

# Equity and Market Support Working Group Meeting #7 Agenda

Date: February 21, 2024  
 Time: 9:00am - 12:00pm PT

## Join Zoom Meeting

URL: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89853023883>

Meeting ID: 898 5302 3883

---

One tap mobile

+13126266799,,89853023883# US (Chicago)

+16465588656,,89853023883# US (New York)

## Objectives

- Take Working Group member feedback on the Draft EMSWG Report
- Address questions in the Draft EMSWG Report

## Agenda

Supporting materials can be found on the CAEECC website:

<https://www.caeec.org/equity-and-market-support-wg-mtg-7>

Time	Topic & Description	Lead
9:00	<b><u>Welcome</u></b>	
9:05	<b><u>Topic 1: Reactions to and General Feedback on Draft Report</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What surprised you about the report?</li> <li>• What disappointed you about the report?</li> </ul>	
9:25	<b><u>Topic 2: Facilitator's Clarifying Questions</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is an example of an expired measure? (page 16)</li> <li>• Do issues with reporting benefits for statewide programs affect only IOUs or all PAs? (page 16)</li> </ul>	
9:35	<b><u>Topic 3: Purposes of Indicators (page 11)</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We originally asked about the purposes of indicators within the context of Equity Indicators. Are these same purposes applicable to Market Support Indicators?</li> <li>• Are any additional purposes appropriate for the Market Support Indicators?</li> <li>• Should the report include a separate section on purposes of Market Support Indicators?</li> </ul>	Common Spark Consulting
9:55	<b><u>Topic 4: Reporting Participant Counts (page 14)</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anything to add to the following recommendation?</li> </ul> <p><i>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.</i></p>	

10:05	<p><b><u>Topic 5: Reporting Bill Impacts (pages 15-16)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which do you prefer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Option 1: For Equity Indicator #2, PAs should report Electric and Gas bill impacts as one value</li> <li>○ Option 2: For Equity Indicator #2, PA should report Electric and Gas bill impacts as two separate values</li> <li>○ Another option</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
10:15	<p><b><u>Topic 6: Nonclaimable Savings (page 16)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should this be included in the report: <p><i>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.</i></p> </li> </ul>
10:25	<p><b><u>10-Minute Break</u></b></p>
10:35	<p><b><u>Topic 7: Reporting on Statewide Programs (page 17)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What else should be added to Recommendation #8, if anything? Is there a conversation about reporting on statewide programs happening anywhere else?</li> </ul>
10:45	<p><b><u>Topic 8: Other Feedback on the Recommendations for the Equity Indicators</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity for general feedback on the Recommendations for the Equity Indicators</li> </ul>
11:15	<p><b><u>Topic 9: Definition of "Partnership" (pages 18-9)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should any of PG&amp;E's suggestions (A-F on page 19) be added to the definition of "partnership"?</li> <li>• What are the potential risks of having an overly broad definition?</li> </ul>
11:25	<p><b><u>Topic 10: Definition of "Partner" (page 19)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the examples be omitted from the definition?</li> </ul>
11:30	<p><b><u>Topic 11: Definition of "Type" (page 20)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should suggested edits A, B, and/or C (on page 20) be implemented?</li> <li>• Should "contractor" be defined as a building/construction contractor?</li> <li>• Is there any disagreement to this statement: <p><i>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</i></p> </li> </ul>
11:45	<p><b><u>Topic 12: Definition of "Non-ratepayer in-kind funds/contributions" (page 21)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should "An entity paying for services on the PA's behalf" be added as a third bullet to the definition?</li> </ul>
11:55	<p><b><u>Wrap Up and Adjourn</u></b></p>

*This meeting will be held on Zoom. We encourage you to use the desktop or web client of Zoom over the mobile app or dial-in mechanisms. Visit [Zoom Support](#) for more info.*