Compensation Task Force Homework #2

Due Date: August 19, 2022 COB

At Compensation TF Meeting #2, participants identified critical questions related to the Application, Application Review Process, Recruitment Strategies, and Evaluation and Metrics.

For homework, please review the following:

1. [Preliminary thoughts to an Application](#_4ivc3ygss719)
2. [Application Review Process notes](#_ps08j3t2cckr)
3. [Strategy for Recruitment](#_swhwokrkf6ts)
4. [Draft Evaluation and Metric Criteria](#_9g9tvjif9ri1)

We will use your homework responses to further these topics and present at Meeting #3 for feedback and discussion.

* *In the appendices, we also have the updated* [*Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria (Version 1)*](#_dp8liicyd5hf)*. We invite additional comments or suggestions as we will be voting for approval on this Version 1 at the September 7 meeting.*

# Preliminary Application

This portion of the homework is a sample application for the Compensation Pilot.

*[Placeholder: General information about this Compensation Pilot for the JEDI-focused Working Group of the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC). Note about meeting all 3 eligibility criteria for application to move forward]*

The deadline to apply for the Compensation Pilot is: *open to suggestions*

*\* Connotes a required field below.*

## Contact Information

\*Primary Contact Name (First and Last); Primary Contact Pronouns; Primary Contact Email; Primary Contact Phone

\*Proxy Contact Name (First and Last); Proxy Contact Pronouns; Proxy Contact Email; Proxy Contact Phone

Will you be representing: ⭘ An organization ⭘ Yourself

Name of organization (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## Identifying Eligibility

\*Do you present a financial need to participate in the JEDI-focused WG that funding through the Compensation Pilot can mitigate? Yes

*Facilitator Question: Are there specific documents needed for applicants to apply? If so, what?*

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* Here are the alternatives CDC requests, just as an example to consider one or more of these: Proof of nonprofit status must be submitted by private nonprofit organizations with the application. Any of the following is acceptable evidence of nonprofit status:
* (a) a reference to the applicant organization’s listing in the Internal Revenue Service’s (IRS) most recent list of tax-exempt organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the IRS Code;
* (b) a copy of a currently valid IRS tax exemption certificate;
* (c) a statement from a State taxing body, State Attorney General, or other appropriate State Official certifying that the applicant organization has a nonprofit status and that none of the net earnings accrue to any private shareholders or individuals;
* (d) a certified copy of the organization’s certificate of incorporation or similar document that clearly establishes nonprofit status;
* (e) any of the above proof for a State or national parent organization and a statement signed by the parent organization that the applicant organization is a local nonprofit affiliate. {Ted Howard, SBUA)
* (f) In general, you must disclose the Customer’s gross and net monthly income, monthly expenses, cash and assets, including equity in real estate, and any other relevant financial information[[1]](#footnote-0).

\*Do you represent a community that has historically been underrepresented by CAEECC[[2]](#footnote-1)? If yes, please describe what perspective(s), representation(s), or community/ies with which you identify. Yes

\*Are you committed to make meaningful contributions to this working group by committing to doing the pre-work, meeting attendance and active engagement, and meeting follow-up or homework?[[3]](#footnote-2) Yes

## CAEECC Policies and Interest

Do you agree to abide by the Groundrules and Meeting norms for CAEECC and CAEECC working groups?[[4]](#footnote-3) Yes

Describe specific prior experience working collaboratively in other stakeholder processes: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The next set of questions are in regards to the application process for applicants. These are not meant to be on the application, but for consideration by this Task Force.

What should application submission timing be in relation to the JEDI-focused WG applications?

*Before, in parallel, after?*

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* Start before and then continuous- Nicole, Eco Services
* Before and perhaps until the midpoint of the WG. I would not close applications at the start of the WG.
* Certainly before, and keep it open continuously unless and until saturated with too many applications to manage effectively

Are there other considerations for applicants in the application process (not application review process) this Task Force should think about?

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* Where will applications be posted and advertised, will it be paper or electronic or both? Nicole, Eco Services

# Application Review Process

This portion of the homework identifies ways to think about the review process for approving Compensation Pilot recipients.

Who should review the Compensation Pilot applications? How might reviewers be related or unrelated to those reviewing general JEDI-focused WG applications?

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* Same as reviewing the WG applications, Could there even be the possibility of combining the applications and just having a couple questions at the bottom asking about whether or not there is a need for compensation, is it necessary to have two completely separate applications? Nicole, Eco Services.
* Facilitation team.
* Any interested CAEECC members; Members of CPUC ESJ team
* The entity that will be responsible for processing compensation

When/How should review of applications happen? *Examples include: rolling basis, upon the application deadline, before or at the beginning/first meeting of the JEDI-focused WG, etc.*

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* Before and then on a rolling basis. Nicole, Eco Services
* Rolling basis.
* ·Flexibility is important, so rolling process seems best

How should the applications be reviewed?

*SOMAH used a weighted scoring system to rank applications for their program. Would a weighted ranking systemenefit this Pilot? How would you envision this?*

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* Since this is a pilot, I suggest give the funding as needed, if there is a pot of money allocated then give until there is no more, but clearly communicate with those in need of assistance so that they can make an informed decision on whether or not they can afford to participate meaningfully with the compensation offered. Nicole, Eco Services
* Seconding Nicole. Allocate until expended if applicant(s) meet minimum threshold
* Yes a weighting system could facilitate a relatively objective evaluation, consistent for each member of Application Review Team

# Strategy for Recruitment

This portion of the homework focuses on recruiting organizations/individuals from historically non-represented groups in CAEECC.

Who should be responsible for recruitment?

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* Collective effort made by CAEECC members, task force members. Reaching out to CBOs and increasing visibility. Nicole, Eco Services.
* If there is an identified list, might be easiest to delegate to facilitation team if the budget allows. Will also allow for consistent messaging on procedures, etc.
* Any interested CAEECC members; members of CPUC ESJ team

The CDEI WG provided an initial comprehensive list of potential recruits for the JEDI-focused WG (view [Appendix A](#_dp8liicyd5hf)). How should additional prospective applicants be identified? *For example, CalEnviroScreen, involvement in similar proceedings, attendance at proceeding events, etc.*

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* Request input from the whole of CAEECC, as well as ED. A second list (beyond Appendix A) should be started that includes specific organizations and contacts That list should be managed by the entities responsible for recruitment, but should not be widely shared given the necessary specificity.
* CAEECC Members can make suggestions. I can provide a list of California CBOs involved in state energy matters

How should recruitment be conducted? *For example, emails, cold calls, outreach meetings, participation in town halls or community events/meetings, etc.*

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* I think a decent amount of effort should go into recruiting efforts, but input from CBOs would be best as to not waste time. Nicole, Eco Services
* Focus primarily on California CBOs involved in energy issues, but consider other relevant organizations

What should the timeline for recruitment be?

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* 3-6 months before launch Nicole, Eco Services
* Starting as soon as the procedures are ready, and extending until available funds are committed or relevant WG has passed a halfway point.
* For several months before officially created, and keep it open for at least a few months more, until having enough members.

# Draft Evaluation and Metric Criteria

This portion of the homework is to identify criteria to evaluate the success of the Compensation Pilot

What are the best indicators of success for this pilot?

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* Increased participation from new communities, Longevity of participation Nicole, Eco Services
* Number of additional participants, and hopefully a steady stream of new ideas or perspectives in the CAEEC/WG processes.
* New perspectives and insights from new members, adding to the value of the WG output; ·# of new JEDI participants making productive contributions in CAEECC meetings

How might success be measured? *For example, number of under-represented perspectives in WG, number of those under-represented perspectives supported via the Compensation Pilot?*

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* # of people participating receiving compensation vs those not, % of those receiving from new communities Nicole, Eco Services
* # of new JEDI participants making productive contributions in WG and CAEECC meetings

Are there any ways in which success should *not* be measured?

* [insert thoughts here to this question]
* The final recommendations of a WG. What that should or should not be should not be prejudged.
* Should not have a specific metric with specific required contributions of definitive impact…flexibility is key, and productive contributions are difficult to quantify.

# Appendix A - Recommended Recruitment Segments

These are suggested groups/organizations that the CDEI WG recommended as a starting point for recruitment of a Compensation Pilot.

* Trade allies
* Unions (work/work implementation groups)
* Authorized Agents of IOU's and Implementers
* Youth, universities, and emerging professionals (including respective diversity groups)
* Consumer advocates like CalPA and TURN
* Environmental, Racial, and Social Justice groups like Greenlining, Rising Sun, and California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA)
* Other experts (e.g., other agencies)
* Advocacy groups whose mission is to promote and establish diversity in EE (similar to E2, ACEEE, etc.)
* A representative sample of customers
* Local Government Coalitions
* Community Based Organizations and/or aggregations of Community Based Organizations
* Local Government Climate Action Organizations
* Tenant right groups
* BIPOC specific groups
* Community Service District Latino Service Providers

# Appendix B - Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria

To avoid having to view multiple documents, we wanted to share the updated Principles, Intentions, and Eligibility Criteria. These are also in the Meeting #2 Summary. We invite additional comments or suggestions as we will be voting for approval on this Version 1 at the September 7 meeting.

| **Modified Set of Principles (Version 1)**   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~~ scalability and learning (through evaluation) 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- and 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. |
| --- |

| **Modified Set of Intentions (Version 1)**   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~~ should have flexibility in how to document and demonstrate financial need.    1. Documentation for application and upon disbursement of funds needs to be sufficient to meet fiscal reporting requirements by the PAs contributing funds from their budgets, and according to any CPUC requirements on pilot funds.\* 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) for a specified duration of activity, e.g., for the duration of a Working Group process/defined series of meetings.    1. Recognize that some individuals may require financial support including but not limited to lodging, travel, food, family-care.[[5]](#footnote-4)\*\* 4. Not requiring baseline knowledge of energy efficiency to participate in the JEDI-related WG compensation program; however, applying participants ~~must engage in on-boarding energy efficiency training to be provided by CAEECC~~ are encouraged to review background information EE (self-guided orientation through resources provided) and the CAEECC orientation in order to support meaningful participation. ~~(Meaningful contribution will likely but may not require baseline knowledge of energy efficiency.)~~   \* Documentation will depend on funding source requirements. Since participation may manifest in different ways (i.e., active participation, verbal comments, or silently learning and contributing via homework) documentation of contribution should be broad and flexible. Consider the use of polls, and other opportunities to document a base level of participation. |
| --- |

| **Modified Set of Eligibility Criteria (Version 1)**   1. ~~Not presently using Intervenor Compensation (I-Comp) funding; or for whom I-Comp Funding is not a feasible option.~~ 2. Not currently and/or 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. This intention does not require an individual be formally engaged in an organization that does this work, only that they can contribute such perspectives 3. With a demonstrated financial need in order to meaningfully participate. E.g. Participation would expose the individual/organization to financial hardship. 4. ~~Are non-financially-interested parties (facilitator note: need to define?).~~ 5. Are committed to a WG or stated engagement process and make meaningful contribution(s). Standard expectations of commitment and proxy representation apply. |
| --- |

Facilitator’s note: Eligibility Criteria #1 and #4 have been removed from the set of Criteria based on the meeting discussion. Eligibility Criteria #1 has been removed for further discussion following research from Nils Strindberg, Energy Division and Ted Howard, SBUA about whether CAEECC activities are accepted in I-Comp. Eligibility Criteria #4 has been removed since the issue will be taken up more broadly in CAEECC Conflict of Interest policy discussions, and has been covered to some extent in the Full CAEECC. Both criteria will be discussed further at the next meeting.

## 

1. CPUC ICOMP Guide p. 14 [Intervenor Compensation Program Guide](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/icomp-materials/updated-icomp-program-guide-april-2017.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. See CPUC Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan (page\_\_\_) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. Meaningful contributions include: *…* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
4. See JEDI-focused WG Scope of Work Appendix [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
5. Family-care is inclusive of elder, child, or self-determined family care [↑](#footnote-ref-4)