

CAEECC EMSWG Meeting #5 Summary

Date: Wednesday, January 24, 2024

Time: 9:00 am - 12:00 pm PT

On January 24, 2024, the Equity & Market Support Working Group (EMSWG) met for its fifth Meeting via Zoom. There were 34 attendees, including representatives from 17 EMSWG Member organizations and 3 representatives from Ex-Officio agencies, as well as 17 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.

Supporting meeting materials are available at:

<https://www.caeec.org/equity-market-support-wg-mtg>. Relevant materials include:

- Agenda (01-24-2024 EMSWG Meeting #5 - Agenda (posted 01-17-2024))
- Slide Deck (01-24-2024 EMSWG Meeting #5 - Slide Deck (posted 01-17-2024))
- Consolidated Responses - Funding-related Indicators (Consolidated Responses - Funding-related Indicators (posted 01-17-2024))

Overview

Key Meeting Takeaways:

- Program Administrators (PAs) need the final EMSWG Report by March 15 to develop the Joint Advice Letter for submittal by May 1, 2024. Members raised concerns about the tight timeline and discussed whether an extension would be appropriate.
- Participants discussed definitions for non-ratepayer in-kind funds/contributions, private capital, market-rate capital, and capital accessed via energy efficiency programs. Facilitators will send out draft definitions for Working Group feedback.
- Participants discussed Market Support Indicators #22 and #23, finding that the Indicators need more clarification and discussion on what is meant to be captured.

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 that may be 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, 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), Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group (DACAG), and Total System Benefits (TSB).

Welcome & Introductions

Slides 1 - 4

Wu welcomed and introduced participants to the fifth meeting of the EMSWG. Wu presented the meeting objectives, which included:

1. Clarify definitions for terms used in Market Support Indicators #2, 17, & 25
2. Discuss other priority Market Support Indicators

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

- Welcome
- Updates from PAs
- [Topic 1](#): Non-ratepayer in-kind funds / contributions
- [Topic 2](#): Private Capital
- [Topic 3](#): MS Indicator #25
- [Topic 4](#): Other Priority Market Support Indicators
- Wrap Up and Next Steps

Updates from PAs

Slide 5

A PA Member presented a working draft of the Joint Advice Letter addressing Indicators and Common Metrics, which will be circulated to the working group closer to the date of submittal (expected May 1, 2024). The Advice Letter will contain the following attachments: (1) CAEECC Final Report, (2) Compilation of all D.23-06-055 Indicators that have been clarified, (3) Modification of indicators/common metrics or removal, suspension, modification from D.18-05-041, and (4) Non-Consensus Items (if applicable). Ordering Paragraph 11 of D.23-06-055 also requires PAs to identify any information that could be used as baselines for future targets. PAs welcome any feedback on the outline of attachments and considerations about information to use for baselines.

Another PA Member presented a schedule for the Advice Letter process and noted that PA need the final Working Group Report by March 15 to meet the Advice Letter submittal deadline (May 1, 2024). Outside of the WG, PAs will be working separately on clarifying any Indicators not undertaken in the CAEECC EMSWG, addressing Indicators and Common Metrics from the 2018 Decision, and baselines. If the WG is interested, the PAs could pursue an extension with ED.

Summary of Discussion on Updates from PAs

- A Member asked why an Advice Letter is required.
 - A PA Member replied that a Tier 2 Advice Letter is due no later than May 1, 2024, in compliance with OP 11 of D.23-06-055. A Tier 2 Advice Letter does not require Commission Vote though ED is required to review and approve or reject the Letter.
- A Member raised concern about whether a draft report can be delivered by the PAs' internal deadline (March 15, 2024), and asked whether a one-month extension is necessary.
 - A PA Member agreed and noted willingness to ask for an extension, but will know with greater certainty whether it's needed by the end of the next meeting (January 31, 2024).
 - A Member from ED noted that any request should convey what is anticipated to get done in the requested timeframe and how an extension may impact reporting (e.g., whether there will be any delays).
 - A PA Member noted that a one-month extension would not cause a reporting delay as reporting is quarterly-based. However, PAs will work on scenarios of an extension longer than one month.
- A Member from ED shared that identifying which Indicators might be useful for baselines in terms of future targets and goals may be helpful, but this is not a top priority of the WG. The OP 11 language about baselines was intended to be flexible.
- A PA member suggested conducting a survey of which Indicators could serve as a potential baseline in the future and adding a bike rack item about baselines to the January 31st meeting.
 - Wu replied that this item will be added.

Topic 1: Non-ratepayer in-kind funds / contributions

Slides 6 - 8

Wu presented the suggested definitions of “non-ratepayer in-kind funds / contributions” from the [homework assignment](#), as well as listed the Market Support Indicator (#2) that includes the term. Wu then guided the group through discussion questions (*italicized below*) while she live-edited notes onto the slide (screenshot included below).

MS #2	Dollar value of non-ratepayer in-kind funds/contributions utilized via partnerships (A, P)
--------------	---

Summary of Discussion on Non-ratepayer in-kind funds / contributions

Should the word "funds" be removed from this Indicator?

- A PA Member shared confusion about whether the words of the Indicator can be changed.
 - A Member noted that since “in-kind” denotes no dollar amount while “funds” means a dollar amount, eliminating “funds” might change the meaning of the Indicator but may also help clarify it.
 - A Member commented that “in-kind” can refer to staff time, so a monetary value can be added to staff time so that a dollar amount can be reported, and suggested the Indicator language is fine as is since it is meant to capture any actual monetary contribution in a partnership. Another Member agreed.
 - A Member noted the need for transparency on how any contributions are valued in dollars and what the contributions are exactly.
- Wu asked if the Indicator language is fine as is, and whether it's the Working Group's understanding that the Indicator is intended to capture both monetary and nonmonetary contributions.
 - A Member suggested separate reporting between monetary and nonmonetary contributions. A number of Members agreed.
 - A PA Member replied that if including monetary contributions is not duplicative of another Indicator, then the language is fine as is.
- A Member asked for an example of how this Indicator may apply to programs.
 - A PA Member replied that IOUs typically don't have services for programs that IOUs don't pay for, so there's confusion as to how this Indicator is relevant.
 - A PA Member noted that the past MSMWG intended the Indicator to put a monetary value on both actual funds and/or the in-kind contributions that are not financial in nature from the PAs' perspective while Market Support Indicator #20 captures the value of the partnership to the partner.

What is the PAs' current thinking about how to assign a dollar value to a non-monetary contribution?

- A Member commented that there needs to be transparency in how in-kind contributions are assessed. When PAs, particularly RENs, put grants in place, challenges come up with inputting In-kind contributions, such as energy efficiency public service announcements (PSA), which are challenging to determine a monetary value. Another Member agreed and added that both parties need to be in agreement of the valuations.
- Wu asked how the Indicator is expected to appear in the reporting.
 - A PA Member replied that there will be a lot of calculations necessary to support these Indicators, so it may look like a workbook to document how the PAs arrived at some of the Indicators. PAs may need to consider an alternative where supporting data and calculations are provided through a data request, as filing that additional information may be overwhelming. A number of Members agreed.

- A Member commented that the reporting should be publicly accessible as opposed to accessed through a data request.

What does the Energy Division and/or the Commission seek to understand through this Indicator? Put another way, how might the data from this indicator be used to improve EE programs?

- A Member from ED noted that this Indicator, along with others, help create a picture of how effective the PAs are at engaging the rest of the market and getting the rest of the market to invest in EE. It is important to know the long-term growth of the EE market and to assess how well the long-term growth is going to be achieved in addition to how much investment is going into the market outside of ratepayers.
- A PA Member commented that these Indicators serve to create accountability for Market Support programs, e.g. capturing the dollar value of partnerships from the partners' and PAs' perspectives is important, and noted that a public workbook of how PAs arrived at a dollar value (e.g. for items like staff time) may present a confidentiality issue so a data request may be better option.
- A Member asked what the ED meant by the "rest of the market."
 - A Member from ED replied that the EE market consists of ratepayer-funded programs, as well as programs, products, and services delivered outside of ratepayer-funded programs. The ED is looking to see how well ratepayer-funded EE programs can work with the other pieces of the market.

Discussion Questions:

1. Should the word "funds" be removed from this indicator?
2. What is the PAs current thinking about how to assign a dollar value to a non-monetary contribution?
3. What does the Energy Division and/or the Commission seek to understand through this Indicator? Put another way, how might the data from this indicator be used to improve EE programs?

Live-edit Notes:

- Eliminating "funds" might change the meaning of the Indicator; it could also clarify the indicator as "in kind" typically means non-monetary
- "In kind" is often assigned a dollar value (e.g., for staff time)
- Language of the indicator should capture both monetary and non-monetary contribution
- Fine to capture both funds and add it to a monetization of in kind contributions
- **Translation of in-kind to monetary value should be transparent; usually involves a lot of documentation;** there may be existing examples out there for grants
- On supporting documentation for Indicator derivation - there will be lots of calculations for all of the Indicators; submitting it all might be overwhelming so it could be available via data request; there may also be confidential information
- Recollection on this indicator is that it's the PA's perspective on value of a partnership
- **Reasonable to separate monetary contributions and in kind contributions in reporting**
- Example of in kind contribution = Public Service Announcements - may be put in place and a dollar value needs to be assessed on what it would have cost
- This indicator, and others, supports understanding PAs' effectiveness at engaging there rest of the market to support EE; aim to assess long term growth of EE and how much non-ratepayer funds are going towards EE
- Indicators also serve to hold Market Support activities accountable

8

Topic 2: Private Capital

Slides 9 - 11

Wu presented the suggested definitions of “private capital” from the [homework assignment](#) and Market Support Indicator #17 which includes the term. Wu then guided the group through discussion questions (*italicized below*) while she live-edited notes onto the slide (screenshot included below).

MS #17	Ratio of ratepayer funds expended to private capital leveraged by sector (Q, P)
---------------	--

Summary of Discussion on Private Capital

MS Indicator #17 compares only ratepayer funds and private capital. Federal and state funds do not fall in either of these categories. Should they be included? Put another way, should "private capital" be broadened to "non-ratepayer funds"? Are customers / program participants the only source for this data? How can PAs obtain data on private capital (or non-ratepayer funds) without being invasive?

- A Member asked for clarification on which programs this Indicator would report on, and commented that from a Resource Acquisition standpoint, private capital means the contribution of the program participant to access a Resource Acquisition program (i.e, the customer's cost/payment for an energy efficiency measure of service).
 - Wu replied that the Indicator is at the portfolio level, capturing Equity, Market Support, and Resource Acquisition programs.
- A PA Member commented that this Indicator was a last-minute addition in the past MSMWG by CAEATFA (California Energy and Advanced Transportation Financing Authority) and CHEEF (California Hub for Energy Efficiency Financing) to make an argument that Market Support programs could support access to capital. The Indicators were originally meant to capture Market Support programs that were intended to help customers to access capital that would be more cost-effective than capital accessed elsewhere but the Decision expands the Indicator to capture data at the portfolio level. Regarding the question about federal or state funding, an argument can be made that a Market Support program, for example, engaged a customer who is unable to access federal or state funding. Broadly speaking, it is difficult to prove how a Market Support program enables access to funding that is widely available.
 - A Member added that there are seven Market Support programs that are providing financing through energy efficiency products, three of them are on-bill financing, two of them are new finance offerings, and two others that are slightly different.
 - A Member asked in the chat why these programs should be measured as performance Indicators as they seem to not provide any service.

- A Member commented that federal and state funding are public funds by nature and thus should not be considered private capital.
- A Member commented in the chat that in the case of competitive grant programs, technical assistance and support from a ratepayer-funded program to create the scope for a project, could be critical to accessing capital. An example in the public sector could look like a program providing technical support to a public agency to find EE opportunities and calculate potential savings. The agency could then use that information to apply for a competitive grant/loan program.
 - A Member asked whether small BIPOC-owned businesses and residents in impacted environmental justice communities could equitably access private capital for energy efficiency programs.
 - A Member replied that a program could help BIPOC-owned businesses and residents in impacted environmental justice communities access capital by providing assistance.
- A Member from ED commented that if the primary objective of Market Support is long-term growth of the EE market, then it makes more sense for the Indicator to look across the whole portfolio versus just the Market Support segment, and noted that this Indicator might be best responded to using third-party data and not necessarily only program-specific data. PAs are accountable, not the programs.
- A PA Member commented that there is a tension between understanding the impact of a Market Support program and segment on the market versus the impact trends occurring at the entire market level. On one hand, if the impact on the total market level is measured, the causal relationship to a specific Market Support program is not captured. On the other, if the impact of an individual Market Support program is measured, then the bigger picture is not captured.
- A Member commented that the past MSMWG discussed this Indicator in terms of loans as it is an Indicator already captured by CHEEF. Broadening the Indicator to the portfolio level needs clarification on how private capital is counted to ensure this Indicator could work across all of the programs and allow for any comparison of ratepayer funds to private capital and purchase of equipment. A PA Member agreed and added that expanding the Indicator to Resource Acquisition programs may mean the data may not be available for Q2 reporting since PAs may not be currently collecting the data.

Wu summarized that private capital includes funding controlled by either an individual or company (e.g. loans) to support EE activities, and asked how data on private capital can be obtained without being invasive to the customer.

- A Member replied that the scale of undertaking data collection of Resource Acquisition programs is significant, asked for an example of private capital being contributed to a Market Support program, and noted that doing a study to determine what amount of private capital contributes to EE does not seem possible at a program or portfolio level.

- A PA Member provided an example of a Market Support program supporting access to private capital by sharing that the PA leveraged state funding to enhance and expand services in addition to access to funding.
- A few Members commented that including public funds could create confusion and should not count as private capital.
- A Member commented that if the intent of the Indicator is to track how well programs are helping ratepayers access capital, then it would make sense to apply the Indicator more broadly. From the perspective of the program participant, the end result would be similar in the sense that the project gets funded whether it's with private or public funding.
- A Member from ED commented that the Indicator is intended to understand how well the PA is engaging private capital into their EE programs since PAs can influence private capital into the EE market as opposed to public funding.

Wu summarized again that private capital includes any money controlled by an individual or company (e.g. loans), the Indicator is limited to private capital (public funding is not included), and there needs to be more discussion about how to count private capital across the portfolio to also include Resource Acquisition programs.

- A PA Member asked whether a participant paying with cash or getting a loan are both considered private capital. If both are included in the Indicator, then incremental measure costs could be used.
- A Member commented that funding controlled by an individual would be included, similar to how companies in the business sector utilize their own money for Resource projects.
- A Member pointed to Market Support Sub-Objective #5 to suggest that the Indicator was envisioned to focus on any private capital that a customer would not have been able to access on their own or is not immediately available to them. For example, CHEEF on the residential side looks at people's credit scores, keeps track of how many people are able to get loans that couldn't because their original score was too low, and aims to improve people's access to capital.
- A Member from ED commented that there are several private capital types, including personal savings, and noted it would be helpful to bring in a finance expert to the discussion.
- A Member asked what the purpose of this Indicator is and how PAs are accountable for it.
 - Wu responded that the Indicator intends to provide an understanding of the ratio of ratepayer funds expended to private capital to help the reader understand what other sources of funding are coming in to support EE. The Indicators are at an early stage of clarifying what they mean, and in the future as data is collected and reported on, there will be more information to decide whether the information is meaningful or needs improvement.
- A Member noted it would be helpful to anchor the conversations with the Market Support sub-objectives.

Discussion Questions:

1. MS Indicator #17 compares only ratepayer funds and private capital. Federal and state funds do not fall in either of these categories. Should they be included? Put another way, should "private capital" be broadened to "non-ratepayer funds"?
2. Are customers / program participants the only source for this data? How can PAs obtain data on private capital (or non-ratepayer funds) without being invasive?

Live-edit Notes:

- Best understand this within the context of Resource Acquisition, where private capital would be the contribution from the program participant
- Recollection was that subobjective about access to capital was a last minute addition to the previous WG, led by CAEATFA, to indicate that MS programs can support access to capital; previous WG discussion was specific to CAEATFA and CHEEF
- Understanding is that Indicator would apply only to MS programs; need to consider what it means to apply this to Resource Acquisition programs
- Might leverage third party data in addition to program data - study on private capital accessed would be difficult and unable to be done at a program- or even portfolio-specific level
- Previous discussions were in relation to loans; CHEEF already reports data on loans
- Need more thought/discussion on how to count private capital so it can apply across all programs +1 - depending on how this is scoped, might have implications for Q2 reporting because new data may need to be collected (and scale of data collection may be large)
- Example of a MS program supporting access to private capital = leveraging ratepayer funding to help customers apply to different funding sources; value of funds that might be secured is tracked
- Example = SoCalREN has leveraged state funding to expand the services that they are able to deliver to participants; including access to financing programs
- Including public funds into this Indicator could create confusion as it is a circular issue (private becomes public becomes public)
- Expanding Indicator to include public funds would change the fundamentals of the indicator and, if public funds are to be covered, it should be separate from private capital → do not blend public and private funds in one
- Indicator meant to capture money that was accessed that otherwise would not have been (wouldn't include individual customer cost)
- Engage a financial expert to better understand how to count private capital
- Relate this Indicator back to sub-objective for Market Support: Access to Capital: Build, enable, and maintain greater, broader, and/or more equitable access to capital and program coordination to increase affordability of and investment in energy efficient projects, products, or services. [Activity e.g., access to capital]

11

Topic 3: Market Support Indicator #25

Slides 13 - 15

Wu presented the suggested definitions of "market-rate capital" and "capital accessed via EE Programs" from the [homework assignment](#), and the Market Support Indicator (#25) that includes both terms. Wu then guided the group through discussion questions (*italicized below*) while she live-edited notes onto the slide (screenshot included below).

MS #25	Comparisons between market-rate capital vs. capital accessed via energy efficiency programs (e.g., interest rate, monthly payment) (A, P)
---------------	---

Summary of Discussion on Market Support Indicator #25

Is there a difference between market-rate capital and private capital (or non-ratepayer funds)?

- A Member replied that there is no difference.
- A PA Member commented that market-rate capital would be capital or loans going out to the market whereas private capital could include funds that can be accessed internally (e.g. money in the bank). Private capital encompasses both terms.
 - A Member asked if market-rate capital is generally debt and private capital is generally equity.

- A PA Member asked how special offerings provided by PAs like on-bill financing (OBF) compare to what customers can obtain outside of the EE market.
 - A Member suggested that OBF is not market-rate capital or private capital, and asked where PACE financing falls in the Indicator.
 - A PA Member replied that PACE is not subsidized so a PACE rate versus OBF would feature differences in interest rates. The PACE rate would be a market rate.
 - A Member commented that PACE financing tends to get lower interest rates because of the lower risk associated with tying to specific property and payment streams.
 - A PA Member agreed and added that this might be a consideration when making a market rate assumption for residential customers, along with other types of loans. There is also the consideration that some types of loans might not be available to all customers due to credit worthiness.

What is the metric being collected? Is this indicator intended to compare loan terms of market-rate vs ratepayer-backed capital? Are the relative amounts of capital meant to be compared as a percentage or total dollar value (thus making the Indicator redundant to MS Indicator #17)?

- A Member commented that the Indicator, along with other related Indicators, will help readers understand whether or not these EE programs and the PAs that run them are helping to develop, build, and maintain equitable access to capital.
- A Member from ED commented that it is important to identify what type of market capital is being compared to EE capital. A PA Member questioned what level of information is required for the Indicator, e.g. what assumptions need to be made and agreed upon about future rates, etc.
- A Member shared that a 2017 market characterization of financing available to small businesses in California by Opinion Dynamics and Dunsky looked at various financing types and determined a baseline for financing that was available for small businesses.

Discussion Questions:

1. Is there a difference between market-rate capital and private capital?
2. What is the metric being collected?
 - a. Is this indicator intended to compare loan terms of market-rate vs ratepayer-backed capital?
 - b. Are the relative amounts of capital meant to be compared as a percentage or total dollar value (thus making the Indicator redundant to MS Indicator #17)?

Live-edit Notes:

- No known difference between market-rate capital vs private capital (at least to this group); though private capital could include funds that can be accessed individually (e.g., customer cost)
- Compare the terms of the loans
- Need some expert input on what types of capital to compare (maybe someone from CAEATFA or CHEEF)
- Where does PACE financing fall in this indicator? Is it market rate capital?
 - Not subsidized (is market rate) so if comparing PACE to OBF, would expect to see differences in interest rate (for example)
- Have multiple points of comparison for market rate capital
- Reference: 2017 Market Characterization of Financing for Small Businesses (Opinion Dynamics and Dunsky); could be useful for a baseline or comparison points

15

Topic 5: Other Priority Market Support Indicators

Slides 16 - 19

At the previous EMSWG Meeting #4, the Facilitation team issued a Zoom poll asking Members to prioritize other Market Support Indicators for further discussion. Members chose to prioritize Market Support Indicators #22 and #23. Wu then invited PA Members to elaborate on their questions from the homework regarding the Indicators.

- A PA Member shared that several terms in the Indicators, how the level of awareness is measured, and the denominator all need to be defined.

Summary of Discussion on Other Priority Market Support Indicators

MS #22	Percent of market participant awareness of emerging/under-utilized or existing energy efficiency products or services (A, P)
--------	--

- Wu asked if this Indicator is captured under AKAB.
 - A Member replied that this Indicator, along with Market Support Indicator #23 and others, is part of the Sub-Objective on Innovation and Accessibility. These Indicators were planned to be the ones that the Emerging Technology Program was already capturing. Market Support Indicator #22 was broadly thought about in terms of products or services and intended to work with Market Support Indicator #21 to draw a connection between the awareness of EE products and services and the

percent of market penetration of those products and services. There needs to be clarification on whether the Indicator relates to any EE product or a product available through EE programs.

- A PA Member agreed and added that there were three different approaches proposed in the past MSMWG: (1) measuring the impact of what's going on in the market as a whole through AKAB metrics; (2) taking a bottoms-up approach of adding up the individual measures and contributions from the project level to the portfolio level through Common Metrics and Equity Metrics; and (3) defining metrics for individual programs through program level metrics. The WG has chosen to do all three approaches which adds many layers of confusion as to how this Indicator can be defined across many different technologies.
- A PA Member noted that this Indicator seems to overlap with the first two AKAB Indicators in D.23-06-055. Another PA Member replied that the difference between the Indicators is that AKAB will be done at the market level (e.g., surveying customers, not necessarily participants) and Market Support will be surveying specific participants of Market Support programs so that individual program levels can be tracked to.
- A PA Member noted it would be helpful to clarify how to define emerging/underutilized technologies.
- A Member asked for clarification about what surveys are referenced in the Indicator.
 - Wu replied that the method is yet to be defined.
 - A Member from ED suggested that the WG or each PA identify a selection of technologies that are the most underutilized or the most important to then track. A PA Member agreed.

Wu summarized that the intention of the Indicator is to survey EE program participants to better understand their awareness of technologies and that there is a suggestion for the WG and/or PAs to select a subset of emerging technologies or existing measures within the EE portfolio track for this Indicator. Wu posed to the group that if a subset of technologies is chosen, would it apply broadly, for example, to Market Support Indicator #21.

- A PA Member asked if all the PAs would need to use the same survey questions and methodology on the same subset of technologies. A Member replied that the same survey should be used for an apples-to-apples comparison across PAs.
- A PA Member commented that since the Indicator says "or existing," not "and existing," a participant participating may mean that they are already aware of a product or service so this Indicator would read as 100%. Another PA Member agreed that there is confusion on how the Indicator can be interpreted and shifted based on what technologies are being tracked.

Wu summarized again that what the Indicator is intending to measure needs more clarification and discussion, and how it might be measured warrants future discussion.

MS #22

Percent of market participant awareness of emerging/under-utilized or existing energy efficiency products or services (A, P)

From 3C-REN:

- *Clarity on parameters for defining 'awareness' regarding emerging/under-utilized or existing energy efficiency products or services*
- *Clarify the methodology for measuring and verifying awareness of energy efficiency products or services among market participant*
- *Define the denominator for the percentage calculation. Considering that partners in the program are expected to have a baseline awareness, how can we accurately measure awareness while acknowledging their pre-existing involvement?*

Live-edit Notes:

- MS Indicators #22 and 23 are under the Innovation and Accessibility subobjective
- Thinking about this term of broad products or services
- MS #22 meant to work with MS #21 to understand how awareness and adoption relate
- Need clarification on whether this relate to any EE product or a product available via EE programs
- One possible Method = survey EE program participants to develop a bottom up calculation
- Methods (generally) - study impact on market as a whole (e.g., AKAB survey; doesn't indicate causation); use a bottom-up approach and cumulatively consider individual participants and measures (miss whole market impacts); use individual program metrics
- MS#22 overlaps with AKAB #1 and #2 - AKAB will be done at a market level (surveying customers, not necessarily participants)
- Given breadth/depth of products and services that this would apply to, output might not be useful
 - Follow Up/Next Step - PAs select a subset of measures to study/track
- Would all PAs use the same method and study the same products and services?
 - Using different methods could limit the ability to compare across PAs
 - Rolling up data to the statewide level may have limited value and use
- Need some more clarification as it seems any market participant is already aware of emerging or existing products or services → what is the specific thing to be aware of?

18

MS #23

Aggregated confidence level in performance verification by production, project, and service (for relevant programs) (A, P)

- A Member from ED commented that this Indicator was intended to understand how confident the PAs are in their energy savings claim, and noted that this Indicator cannot apply to every product or service, so it will have to be narrowed rather than applied to the whole portfolio.
 - A Member asked for clarification if the Indicator would be limited to Resource programs of any segment that deliver savings, not Resource Acquisition programs. A Member from ED replied that if the PAs agree to that, then it is defensible.
- A Member asked for context on how this Indicator ended up as a Market Support Indicator.
 - A Member from ED replied that the Indicator intends to provide perspective on where the PAs are having difficulty in understanding savings and whether that is specific to certain types of goods and services.
 - A Member added that it was originally meant to combine with another Indicator (the number of providers for performance verification services) to gauge the level of confidence of performance verification providers. However, the other Indicator did not make it in the final Decision.
 - A PA Member referenced the Sub-Objective on Innovation and Accessibility to share that the Indicator intended to capture whether a

customer or contractor not feeling confident about suggested savings presented a barrier for those participants to install the measures.

- A PA Member suggested clarifying this Indicator to only apply to programs that have energy savings. Another PA Member suggested that since there are no energy savings goals, achieving or contributing to Total System Benefits (TSB) might be better to broaden the scope.
- A PA Member asked for clarification on whose confidence level is being captured in the Indicator and who is providing the input to develop the output for the Indicator.
 - A Member from ED replied that it would be the PAs' confidence level that is being measured.
 - A Member commented that providing a point of certainty when the customer, contractor, PA, third-party implementer, and ex-post evaluator may all have differing notions of what the energy savings might be is misaligned with reality.
- A PA Member asked in what situations PAs would self-report low confidence and how this Indicator would be reported.

Wu summarized that clarification is still needed on what is meant by the Indicator, what is intended to be captured, whose perspective should be captured, and which programs the Indicator should apply to.

- A Member from ED suggested pausing or suspending the Indicator if there is no consensus on what to do with it. A number of Members agreed.

MS #23

Aggregated confidence level in performance verification by production, project, and service (for relevant programs) (A, P)

From 3C-REN: Criteria for accessing aggregated confidence level as well as if this pertains solely to the program itself or encompasses the performance of partners as well.

Live-edit Notes:

- Intent is to measure confidence level in EE claims; study scope likely needs to be narrowed rather than apply to the whole portfolio
- "Production" should be "product" (per previous MSMWG report)
- Would make sense to apply this to resource programs (programs that contribute to Total System Benefits)
- Is there a specific reason why this is a Market Support Indicator? In general, confidence level in EE claims is a broad issue
- Number of providers for performance verification services (not included in final Indicators) was meant to pair with this
- Performance verifiers is different from evaluators (might be ESCOs)
- Unclear if this Indicator is clearly aligned with an existing intervention
- "Aggregated confidence level" - confidence level may differ by stakeholder group; who's confidence level is referred to here? Is it the PAs' confidence level?
 - Seems likely to be the PAs' confidence level, which would be inclusive of third parties
 - May be more value in understanding customer perspective
- What is the actual reported value? Numerical? High/medium/low
 - Perhaps ask Cody C
- Could pause on reporting on this Indicator (and other unclear ones) until there is greater clarity on what is meant to be captured and how

19

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Slides 20 - 23

Wu provided a recap of the day, reminded participants of the meeting objectives, and shared next steps, including:

- Meeting #5 Summary will be posted on January 31.
- Meeting #6 will be held on January 31, 2024 from 9am-12pm PT.
- Meeting #6 materials will be posted on January 24.

Appendix A: Attendees

Organization	Name
CAEECC Members	
3C-REN	Erica Helson
AMBAG	Amaury Berteaud
BayREN	Mary Sutter
MCE	Brandon Ewart
Mendota Group	Grey Staples
Oracle/Opower	David Siddiqui
PG&E	Rob Bohn
RCEA/RuralREN	Patricia Terry
Resource Innovations	Chrissy Crowell
SBUA	Ted Howard
SCE	Gary Golden
SDG&E	Stephanie Guterrez
Silent Running LLC	James Dodenhoff
SoCalGas	Halley Fitzpatrick
SoCalREN	Patrick Ngo
The Energy Coalition	Rebecca Hausheer
William Worthen Foundation	Alice Sung
Ex-Officio	
CPUC	Pam Rittelmeyer
CPUC, Energy Division	Ely Jacobsohn
CA Public Advocates	James Ahlstedt
Other Interested Stakeholders	
BayREN	Jenn Mitchell-Jackson
Birch Road Consulting	Katie Abrams
Frontier Energy	Jesse Farber-Eger
Frontier Energy	Margaret Marchant
Frontier Energy	Nancy Barba
PG&E	Conrad Asper
SD Community Power	Sheena Tran
SDG&E	DeDe Henry

SDG&E	Jen Palumbo
SDG&E	Stacy Risley
SDG&E	Matt Saintarbor
SoCalGas	Halley Fitzpatrick
SoCalGas	Brian Johnston
SoCalREN	Tessa Charnofsky
SoCalREN	Fernanda Craig
The Energy Coalition	Natalie Espinoza
Unknown	Aaron Jones
Facilitators	
Katie Wu	Common Spark Consulting
Sooji Yang	Common Spark Consulting