

Evolving CAEECC WG Process Survey

Twenty (20) total survey respondents, 19/20 were ECWG Members and 6/20 were Full CAEECC Members.

Survey Response Summary

The following table is by number of respondents (20)

I completed the following written assignments (select all that apply):	CAEECC Members (# out of 6)	Non-CAEECC Members (# out of 14)	ALL (# out of 20)
Homework Before Meeting #2: Consensus, Productive Collaboration, Prospectus Activity	4/6	11/14	15/20
Homework Before Meeting #3: CAEECC Purpose, Scope, and Objectives, ECWG Prospectus, Values and Principles	3/6	10/14	13/20
Survey after Meeting #3 to prioritize topics	4/6	9/14	13/20
Written Statement for 11/29 Full CAEECC Meeting	1/6	6/14	7/20
Written Reflection for 5/15 Full CAEECC Meeting	2/6	9/14	11/20
None of the above	1/6	0/14	1/20

The following table is the Average (AVG) and Median (MED) of respondent categories.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements;	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
The overall goals and objectives as outlined in the original ECWG scope of work were clearly articulated.	4.8	5	3.4	4	3.9	4
The overall goals and objectives as outlined in the original ECWG scope of work were accomplished.	2.7	2	2.8	3	2.8	2
The homework between meetings was an effective way to develop draft recommendations for the entire WG to consider.	3.5	3.5	3.2	3	3.3	3

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements;	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
Presentations and Documents throughout the ECWG process were clear and helpful.	4.5	5	3.5	4	3.8	4
The timeframe of 6 months for 4 WG Meetings and 6 months for ECWG Final Reflections was sufficient.	4.5	5	1.8	1	2.8	2
ECWG Members were flexible in seeking outcomes that were potentially mutually agreeable, where applicable.	3.0	3	4.5	5	3.9	4
The facilitator(s) were effective in running the ECWG process (e.g., fostering constructive and efficient WG meetings, productive process between meetings, being impartial and inclusive, facilitating consensus building, ensuring that no one dominated discussions, and accurately documenting outcomes in a timely fashion).	3.7	4	2.6	3	3.0	3
All things considered, this ECWG process was successful in meeting its goals and objectives and yielding productive outcomes.	2.8	2.5	2.4	2	2.5	2
The ECWG process created relatively more value than would have likely been the case if the deliberations had remained at the CPUC (for example, regarding additional insights, greater specificity, higher degree of convergence and attainment of consensus on issues, and/or more timely outcome).	4.3	4.5	3.7	4	3.9	4
The ECWG was a trusting and inclusive environment.	3.0	3	3.0	2	3.0	2

Open Text Responses

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to questions about the ECWG goals and objectives.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
The overall goals and objectives as outlined in the original ECWG scope of work were clearly articulated.	4.8	5	3.4	4	3.9	4
The overall goals and objectives as outlined in the original ECWG scope of work were accomplished.	2.7	2	2.8	3	2.8	2

CAEECC Members

- Given the dynamics of the ECWG and the shift in its process and meeting structure, no recommendations were developed by the ECWG as a whole. Instead, members of ECWG - if they chose to - submitted reflections.
- I attended several of the meetings but had a consultant attend all meetings on behalf of my organization [redacted]. I was not as up to speed as our consultant was.
- In retrospect, there was too much in the prospectus for the timing of the group. I also reiterate that we needed time to work with the members to set the scope, but I believe we were under the impression we didn't have enough time to do so.
- It was a well-thought-out effort, but the goals and objectives document was dense, making it difficult for the group to align on a path forward. Attempts to simplify were not successful.
- The WG veered off-course early on and was not able to get back to the goals and objectives.

Non-CAEECC Members

- Goals and objectives were somewhat clear but the goals and objectives of the CAEECC group were only somewhat clear as well
- A better process for the ECWG to reconfirm from the CDEI REport directly, and/or establish its own ECWG goals, should have begun with a more fully comprehensive review and understanding of the CDEI and its report. Instead, what was presented to us, in- stead of developed and built upon an understanding of the comprehensive Recommendation of the CDEI WG was a CAEECC pre-approved shortened Prospectus, filtered by the Facilitation team presentations exclusive of much serious discussion, reference to CDEI Recommendations (many which were excellent, but never followed.) See pages starting with 26, and include Appendices through App. 5 for examples of good recommendations that were never implemented or followed procedurally.
- The Scope of Work was clearly written but I felt the orientation and initial sessions did not clearly articulate the goals and objectives. In addition to a more comprehensive

articulation of goals and objectives, including a more thorough run-through of the previous work (eg briefing us on the CDEI working group process and results), I think more orientation and open question and discussion times were needed for the goals to be articulated.

- The facilitators were not capable of managing an equity building process. They instead used bullying as a management tactic. Even when asked directly to clarify assignments, they remained vague.
- The CAEECC was genuinely unaffected by our commitment and were even less impressed with our final product, because it stressed EQUITY despite market rate conduct as it is presently practiced.
- Because the group was dismantled, it decreased the ability to gain more clarity on the goals of the group and fulfill them.

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to questions about the ECWG homework.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
The homework between meetings was an effective way to develop draft recommendations for the entire WG to consider.	3.5	3.5	3.2	3	3.3	3

CAEECC Members

- I think HW would have been an effective way to develop recommendations if everyone had done it, and most importantly, if all members had understood/been on the same page on what was expected of them. Unfortunately, given the dynamics and certain personalities, the HW didn't serve its intended purpose. However, the HW content was helpful to see what others in the ECWG were thinking about and to generate discussion topics.
- Our consultant completed all homework assignments on behalf of my organization [redacted] and provided responses to contribute to the discussions.
- It was a lot but we needed to advance ideas in between. I think that in other working groups we had individual members lead informal meetings to advance ideas, which worked well and built collaboration. Perhaps that would have been a better model for this group in hindsight.
- Google docs provided transparency but also influenced responses and likely led to participants filtering potentially conflicting views with other participants. It also took extra time and was somewhat confusing to navigate.
- Homework assignments did not seem helpful.

Non-CAEECC Members

- The homework included the kind of discussion that I thought would/should take place during the ECWG meetings.
- The questions posed in the homework were often either not meaningful or confusing/obfuscating of real issues at hand. they were often framed in a such a way as to elicit a biased response or unactionable opinions. I felt the "right" questions were not often posed, and if/when they were decent questions, they weren't generative enough.
- The home work after each of the initial meetings was a great way to better understand the issues and tasks required by ECWG members and provided a better opportunity for members to learn from each other than during the live meetings.
- Homework B served as a great starting point to generate questions that I expected would lead to productive conversations during the subsequent meeting. However, I felt that the meeting structure did not allow enough time for these discussions, which could have been more beneficial. The second Homework assignment, asking us to draft purpose, objectives, scope, etc., was too obscure and ambitious, and the lack of proper facilitation through this Homework C process was the primary reason the group experienced internal conflict. Too many of the key Community of Concern participants were not resourced to jump in and draft language. We needed to have group conversations on the topics to best create meaningful contributions. The hastiness and pressure from the facilitators to rush through the process incited fears in some that we were being railroaded into consenting to language that had not been created through consensus (as we had been promised) and did not reflect our collective thoughts. One particular ECWG typed their concern over the process into the document and the facilitation team did not adequately address their concerns and instead, seemingly marginalized her voice by moving her comments to another section. It would have been more helpful if we could have had a pop up survey of the group regarding the comments that challenged the group process or some other approach to address the concerns raised instead of pushing through with trying to get the group to create purpose, scope, etc. Additionally, break-out discussions on the purpose, goal, and scope during a meeting would have been a much better way to generate group content on the topic that could have drafted collective language drafts that could have been polished further with homework between meetings instead of trying to get us to develop our ideas initially in the homework between meetings time. What was most frustrating was the facilitation teams inability to read the room and understand a minor pivot was needed. This lack of action resulted in a sense of mistrust in the group and ultimately the facilitation team feeling too much conflict had emerged and shutting down the process.
- With no guidance provided, the ENTIRE group was unable to complete assignments as they were assigned. This led to confusion. That confusion led to the ECWG members having to organize themselves to get the work done.
- It depends on the commitment made by WG Participants. Although the language used in this field is highly technical and confusing to industry insiders let alone novices in this work. Language needs to be dumbed down.
- I liked being able to see others work and feel unified as the document formed

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your responses to questions about the ECWG presentations and documents.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
Presentations and Documents throughout the ECWG process were clear and helpful.	4.5	5	3.5	4	3.8	4

CAEECC Members

- For the meetings I attended, and from what I can recall, the presentations and documents sufficiently explained the goals and objectives we were trying to accomplish. The discussions during the meeting is where things became befuddled and unclear.
- I have not reviewed them in some time, but I recall feeling that they felt dense at times. Comments were often made at various stages that derailed the conversation or made it challenging to make progress.
- Presentations were dominated by facilitators. It would have been helpful to hear from members of the WG or other experts when topics were unclear.

Non-CAEECC Members

- Lots of jargon, lots of assumptions re common understanding of terms and intentions
- I felt the slides /presentations were often filtered somehow, biased, or presented in such a way as to "avoid controversy " thus "what policies, procedures, structures, instruments(documents) and systems needed changing and how to move towards equity, environmental and social justice was never discussed. And equity and social justice was certainly never discussed in the full ECWG through recognitional, procedural, distributive nor restorative terms. They were never discussed at all, (only raised as issues a few of us wanted to talk about how to resolve,) as after only 2 meetings, either the Facilitation team lacked skillsets/capacity or pressures from some folks who felt "uncomfortable" (hint: I don't know who these voices were with the power to shut things down, but I strongly believe this was NOT coming from any independent ECWG Collective or Compensation Pilot members.) Perhaps a requirement for participation in the CAEECC and any working groups such as ECWG without BIPOC, LI, disability, or marginalized community member lived experience and a certain level of culturally informed community engagement and racial equity training should be mandatory; but importantly, not be funded by public monies as free riders of PPP funds, but qualifications they may be privileged to gain from their own employment.
- Most of them provided clarity, but some presentations were too long and took too much time on defining community agreements, values, etc. Those should be clear from the beginning and could be proposed in a more concise form by the facilitators with little need for extensive group discussion

- I saw a lot of work was put into the orientation slide deck and the meeting slide decks. I also saw that there was some genuine attempts to adapt to different needs in the group using jamboards and pop surveys. I think the level of formality of the presentations was too severe and alienating to those not regularly engaged in the highly formal CPUC settings. More could have been done to generate connection and trust during the presentations.
- I think more time was needed. I won't say it wasn't helpful, but it went 0 to 100 and not everyone was ready.
- The "how the CPUC works" training was especially poor. Facilitators used exclusionary language that did not provide clarity on the process. It only alienated people. It showed that the facilitators did not understand how to bring non-cpuc energy voices to the table in an effective manner.
- Better focus on tailoring the focus on laypeople to grasp and understand would have helped out tremendously.

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response about the written reflection timeframe.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
The timeframe of 6 months for 4 WG Meetings and 6 months for ECWG Final Reflections was sufficient.	4.5	5	1.8	1	2.8	2

CAEECC Members

- A year to do this work was definitely a very sufficient timeframe. In comparison to what other WGs in CAEECC are usually given, which is usually no more than 3 months, and considering the nature of what the ECWG discussed, a year for meetings and reflections was a good timeframe.
- I understand the need to move things along, but I felt that more time was needed to discuss the strategies to achieve the goals and objectives of this working group.
- This work needed much longer but the funding and guidance from CPUC was to speed it up.
- The timeframe was reasonable.
- Meetings were too long.

Non-CAEECC Members

- I think it was too drawn-out. I would have preferred a more compressed timeline to keep people working and learning about each other.
- the timeframe for the 4WG meeting of 6 months was too short
- The ECWG group reflections relied heavily on the time and commitment of folks who were very committed to a positive outcome without the benefit of a consultant. The heavy lift that that group accomplished was outstanding.

- The original timeframe of 6 months, with no onboarding and adequate compensation Pilot supports, with only 3-4 WG meetings, and Facilitation team unfamiliar with, or inexperienced in facilitating community-led engagement, shared leadership to self-determine decisions, was highly unrealistic. If this was partially dictated by past rulemaking policy, then these are the kinds of systemic policies and institutionalized practices that, as human construct, can and should simply be re-designed. This was some of the work I had hoped this ECWG would be resourced and supported in doing, before we were abruptly disbanded.
- The timeframe was long enough, but the process was not efficient with little progress being made.
- The timeframe was insufficient mostly because the entire process hinged on collaboration across areas of expertise (EE and ESJ). Having only 4 WG meetings with broad membership participation with a highly structured format that did not allow time for dialogue made it impossible to create recommendations that had buy in from the broad membership required to create change within CAEECC. This was the most disappointing part of the entire process.
- Given the inability of the facilitators to properly inform many of it's ECWG participants because of bullying and exclusionary language, most of the time was wasted. The final reflections wouldn't have been needed and the process would have been much more impactful. Had the trainings been SUPPORTIVE of new learners, the ask to bring JEDI to CAEECC's processes could have been effectively reached. Insterad, the bullying experienced by many of the ECWG members caused the timeline to have to shift making the reflections a triage of failed facilitator support. Disappointing
- Not enough time.
- Equity is not an easy task and takes time to gain momentum in the right direction. This really needs to be a 2 year process at minimum. The first year is to plan and the second is to implement.

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response about member flexibility.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
ECWG Members were flexible in seeking outcomes that were potentially mutually agreeable, where applicable.	3.0	3	4.5	5	3.9	4

CAEECC Members

- Before the reflections process, there were some ECWG members that were not really flexible in seeking outcomes that were potentially mutually agreeable. However, member flexibility seemed to increase during the reflection process, at least for those who worked on the group reflection/recommendations.

- I felt the meeting discussions were objective and regarded multiple points of view.
- Several ECWG members did not seem flexible during discussions, and I do not recall any mutually agreeable outcomes.

Non-CAEECC Members

- I think a number of members were not willing to compromise nor due the necessary homework to understand the situation and what was and was not possible and this caused a lot of the issues we observed.
- Thoroughly impressed with members commitment to talk through any disagreements to find common ground.
- #1, I can only speak for myself, that I felt I was open to listening to all perspectives, and finding mutual solutions as possible. Note listening to others, does does not mean I don't try to speak my position clearly, even in the face of being a lone or minority voice, nor that I cannot be persuaded, upon hearing rational positions that make sense, to change my mind. I do try to seek win-win mutual solutions. But here again is an example of a somewhat meaningless [survey] question, framed in a way so as to solicit innocuous positive responses that can be framed by the Facilitator-Evaluators, as " a positive" review of their performance. Whether any one ECWG survey respondent thinks their fellow ECWG members were "flexible" in being susceptible to going-along-with-the-decision that is the most potentially "mutually agreeable" is neither here nor there. (What is the purpose of the question, whether the majority answer agree or disagree? It would be impossible to discern whether any respondent answered the question as framed as meaning "I am flexible." or "I think those that disagreed with my opinion were INflexible," or any other interpretation in-between.) In fact, that is how the status quo and societal norms are perpetuated. (In the name of being "flexible" and going along with the norm without dissent, is how the Emperor without any clothes remains Emperor.) Having said all that, I will say that having experienced only 2 real ECWG meetings , with the majority of the 3 hours spent listening to being presented at, I can't honestly say I have any strong sense of if the whole of the ECWG members were "flexible" or not. I simply didn't get enough time in real discussion or conversations with many of them (Exception being the independent Collective that self-organized after disbanding--those folks I found to be quite forthright and "flexible." (The third meeting was the one where members simply listened to the disbanding...and tried to process it.)
- Most members were flexible, but some were not, and were able to hijack the conversation.
- Because the ECWG group was de-facto disbanded, we did not get a breadth of CAEECC member opinion in order to have the chance to disagree and be flexible. That being said, within our small, ideologically similar ECWG reflection team, we did find many opportunities to flex our plans and approaches and compromise on our final recommendations in order to accommodate the disparate opinions in the group.
- BUT, ONLY when they could work independently from the facilitators. The facilitators clearly felt threatened when equity members expressed HONEST comments on how

equity really works. This forced sub groups to form to achieve the goals despite the bullying of facilitators. Terribly unnecessary.

- Our workgroup epitomized teamwork and flexibility in every way, because we facilitated ourselves.
- Those that created our "CupCAEECC" group chose to have flexibility, despite backlash from the main group and lack of half of the WG also joining us.

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response about facilitation.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
The facilitator(s) were effective in running the ECWG process (e.g., fostering constructive and efficient WG meetings, productive process between meetings, being impartial and inclusive, facilitating consensus building, ensuring that no one dominated discussions, and accurately documenting outcomes in a timely fashion).	3.7	4	2.6	3	3.0	3

CAEECC Members

- This was unlike any other CAEECC WG. The facilitators did their best to run the ECWG process. They were often "loud" voices that at times dominated the discussions. The facilitators did their best to navigate these dynamics because I think they wanted to be respectful of these members and their expertise and lived experiences. The facilitators also shifted the meeting structure based on feedback that was provided. Their summaries of discussions and other documents were very helpful.
- Facilitation of meetings of this type and magnitude are always difficult. I feel the team did a great job handling the many personalities and opinions of the group.
- Not sure what went sideways but the dynamic in the group was challenging. Being remote was not amenable to building trust that would lead to collaborative solutions.
- The facilitators were clearly well-intentioned, experienced, and professional. However, their approach did not lead to effective meetings for this group, as the group was too large and diverse for the format.
- Facilitators were in a difficult and challenging situation. Some members dominated conversations and side conversations were distracting.

Non-CAEECC Members

- Yes, mostly. The decision to shift the process to reflections was a surprise and I think there's room for growth in how to deal with contentious situations in the future as to ensure a safe space while not marginalizing others who were showing up in good faith.
- The decision to stop all facilitated ECWG meetings was abrupt and confusing - it is still a mystery to me.

- I don't have the time or compensation to give as much constructive feedback in response to this question as I'd like. It is difficult to identify the failures now as the disbanding, and thus the ECWG engagement with the facilitators, occurred last November, 2023 (8 months ago.) The facilitation, from my experience, in general, was reflective of the norms of "0-Ignore (marginalization), 1-Inform (placation), to 2-consult (tokenization)" along the lines of the "Spectrum of Community Engagement to Ownership" by Rosa Gonzales of Facilitating Power, rather than more of "4- collaborate (delegated power) or 5-Defer to (community ownership.)" The fact that the Facilitation team could not hold space for us all beyond even 2-3 meetings, and felt compelled to keep tight control of the narrative, process, timelines, decision-making and power over us, speaks for itself.
- The facilitators faced a very challenging vocal and diverse group, which would have been hard to manage by anyone. Some members were very much dominating the conversations, and the facilitation team had great difficulty to divert that. The facilitators worked hard to move the process (of generating recommendations) forward, but they were too easily criticized by some that they did not accurately reflect member opinions. Personally, I did not feel that way, but this led to very little progress being made. While it was never communicated why the facilitation was abandoned, this was a painful reminder that in order to incorporate community voices, a different facilitation strategy is needed.
- The facilitators are clearly skilled in many ways and function well within the familiar territory of formal meetings. I also saw them make an effort to flex these standard office culture practices in small ways to ostensibly create a more welcoming environment for the broader public (ice breakers, jam boards, initial openness to pivoting to accommodate concerns of the group). I think they very poorly handled the relatively minor conflict that facilitators should expect to arise. Conflict is an inherent part of group decision-making and a skilled facilitator can leverage it to build trust and increase the group's ability to produce a meaningful contribution. The dissatisfaction that ECWG members representing Communities of Concern expressed were relatively tame, strongly worded comments expressing frustration and dissatisfaction (no curses, no name calling, no direct insults of any kind), and one instance of the meeting process being interrupted to express a desire for a more inclusive, less hierarchical meeting structure. Because the Common Spark facilitation team is branded as one with expertise in energy and social justice, it was particularly shocking that they were ill-equipped to manage even this minor conflict, and even more dismaying that instead of owning their own lack of capacity to handle the level of facilitation required, they pointed the finger at the group dynamics and essentially shut down the group process. They additionally misappropriated the Jemez Principles by calling the shutting down of the group "Letting the People Speak for Themselves." This was a particularly infuriating insult to a very important principle that asks status quo groups to create access to the decision-making process for Communities of Concern, where they can actively be heard and engage in dialogue about meaningful actions that can be taken to create more equality. Calling our

written reflections “letting the people speak for themselves” was an insult and a clear indication that Common Spark does not adequately understand what centering Environmental and Social Justice looks like. It still baffles me as to why they did not just either hold an extended group discussion session to air out whatever grievances were there or actively utilize the leadership team to help create a strategy to address the issues present. All the tools were available to them, and instead of using them, they folded. This wasted not only so many people’s time and high hopes but also a precious opportunity to prove that there is a pathway to expanding CAEECC’s decision-making structure to include Communities of Concern.

- The facilitators were woefully inadequate for this process. They did and still don't see that they are incapable of supporting equity. It is concerning that Common Spark is being hired to facilitate yet another equity project. Clearly, the people in charge of the ECWG project don't understand how badly they failed. It is a waste of ratepayer money to continue hiring them for this type of process. Maybe they are good at other CPUC projects, but equity is not one of them.
- The facilitators initially wasted another of our time in the beginning of the process and blamed the WG for being unable to reach a consensus. Yet after we refuted their opinion and fought to move forward and facilitate ourselves our progress and completion should speak for itself.
- I personally enjoyed the facilitators. Problems arise when transparency was lacking on discussions being had and personal feelings of being attacked or ignored were not addressed with the group, until it was stated the group was being closed.

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response about process success.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
All things considered, this ECWG process was successful in meeting its goals and objectives and yielding productive outcomes.	2.8	2.5	2.4	2	2.5	2

CAEECC Members

- As I mentioned before, the main objective of having one set of recommendations from the ECWG as a whole was not achieved. However, the group reflection does provide some good and solid recommendations that the CPUC should consider and implement.
- For the most part, I believe the discussions moved the group forward in a positive and productive manner. I am not entirely sure the ECWG met its goals, however.
- The outcomes from this group fell short of its original objectives.

Non-CAEECC Members

- Unfortunately, the time invested does not appear to have had any productive outcome and in fact, likely reified concerns over power structures.
- The follow up ECWG group did a great job developing useful outcomes but not sure if the CAEECC group is open to the recommendations. The jury is still out.
- The facilitated ECWG process between the summer and Nov. 2023, such as it was, was quite distressing and disappointing. The sudden and unexpected disbanding, with no real transparency or believable, rational reason given for the extreme action of disbanding was both shocking and disconcerting at best. So, again, the way this survey has bolded the words "successful, Productive' and process success" belies evaluator bias in their development with subliminal suggestion. I would not characterize the formal facilitated ECWG process as successful. What WAS successful was the self-facilitated process of the independent collective group that continued to work together to discuss some of the tough issues to produce some 20 pages of Recommendations that move the work of the ECWG in support of evolving CAEECC and its work towards the goals of the CPUC ESJ Action Plan, as intended. Please keep comments clear as to which process, (although not the ideal as there was not a lot of support and very limited resources) was more successful and which process was not.
- It was only partially successful. Not all ECWG members participated in or provided their own recommendations. The facilitation process was discontinued. It was clear from the beginning that the original scope of tasks for the ECWG would be limited in its ability to bring real ESJ into the rate payer EE programming, because CAEECC by itself has limited, if any, influence on the existing proceeding that is deficient in ESJ considerations.
- The rare opportunity that the CDEI and others worked for years to create was squandered because of expected and easily managed internal disagreements. The pivot to written reflections was insufficient to make up for the necessary dialogue that the larger group process held.
- The facilitators BLOCKED the ECWG's ability to do the project as assigned. It forced a side collaboration of equity partners to push back on the bullying to try and make a difference. Having the IOU's create a bloc that stopped the ECWG's document being brought forward as the foundation it is, is emblematic of the problem at its core. Powerful bullies, bullying meaningful dialog by equity members. It is shameful.
- Our WG did its job, despite the obstacles and CAEECC members didn't even engage with us (except one who defended an existing Equity program that they also admitted hasn't shown results yet).
- Even at our attempt to keep working and provide a presentation, I did not feel any attempt to desire the suggestion being offered or be supported when there was a clear push back from certain members.

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response about value created.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
The ECWG process created relatively more value than would have likely been the case if the deliberations had remained at the CPUC (for example, regarding additional insights, greater specificity, higher degree of convergence and attainment of consensus on issues, and/or more timely outcome).	4.3	4.5	3.7	4	3.9	4

CAEECC Members

- I think having the CPUC staff at the meetings was a benefit. I can't really say it added more or less value than if the CPUC held the meetings. I don't have enough experience in CPUC-led working groups to make that determination.
- There were some good recommendations in the end that could be used to inform the scope of CAEECC 2025

Non-CAEECC Members

- No additional value was created as of now--time will tell as decision makers continue to digest the life-cycle of the ECWG and how it concluded.
- The ECWG provides recommendations only to the CAEECC who provides recommendations to the CPUC - not sure if that's better than ECWG providing recommendations to the CPUC
- In the end, the value created by the independent Collective's Recommendations, largely by community and Compensation Pilotees, and speaking up at CAEECC meetings, and the lessons learned from the earlier Facilitated ECWG process/meetings pre-Nov. 2023, did create more value had NO ECWG been created. The value added by the Compensation Pilot and demonstrated commitment by the independent Collective members, stemming from the CDEI Report Recommendations and moved forward by the Collective Recommendations submitted early 2024 is of great value to the CPUC. So yes, much value was brought to the CPUC--much more than had deliberations remained at the CPUC, and even at the level of the formal CAEECC itself. Hearing from diverse community members themselves was tremendous in clarifying specific recommendations for change, both short and longer term, specific actions, and additional insights that have never been fully represented before, all while presented largely from a consensus stance.
- Not sure if the process created that much value. Since different people and groups provided separate recommendations, there is no good sense of any consensus. The range of diversity of the ECWG members, in terms demands, was too great, and this led to people pushing hard for unrealistic recommendations. On the other hand, the CAEECC

has very little influence and opportunities in making EE more ESJ, so an internal CPUC discussion may actually have resulted in more systemic change, if that discussion would have gone beyond the scope, purpose and objectives of the CAEECC. The rules of the game need to be changed, much more so than the working of one of the players, the CAEECC.

- Yes, the fact that the ECWG existed, bringing together so many people who would never had the opportunity to contribute their perspectives to the process, was much more valuable than if no one had been invited, and compensated for their time. In addition, the fact that the team did allow the Compensation funds to continue to be used to their fullest capacity to compensate those of us who continued to work together on their written reflections did show the core interest in justice and fairness of the facilitation and leadership team. My hope is that a similar Pilot can be run again, this time with more clarity and planning to accommodate and incorporate the inevitable conflict that will arise, instead of avoiding it.
- With the facilitators being so inept at supporting the voices of equity, just about ANYTHING would have been better than having Common Spark in charge of this process.
- The Self-facilitated Compensation Pilot was a success. CAEECC members acceptance of the work was rude and dismissive.
- This is a group that fought to keep working! The value was in the knowledge, determination, and passion delivered.

Please add any clarifying comments regarding your response about the environment created.

On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), please rate the following statements	CAEECC Members		Non-CAEECC Members		ALL	
	AVG	MED	AVG	MED	AVG	MED
The ECWG was a trusting and inclusive environment.	3.0	3	3.0	2	3.0	2

CAEECC Members

- I personally felt that it was a trusting and inclusive environment, but I know a good number of ECWG members didn't feel that way.
- I felt safe and inclusive enough to provide my input.
- Comments made by several members during meetings created a sense of distrust, and the large group/meeting format made it difficult to feel inclusive and trusting.

Non-CAEECC Members

- I believe the facilitators did everything they could to facilitate a safe environment, including taking a different approach when they deemed the environment not safe. Nonetheless, the environment was not trusting nor inclusive and I think this is evidenced by the facilitators decision to stop the meetings.

- I was thoroughly impressed with the commitment of members and their willingness to consider and discuss all viewpoints in order to reach a joint conclusion. Very positive experience.
- I felt, during the formal ECWG process through Nov. 2023, that the ECWG facilitators failed to establish and nurture a trusting and inclusive environment. I can say they may have intended to or attempted to, but in the end, and in particular, the communications of the disbanding and formalized guardrails of narratives and process afterwards only seemed to confirm the lack of establishment of trust. Lack of transparency, and enforcement of hierarchy/control and power dynamics, and poor community engagement to ownership, did not help to create an environment of trust.
- It may have started out that way, but it didn't remain so for very long. The facilitators should have provided a more trusting environment by focusing less on the latest and greatest principles of DEJI processes, and more on true, heartfelt, engagement with the participants. They should also have given more room for the participants to get to learn each other, for instance by pairing up IOU members with community members in conversations. While some small group discussions were offered during the early sessions, those were not sufficient, and with most of the discussion taking place in a large group, there cannot be a trusting environment. The eventual decision to dissolve the facilitation process was the logical outcome of the lack of this trust. There seemed to have been sabotage by some involved as well.
- There was much fanfare made by the facilitation and the CAEECC leadership team in the first few meetings about just how open CAEECC would be to the recommendations of the ECWG. Many in the group expressed skepticism that our recommendations would be taken seriously and that this was not just a token exercise in a post-George Floyd era to make it seem like the CPUC is making big moves to invest in Environmental and Social Justice. We were assured that those within the membership, as well as in the broader CPUC, were seriously interested in hearing community voices. I believed these statements and kept a positive attitude about the process. The path the facilitation team chose to take, shutting down instead of opening up, reinforced my cynical aspects, and I am left much more suspicious of the actual intentions of CAEECC.
- Bullying is NOT acceptable. In one on one conversations with the CS staff, it was clear that they did not have a clear idea of the process. The sudden closure of the process when the groups were finally able to make progress, is a prime example of this bullying. CS was unwilling to recognize their possible mistake in shutting them down. Instead, they continued to threaten and abuse. It took going outside CS to ED, to get support. Only AFTER sharing the frustrations with ED, was the group able to loosen the grip of CS. THEN real work could be done. But the process was exceptionally hostile.
- Once we began our Self-facilitation it became that way. Facilitators did nothing to incur our trust as a WG, we established that trust amongst each other.
- If there was more transparency in discussions had with facilitators I believe resolve would have been a high possibility and we could have moved forward as a whole group,

but the "CupCAEECC" group, made sure to always send an invitation to the entire group to participate.

Please add any additional comments or elaborations to your previous answers or generally about the Working Group.

CAEECC Members

- I think it may have been better to coordinate a sub-working group which included members of the public where they could express their opinions and concerns and use the main working group for individuals with the professional experience and knowledge to achieve the goals and objectives.
- It was a challenging and frustrating experience for me since I volunteered my time and energy to engage and participate but it did not feel like progress was made during meetings.

Non-CAEECC Members

- This was a wonderful attempt and I hope that lessons learned will be incorporated into future working groups. Although consensus is ideal, I think the working group would have benefited from taking a slightly different decision making heuristic.
- I hope that the recommendations of the ECWG are acted on by the CAEECC and are distributed widely to the CPUC and others.
- I am disappointed the ECWG was disbanded such that I never really got a chance to know and work with many of them . I hope to be enabled to listen to their perspectives and hold deeper discussions to co-create solutions to meet the state's/CPUC's equity and ESJ goals.
- The working group was a creative and ambitious experiment that seemingly had every detail prepared in advance to tackle the notably challenging task of integrating Equity expertise into the CAEECC decision-making process via this working group. The facilitation was seemingly well equipped and versatile to handle the complexity of this facilitation challenge. I was honestly surprised and confused by their decision to end the group meetings and felt very disrespected ultimately by their unwillingness to even attempt to address the conflict within the group before deciding to shut it down. It was bewildering given the apparent skill Michelle and Suhaila presented as having. I am still confused about their actual reasoning for the choices made. I did appreciate their ability to continue to administer funds to the small group who attempted to continue the dialogue in order to present recommendations that reflected a group process which is ultimately a more valuable deliverable than what a handful of individually written reflections would have been. ultimately the ECWG brought a new group of people to the CAEECC table and it remains to be seen how much CAEECC will be open to harvesting from this beneficial process.
- The work is not done, I hope that it will continue.
- I am very proud to be a part of the WG that continued to work together despite the hurdles presented. I contributed to meetings, the WG reflection and created the visuals

with the hope of being as helpful to the delivery as much as possible. I highly suggest brining at least 5 people into a new WG,if one is created to keep the momentum towards equity.