved group will be meeting on the 12th. The launch of this effort is the 15th, and I think we will glean the high-level findings and be able to factor that into this set of working groups.*
* E. Brooks: SoCal Gas: The Commission decided that program-level metrics are not necessary in this format, and I don't see any change in recent Decisions that modified that. So we don't support delegating reconsideration of that Decision to the working group, and would really prefer to not do any program-level metrics, because that's been addressed. The second thing I wanted to provide comment on is about the proposal for the amount of working group sessions dedicated to this: four half-day sessions for two different equity and market support segments feels like too much. I would support like two-hour sessions, maybe four two-hour sessions. I think we can accomplish the goals of the WG in substantially less time
	+ *J. Raab: We will discuss your first comment with ED. For second comment, would like to circle back after showing the timeline slide*
* S. Kullmann, RCEA: Will there be an opportunity for the two WGs to come together and align?
	+ *J. Raab: We'll talk about ways to communicate and coordinate without necessarily having a joint meeting. Unless you have some ideas?*
* M. Campbell, Public Advocates: One of the key things for setting metrics is better understanding what the objectives for each of those new segments set up in the decision are, so that we can be sure that those segments are trying to achieve those objectives. Regarding Erin’s question, CalAdvocate’s perspective is to evaluate if programs are on or off track, and would hope that PAs would propose metrics so there’s clarity on what’s off track and why.
	+ *E. Brooks: Majority of programs are outsourced, and have KPIs with those contractors. We’re not set up to report at KPI level of detail, but instead have visibility into 300+ metrics. We report cost-effectiveness and savings at a program level.*
* M. Campbell, Public Advocates: For the segments not subject to cost-effectiveness, they may need more scrutiny to ensure program designs are achieving those objectives.
* C. Malotte, SCE: Three comments. 1) Agree important to have objectives before defining metrics, but Decision defines objectives of each segment (in the definitions). Therefore WG should focus on metrics. 2) Agree with Erin that 9 half-day meetings is a lot. Propose integrating first meeting of the two WGs. 3) Support Erin’s comments about program metrics.
	+ *J. Raab: On first point, you’re assuming that Decision’s definitions are strong enough to create crisp objectives.*
* T. Howard, SBUA: 1) Will there be a guideline or consideration on definition of market transformation vs. market support? 2) On the 30% budget allocated to Market Support and Equity, assume the WG won’t be charged with determining the split, right? 3) Will programs with an equity or market support focus be excluded in resource acquisition segment?
	+ *J. Raab: For first question, refer to Decision and defer to ED. That’s a good example of where need to look at definitions and objectives. On second question, PAs will make a budget split proposal in their filing.*
	+ *L. Ettenson, NRDC: ED has emphasized that there will be overlap across equity, market support, and resource acquisition programs.*
	+ *A.LaBonte, CPUC: That something is filed under resource acquisition doesn’t preclude a program from including equity components and vice versa.*
* M. Campbell, Public Advocates: I don’t see the definitions in the Decision as providing clarity on objectives. One approach could be for each PA or stakeholder to write up objectives and meeting dates, tasks, and deliverables – then see if they’re consistent.
* R. Murali, CSE: If this is a consensus and non-consensus report, will it be adopted by CPUC decision? If not, what authority will it have? CSE was among many parties who offered definitional suggestions to the CPUC that were not adopted in the final decision. While that's fine, if we're adopting objectives and metrics in these two working groups that are going to effectively shift the definitional nature of these segments, I’d like to understand the implications.
	+ *J. Raab: Based on timeline, there won’t be time for ED to decide non-consensus issues, but ED has been clear that they’ve turned to CAEECC to use the WG to make recommendations that the PAs would implement on the Segment Objectives and the associated Metrics. If there’s consensus, that’s what PAs will implement. The outstanding question is what will happen with non-consensus issues. One option is that PAs would file both options, pick one and justify and litigate - then ED would weigh in later.*
	+ *A.LaBonte, CPUC: In addition to Jonathan’s comments, we did make a statement in our updated revision one to the guidance attachment that the PAs are to adhere to the metrics that come out of these CAEECC working groups. If this guidance revision is going to be adhered to, then I'm trusting that the PAs are going to follow the outcomes of the working groups. And it's to the PA's best interest to do so for trying to efficiently move through the application process.*
* R. Murali, CSE: Where will objectives and metrics reside? On CAEECC’s website? Will that suffice under Commission’s authority? If they’re not part of the regulatory docket, is that sufficient to guide not only the PAs, but all the other relevant stakeholders to understand what the operable metrics and objectives are?
	+ *L. Ettenson: Metrics will be filed in applications, then decided by Commission, and then part of the Record. So while there’s not time to codify in a Decision before applications are submitted, it will be officially be part of the record after Commission reviews applications*.
* A.Besa, SDG&E: Acknowledge reviewing existing metrics is a good starting point. Also, agree with Erin’s comment about program metrics. Would like them to be more actionable; program-level metrics are handled in contracts, which will largely be run through 3P by 2024. Need to think about how metrics are being used to make a difference in the portfolio. Probably more informative to reduce to far fewer than 300 metrics.
	+ *J. Raab: Our job is not to take the 300 metrics and whittle down to 8, but … to determine most useful metrics for each objective - not to create a laundry list.*
	+ *A.LaBonte: It would be outside scope of this WG to revisit the existing metrics PAs are required to file. It is in scope to leverage existing metrics.*
	+ *E. Brooks: Unfortunately, the decision said that we aren't revisiting all of those metrics at this time, and really just directing us to look at incremental metrics*
* C. Malotte: For low-income outreach, be sure to note that the Equity WG is distinct from ESA
	+ *J. Raab: Good suggestion; it’s not currently clarified in the Prospectus and draft outreach*
	+ *L. Ettenson: I can draft something and share with ED for review*

***Initial Discussion of Short- and Long-Term Implications for CAEECC of Final Decision***

Jonathan Raab, facilitator, presented a slide then requested input on possible implications of ED’s recent Final Decision on the future of CAEECC. The slide is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Implications for CAEECC of Final Decision slides 6.17.21,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”)

Clarifying Questions and Comments on Initial Discussion of Short- and Long-Term Implications for CAEECC of Final Decision

* A.Besa, SDG&E: In short-term implications, can we anticipate the Commission assigning CAEECC as a forum to discuss issues raised in the application? We had several working groups after we filed the business planning application last time that worked through the details of the metrics.
* *J. Raab: Were those directed by ED, or proposed by PAs? This pre-dates our involvement.*
* *A.Besa, SDG&E: Either is possible. The commission could delegate to CAEECC, as a discussion forum. I wouldn't say a decision-making forum, but at least a forum for discussion or if it was useful CAEECC could volunteer to address some issues and the Commission could agree to do it.*
* L. Rothschild, The Energy Coalition: How do we recommend new PAs (RENs or CCAs) interact with CAEECC? I-REN participated in two CAEECC meetings before launching programs.
* *L. Ettenson, NRDC: Previous Decision required new PAs to vet their Business Plans through CAEECC.*
* *J. Berg, BayREN: CCAs that elect to administer do not need to vet through CAEECC, but RENs or CCAs that apply to administer are required to vet through CAEECC*
* G. Wikler, CEDMC: We made recommendations in our comments in the P&G ruling to assign certain technical activities that would be ideal for CAEECC forum for feedback; wondering about process for addressing those recommendations (i.e., fuel substitution) through CAEECC?
* *A.LaBonte, CPUC: Yes there will be an opportunity for stakeholder feedback on technical aspects, but not all technical guidance requires CAEECC facilitation - some things may be simple and can be addressed through a workshop hosted by ED*
	+ B. Sanders, SCE: When the Proposed Decision came out, there was confusion about whether PAs are filing one or two applications. The Final Decision clarified it’s one filing. Is the intent that four years from now we'd be working on just a four year portfolio refresh under the previous applications, eight years of strategy, or would we be refreshing both?
* *A.LaBonte, CPUC: Both. Slide 56 needs to be updated to show every four years there will be an update to the 8-yr Biz Plan when filing the 4-yr Portfolio Application.*
* *J. Raab: We will update the “CAEECC Implications” slide (56).*
	+ L. Rothschild: Were annual reports going to be considered for presentation to CAEECC?
* *A.LaBonte: There may be things that change, what an annual report gets reviewed for and when, how much stakeholder engagement there is… I think a lot of that was proposed by the motion filed with the CAEECC reform proposal. But I guess locking in what that looks like, to me doesn't necessarily make sense until that decision lays out what the commission is adopting on all these different pieces. I do suggest though that if it's clear to stakeholders in advance of applications being filed, I think I stopped short of including this in the guidance, because it's maybe not critical information and we're trying to keep those applications streamlined to critical information so we can all get through them. And with these applications, we see the CAEECC stakeholder engagement elements fall in here. That could also be just shared with us through the application.*
	+ B. Sanders: Related to the BBAL process, there’s a stakeholder vision and process that we proposed. I expected more engagement at CAEECC meetings, so that PAs can get stakeholder feedback on whether PAs are on track.
* *J. Raab: Will add something like “tracking progress, identifying, and discussing challenges and barriers”. Will revisit at December meeting when we discuss work plan for 2022.*
	+ J. Raab: In the chat, someone asked if the general public can attend WG meetings without applying. The answer is yes but if an organization wants to provide input and fully participate so your input is part of the recommendations, you need to apply.

**SESSION C: CAEECC Planning & Policies**

***CAEECC Conflict of Interest (COI) Policies/Enforcement/Updating***

J. Raab provided the historical context that the COI policy was drafted before the movement towards RFPs comprising 60% or more of the portfolio for third party providers. The COI policy is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *CAEECC Conflict of Interest Policy (6.17.21),* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”).

J. Raab presented two questions for CAEECC member discussion:

* Is a COI still needed?
* If so, in what ways if any should CAEECC’s existing be updated and by whom?

Clarifying Questions and Comments on COI Policy:

* M. Campbell: Yes, believe it’s still needed. For WGs, suggest that consulting groups, especially those with financial ties with participants, disclose those relationships - this wouldn’t preclude participation.
* J. Raab: Do you think this is important for non-CAEECC members and also CAEECC members? And financial relationship between who? And if historical, how far back would you go?
	+ - *M. Campbell: Don’t think it’s necessary to have disclosures with current CAEECC Members because those interests are clear. For financial interests, would want this to be open and comprehensive - for example, a consulting group working for a PA or an implementer. Intent is to ensure a PA isn’t amplifying its voice through a consultant. For historical timeline, a year seems adequate.*
		- *L. Ettenson: For the EE Procurement Review Groups, it’s one year for independent evaluators*
* J. Raab: Does that need to be in the conflict of interest policy? Does it need to be a question that we ask in what we're just about to send out for the working groups for non-CAEECC members? Or in the ground rules and then declared later on, but not in the application process?
	+ - *M. Campbell: Propose operationalizing in Groundrules and also codifying in COI.*
		- *J. Berg: There are times when a third party is acting on behalf of a PA and makes that representation known. And then, there's another situation where a third party is just an attendee in their own capacity, but may also have existing or past contracts with their program administrator, but they are not representing them, that they are just a stakeholder.*
		- *M. Campbell: I don't see as much of a distinction, but I think it's useful for folks to know that they may have that relationship.*
		- *B. Sanders: I agree with keeping the time frame short - perhaps a year, since we all have conflicts if we go back farther. Also suggest looking to PRG and IE for alignment. And agree with needing to disclose if things change midstream.*
		- *A.Besa: For background, we proposed a COI when CAEECC was working on the initial Business Plan applications. It’s important to ensure implementers have a voice so CAEECC isn’t PA focused. I appreciate how Cody always introduces himself and his relationships*

J.Raab summarized that makes sense to keep COI as-is. To accommodate Mike’s input, he suggested adding a Groundrule that WG members must disclose their relationships (will include in the new WGs application process). It won’t have full CAEECC review and approval, so we’ll note that it’s subject to CAEECC approval and being piloted in new WGs and then discussed with Full CAEECC at next full CAEECC meeting.

The pilot disclosure Groundrule language is as follows: *Non-CAEECC Member organizations participating in a Working Group are required to disclose to the Working Group and the Facilitation Team the entities with whom they are currently doing energy-related business with or for, both currently and within the past year. If new contractual relationships develop during the course of the Working Group, they will update their disclosure.*

***Next CAEECC Meeting Date & Topics***

J. Raab reminded CAEECC members of upcoming meeting dates: September 2nd and December 2nd, 2021.

He then led a discussion on possible topics for the Q3 meeting. CAEECC member suggestions are as follows:

* M. Campbell: How do two-year ABALs feed into filings? How does that sync with setting objectives and metrics and things that are supposed to be helping design what's going into the applications?
* *J. Raab: The WGs will define objectives and metrics, but that won’t be finalized before ABAL deadline. But PAs will be pilot testing segmentation. The December meeting will be too late, so the 9/2 meeting would be the appropriate time.*
* M. Campbell: Can we structure it so less of a dog and pony show and instead let PAs lead off with where they landed in the ABALs with their segmentation, how that compares to where the Working Groups are headed, and then have other parties raise their observations. It’s not about whether ABALs are structured correctly, but rather a case study for how it’s working
* J. Raab: Unless there are some other issues in their ABALs that people want to hear about, like overall budgets. But on a ABAL review, it's really a case study, pilot of the segmentation exercise that they will all have just gone through.
* L. Ettenson: Would like to have a conversation about how it’s going, in light of fact that it’s all new, so would like to have a discussion on approach and issues so that stakeholders can provide input and PAs can align before the February filing. So propose soliciting questions from CAEECC members on what they would ask PAs at that meeting.
* J. Berg: Support this idea, but important to note that the 9/2 meeting is the day after the ABAL filing, so need to be clear on the pre-CAEECC meeting expectations

J.Raab summarized the next step is for the facilitation team to propose a few discussion questions related to the segmentation in the two-year ABALs, for the PAs to come prepared to talk about. Also, perhaps two or three PA's would volunteer to just share in a little more detail and show where they ended up with their programs in terms of the segmentation.

***3.17 Meeting Evaluation***

J.Raab summarized the results from the 3/17 full CAEECC evaluation. This presentation is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *Combined 6/24 CAEECC Mtg Slides 6.23.21,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”).

**Wrap Up/ next Steps**

J. Raab thanked participants for attending and encouraged all participants to fill out the CAEECC Evaluation. Next steps are as follows:

**CAEECC Members:**

* **Filing Outline/Template Guidance**
* PAs to consider how best to ensure that stakeholders have an updated version of their outline and accompanying spreadsheets to comment on
* PAs to consider developing a matrix showing feedback/lessons learned/best practices to compile feedback not incorporated into the templates that PAs file with ED (see comment from Lujuana Medina on page 4)
* **Evaluation:** Fill out the CAEECC Evaluation of the meeting (as required by our CAEECC groundrules) no later than COB Wednesday June 30, 2021

**CAEECC Members, Stakeholders, and other members of the Public:**

* **Filing Outline/Template Guidance**
* Any final stakeholder feedback on the revision to Guidance (attachment A) should be sent to ely.jacobsohn@cpuc.ca.gov, nils.strindberg@cpuc.ca.gov, and Alison.labonte@cpuc.ca.gov by COB July 6 – it can also be sent to the PAs via Brandon.Sanders@sce.com

**Facilitation Team:**

* **Filing Outline/Template Guidance**
	+ Facilitate a call with CAEECC Members and ED to discuss filing template issues, if needed, before 9/2
* **Equity & Market Support Metrics WG(s):**
	+ Determine whether anything from UWG should be in background documents for Equity WG, and or presented at first or 2nd mtg
	+ For low-income outreach, note that the Equity WG is distinct from ESA (Lara to draft and share with ED)
	+ Add a Groundrule (referenced in application process) that non-CAEECC WG members must disclose their financial/consulting relationships [after piloted in Meterics WGs and then discussed/adopted at Full CAEECC meeting.]
* **Initial Discussion of Short- and Long-Term Implications for CAEECC of Final Decision**
	+ Update “CAEECC Implications Slide” to show that there will be an update every four years including the 8 year Business Plans
* **Next CAEECC Meeting Date & Topics**
	+ Add the following possible agenda items for September 2021 meeting:
		- Addtional feedback to ED on Filing Outline/Template, at ED’ option
		- Discussion of segmentation in ABALs (Facilitation team to propose a few questions for PAs to come prepared to discuss – and perhaps a couple PAs would volunteer to share more detail on their segmentation approach)
		- Discussion and approval of new Groundrule about non-CAEECC WG members disclosing financial/consulting relationships (possible conflicts of interest)
		- Discuss Biz Plans & 4-yr Portfolio filings due Feb 2022 (consultation role only)
	+ Add the following possible agenda items for December 2021 meeting:
		- 2022 workplan discussion: tracking progress, identifying, and discussing challenges and barriers to implementation (of BBALs and 4-yr Portfolios)
* **Meeting Facilitation:**
	+ Develop, post and notice draft meeting summary (this document) to the meeting webpages by Thursday July 1, 2021, COB.
	+ Review and analyze survey evaluations of 6/24 Full CAEECC meeting for continuous improvement opportunities
	+ Prepare for next Full CAEECC meeting (September 2, 2021)

**Appendix A: Meeting Attendants**

|  |
| --- |
| **CAEECC Members/Proxies, Presenters and Ex Officio** |
| **Organization** | **First Name** |  **Last Name** |
| 3C REN | Alejandra |   Tellez |
| BayREN | Jennifer |   Berg |
| CALCTP | John |   Busch |
| CalPA | Michael |  Campbell |
| CalPA | Ashlyn |  Kong |
| CEC | Brian |   Samuelson |
| CEDMC | Serj |   Berelson |
| CEDMC | Greg |   Wikler |
| Code Cycle | Dan |   Suyeyasu |
| CPUC | Jessica |  Allison |
| CPUC | Dan |  Buch |
| CPUC | Peter |  Franzese |
| CPUC | Paula |  Gruendling |
| CPUC | Ely |  Jacobsohn |
| CPUC | Jen |  Kalafut |
| CPUC | Alison |   LaBonte |
| CPUC | Jacob |  Rudolph |
| CPUC | Nils |  Strindberg |
| CPUC | Jason |   Symonds |
| CPUC | Christina |   Torok |
| CSE | Raghav |  Murali |
| CSE | Stephen |   Gunther |
| JATC | Randy |   Young |
| LGSEC | Lou |  Jacobson |
| LMCC | Bernie |   Kotlier |
| MCE | Alice |   Havenar-Daughton |
| MCE | Jana |   Kopyciok-Lande |
| NRDC | Lara |   Ettenson |
| PG&E | Lucy |   Morris |
| Redwood Energy | Stephen |   Kullmann |
| Redwood Energy | Aisha |   Cissna |
| SJVCEO  | Samantha |   Dodero |
| SBUA | Ted |   Howard |
| SCE | Christopher |   Malotte |
| SCE | Brandon  |  Sanders |
| SDG&E | Mike |   McConnell |
| SoCalGas | Erin |   Brooks |
| SoCalREN | Lujuana |   Medina |
| SoCalREN | Fernanda |   Craig |
| The Energy Coalition | Marc |   Costa |
| The Energy Coalition | Laurel |   Rothschild |
|  |
| **Other Participants** |
| **Organization** | **First Name** |  **Last Name** |
| 3CE | Susan |   Davison |
| CA STO | Bill |   Heberger |
| CA STO | Jonathan |   Verhoef |
| CEC | Heather |   Bird |
| CFRE | Martin |   Nomec |
| Clearesult | Joanne O'Neill |   O'Neill |
| CHIOC | Anna  |   Solorio |
| CPUC | Augustus |   Clements |
| CPUC | Peng |   Gong |
| Daikin US | Matthew |   Baker |
| Daikin US | Ryohei |   Hinokuma |
| DNV | Nick |   Brod |
| DNV | Bob |   Ramirez |
| Don Arambula Consulting | Frank |   Spasaro |
| Earth Justice | Matt |   Vespa |
| East Bay Community Energy | Beckie |  Menton |
| East Bay Community Energy | Feby |  Boediarto |
| Ecology Action | Josiah |   Adams |
| Engie | Vincent |   Llorens |
| ERI | Eric |   Noller |
| Franklin Energy | Brett |  Bishop |
| Franklin Energy | Chad |   Ihrig |
| Franklin Energy | Justin |   Kjeldsen |
| Frontier Energy | Nancy |   Barba |
| Gemini Solutions | Anthony |   Kinslow II |
| GreeNet IoT LLC  | Eric  |  Taylor |
| Gridium | Mark |   Shahinian |
| Grounded Research & Consulting | Jenn |   Mitchell-Jackson |
| Grounded Research & Consulting  | Mary  |   Sutter |
| High Sierra Energy | Pam |   Bold |
| iCast USA | James |   Quish |
| ICF | Elizabeth |   Chi |
| ICF | Daniel |   Glatman |
| ICF | Mori |  Javaheri |
| ICF | Lorelei |   Penera |
| James Hirsch & Associates | Jeff |   Hirsch |
| Legend Power | Mark |   Morales |
| Lincus | Cody |   Coeckelenbergh |
| Lincus | Patrick |   Ngo |
| Mark Wallenrod Consulting | Mark |   Wallenrod |
| Mendota Group | Grey |   Staples |
| Mitsubishi Cooling & Heating | Sam |   Beeson |
| Mitsubishi Cooling & Heating | Bruce |   Severance |
| Nexant | Kimberly |   Rodriguez |
| NRDC | Julia |   de Lamare |
| OC Power | Antonia |   Graham |
| Onyx Renewable Partners | David  |   Brian |
| Onyx Renewables | Martin |   Agrimis |
| Oracle | Charlie |   Buck |
| Pacific Corp | Nancy |   Goddard |
| Pacific Trade Consultancy | Ty |   Keith |
| PG&E | Paola |   Benassi |
| PG&E | Maya |  Biery |
| PG&E | Ben |   Brown |
| PG&E | Mananya |   Chansanchai |
| PG&E | Pat |   Eilert |
| PG&E | Caroline |   Francis |
| PG&E | Robert |   Marcial |
| PG&E | Caroline  |   Massad Francis |
| PG&E | Roopa |   Reddy |
| PG&E | Kate |   Schulenberg |
| PG&E | Bella |   Shamoun |
| PG&E | Lindsey |   Tillisch |
| Quality Conservation Services | Rich |  Esteves |
| Quality Conservation Services | Allan |   Rago |
| Redwood Energy | Marianne |   Bithell |
| Reliable Energy | Ron |   Garcia |
| Resource Innovations | Margie |   Gardner |
| Resource Innovations | Corey |   Grace |
| Rising Sun Opportunities | Julia |   Hatton |
| RMS Energy Consulting | Steven |   Apodaca |
| RMS Energy Consulting | Jeremy |   Sasse |
| RMS Energy Consulting | Martin |   Vu |
| SCE | Linda |   Hewitt |
| SCE | Randall |   Higa |
| SCE | Patricia |   Neri |
| SCE | Tom |   Pasker |
| SCE | Larry |   Tabizon |
| SCE | Sonita |   Tan |
| SDG&E | Elaine |   Allyn |
| SDG&E | Sandra |   Baule |
| SDG&E | Athena |   Besa |
| SDG&E | Christina |   Chase |
| SDG&E | Evan |   Frank |
| SDG&E | Lonnie |   Mansi |
| SDG&E | Dominique |   Michaud |
| SDG&E | Roland |   Mollen |
| SDG&E | Fred |   Rucinski |
| SDG&E | Jen |   Taylor |
| SDG&E | Kelvin |   Valenzuela |
| SDGE | Kenneth |   Pitsko |
| SDGE | Fred |   Rucinski |
| SEI | Stephen |   Miller |
| Silent Running | James |   Dodenhoff |
| SoCalGas | Michael |   Diaz |
| SoCalGas | Allison |   Dourigan |
| SoCalGas | Kevin |   Ehsani |
| SoCalGas | Becky |   Estrella |
| SoCalGas | Carlo |   Gavina |
| SoCalGas | David |   Kim |
| SoCalGas | Brian |   Piche-Cifuentes |
| SoCalGas | Kim |   Sides |
| The Energy Alliance | Ross |   Colley |
| The Energy Coalition | Chris |   Ford |
| The Energy Coalition | Rebecca |   Hausheer |
| The Energy Coalition | Craig |   Perkins |
| TRC | Michael |   Green |
| TRC | Abhijeet |   Pande |
| TRIN, LLC | Pepper |   Hunziker |
| Unknown | Alice |   La Pierre |
| USGBC-LA | Edmund |   Novy |
| Willdan | Eric |   Bornstein |
| Willdan | Rosie |   Kang |
| WRCOG | Anirudhha |   Dhruva |
| Yinsight | Carol |   Yin |

**Appendix B: Chat Log**

06/24/2021 12:29:39 PM from susan@raabassociates.com to laurel rothschild (privately): forwarding to you

from mark w to Host (privately): 12:26 PM

Re: Catalina - are you referring to an all source RFO for Catalina Island or a more focused EE program implementor for customers of Catalina?

Note: After the mtg, Brandon Sanders (SCE) provided the following information: CATALENA has nothing to do with Catalina Island, more information about this effort can be found in D.18-05-041 pp 120-121 and Ordering Paragraph 32

06/24/2021 14:44:21 PM from Erin Brooks to Everyone: From D.21-05-031, p.65: "Several parties, including Cal Advocates and NRDC, commented on the need for a further process to develop metrics for equity and market support programs. We agree with this suggestion and have made this modification in the decision. We disagree with SoCalGas’ comment, however, that the program administrators should be allowed to disregard all prior required metrics and propose their own for their new portfolios. There is a lot of useful tracking information provided in the existing required metrics and we are not ready to replace the whole structure with a new one proposed by each program administrator. Existing metrics are still required, unless and until the Commission undertakes a review process for the metrics, which could occur in the future."

06/24/2021 14:49:53 PM from Cody Coeckelenbergh to Host (privately): can you confirm that the general public can attend the WG meetings without applying as a WG member?

06/24/2021 15:32:04 PM from Alison LabOnte to Everyone: Any final stakeholder feedback on the revision to Guidance (attachment A) should be sent to ely.jacobsohn@cpuc.ca.gov, nils.strindberg@cpuc.ca.gov, and Alison.labonte@cpuc.ca.gov by end of day July 6

**Appendix C: Q&A Log**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­Aisha Cissna­(­acissna@redwoodenergy.org­)­ - 12:20­

Q: ­Question on the prior slides: Regarding the third party program implementation of EE programs, how far along is PG&E toward satsifying its 60% 2023 requirement?­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Jennifer Berg­­­­ - 12:35­

 A: ­Annual Budget Advice Letter­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­Bruce Severance­(­bseverance@hvac.mea.com­)­ - 12:35­

Q: ­For those of us unfamiliar with acronyms, please define ABALS.­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Jennifer Berg­­­­ - 12:36­

 A: ­Bruce, see above response­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­RICH ESTEVES­(­rich@qcsca.com­)­ - 12:56­

Q: ­aRE THE CHANGES YOU DESCRIBD BEEN ACCEPTED BY ED?­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Jennifer Berg­­­­ - 12:59­

 A: ­Rich, ED is presenting the proposed accepted revisions­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­Aisha Cissna­(­acissna@redwoodenergy.org­)­ - 13:24­

Q: ­As Lara mentioned, I posed a question about PG&E's 60% that wasn't responded to.­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Lucy Morris­­­­ - 13:34­

 A: ­Hi Aisha, PG&E is making good progress towards 60% 3P but I don’t have a number for you right now. Can we connect via email and I can get you the latest info when I have it? Thanks. -Lucy LLAA@pge.com­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­Elizabeth Chi­(­elizabeth.chi@icf.com­)­ - 13:27­

Q: ­Referring back to earlier in this presentation - Joint Cooperation Memos are no longer required after 2024, but are they still required in 2022? ­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Jennifer Berg­­­­ - 13:28­

 A: ­Elizabeth, JCMs will still be required­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­James Dodenhoff­(­james.dodenhoff@silentrunning.biz­)­ - 13:27­

Q: ­Non-CAEECC Comment: Business Plan information needs to be at sufficient detail to provide 3rd Parties sufficient detail to reasonably assess sector and segment opportunities for the purpose of future solicitations. (i.e. from my perspective the "Shiny document" was of greater value to me than the testimony format.­

Priority: ­N/A­‑‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­mark w­(­mark.wallenrod@gmail.com­)­ - 13:47­

Q: ­a late filed questionRe: Impact of New Policy Decision on Currrent Solicitations: Recognizing that the current solicitations (and contracts) were responsive to an old (2017) business plan - what is the plan for addressing potential contract changes resulting from an updated application (2022) based on the new policy guidance (eff. 2024)? Note: Some 5 year negotiated contracts extend well beyond 2024­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Jen Kalafut­­­­ - 13:53­

 A: ­Mark, ED has asked the IOUs to inform ED of any unintended and adverse impacts on existing contracts / solicitations due to new policy guidance. We are monitoring the issue but if you have a quesiton on a specific contract, please bring that up with the relevant IOU.­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­Julia Hatton­(­hatton@risingsunopp.org­)­ - 14:03­

Q: ­Regarding the 3P solicitation - how will gaps in resulting programs and communities served be identified?­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Lara Ettenson­­­­ - 14:29­

 A: ­Julia, that’s a question for each IOU, I don’t think there are any requirements/guidance from ED. It’s about each IOU assessing their portfolio and making sure they are complying with the various requirements in commission decisions.­‑

 ‑­Christopher Malotte­­­­ - 15:06­

 A: ­Julia to your question regarding 3P solicitation and gaps: through internal portfolio analysis, SCE will identify segments or sectors with gaps and determine the best path for serving those customers. That may be done through a solicitation with PRG guidance or SCE led programs. ­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­RICH ESTEVES­(­rich@qcsca.com­)­ - 14:20­

Q: ­Is it correct that the 30% for the 2 non-resource portfolios is a MAXIMUM, and there is no minimum. ­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Jessican Allison­­­­ - 14:23­

 A: ­Hello. Yes, its correct that the 30% is the maximum for equity and market support without a specific minimum or a required division between the two.­‑

 ‑­Jennifer Berg­­­­ - 14:25­

 A: ­Rich, the RENs are exempted from the 30% maximum­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­mark w­(­mark.wallenrod@gmail.com­)­ - 14:06­

Q: ­Thank for your response to my question. It will difficult to address impacts until the new business plans are published. Best to adopt principles which allow for some degree of program flexibility within existing contract provisions (vs. penalties, re-bid etc)­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Jen Kalafut­­­­ - 14:27­

 A: ­Mark, thank you for this point. We can look at whether / how the business plan and applicaiton templates can include a section related to impacts on or principles for existing contracts / solicitations. ­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­Cody Coeckelenbergh­(­codyc@lincus.com­)­ - 14:51­

Q: ­can you confirm that the general public can attend the WG meetings without applying as a WG member?­

Priority: ­N/A­‑‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­Carol Yin­(­cyin@yinsight.net­)­ - 14:09­

Q: ­Erin, we had dozens of meetings on the BP metrics :(. I was holding them across PAs, weekly for a couple-three months.­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Erin Brooks­­­­ - 14:52­

 A: ­Aisha - they said they were open to shortening the meetings if everything can get done in a shorter time, but they wanted people to hold a half day...­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­Aisha Cissna­(­acissna@redwoodenergy.org­)­ - 14:47­

Q: ­They haven't addressed your request to shorten the meetings to 2 hours, did they?­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Erin Brooks­­­­ - 14:54­

 A: ­Aisha - they said they were open to shortening the meetings if everything can get done in a shorter time, but they wanted people to hold a half day...­‑

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‑­Cody Coeckelenbergh­(­codyc@lincus.com­)­ - 14:57­

Q: ­can you confirm that the general public can attend the WG meetings without applying as a WG member?­

Priority: ­N/A­‑

 ‑­Lara Ettenson­­­­ - 14:58­

 A: ­Yes, everyone can attend the working groups. Those meetings will be noticed to the CAEECC listserv.­‑