

CAEECC EMSWG Huddle #1 Summary

Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023

Time: 9:00 - 12:00 pm PT

On November 1, 2023, the Equity & Market Support Working Group (EMSWG) met for its first Huddle via Zoom. There were over 50 attendees, including representatives from 16 CAEECC Member organizations and 2 CAEECC Ex-Officio agencies, as well as over 30 Members of the Public (see [Appendix A](#) for a full list of meeting attendees). This meeting was facilitated by Katie Wu (Wu) of Common Spark Consulting and supported by Sooji Yang (Yang) of Common Spark Consulting and Susan Rivo (Rivo) of Raab Associates. Additional presenters included Stephanie Gutierrez and Stacie Risley of San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E).

Supporting meeting materials are available at:

<https://www.caeccc.org/equity-market-support-wg-huddle-1>. Relevant materials include:

- Agenda (11-1-2023 EMSWG Huddle #1 - Agenda (posted 10-26-2023, rev. 10-27-2023))
- Slide Deck (11-1-2023 EMSWG Huddle #1 - Slide Deck (posted 10-26-2023, rev. 10-31-2023))
- Table of Adopted Indicators (Table of Adopted Indicators (posted 10-30-2023))
- PA Edited Table of Adopted Indicators (PA Edited Table of Adopted Indicators (posted 10-31-2023))
- PA Workplan for OP 11 Tier 2 Advice Letter Workstream (PA Workplan for OP 11 Tier 2 Advice Letter Workstream (posted 10-31-2023))

Overview

Key Meeting Takeaways:

- Wu provided a brief history of the outcomes from the Equity Metrics Working Group and the Market Support Metrics Working Group that have led to the opening of EMSWG.
- Representatives from SDG&E presented a proposed PA Work Plan that sets a schedule for meetings, huddles, and PA homework for Phase I activities, as well as a Table of Adopted Indicators to serve as a potential template for WG members to work with PAs to clarify the adopted Indicators.
- Members raised concerns about the tight timeline to complete Phase I activities, given the upcoming holidays and vacations. PAs noted they will update the PA Work Plan for deliberation in Meeting 1.

- Members expressed desire to continue discussing the Table to establish the framework for the Working Group and Member roles related to completing the Table.
- Members noted the importance of establishing common definitions and ensuring the confidence of PAs and third-party implementers in collecting and tracking from reliable data sources.

This meeting summary is intended to capture this meeting's discussion of ideas, concerns, alternative options for proposals and consensus; it is a high-level summary and not a transcript.

Key acronyms used in this document include California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), Energy Division (ED), energy efficiency (EE), working group (WG), disadvantaged communities (DAC) and hard-to-reach (HTR) communities, justice equity diversity and inclusion (JEDI), CPUC's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan (ESJ Action Plan), Program Administrator (PA), Investor-owned utilities (IOU), Regional Energy Network (REN), community-based organization (CBO), market transformation (MT), Equity Metrics Working Group (EMWG), Market Support Metrics Working Group (MSMWG), Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group (DACAG), and Compensation Task Force (Compensation TF).

Welcome & Introductions

Slides 1 - 10

Wu welcomed and introduced participants to the first huddle of the Equity & Market Support Working Group (EMSWG), and provided general reminders and Zoom etiquette. Participants were asked to introduce themselves off mute or through the chat.

To encourage a space of inclusion and diversity, Wu reviewed Meeting Norms and CAEECC Groundrules (see [Appendix B](#) for the full list).

Wu presented the meeting objectives, which included:

1. Participants have shared understanding of the background of the past Equity and Market Support Metrics working groups.
2. Participants have shared understanding of the EMSWG phases.
3. Participants share ideas on the process for completing work related to Phase I of the EMSWG.

To achieve meeting objectives, the Facilitation Team developed the following agenda:

- Introduction and Background
- [Topic 1](#): Brief History of the Equity and Market Support Metrics Working Groups
- [Topic 2](#): EMSWG Prospectus and Process
- [Topic 3](#): Discussion on Phase I work process
- Wrap Up and Next Steps

Wu asked if there were any previous members of the Equity and Market Support Metrics Working Groups who had not yet applied and are interested in joining EMSWG, that they should reach out to facilitator@caeec.org by November 3, 2023 to indicate their desire to join.

Topic 1: Brief History of Equity and Market Support Metrics working groups

Slides 11 - 23

Wu provided an overview of the history of the Equity and Market Support Metrics Working Groups, by first establishing key terms and acronyms that were used for the previous WGs and will be used for EMSWG. Wu then shared how EMSWG came to be after the two WGs identified Equity and Market Support Metrics and Indicators in 2021 that were then adopted in June 2023 in Decision 23-06-055, which orders the clarification of the adopted Indicators.

Wu noted that EMSWG is charged with clarifying thirteen adopted Equity Indicators and twenty-five adopted Market Support Indicators in Phase I of the WG. A Member from Energy Division also noted that it is up to the WG to decide on how to engage in the process of clarifying the Indicators.

Wu briefly recapped the outcomes and final recommendations from the two WGs and noted these recommendations are used by PAs to develop their energy efficiency portfolio applications and business plans.

Summary of Discussion during Topic 1

- In a discussion about goals and Ordering Paragraph 11, a Member emphasized the importance of establishing clarity on the Indicators that were adopted. Another Member asked whether the CPUC had established goals already. A Member from Energy Division replied that the CPUC had not and the Decision outlines a process for goal development.
- A Member from Energy Division emphasized the reason that EMSWG is convened is to build on the work of the two WGs by making the adopted Indicators more clear and concrete.
- A Member noted that the Indicators in the Decision are not identical, e.g. the Decision does not capture the nuance between the number of multifamily buildings versus number of multifamily participants in the Equity Indicator that counts the number of participants; that after participating in the MSMWG that there is a lot of work that needs to be done to collect data and put together information that is informative to track at the state level; and that there appears to be Indicators that were added to the Decision. A Member from Energy Division clarified that the added Indicators came from recommendations from the Disadvantaged Community Advisory Committee.

- A Member noted that consensus was not reached on defining “underserved” in the previous WGs, and asked whether full consensus is required for EMSWG. A Member from Energy Division replied that the Decision defines “underserved” and that CAEECC is a recommending body, not a decision-making body.
- A few Members asked for clarification about who the WG is directly making recommendations to. A Member from Energy Division replied that the recommendations are directed to the PAs for clarifications to include in their Advice Letter.

Topic 2: EMSWG Prospectus and Phases

Slides 24 - 47

Wu provided a brief walk-through of the EMSWG Prospectus and the two phases of the WG process: Phase I includes the required activities focused on clarifying the Indicators, identifying any to elevate as future Metrics, and establishing methods for setting baselines and valuation methods for the identified Indicators; and Phase II involves optional activities that are pending CAEECC approval.

Wu outlined the expected timeline for meetings and the report that will serve as the final deliverable to detail recommendations to the PAs, including clarifications of the adopted Indicators. Wu noted that revising the adopted Indicators, adding Indicators, and defining Segment Objectives are not included in the scope.

Wu introduced the Table of Adopted Indicators, which is a table that maps the current adopted Indicators to the 2021 recommended Indicators, as a potential template for EMSWG to use in clarifying each of the adopted Indicators.

Summary of Discussion on Topic 2

- A Member highlighted the unique role and circumstances of EMSWG and encouraged others to read the Decision 23-06-055 language, calling attention to Section 7.8 on pages 68-69. A Member from Energy Division clarified that the relevant section for EMSWG is Section 5.2, which describes the required activities whereas Section 7.8 describes the optional activities.
- A Member asked whether there is any flexibility to negotiate whether EMSWG can self-determine whether it addresses Phase I optional activities. A Member from Energy Division replied that the default is for PAs to engage stakeholders on these issues. The Member will chat offline with Wu about adjusting the PA schedule as needed and will plan to show an edited schedule that reflects the EMSWG pursuing Phase I optional activities for Meeting #1.
- A Member asked whether it would be helpful if PAs were to provide preliminary homework on this Table to the WG as a starting point. A Member from Energy Division and Wu replied that the WG Members can decide for themselves and speak more about this at Meeting #1.

- A Member asked whether revisions can be made to the Indicator language to add clarity. A Member from Energy Division replied that the language should preferably remain the same or only change modestly, but will confirm this.
- A Member asked whether the AKAB surveys are a dependency within the first Advice Letter. Wu and a Member from Energy Division replied that there is no dependency as the Awareness, Knowledge, Attitude, Behavior surveys are optional activities.

Topic 3: Discussion on Phase I work process

Slides 48 - 52

PA's Work Plan for Advice Letter preparation

Two Members who serve as PA representatives presented a draft PA Work Plan for the Working Group process, based on the Prospectus and the responsibilities and internal timelines PAs are operating under to complete the task and file the Advice Letter by May 1, 2024. The Presenters noted that the most significant difference between the expected timeline in the Prospectus and the PAs' Work Plan is that the Work Plan calls for an earlier delivery of the final report by the end of February instead of the end of March. The Presenters also noted that deciding on optional activities was moved up the schedule in the Work Plan to allow enough time to schedule any necessary meetings or homework for those activities.

Summary of Discussion on PA's Work Plan

- A Member asked in the chat to clarify the cycle(s) in which the Work Plan will take place. A Member from Energy Division replied that EMSWG is focusing on the 2024-2027 cycle, which is the first half of an eight-year cycle, and noted that the adopted Indicators will be active starting in January 1, 2024, with the expectation that the PAs will include them in their Q1 report and that the Indicators will be clarified by the next quarterly report.
- A Member from Energy Division raised concern with the timeline presented in the PAs' Work Plan, noting that there is not enough time for WG Members to deliberate and present recommendations in a final report, especially with upcoming holidays and vacations. Two Members in the chat agreed with the concern raised. A Presenter replied that PAs need a minimum of 6 weeks for internal coordination and legal review before filing the Advice Letter, and suggested Members consider whether more meetings should be scheduled as optional.
- A Member asked for clarity on the Table of Adopted Indicators, e.g. whether PAs meant to fill in the "numerator" and "denominator" columns, and suggested to add Huddle #3 back into the Work Plan as a placeholder if more discussion is needed. A Presenter replied with a suggestion to connect with the BayREN

representative who was present in the PA discussions about the Table, and agreed to add Huddle #3 back in.

PA's Review of Table of Adopted Indicators

Wu walked through a draft Table of Adopted Indicators, which includes all adopted Indicators and identifies different components that need information to support clarification. Wu noted that the PAs reviewed the Table and suggested edits to the structure, and the Table is open to feedback from EMSWG. Wu also shared the 2022 Proposed Methodology Framework as a potential starting point to identify how there will be more clarity provided around the Indicators.

Wu shared that the primary intent of sharing the Table is to introduce a possible work process for the WG and asked whether working through the Table is the most productive way to provide input to the PAs or if there are other methods for providing feedback on clarifying the adopted Indicators.

Summary of Discussion on Table of Adopted Indicators

- A Member from Energy Division asked whether there will be opportunity for the WG to discuss the framework/format of the Table. Wu replied that there will be discussion on this in Meeting #1.
- A Member noted that numbers for numerators and denominators were never collected for Indicators, just Metrics, and asked whether EMSWG will be filling in numbers for Indicators that do not have targets yet. Another Member replied that at least on the Equity side, the numbers were aspirational and doesn't recall whether all the numbers were filled in for Equity Indicators. A Member from Energy Division asked in the chat whether filling in the numerators and denominators would depend on what the Indicator is collecting. A Member added that the numerator and denominator in the table refers to a ratio so that's why the denominator is blocked out for "counting" Indicators and only pertains to ratio or percent Indicators. A Member agreed with the previous comment and clarified that Indicators do not have targets and the WG exercise is to address how Indicators will be tracked.
- A Member noted the challenges in defining data sources for the Indicators and uplifted the importance of ensuring that PAs and third-party implementers have the confidence to be able to capture and collect recommended data, and also added in the chat PAs and third-party implementers will need to have similar data dictionaries in order to capture the elements the WG is trying to track. Another Member noted in the chat about having a similar question, e.g. how capable the PAs feel about identifying HTR and DAC participants across their programs for reporting at the portfolio level. A Member from Energy Division added in the chat that any challenges or concerns with data sources should be documented. A PA Member agreed with the importance of aligning definitions and information between PAs and implementers.

- A Member asked who is expected to fill out the Table. Wu replied that this is a question for the WG of whether Members who are not PAs and implementers should be responsible for filling in the spreadsheet. The Member replied that it is critical to hear from non-PAs and non-program implementers, such as in defining denominators.
- A Member asked for clarification about the different interpretations of what equity target participants meant in Equity Indicator 1. A Member replied in the chat that “equity target participant” and “equity segment participant” are both defined in the Decision language.
- A Member noted hoping to discuss bigger picture questions in Meeting #1, e.g. clarifying how participants are defined for HTR, DAC, and equity Indicators. A Member in the chat added that there may be a larger issue to discuss on this that leads to meaningful goals that CAEECC seeks, having to do with how the metric of equity versus inequity baselines (and changes) are measured.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Slides 53 - 56

Wu provided a recap of the day, reminded participants of the Huddle objectives, and shared next steps, including Meeting #1 on Tuesday, November 7 where WG members can talk in more detail about Phase I activities, meeting schedule, and the Table.

Summary of Discussion on Next Steps

- A Member noted that the PAs will send an updated version of the Work Plan and invite Members to provide feedback through email to discuss at Meeting #1.
- A Member asked about the feedback process for the Table. Wu suggested sending any feedback or comments to update the Table prior to Meeting #1.
- Two Members noted that neither PAs nor WG Members have enough time to work on the report and Advice Letter and asked whether it is unreasonable to ask for an extension request. A Member from Energy Division replied that the objective is to ensure PAs have clarity on the Indicators by the second quarterly report and that these Indicators lead up to future work that will result in goal development, and noted that delaying the Advice Letter submission will give less time for certainty for the quarterly reporting.

Appendix A: Attendees

Organization	Name
CAEECC Members	
3C-REN	Erica Helson
AMBAG	Amaury Berteaud
BayREN	Jane Elias
BayREN	Mary Sutter
Mendota Group	Grey Staples
Oracle	David Siddiqui
PG&E	Moses Gastelum
PG&E	Rob Bohn
Resource Innovations	Chrissy Crowell
SBUA	Ted Howard
SCE	Gary Golden
SCE	Jessica Lau
SDG&E	Stacie Risley
SDG&E	Stephanie Guterrez
SJVCEO	Courtney Blore Kalashian
Silent Running LLC	James Dodenhoff
SoCalGas	Halley Fitzpatrick
SoCalREN	Fernanda Craig
SoCalREN	Lujuana Medina
The Energy Coalition	Rebecca Hausheer
The Energy Coalition	Natalie Espinoza
William Worthen Foundation	Alice Sung
Ex-Officio	
CPUC, Energy Division	Coby Rudolph
CPUC, Energy Division	Pam Rittelmeyer
CPUC, Energy Division	Ely Jacobsohn
CPUC, Public Advocates Office	James Ahlstedt
Other Interested Stakeholders	
I-REN/WRCOG	Benjamin Druyon
Franklin Energy	Brett Bishop
Lifers Leaving a Legacy	Charles Reed

Frontier Energy	Conor Moar
PG&E	Conrad Asper
SDG&E	DeDe Henry
City of Chula Vista	Dennis Gakunga
DAC	Don Arambula
SCE	Elizabeth Gomez
CPUC	Emily Pelstring
SDG&E	Jen Palombo
Grounded Research	Jenn Mitchell-Jackson
Valley Clean Air Now	Jessica Alzofon
Frontier Energy	Jesse Farber-Eger
SoGalGas	Kevin Ehsani
PG&E	Lindsey Tillisch
Frontier Energy	Margaret Marchant
Frontier Energy	Nancy Barba
Resource Innovations	Nils Strindberg
Lincus	Patrick Ngo
CPUC	Peter Franzese
SoCalGas	Sandra Gonzalez
PG&E	Sebastien Csapo
SoCalRen	Tessa Charnofsky
Valley Clean Air Now	Tom Knox
Facilitators	
Katie Wu	Common Spark Consulting
Sooji Yang	Common Spark Consulting
Susan Rivo	Raab Associates

Appendix B: Meeting Norms & Groundrules

Meeting Norms

To encourage a space of inclusion and diversity, meeting participants were asked to agree to the following meeting norms:

- Make space, take space (share the mic).
- Stories shared here stay here; what is learned here leaves here.
- Share your unique perspective: share your unpopular opinion.
- Generative thinking: "yes, and" instead of "yes, but".
- Listen from the "We", speak from the "I".
- Offer what you can; ask for what you need.
- Be inquisitive.

- Assume best intent and hold each other accountable.
- Be empowered to share impact.

Creating a space of inclusion and diversity

Groundrules

1. Attend all meetings (or send designated alternate)
2. Do your homework (complete pre-and post-meeting work to ensure productive meetings and that a complete deliverable is finalized)
3. Facilitation team posts materials 5 days before the meeting
4. If there are recommendations you don't agree with, propose alternatives or think creatively to try to bridge the gap

See Goals, Roles & Responsibilities for the full list of Ground Rules:

<https://www.caeccc.org/caeccc-info>