

CAEECC EMSWG Meeting #1 Summary

Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023

Time: 9:00 - 12:00 pm PT

On November 7, 2023, the Equity & Market Support Working Group (EMSWG) met for its first Meeting via Zoom. There were over 43 attendees, including representatives from 18 EMSWG Member organizations and 3 representatives from Ex-Officio agencies, as well as over 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. An additional presenter included Stacie Risley of San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E).

Supporting meeting materials are available at:

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

- Agenda (11-7-2023 EMSWG Meeting #1 - Agenda (posted 11-2-2023))
- Slide Deck (11-7-2023 EMSWG Meeting #1 - Slide Deck (posted 11-2-2023, rev 11-6-2023))
- Table of Adopted Indicators (Table of Adopted Indicators (posted 10-27-2023, rev 11-2-2023))
- PA Workplan for OP 11 Tier 2 Advice Letter Workstream (PA Workplan for OP 11 Tier 2 Advice Letter Workstream (posted 11-6-2023))
- PA Starting Proposal - Table of Adopted Indicators (PA Starting Proposal - Table of Adopted Indicators (posted 11-6-2023))

Overview

Key Meeting Takeaways:

- Members discussed pursuing Awareness, Knowledge, Attitude, and Behavior (AKAB) Indicators as an optional activity in Phase 1 and decided against pursuing Common Metrics.
- Members discussed the need for alignment across the PAs on filling out the Table of Adopted Indicators before non-PA Members review the Table.
- Members discussed the need to establish consistency of definitions and the interpretations of those definitions before filling out the Table, especially definitions of hard-to-reach (HTR), disadvantaged communities (DAC), equity segment participants, equity target participants, and underserved.
- Members did not decide on a Workplan yet but will decide after working through the Equity Indicators at the next huddle/meeting.

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 - 19

Wu welcomed and introduced participants to the first meeting of the Equity & Market Support Working Group (EMSWG), and asked participants to introduce themselves through the chat.

Wu presented the meeting objectives, which included:

1. Affirm the scope of work included in the Prospectus including Phase 1 and 2 activities and related timelines
2. Confirm the structure for the Table of Adopted Indicators
3. Begin to compile information into the Table of Adopted Indicators

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

- Introduction and Background
- [Topic 1](#): EMSWG Prospectus and Phases
- [Topic 2](#): Phase 1 Work Process
- [Topic 3](#): Table of Adopted Indicators
- Wrap Up and Next Steps

Wu provided general reminders and Zoom etiquette. To encourage a space of inclusion and diversity, Wu reviewed Meeting Norms and CAEECC Groundrules (see [Appendix B for the full list](#)). Wu also asked Members to disclose financial linkage information to facilitator@caeccc.org.

Wu presented background context for the WG, including key terms, acronyms, history of the Equity and Market Support Metrics WGs that led to the opening EMSWG, and the Decision 23-06-055 language.

Summary of Discussion on background context

- A Member asked whether identifying indicators that could become metrics is intended to be included in the Advice Letter. A Member from Energy Division replied that the main priority is to clarify adopted Indicators and then to begin establishing options for Equity and Market Support goals for the Advice Letter, and noted the importance of setting goal options to identify the Indicators that should become Metrics. A Member asked how specific the goals need to be. A Member from Energy Division responded that the WG needs to define the goal constructs.
 - Wu asked Energy Division for clarification on how it envisions this information should be provided, e.g. as priorities in the Advice Letter or as a separate set of recommendations. A Member from Energy Division replied that page 70 of the Decision outlines the information to be included in a Tier 3 Advice Letter submitted no later than March 1, 2025. Wu noted the Prospectus will be updated to reflect this clarification.
- A Member asked for clarification on the order of required activities with deadlines, such as through a written bullet-point form, and asked Energy Division what its expectations are for the goals. A Member from Energy Division replied that in his perspective, it comes down to the reasonableness of ratepayer funds.
- Wu offered clarification that Indicators are used to illustrate what's occurring and to track progress, even if there are no targets or goals attached to the Indicators. A Member mentioned in the chat that Indicators can also help PAs to make adjustments to their program.
- Wu asked Energy Division for clarification on whether the WG can choose and prioritize which of the Common Metrics it would work on as an optional activity in Phase 1 while the PAs are expected to file all of them. A Member from Energy Division confirmed this.
- A Member asked a Member from Energy Division in the chat to define what he meant by "group of stakeholders" in his earlier comments and what feedback mechanisms are available to non-WG stakeholders. A Member from Energy Division replied that he was referring to EMSWG as the stakeholder engagement ED is seeking but other non-WG stakeholders are free to provide their feedback to the PAs as well. Two Members noted that the PAs are not intending to engage with stakeholders outside of the WG but are open to any feedback that comes to the WG from non-WG stakeholders.
- A Member asked about the two Tables of Adopted Indicators posted to the EMSWG Meeting #1 webpage on whether the WG is expected to work on a standardized Table or separate Tables for each PA. A Member from Energy Division replied that the goal is to achieve consistency and clarity across the PAs and for the ED to see the same definitions and applications employed by the PAs. A Member noted hoping for more consolidation and standardization across the PAs and the need for clear directions on what the WG Members should look at.

Topic 1: EMSWG Prospectus and Phases

Slides 20 - 33

Wu provided an overview of the two phases of the EMSWG process: Phase 1 includes expected activities (developing and reviewing recommended methodologies for all adopted Indicators, identifying any that can be elevated as Metrics, and identifying information that could be used as baselines for the elevated Indicators) and optional activities (clarifying or modifying Common Metrics and AKAB Indicators). Phase 2 is pending CAEECC approval to discuss topics such as Goals for the Equity & Market Support segments, Objectives for the Equity & Market Support segments, Community Engagement Indicators, and Reporting Demographic Participation Data.

Wu outlined the expected timeline for the meetings, huddles, and homework in the Prospectus and explained the required components of a final report that will serve as the final deliverable to detail recommendations to the PAs. Wu noted that revising the adopted Indicators, adding Indicators, and defining Segment Objectives are not included in the scope.

Summary of Discussion during Topic 1

- Wu asked participants to share any affirmations or reactions to the Prospectus, to which six Members expressed excitement or support. One Member noted that despite being challenging, the work is to tweak the Indicators for clarification, not to reinvent them. Another Member noted that this is an opportunity to create useful data for all to see what is occurring in the Equity and Market Support segments.
- Wu asked participants to name any barriers to the work ahead.
 - A few Members noted the need to coordinate with a lot of people, especially around the holidays, and the time it takes to do so.
 - A Member raised concern about the potential issue of trust, explaining that handing over more control can lead to earning more trust while holding control can lead to distrust. Another Member agreed in the chat.
 - A Member noted competing reporting priorities.
 - A Member of the Public noted keeping the agenda on track as discussions arise on various topics.
 - A Member suggested a maximum of 3 hours for each meeting/huddle.
- A few Members discussed aligning data reporting with the CEDARS database, and the need for CEDARS to be improved in transparency and user functionality. Wu noted that there are efforts outside of the WG to improve CEDARS, and a Member noted that SCE is currently lead on a contract to make improvements to CEDARS.
- Wu asked Members if they would be interested in taking on the Phase 1 optional activities, to which a handful of Members noted interest in taking on the AKAB Indicators as they intersect with the Equity and Market Support Indicators. A Member from Energy Division noted that since the Advice Letter addressing AKAB Indicators is due August 1, 2024, the WG could potentially extend its schedule to work on AKAB after completing Phase 1 required activities. A few Members expressed their preference to not pursue Common Metrics given the

timeline and the amount of work required to complete this activity. A Member noted the need to ensure there is room in the schedule to pivot to optional activities if the WG chooses to do so.

- Wu noted that she will update the Prospectus to include a potential meeting to discuss AKAB indicators later in the process and exclude Common Metrics from Phase 1 activities.

Topic 2: Phase 1 Work Process

Slides 34 - 37

Wu proposed a Phase 1 work process, which outlines the PAs providing a starting point by filling out the Table of Adopted Indicators, EMSWG providing feedback on the Table, PAs incorporating the feedback, and the Facilitation Team drafting the final report based on the discussions and finalized Table which EMSWG reviews and adopts to be submitted to the PAs, who will then submit their Advice Letter by May 1, 2024.

A PA Presenter shared an updated PA Workplan that includes four options: Timely Option #1 (without optional activities), Timely Option #2 (with optional activities), Extended Option #3 (without optional activities), and Extended Option #4 (with optional activities). Due to the earlier agreement to not undertake Common Metrics, the Presenter focused on Option #1 and Option #3, in which the two are the same except the latter has a one-month extension. The Presenter outlined two huddles and two meetings to deliberate the Equity Indicators and three huddles and three meetings to deliberate the Market Support Indicators, and emphasized the role of PAs filling out the Table of Adopted Indicators as homework to serve as a starting point for WG deliberation. Option #1 sets March 15 as the deadline for the EMSWG final report.

Summary of Discussion on Topic 2

- A Member asked how confident the PAs are to gain alignment on the Table and how WG Members should efficiently and effectively review the Table given there are separate tabs for each of the PAs describing different data sources and methodologies for each Indicator. Wu replied it is up to WG Members to decide how they wish to review the Table and what they need from PAs to do this.
- A few Members discussed the interest of non-PAs to provide input on the Table – one Member suggested making it optional for non-PAs to engage with the PAs' homework and another Member agreed that non-PAs are welcome to share any feedback or input on the Table so that at the next huddle or meeting, the Tables can be looked at in tandem. A Member noted preference to not fill out the Table but rather highlight potential improvements to assure standardization.
- Members discussed the importance of having a consistent understanding of terminology, such as "equity market participants," "equity program participants," "HTR," "equity target participants," and "participants." One Member noted that definitions, their source/basis, and interpretations need to be shared and deliberated. A Member from Energy Division noted that since the goal of the WG

is to create a consistent framework across PAs, that there should also be consistency in the definitions used. Another Member noted that PAs usually provide definitions in their workbooks.

- Wu noted that there is a tab in the PA Starting Proposal Table with a few CPUC definitions from the June Decision and that the Facilitation Team can coordinate with PAs to revisit the June Decision and other decisions for relevant definitions.
- A Member in the chat noted that she could share a useful map that The Energy Coalition created for all definitions based on CPUC guidance. Another Member asked if the map is granular enough to count households/customers tied to a meter. A Member replied that it does not have counts, and another Member noted that data about certain things, such as master-metered apartment buildings, will be difficult to capture but that shouldn't preclude development of meaningful Indicators.
- A Member noted that the current definition of DAC is geographically-based and straightforward whereas the definition of HTR is complicated and raises concern about whether PAs and implementers can identify customers who are HTR. Another Member noted that the June Decision refined the HTR definition, added the term "underserved," and did not address DAC. Another Member noted that while the June Decision updated the HTR definition, PAs and implementers have worked with and tracked HTR for a long time and should be capable of working with an updated definition to identify program participants. A Member asked for clarification in the chat about the definition being used to define DAC – the definition from CalEnviroScreen or from Section 75005 of the Public Resources Code. A Member replied that the underserved definition includes DAC per Section 75005 whereas the HTR criteria includes DAC pursuant to CalEnviroScreen. Another Member noted that it would be helpful to have a document of the definitions with links to their sources.
- A Member raised concern that there's overlap between equity, DAC, and HTR participants that renders some of the Indicators useless, and noted that the WG needs to determine a logic on how to prevent double-counting a single person who can be identified as more than one (DAC, underserved, and/or HTR). Another Member agreed in the chat.
- A few Members asked for clarification about where the work on AKAB Indicators will show up in the PA Workplan.
 - Wu suggested a meeting to address AKAB Indicators could occur sometime between March and May when the first round of Indicators in Phase 1 is completed, and suggested adding an addendum of WG recommendations on the AKAB Indicators to the final report before the AKAB Indicators are due August 2024 or as a separate report. Wu noted that AKAB scheduling will be revisited at the next meeting.
- Wu asked Members if there are any reactions to the PA proposed Workplan.
 - A Member from Energy Division noted that the time extension option will need to be approved. The PA Presenter noted that they are seeking

feedback now so that they can work with the legal department to file for a time extension.

- A Member from Energy Division suggested that the WG make a decision about the Workplan after the Equity Indicator huddle/meeting so that Members have informed ideas about the intensity of the work.
- A Member noted feeling hopeful to get the work done in reasonable time as the WG is tasked to clarify the Indicators, not reinvent them.
- A Member noted that a time extension may be helpful since annual reporting is due around the same time.

Topic 3: Table of Adopted Indicators

Slides 38 - 43

Due to time constraints, Wu noted that instead of opening breakout rooms during the meeting for participants to discuss which Indicators are priorities for the WG to clarify and why, that this will be assigned as homework. Wu briefly walked through the PA Starting Proposal - Table of Adopted Indicators, showing the different tabs of each PA who filled out most of the boxes for the Equity Indicators.

Summary of Discussion on Table of Adopted Indicators

- A Member walked through Equity Indicator 1 in the Table to raise questions about how the PAs plan to use the Indicators (in relation with other Indicators) by noting that Equity Indicator 1 is a count of who has energy savings or not while only 14-15 programs in the 50 Equity segment programs directly result in energy savings. A Member noted that SDG&E's intent is to capture energy savings in its portfolio of offerings in the Equity segment because it will have this information available, but every PA will respond differently to this Indicator because they have different portfolios and abilities to capture information. Another Member noted in the chat that the discrepancies between the PAs are not clear, e.g. SDG&E uses "sector participant" whereas PG&E uses "unique participant," and asked whether these numbers are baselined against numbers of potential participants. A Member agreed with the importance of raising the initial questions, noting that Equity segment programs are not 100% doing resource acquisition activities as there may be equity programs that serve more of a Market Support function. Another Member noted that even though an Equity program may not have energy savings or a resource acquisition element attributed to it, it can still have customer-related metrics that can still be useful. A Member clarified that PAs are not suggesting that every Indicator must be focused on energy savings.
 - Wu asked the Member who raised the initial questions to prepare a paragraph or note to share with WG Members to summarize the Indicators she was referring to and what broader issues need to be addressed.

- A Member noted in the chat that it is critical for PAs to sort out these discrepancies amongst each other prior to asking the non-PA WG Members to review the Table.
- A Member pointed out the need to plan how these Indicators will work together, determine how equity participants will be counted, and what methodologies are used (which would affect five of the thirteen Equity Indicators). She noted that about half of the Equity segment funds are going towards programs without energy savings, the Equity Working Group originally had separate counts for equity participants with savings and without savings, and Equity Indicator 3 goes beyond the bounds of the Equity segment budget and into the Market Support segment so there's a need to clarify who is counted in Equity Indicators 1, 3, and 4. She suggested as an example, Equity Indicator 1 can count everyone (whether they are supported or have energy savings or not), Equity Indicator 3 can count people who do not have energy savings and Equity Indicator 4 counts people with energy savings. Three Members agreed with these comments. A Member added in the chat that Equity Indicator 4 is an Indicator of equity target participants in resource acquisition by segment and by sector. A Member from Energy Division noted that the ED sees utility to Equity Indicators 4 and 5 to see how many equity target participants are participating in resource programs and whether these programs are performing well.
- A few Members discussed the overlap and confusion between HTR, DAC, equity target participants, equity market participants, and underserved. A Member noted that defining who is included in the Equity segment as a subset of the entire market is critical to prevent double counting. Another Member suggested that defining equity target participants as customers who meet the definition of either DAC, underserved, or HTR could greatly reduce the issue of double counting. A Member suggested that putting together a matrix of definitions might be helpful.
- Wu suggested using the next huddle and meeting to establish consistency in definitions and interpretations of those definitions before diving into the Table, as well as noted that the Facilitation Team is open to any feedback on how to approach the work and what to prioritize.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Slides 44 - 47

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

- Requesting responses by November 14 on a Doodle poll that will be sent to determine meeting and huddle dates in December and January
- Requesting feedback on what Indicators should be prioritized
- Following up with PAs about the Workplan
- Inviting non-PA Members to provide feedback on the Table as optional homework

Appendix A: Attendees

Organization	Name
CAEECC Members	
3C-REN	Erica Helson
AMBAG	Amaury Berteaud
BayREN	Jane Elias
Code Cycle	Dan Suyeyasu
Mendota Group	Grey Staples
Oracle	David Siddiqui
PG&E	Moses Gastelum
RCEA/RuralREN	Stephen Kullmann
Resource Innovations	Chrissy Crowell
SBUA	Ted Howard
SCE	Gary Golden
SDG&E	Stephanie Guterrez
SJVCEO	Courtney Blore Kalashian
Silent Running LLC	James Dodenhoff
SoCalGas	Halley Fitzpatrick
SoCalREN	Lujuana Medina
The Energy Coalition	Rebecca Hausheer
William Worthen Foundation	Alice Sung
Ex-Officio	
CPUC	Pam Rittelmeyer
CPUC, Energy Division	Ely Jacobsohn
Cal Advocates	James Ahlstedt
Other Interested Stakeholders	
SDCP	Aisha Cissna
PG&E	Charles Ehrlich
PG&E	Conrad Asper
PG&E	Rob Bohn
SDG&E	DeDe Henry
SDG&E	Jen Palombo
BayREN	Jenn Mitchell-Jackson
Frontier Energy	Jesse Farber-Eger

ICF	Jesse Feinberg
SCE	Jessica Lau
SoGalGas	Kevin Ehsani
PG&E	Lindsey Tillisch
BayREN	Mary Sutter
High Sierra Energy Foundation	Pam Bold
SoCalGas	Sandra Gonzalez
SDG&E	Stacie Risley
SoCalRen	Tessa Charnofsky
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.caeec.org/caeec-info>