**California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee-Hosted Meeting for**

**Market Support Metrics Working Group (MSMWG)**

**4th Meeting of the WG**

**September 21, 2021, 9:00-1:00**

*See Supporting Documents on* [*Meeting Page*](https://www.caeecc.org/9-21-21-msmwg-mtg)

Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates & Katie Abrams, CONCUR

On September 21, 2021, the CAEECC hosted its fourth and final meeting of the Market Support Metrics Working Group (MSMWG) via WebEx. 30 representatives from 19 MSMWG Member organizations (including leads, alternates, and Ex-officio) attended, as well as 5 other participants. A full list of meeting attendees is provided in Appendix A.

This meeting summary captures a high-level summary of critical areas of agreement and non-consensus.

During the meeting, changes were made in redline to the draft MSMWG report. The redlined document is available on the CAEECC website (see link above to Meeting Materials, *MSMWG Report Draft 9.21.21 redline (9.22.21),* under “Documents Posted After the Meeting”).

**Meeting Goals**

At the beginning of the meeting, CAEECC facilitator Dr. Jonathan Raab (J. Raab) welcomed MSMWG participants to the fourth meeting. He opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda and focus of the meeting— refine, seek consensus, and finalize Metrics and Principles, and address the remainder of the report (Other Key Scope Questions, Primary Objective and sub-Objective, and Introduction & Overview.

**Associated Priority Metrics (for each Segment sub-Objective)**

Summary of areas of agreement and non-consensus:

* **The Working Group reached a consensus on all the metrics and indicators for all five sub-Objectives.**
* As part of that agreement, the Working Group agreed to have three or four buckets under each sub-objective including:
	+ Applicable existing Metrics that will continue to be collected
	+ New Metrics with data that can be collected now (program outputs for relevant programs)
	+ New Metrics with data that needs to be collected later
* The primary focus of metrics and indicators is at the sector level
* Add the following note: “Note: In developing the metrics, the MSMWG noted that there can be useful data in Marketing Education & Outreach (ME&O) and other evaluations.”
* Recategorize metrics to indicators where targets can’t be readily
* Add the following footnote “Any AKAB surveys for the MS segment should be led by single entity in a timely fashion with fidelity down to applicable PAs. It could be done by a contractor to Energy Division or by a lead PA.”

**Principles**

Summary of areas of agreement and non-consensus:

* **The Working Group reached a consensus on five Principles, and Principle #6 is non-consensus**
* Consensus edits and additions were made to Principles 2-5 (see redlined report, linked above, for changes)
* For non-consensus Principle #6 on target-setting, BayREN, SCE, and PG&E collaborated after the meeting to draft option 1 text; Cal Advocates revised option 2 text. The final text for options 1 and 2 can be found on pages 10-11 in report, and are attached here as Appendix B.

**Remainder of the Report**

Jonathan Raab presented Section 5 (Other Key Scope Questions), Section 3 (Primary Objective and sub-Objectives), Section 1 (Introduction and Overview). There were no questions, concerns, or proposed changes with any of these sections of the report.

**Wrap-Up and Next Steps**

Jonathan Raab thanked the MSMWG for a productive Working Group process, and outlined the next steps as follows:

* Post redline document from today (9/21)
* Submission of alternative supporting text for non-Consensus items, if any (9/24)
* Circulation of Final Draft Report and sign-up process poll (9/27)
* Sign up process for non-consensus items, if any (10/1)
* Final Report produced and posted by (10/6); and submitted w/EMWG report 3rd week in October (note these dates have been revised following the meeting).

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix A: Attendance** |
| **Organization** | **Name** |
| 3C-REN | Erica Helson |
| BayREN | Jenny Berg |
| BayREN | Mary Sutter |
| Cal Advocates | Dan Buch |
| Cal Advocates | Sophie Babka |
| CEDMC | Greg Wikler |
| CHEEF | Bill Heberger  |
| CHEEF | Kaylee Damico |
| Code Cycle | Dan Suyeyasu |
| CSE | Stephen Gunther |
| Mendota Group | Grey Staples |
| Nexant | Kimberly Rodriguez |
| PGE | Rob Bohn |
| RCEA | Marianne Bithell |
| RCEA | Stephen Kullmann |
| SBUA | Ted Howard |
| SCE | Christopher Malotte |
| SCE | Patricia Neri |
| SDGE | Elaine Allyn |
| SJVCEO | Samantha Dodero |
| SoCalGas | Halley Fitzpatrick |
| SoCalREN | Cody Coeckelenbergh |
| The Energy Coalition | Chris Ford |
| The Energy Coalition | Craig Perkins |
| **Ex-Officio** |
| **Organization** | **Name** |
| CEC | Brian Samuelson |
| CPUC | Sasha Merigan |
| CPUC | Alison LaBonte  |
| CPUC | Nils Strindberg |
| CPUC | Peng Gong |
| CPUC | Peter Franzese |
| **Other Stakeholders** |
| **Organization** | **Name** |
| BayREN | Jennifer Mitchell-Jackson  |
| PGE | Lindsey Tillisch |
| Tierra Resource Consultants | Nicholas Snyder |
| Willdan | Jonathon Stage |
| Yinsight | Carol Yin |
| **Facilitators** |
| Raab Associates | Jonathan Raab |
| Concur, Inc. | Katie Abrams |

## **Appendix B: Non-Consensus Principle #6** **Target-Setting Options**

**Option 1: Targets will be set by the PAs for MS segment metrics following the collection of the first two program years of data (or a baseline has been set using reasonable proxy data).**

*[drafted by BayREN, SCE, PG&E]*

All MS segment metrics should have meaningful targets based on available data.  Since little or no data exists for new programs, pilots and/or programs still being designed, targets cannot be reasonably established. Similarly, existing programs that are moved into the MS segment may not necessarily have relevant data to be able to report on the newly determined MS segment metrics. PAs should have the time to collect baseline data so that targets are both appropriate and reportable.  Additionally, D.18-05-041 OP9 allows for new or modified metrics or indicators to be proposed in annual budget advice letter filings. Therefore, tier 2 advice letters (such as the True Up Advice Letter) may be an appropriate avenue for also providing targets.

**Option 2: In their Budget Applications, PAs will propose targets and/or set a date certain by which they will propose targets for all MS segment metrics.** [*drafted by Cal Advocates]*

All metrics proposed must have targets. The appropriate venue to propose and litigate targets is the budget application proceeding, where the evidence underlying proposed targets can be considered and alternatives proposed and considered. Most PAs already have the data and/or experience to set targets based on existing programs.

For any metrics that PAs think target setting isn't feasible without collecting baseline data, the proponents of Option 2 propose that the PAs include in their applications a proposal for a date certain by which the PAs will file a Petition for Modification (PFM) to the budget application decision. That PFM would include the proposed targets for each metric that had the targets deferred and include the evidentiary basis for the proposed target.

In addition, for those metrics that currently have uncertain baseline data, more significant adjustments to targets may be needed in the future after initial targets are set in applications or PFMs. The PAs should propose a process for making such adjustments (e.g., rely on the reporting requirements through CAEECC, use the annual reporting process to seek adjustment as needed, etc.) in their budget applications.