Coordinating Committee Meeting #15

February 15, 2018 10:00 to 5:00
NRDC, 111 Sutter Street @ Montgomery, 21st Floor, San Francisco
Facilitator: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates

Meeting Summary

California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) Members and proxies attended this meeting in person or via webcast. A list of the those Members is included in Appendix A. Approximately a dozen members of the public were present in person and an additional nearly 40 individuals joined via webcast. Meeting materials are provided on the CAEECC website at: https://www.caeecc.org/coordinating-comm-meetings.

In this document, all **key decisions** made by CAEECC members are noted in **bold and italics**, all **next steps** are noted in **bold**, and all *responses to questions* are noted in *italics*. Key Decisions and Outcomes and Next Steps are also recapped at the end of this document.

SESSION 1: INTRODUCTIONS AND OVERVIEW

Dr. Jonathan Raab, facilitator from Raab Associates, welcomed the group, introduced the Facilitation Team, and asked CAEECC Members and members of the public to introduce themselves.

J. Raab noted the purpose of today's meeting: to introduce the new Facilitation Team, provide a high-level playback of the stakeholder interviews; and re-launch and recalibrate the CAEECC by: 1) adopting Goals, Roles and Responsibilities, and Ground Rules; 2) adopting a 2018 work Plan; and 3) selecting the 2018 Co-Chairs and discussing Membership guidelines.

J. Raab noted that the meeting will be recorded, and asked that each Member state their name and affiliation before speaking.

SESSION 2: HIGH-LEVEL SUMMARY OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE INTERVIEWS

J. Raab provided a summary of feedback received during stakeholder interviews including major CAEECC accomplishments, challenges and limitations and past meetings and decision-making. Slides from the presentation are available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

Comments on High-Level Summary of CAEECC Member Interviews:

- M. Campbell[1] emphasized that CAEECC operated most effectively when written documents were provided in advance of meetings. He also noted that achieving consensus is not critical, but that documenting areas of agreement and disagreement for CPUC review is an important outcome of CAEECC meetings, and allows the conversation to move on.

---

[1] See Appendix A for full name and organizational affiliation for all Members and proxies listed in meeting summary.

- M. Gardner noted that consistent CPUC involvement with the CAEECC is a foundational criteria needed for a successful CAEECC stakeholder process. Other members agreed, requesting that the CPUC commit to sending a consistent representative to at least 85% of the CAEECC meeting. Members emphasized that consistent involvement can help provide feedback and guidance to shape work products at an early stage, and that this will be particularly useful in reviewing implementation plans. Peter Francese with CPUC noted that the CPUC plans to provide more consistent representation than in the past, and that more details will be known when staffing changes that are currently underway have been settled. J. Raab noted that specifics of CPUC involvement can be included in the Ground Rules document.

SESSION 3: GOALS, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES, AND GROUND RULES

J. Raab presented the draft Goals, Roles and Responsibilities, and Ground Rules ("Ground Rules") drafted by the Facilitation Team. He noted that: (1) the earlier lengthy CAEECC Charter had not been adopted; (2) the Ground Rules document represents a more concise version of the Charter that was informed by the Member interviews and including ground rules that have worked well in other similar processes that the Facilitator Team has facilitated elsewhere; (3) that the team would like Member feedback on the Ground Rules in this session; and (4) the goal is to adopt a revised set of ground rules today. Member discussion and questions on the Ground Rules are captured below, and organized by document subheading. A clean version of the Ground Rules document is appended to this meeting summary in Appendix B and both the clean and redline versions are available on the CAEECC website (see above link).

I. Goals of the Coordinating Committee

Comments and Questions:

- K. Kriozere proposed language to capture the goal of supporting the development and expansion of high-quality energy-efficiency programs "for all sectors and subsectors." The CAEECC explored various alternative language to incorporate this point but ultimately decided to leave the text of the Goals of the Coordinating Committee as originally drafted (since this concept is already captured as one of California's climate and energy goals).

- *In the end, the CAEECC agreed to all the goals as written.*

II. CAEECC Meeting Types

Comments and Questions:

- J. Berg requested that Quarterly meetings be held and that the dates of these meetings be decided at today's meeting.

- M. Gardner requested that the Ground Rules document include a description of how public input will be dealt with in the CAEECC meetings. *At the break, the Facilitation Team drafted language to note that the public will be given an opportunity at CAEECC meeting to provide input periodically as time allows and at the discretion of the facilitator.*

- B. Kotlier noted that CEE member organizations were unhappy with the determination of workshops in the past. *J. Raab noted that the Ground Rules include language on how Work Groups are proposed and approved.*

- C. Coecklenbergh asked for clarification as to whether subcommittees will be a component of future CAEECC processes. *J. Raab noted that since having sector-specific meetings is still a possibility the team chose not to remove the language about the Subcommittees in the Ground Rules. But he also noted that Working Groups on cross-sector related issues are expected to be more common."*

- Members noted that subcommittees have been highly effective in the past, but requested that their use be "extremely sparing". M. Campbell noted that subcommittees were used effectively in the past to address subjects of importance but that were outside the scope of the CAEECC's agenda, or were best dealt with by a sub-group. However, he cautioned that if not wisely selected, unnecessary meetings cause a burden on CAEECC members without improving overall productivity.

- ***In the end, the CAEECC agreed to all the meeting types as written, but with the addition of a sentence on public input for Full CAECC and Working Group/Subcommittees (as noted above).***

III. CAEECC Roles and Responsibilities - Members

Comments and Questions:

- Several members requested that facilitators and Co-Chairs firmly enforce a "no-go" rule if documents are not received 5 days in advance per the draft language in the Ground Rules document (for that particular presentation).

- ***In the end, the CAEECC agreed to all the CAEECC Member Roles and Responsibilities as written.***

III. CAEECC Roles and Responsibilities – Facilitator Team

Comments:

- C. Coecklenbergh suggested that the Ground Rules clarify that agendas and discussions should line up with the goals of the committee.

- M. Gardner requested that the facilitator role include ensuring compliance with the CPUC's CAEECC Conflict of Interest (COI) policy, both in setting agendas and in ensuring that no conflict of interest discussions take place at the CAEECC.

- ***After additions were made to cover the above two suggestions, the CAEECC agreed to all the CAEECC Facilitator Team's Roles and Responsibilities.***

III. CAEECC Roles and Responsibilities – Coordinating Committee Co-Chairs

Comments and Questions:

- J. Berg asked for clarification from the PA Co-Chairs regarding the regular involvement of non-IOU PAs. She noted that no edits to the Ground Rules are needed, but requested a response from the new PA Co-Chair.

- M. Campbell emphasized that the Co-Chair role should include coordinating, organizing, and "wrangling", but should not include agenda setting. Instead, he suggested that at the close of each meeting the agenda for the next CAEECC meeting should be discussed by Members. Based on this discussion, Co-Chairs and facilitators should draft an agenda, which will be emailed to Members for their review and feedback.

- To capture the points above, Members agreed to change "set meeting agendas" to "develop and propose meeting agendas".

- Based on a discussion and decisions made later in the meeting, the Members also agreed to add language about Co-Chair terms and replacement. Following the meeting, J.Raab drafted language to convey that Co-Chairs will be approved annually by the Members, and that if a Co-Chair does not finish their term (either voluntarily of removed by Members for a cause), the Members will need to make any replacement consistent with the Ground Rules below and the replacement will serve for the duration of the annual term.

- ***With the edit and addition described above, the CAEECC agreed to the Co-Chairs Roles and Responsibilities.***

III. CAEECC Roles and Responsibilities – CPUC
Comments:

- As noted in "Comments on High-Level Summary of CAEECC Member Interviews", several CAEECC Members noted that more regular and forthcoming involvement from the CPUC staff at CAEECC meetings would be beneficial.

- **The CAEECC agreed that the Facilitator and Co-Chairs should meet with the appropriate CPUC representatives to discuss these issues, and perhaps subsequently add a set of Roles of Responsibilities for the CPUC.**

IV. CAEECC Ground Rules on Substantive and Process Issues

Comments on Substantive Issues:

- M. Campbell emphasized that the CAEECC provides a venue for stakeholder discussion, an opportunity to narrow disagreement and/or reduce litigation on key issues, and an opportunity to clarify areas of convergence and divergence. However, M. Campbell stated

that the CAEECC should not be a consensus-seeking entity, and that the CAEECC should not be working to communicate decisions to the CPUC or other entities. E. Brooks agreed that a consensus goal or requirement would be burdensome/time consuming and rarely achievable. M. Gardner requested that when relevant, documents be developed to capture areas of agreement and disagreement to "put squares around" the subjects discussed for the benefit of the CPUC and other parties.

- E. Brooks agreed that the role of the CAEECC is to provide input to Program Administrators (PAs) that shapes their filings. However, she noted that the CAEECC is not a formal party to a decision, and that a pathway does not exist for the CAEECC to submit decisions to the CPUC. Outside the purview of the CAEECC, Members have the opportunity to submit documents or filings to the CPUC. She noted that CAEECC input is captured via PA filings to the CPUC.

- A. Besa and M. Davis noted that to the extent that the CPUC is notified of CAEECC decisions, a mechanism is needed for communication of any positions that may have changed since the decision was made.

Based on the discussions, the Facilitation Team agreed to revise the proposed Ground Rules related to substantive issues over lunch and present them to the CAEECC. The proposed substantially revised Ground Rules were as follows:

A. **Substantive Issues (Discussing Issues, Developing Options, and Exploring Agreement)**
   i. The goal of the process is to fully explore substantive issues before the CAEECC, define options, elicit constructive feedback, clarify and narrow points of divergence, seek consensus where feasible, and document points of convergence and any remaining divergence.
   ii. During the substantive discussions, if a Member cannot agree with a substantive option under consideration that member should explain why and propose a specific alternative that he or she can support.
   iii. Documentation (e.g., in the high-level meeting summary) of consensus and multiple options on any particular issue would include a clear description of each option and supporting rationale, and include the Members supporting each option.
   iv. The intended use of the documentation (e.g., the high level meeting summary) is to serve as a reference document to inform and assist Members (and groups of Members) in preparing formal advice or recommendations to the CPUC, PAs, and others, if they so choose.
   v. All the above ground-rules would apply to all Full CAECC, Working Group and Subcommittee meetings. However, unless the CAEECC previously agreed at a Full CAEECC meeting that the particular Working Group or Subcommittee was delegated to complete the deliberations on behalf of the Full CAEECC on those specific issues, any options devised or consensus agreement-if any-would come back to the full CAEECC to review, refine if need be, and finalize.

- After a brief discussion the Members agreed that the proposed revised Substantive Issues were substantially better than as originally drafted, and made sense.

Comments on Process Issues:

- Members agreed that, for significant process-related issues (including the annual selection (or removal) of Co-Chairs, whether or not to launch a CAEECC Working Group or Subcommittee on a particular topic, and approval of new Members, etc.), a consensus decision-rule, moving to a 2/3rds majority if consensus cannot be achieved in a timely fashion, is agreeable*.*

- Members also agreed that for secondary process related issues (including setting meeting dates, finalizing agenda designs, etc.) the Facilitator Team in consultation with the Co-Chairs, and after seeking input and feedback from CAEECC Members, will have the responsibility to make these decisions.

- M. Campbell requested that the decision rule be adopted for now, but revisited if it doesn't seem to be working. J. Raab added language stating that all the roles and responsibilities and Ground Rules will be revisited annually, or as needed.

- ***With the changes described above in "Comments on Substantive Issues" and "Comments on Process Issues", the CAEECC adopted the revised CAEECC Ground Rules on Substantive and Process Issues.***

At the close of the discussion, J. Raab stated that **the Facilitation Team will finalize the revisions to the Ground Rules per the CAEECC discussion, and that they will be posted to the CAEECC website in redline and clean version. The clean version can also be found in Appendix B of this summary.**

SESSION 4: DRAFT WORKPLAN FOR 2018

J. Raab presented the Draft CAEECC 2018 Workplan developed by the Facilitator Team and Co-Chairs and refined based on feedback from Members during interviews. The Work Plan includes: (1) Potential topics for Full CAEECC meeting – Topics the majority of CAEECC members want to work on and which can be included in regular full CAEECC meetings; (2) Potential topics for Working Groups – topics identified by the Co-Chairs and/or embraced by many Members (during the interviews); and (3) Potential work group topics – topics mentioned by only one Member but which could be addressed by a Work Group if there is sufficient interest. The draft/revised Work Plan is available on the CAEECC website (see link above).

Comments and Questions on Full CAEECC Topics:

- M. Campbell requested that "Program Solicitation Progression/Updates" include Commission updates.

- ***The CAEECC Members agreed that the topics identified for the Full CAEECC meetings are all appropriate.***

Comments and Questions on Working Group Topics:

- C. Coecklenbergh requested that the CAEECC focus on developing centralized guidelines for claiming energy savings, citing the lack of these guidelines as "the greatest barrier to achieving energy efficiency in California". Some members stated that work groups external to the CAEECC are already addressing this issue. C. Coecklenbergh stated that these efforts are not as effective as they need to be. J. Raab added "Custom Review Process" as a potential CAEECC Work Group topic.

- Several members expressed interest in participating in a planning call to develop the scope and strategy for a Work Group on Market Transformation (MT) including a draft agenda for its first meeting. **The MT planning group includes: M. Gardner, M. Dewey, L. Ettensen, and E. Brooks.**

- Several members expressed interest in participating in a planning call to develop the scope and strategy for a Work Group on Cost-Effectiveness (CE) including a draft agenda for its first meeting. **The CE planning group includes: M. Vigen, M. Dewey, C. Kalashian, J. Berg, M. Evans, A. Besa, D. Dias, L. Ettensen; and E. Brooks.**

- Members discussed the role that the CAEECC can play relative to other groups also working on similar issues (e.g., MT and CE). Some Members noted that the CAEECC can play an important role in applying existing research to make the findings practicable in California, and in applying understanding to address logistical issues such as what a Market Transformation issue looks like in annual advice letters.

- K. Kriozere asked that the potential topic "Reducing Cost of Savings v. Equity" be listed as a subtopic of the Working Group topic "Cost Effectiveness".

- B. Kotlier asked where the subject of workforce access will be addressed? *M. Dewey responded that workforce access will be addressed under Program and Solicitation Progression/Updates as the CAEECC moves to focus on implementation in 2018.*

- L. Ettenson suggested that the CAEECC hold meetings in the week after filings so that Members can discuss the outcomes of filings with PAs.

- CAEECC Members also briefly discussed the listing of Other Potential Work Group topics listed by one or more Members, but decided not to move any of these topics to the active Working Group topic list for 2018 except Reduce Cost of Savings vs. Equity, which the Members agreed to move as a sub-topic under Cost-Effectiveness.

- ***Members agreed that the topics selected for Work Groups reflect the topics they feel are most appropriate and important for the CAEECC to address in Work Groups.***

SESSION 5: SELECTING CO-CHAIRS FOR 2018 AND MEMBERSHIP

J. Raab explained that in this session, Co-Chairs would discuss nominations for Co-Chairs and alternates, select the 2018 Co-Chairs, and discuss the approach to adding new members. He explained that Meghan Dewey (PG&E) is rotating out of her current role within PG&E, and so vacating a Co-Chair position. Erin Brooks (SCG) has been nominated to replace her. Lara Ettenson (NRDC) has been nominated to continue as Co-Chair.

Comments on Co-Chair Selection:

- M. Campbell expressed concern about having a Co-Chair from SCG as ORA is litigating several EE issues related to SCG before the CPUC (noting that it was nothing personal against Eric). E. Brooks from SCG stated that this litigation was still pending before the CPUC. She added that she hoped her involvement in the role of CAEECC Co-Chair would still be acceptable to CAEECC Members.

- B. Kotlier reinforced that the role of the Co-Chair must be purely administrative. He stated that if this is not the case, then having a Program Administrator (PA) as Co-Chair raises a conflict of interest issue. He stated that, should the Co-Chair act outside of this administrative role, they should be removed. Other members agreed.

- L. Ettenson explained that at the start of the CAECC, it was decided that one PA and one non-PA Co-Chair provides balance and allows each Co-Chair to "corral" the non-PA and PA Members respectively. It was also originally decided that more than 2 Co-Chairs would create inefficiencies.

- J. Raab noted that Co-Chairs are both Members and Co-Chairs. As Members (e.g., during meetings) they may advocate for their organization; as Co-Chairs (e.g., working with the Facilitator Team between meetings), they must behave neutrally. He added that one role of the facilitator is to ensure the neutrality of Co-Chairs when acting as Co-Chairs.

- Members discussed whether the Co-Chair position should be held by the organization or the individual. Specifically, if the individual changes positions within his/her organization during their term as Co-Chair, would the organization select a new individual to replace the Co-Chair, or would the CAEECC select a new member from the CAEECC?

- ***Members agreed that the position of Co-Chair should be held by an individual, and that if a replacement is needed, the decision should come back to the CAEECC.***

- Members discussed whether the term limit for a Co-Chair should be one or two years, and if two years whether the two-years should be staggered so both aren't replaced at once. Many Members felt ambivalent, but generally felt that a one-year term for Co-Chairs makes sense.

- ***Members agreed to approve a 1-year term for Co-Chairs for the time-being.***

- Co-Chair selection:
    - ***Members approved Lara Ettenson (NRDC) as Co-Chair for 2018.***
    - ***Members approved Erin Brooks (SCG) as Co-Chair for 2018.***

J. Raab and L. Ettenson explained that past Membership was decided based on a 2/3 vote from the CAEECC on the basis of several criteria, including (1) Ability and commitment to participate in 85% of meetings, and (2) Interest in CAEECC issues, demonstrated via a Letter of Interest to the CAEECC. They explained that the Facilitator Team and Co-Chairs want to solidify a mutually acceptable and appropriate process to determine and bound Membership as interest in joining the CAEECC increases. They noted that criteria for membership need to be updated, and it needs to be determined whether annual re-establishment of membership is appropriate.

Questions and comments on CAEEC Membership:

- A. Besa asked whether Membership is based on the organization or the individual. *J. Raab explained that decisions about CAEECC Membership are based on the combination of the organization and its relevance to the CAEECC process, and the suitability of the individual* to *both represent the organization and participate in the CAEECC.*

- B. Kotlier proposed that non-Members who have been regularly engaged in the CAEECC and would like to become Members be offered an expedited voting process to establish Membership. C. Kalashian noted that the Letter of Interest is not burdensome, and the main purpose is to introduce new members to the group who may not understand the connection of the organization to the CAEECC.

- C. Kalashian asked whether Membership is open on a rolling basis. *L. Ettenson explained that Membership has been open on a rolling basis, but that the CAEECC may wish to establish a period of time when Membership is open instead.*

- E. Brooks asked whether there is a limit to the size of the CAEECC. *L. Ettenson explained that there is currently no limit, but that the CAEECC may wish to establish a size limit.*

- C. Kalashian asked whether any guidelines or practices dictating a balance of interest exist, or whether any new Members can be considered regardless of how this may affect balance of representation on the CAEECC. Other members agreed that it is important to address the question of balanced representation. M. Gardner also agreed, noting that the development of "pods" organized by interest and with number limits is one way to address both challenges of balanced representation and group size limit. D. Dias suggested that ANSI guidelines could be used to guide CAEECC decisions on representation and a membership cap.

- **J. Raab suggested the final decision on new membership, balance, and size cap be tabled until the next meeting, and that the Facilitator Team and Co-Chairs develop a draft approach for CAEECC's consideration—and that they check with existing CAEECC Members regarding intention to continue.**

- *Members agreed to J. Raab's suggested next steps on Membership above.*

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- Members revised and then adopted the Goals, Roles & Responsibilities, and Ground Rules with changes noted above and shown in redline in Appendix B and on the CAEECC Website (see link above).
- Members agreed to the Workplan/Topics for the Full CAEECC meetings and the Working Groups with a few small modifications noted above and shown in Revised Workplan posted on the CAEECC Website (see link above)
- Members approved CAEECC Co-Chairs For 2018:
  o Lara Ettensen (NRDC)
  o Erin Brooks (SCG)
- Members agreed to have Facilitator Team and Co-Chairs develop a draft annual Membership process for new and existing Members
- Members agreed that Facilitator and Co-Chairs should meet with the CPUC to discuss their on-going involvement and implementing the conflict of interest policy

NEXT STEPS

- **The Facilitation Team:**
  o Finalize the revisions to the Goals, Roles & Responsibilities, and Ground Rules per the CAEECC discussion, and post these to the CAEECC website.
  o Finalize the revisions to the 2018 Draft Workplan as per the CAEECC discussion, and post this document to the CAEECC website.
  o Draft and post a Meeting Summary
  o Set up Working Group planning calls for Market Transformation and Cost Effectiveness
    ▪ The MT planning group includes: M. Gardner, M. Dewey, L. Ettensen, and E. Brooks
    ▪ The CE planning group includes: M. Vigen, M. Dewey, C. Kalashian, J. Berg, M. Evans, A. Besa, D. Dias, L. Ettensen; and E. Brooks.
  o Post and notify 2018 quarterly meeting dates and locations
    ▪ May 10 (Southern California—SDG&E)
    ▪ August 2 (Northern California--)
    ▪ December 6 (Southern California)
- **Facilitation Team & Co-Chairs:**
  o Meet with the CPUC to discuss CPUC staff on-going engagement with CAEECC, as well as the Conflict of Interest protocols
  o Develop a draft process for annual Membership updating
  o Develop agenda for next quarterly CAEECC meeting based on Workplan and agenda items already identified (e.g., Membership) in consultation with Members
- **Members:**
  o Review and comment on draft meeting summary
  o Participate in MT and CE planning Working Group planning calls if volunteered, and in actual Working Groups if of interest

CAEECC Members present:
Margie Gardner, California Efficiency and Demand Management Council (CEDMC)
Doug Avery, California Advanced Lighting Control Training Program (CalCTP)
Alice Stover, Marin Clean Energy (MCE)
Athena Besa, San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E)
Jenny Berg, Bay Area Regional Energy Network (BayREN)
Bernie Kotlier, Statewide Labor Management Cooperation Committee (LMCC)
Dave Dias, Sheet Metal Workers Local 104
Lara Ettenson, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
Meghan Dewey, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
Mike Campbell, Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)
Erin Brooks, Southern California Gas (SCG)
Cody Coecklenbergh, Lincus
Courtney Kalashian, San Joaquin Valley Clean Energy Organization (SJVCEO)
Alejandra Tellez, County of Ventura
Brian Samuelson, California Energy Commission (CEC)
Kate Kriozere, Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA)

CAEECC Members joining by phone:
Shelby Gatlin, CalCERTS
Matt Evans, Southern California Edison (SCE)
Lindsey Hawes, Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE)
Demetra McBride, Southern California Regional Energy Network (SoCalREN)
Jessie Denver, City of San Francisco

California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC)
Goals, Roles & Responsibilities, and Ground-rules
Adopted by CAEECC-February 15, 2018

II. **Goals of the Coordinating Committee**
   A. Support the development and expansion of high-quality energy-efficiency programs that reduce greenhouse-gas emissions in line with state climate and energy goals while responding to customer needs and market dynamics
   B. Provide meaningful and useful input to the Program Administrators (PAs) in the development and implementation of their energy-efficiency business plans
   C. Improve collaboration and communication among parties and with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on energy-efficiency matters
   D. Resolve disagreements among stakeholders whenever possible to reduce the number of matters that need to be litigated before the CPUC

III. **CAEECC Meeting Types**
   A. **Full CAEECC Meetings**—These are formal meetings of the entire CAEECC membership convened to discuss on-going as well as periodic issues of broad interest to CAEECC Members. The Full CAEECC Meetings will be scheduled at least quarterly, and otherwise as needed, in person or via conference call. The public will be given an opportunity to provide input periodically as time allows and at the discretion of the facilitator.
   B. **CAEECC Working Group and Subcommittee Meetings**—These are dedicated meetings of CAEECC Members or their proxy/designees whose organizations are interested in specific topics of importance identified by the CAEECC (or the CPUC) for which CAEECC advice or recommendations are sought. Subcommittees, if any, will generally be focused on sector-specific issues. Working Groups will generally be focused on non sector-specific issues. The public will be given an opportunity to provide input periodically as time allows and at the discretion of the facilitator.
   C. **Ad Hoc CAEECC Workshops**—These are generally one-off workshops on issues identified by the CPUC or CAEECC where broader public input is desired. There will generally be greater time allocated for public input at these workshops than typically allocated at other CAEECC meetings. Seeking formal CAEECC advice or recommendations is not an expected focus of these workshops.

IV. **CAEECC Roles and Responsibilities**
   A. **Coordinating Committee Members** (and their proxies/designees):

i. Attendance:
    1. Make every attempt to attend all Full CAEECC meetings (in person preferred)
    2. Participate in all Working Group and Subcommittee meetings and Ad Hoc Workshops on topics of interest, by direct Member attendance or through a proxy or a designee
    3. Be on time to meetings and workshops
ii. At Meetings/Workshops:
    1. Come prepared to discuss agenda items (by reviewing all documents disseminated prior to the meeting, conferring with your organization and other colleagues, etc.)
    2. Be forthright and communicative about the interests and preferences of your organization and actively seek agreement if CAEECC recommendations/advice are being sought
    3. Be clear so that everyone understands your interests and proposals
    4. Be concise so that everyone who wants to provide input has an opportunity to do so
    5. Minimize electronic distractions during meetings
iii. Between Meetings:
    1. Keep your organizations informed of developments in the CAEECC process
    2. Confer with other Members during meeting breaks and in between meetings, as needed
    3. Notify the Facilitator Team prior to the meeting (by telephone or e-mail) if you or your proxy cannot attend a Full CAEECC meeting
    4. Be responsible for actively tracking Facilitator Team and Co-Chair communications as well as relevant proceedings and policies
    5. Provide input, feedback, and written material when requested by the Facilitation Team or Co-Chairs in a timely manner
    6. Any presenter (Member or their proxy or designee) should have their presentation ready for posting at least five business days prior to the meeting; and presenters should work with the Facilitator Team prior to the posting deadline to help ensure that materials are clear, concise, and on topic
    7. Discuss pertinent matters with the Facilitator Team and Co-Chairs when and if the need arises
iv. Note: New/Existing Members Selection Process TBD (to be developed by Facilitator Team and Co-Chairs, for discussion/finalization at next quarterly meeting).

B. **Facilitator Team**
    i. Overall Goal: Help design and facilitate a productive and fair CAEECC process
    ii. Before Meetings:

1. Set appropriate meeting agendas based on CAEECC workplan and discussions at prior meetings, in consultation with Co-Chairs, and through soliciting additional input from CAEECC Members
2. Ensure that agenda items (and discussions) are align with CAEECC goals
3. Work with any and all presenters to help ensure that all meeting materials are available for posting in a timely manner (at least 5 business days prior to meetings), and help ensure that materials are clear, concise, and on topic
4. Ensure compliance with the CPUC's CAEECC Conflict of Interest policy both in setting agendas, and that no conflict of interest discussions take place at CAEECC

iii. During Meetings:
1. Ensure that discussions at meetings stay focused on the agenda topics (and on time), and are conducted in an efficient and effective manner
2. Help foster a constructive forum where diverse points of view are voiced and examined in a professional and balanced way
3. Facilitate all meetings impartially and in a non-partisan manner, (i.e., not favoring any representative, alternate, or organization over another)
4. Ensure that individual Members (whether representing an IOU or non-IOU organization) do not dominate the discussion;[2]

iv. After Meetings:
1. Prepare meeting summaries that are sufficiently detailed (capturing agreements, disagreements, important discussions, and clear next steps)
2. Post all pre/post meeting materials to the common website/calendar (at least 5 business days before/no more than 5 business days after meeting)

v. On-Going and Periodically:
1. Work with Co-Chairs and Members to develop an annual workplan (topics, timing, etc.) for Full CAEECC Meetings; Working Group and Subcommittee Meetings; and Ad Hoc Workshops
2. Work with Co-Chairs, Members, and CPUC staff outside the regularly scheduled meeting as requested and/or as needed
3. Check in with CAEECC Members periodically to make sure the CAEECC process is as effective as possible

C. *Coordinating Committee Co-Chairs*
   i. Work with the Facilitator Team (and CAEECC Members) between and during meetings to help:
   1. Develop and propose meeting agendas
   2. Identify and plan for additional Working Groups and Subcommittees and Ad Hoc Workshops, as needed
   3. Identify suitable locations/hosts for each meeting and workshop (alternating between Northern and Southern California at a minimum for the quarterly Full CAEECC meetings)

---

[2] D.15-10-028, p.75

        4. Coordinate and help seek input from their respective cohorts (e.g., PA or non-PA Members)

        5. Develop an annual CAEECC workplan to be filed by a PA as a Tier 1 Advice Letter in January of each year[3]

    ii. Review and approve monthly invoices from the Facilitator Team

    iii. Note: Co-Chairs will be approved annually by the Members. If a Co-Chair does not complete his or her term (either voluntarily or as a result of removal by the Members for cause), the Members will need to select a replacement consistent with the groundrules below and the replacement will serve for the duration of the annual term.

  D. <mark>CPUC—TBD (after discussions w/CPUC)</mark>

<mark>V.</mark> *CAEECC Ground-rules on Substantive and Process Issues*

  A. **Substantive Issues (Discussing Issues, Developing Options, and Exploring Agreement)**

    i. The goal of the process is to fully explore substantive issues before the CAEECC, define options, elicit constructive feedback, clarify and narrow points of divergence, seek consensus where feasible, and document points of convergence and any remaining divergence.

    ii. During the substantive discussions, if a Member cannot agree with a substantive option under consideration that member should explain why and propose a specific alternative that he or she can support.

    iii. Documentation (e.g., in the high-level meeting summary) of consensus and multiple options on any particular issue would include a clear description of each option and supporting rationale, and include the Members supporting each option.

    iv. The intended use of the documentation (e.g., the high level meeting summary) is to serve as a reference document to inform and assist Members (and groups of Members) in preparing formal advice or recommendations to the CPUC, PAs, and others, if they so choose.

    v. All the above ground-rules would apply to all Full CAECC, Working Group and Subcommittee meetings. However, unless the CAEECC previously agreed at a Full CAEECC meeting that the particular Working Group or Subcommittee was delegated to complete the deliberations on behalf of the Full CAEECC on those specific issues, any options devised or consensus agreement-if any-would come back to the full CAEECC to review, refine if need be, and finalize.

  B. Process Issues

    i. For any **significant process-related issues** (including the annual selection (or removal) of Co-Chairs, whether or not to launch a CAEECC Working Group or Subcommittee on a particular topic, and approval of new Members, etc.) the goal

---

[3] D.15-10-028, p.74

would again be to reach a consensus. However, if a consensus is not achieved in a timely fashion, a decision can be made if two-thirds of the CAEECC Members present (including those participating on the phone) agree.

ii. For secondary **process related issues** (including setting meeting dates, finalizing agenda designs, etc.) the Facilitator Team in consultation with the Co-Chairs, and after seeking input and feedback from CAEECC Members, will have the responsibility to make these decisions.

The above roles and responsibilities and ground-rules will be revisited annually, or as needed.

DRAFT Agenda
Coordinating Committee Meeting #15
February 15, 2018 10:00 to 5:00
NRDC, 111 Sutter Street @ Montgomery, 21st Floor, San Francisco
Facilitator: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates
Call-in and Webinar Information: *See instructions at bottom of Agenda for Day*

Time	Session	Objective	Document	Presenter
10:00-10:10a	**Session 1: Introductions** • Welcome/Introductions • Objectives for today's meeting	*Introduce new facilitation team, CC members and others*	Agenda	Facilitator
10:10-10:40a	**Session 2: High-level Summary of Coordinating Committee Interviews**	*Identify key themes and suggestions from interviews—CC discussion*	Slides	Facilitator
10:40-11:30a	**Session 3: Goals, Roles and Responsibilities, and Ground Rules**	*Review draft prepared by facilitators* *Refine and improve as needed* *Adopt*	Word Document	Facilitator
11:30 – 11:40a	**Break**			
11:40-12:40p	**Session 4: Draft Workplan for 2018** • Coordinating Committee • Work Groups/Subcommittees • Ad Hoc Workshops	*Discuss potential topics, approximate timing of meetings, and schedule*	Excel Spreadsheet and Slides	Facilitator
12:40-1:00p	**Session 5: Selecting Co-Chairs for 2018 and Membership** • Nominations - Erin Brooks, SCG, Lara Ettenson, NRDC	*Discuss nominations including any alternates, and select 2018 Co-Chairs; discuss approach to adding new members*		Facilitator
1:00p	• **Lunch/Informal Networking** – Provided for CC Members; public participants please feel free to bring own food to NRDC or plenty of quick options close to NRDC			