California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee-Hosted Market Transformation Working Group – Part II

September 22, 2020 12-3:00 pm

WebEx-Based Meeting

Draft Meeting Summary

Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab & Katie Abrams

On September 22, 2020, the CAEECC hosted the launch meeting of the Market Transformation Working Group Part II (MTWG) via WebEx. Twenty-nine MTWG Members (including Leads, Proxies and Ex Officio) participated in the meeting as panelists. Approximately 8 additional members of the public participated as attendees. A full list of meeting registrants is provided in Appendix A.

Meeting materials are provided on the CAEECC website at: <https://www.caeecc.org/9-22-20-mtwg-mtg>

In this document, the majority of the discussion is captured without attribution. In some cases, the affiliation of the speaker is identified, because their affiliation is relevant to the comment. Presentations are summarized only if the presenter did not use a PowerPoint presentation or if it is not available on the meeting webpages (see link above).

Following the presentations, key clarifying questions or comments are listed and relevant *responses to questions* are noted in *italics*. Where multiple responses were given, these responses are listed as sub-bullets. Public comment, and any responses given, is included following these discussion sections. Next Steps, at the end of this document, list all next steps discussed at the meeting.

**Introductions and Goals**

J. Raab welcomed participants and reviewed the agenda. He provided an overview of recent MTWG updates: the Savings sub-WG has met twice, and a sub-sub WG has also met a few times. There has also been one meeting for the Goals sub-WG. The MTWG group is still exploring how best to approach overlap between Market Transformation initiatives (MTIs) and Resource Acquisition programs (RAs) and Codes and Standards (C&S) in both savings attribution and goal setting. The purpose of this meeting is to update the full Working Group on the sub-WGs, discuss Savings Attribution options, and review and revise the multi-meeting strategy and timing going forward.

**Attributing Savings Between MTIs and Other EE Efforts**

The bulk of the meeting was spent on Savings Attribution, guided by a series of presentations followed by discussion.

***Report Back from Savings Attribution Sub-WG – Margie Gardner, Resource Innovations***

This presentation is available on the meeting webpage (see link above, *Savings Attribution sub-WG Status (9.18.20),* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”). Members posed the following clarifying questions and comments on this presentation, focused on MTIs/RAs attribution:

* Do the total market units represent all MTIs in the portfolio, or a single MTI activity? In other words, can you get savings from an individual program? For example, with major building retrofits, you can’t isolate one initiative from another.
  + *This scenario will happen; we’ll need a system to adjust A B C values [see presentation slide 6, “MT and RA Savings” diagram] to reflect the MTIs it falls within. Use CEDARS over time to make adjustments. Suggest flagging this issue for Savings and C&S discussion, too.*
* Have the current RA programs set deemed savings at 5%?
  + *C. Torok: confirmed 5% deemed savings for RA*
* If savings are split up front, that could impact measure selection for RAs or C&S. Has that been discussed in each of the sub WGs?
  + *For RA, the proposal is that savings aren’t split upfront, but rather, as you gain market transformation (MT) units, you subtract RA savings as you go. So it’s as you go, not a forecast. This differs from the C&S proposal options on the table.*
* An already marginally cost-effective (CE) measure might have savings split between MTIs and RA, this approach may have some impact on RA, though potentially larger impact on C&S
  + *An integral part of developing MTIs needs to be sitting down with parties (C&S and RA) and discussing what augments, what fills gaps, and what adds value. This is clear in the Decision. The Administrator and other parties need to discuss the impact to CE and implementation. Ultimately, the MTA needs to decide if a given MTI fits within the portfolio*
  + *The theory is that MTIs create new savings opportunities where they may not have existed before. So rather than a zero sum game whereby MTIs would be taking savings away from RAs, the theory is that MTIs may enable more RAs savings*
* We know there are issues with CE in the RA framework, such as non-RA programs that are included in CE framework. Because an MTI doesn’t have the same CE requirement, we need to be careful to ensure MTIs don’t get excluded based on RA programs and CE issues.
  + *J. Raab responded that CAEECC has been given some leeway by the Commission to look at CE for MTI, including proposals that might deviate from RA CE tests. CE has the potential to be on the MTWG Part II agenda if ED wants CAEECC to explore the topic. CAEECC has expressed willingness in engaging in CE more generally, but that’s a separate docket for now.*
* On slide 6, consider adding “per units” to clarify the savings framework. Also, how would this framework work for metered or deemed savings?
  + *If the savings are reported in CEDARS, then this framework would still apply*

***RAs/MTIs Savings Attribution***:

J. Raab explained that the Savings sub-WG is getting more convergence on RAs than C&S, and

summarized the ***proposal***: ***subtract RAs savings from total savings to establish MTI savings.*** He asked if anyone saw significant issues with the sub-WGs’ proposal or wanted to propose alternatives. Hearing none, he noted there seemed to be agreement on the overall approach subject to further discussion on *how to operationalize* it*.* He then said that that sub-WG should continue discussions on how to operationalize the approach including the following two issues identified in M.Garnder’s presentation (summarized below), plus other issues raised in the discussion (above):

* Is CEDARS the best source for net savings?
* Will “free rider” RA calculations be biased by the MTI activities? If so, what can be done?
  + Keep FR rate static so less penalty to RA from a moving market?
    - This is alluded to in Decision (p 159 in requirements for MTI Plan)
  + Other ideas?

***Savings Attribution between MTIs and Codes & Standards***

J. Raab transitioned from MTIs and RAs to MTIs and C&S. He walked members and participants through the five sub-elements on the agenda:

* Show Sub-WGs Matrix—Jonathan Raab
* Discuss draft criteria for evaluating options
* Presentation on Option 4 (Split and Evaluate): RI, NEEA, CodeCycle, Luboff
* Presentation on Option 1 (Evaluate After C&S Adoption): NRDC, PG&E & SCE
* Discussion of options and proposed approaches

### Sub-WGs Matrix on MTIs and C&S options

J. Raab introduced the goal for today as discussing *option proposals* and *criteria*.

For the *option* proposals, J. Raab explained that before the last sub-WG held 9/16/2020, he asked participants to do homework. Based on members’ proposal of four different options, he asked members to come to the meeting having identified a first choice, as well as which options would be acceptable. See spreadsheet (see link above, *Preferences for Savings MTAs and Codes & Standards v3 (9.18.20),* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”) for details on options and initial voting preferences. He noted that Option 1 (Evaluate After C&S Adoption) was, at least initially, supported as a first choice by PG&E, SCE, and NRDC; and option 4 (“split and evaluate”: select a split now and evaluate after C&S adoption) was initially supported by Resource Innovations, NEEA, CodeCycle, and Jay Luboff. J. Raab noted that red text indicates changes made during or after the meeting, which shows the value in working groups meeting listening, reflecting, and having constructive dialogue.

J. Raab asserted that today’s goal is to start to better understand the rationale for each option, in the hope of developing a single option through the remaining MTWG process before having to go to the Commission with two or more options.

### Discuss draft criteria for evaluating options

J. Raab summarized the *criteria* proposal: ***simple, guides good investments, and enhances cooperation*.** For details on the criteria proposal see link above, *Preferences for Savings MTAs and Codes & Standards v3 (9.18.20),* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”. J. Raab mentioned that based on the input, the group could do a weighted exercise. Members and participants provided the following feedback and clarifying questions on the proposed criteria:

* Is “cooperation” (the language in the criteria proposal) synonymous with “collaboration”?
  + *J. Raab replied that the proposal has been using them interchangeably. A member opined that cooperation is different entities coming to an agreement, whereas collaboration is figuring out how to make it work.*
* The criterion needs to define “good investment” – CE, amt of savings, ratepayer benefits, etc. One proposal was to define good investment as benefits to ratepayers, which implies rigorous evaluation.
* Consider replacing or adding “feasible” to the criteria “simple”. A member emphasized that simplicity should not be a restricting factor; if it’s feasible but challenging, still go for it. A couple of additional members echoed the notion to add “feasible” to the criteria set.

J. Raab thanked members for the input and suggested that all participants keep the criteria in mind during the C&S presentation and discussion.

### Presentation on Option 4 (Split and Evaluate): RI, NEEA, CodeCycle, Luboff

This presentation is available on the meeting webpage (see link above, *Option 4 Savings Attribution –RI, NEEA, CodeCycle, Luboff,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”). The facilitation team organized the discussion into three categories: clarifying questions and comments on the presentation, comments in support of the proposal, and comments that express concern over elements of the proposal.

Members posed the following clarifying questions and comments on this presentation:

* A proposal in the Final Decision states that for MTIs that result in C&S, the savings afforded by MTI shall be equal to 3 times the savings claim made in the final year of MTI operations. Therefore, should we be discussing this based on the “shall be” language?
  + *C. Torok explained that the body of a Decision overrides any attachments, so the “shall be” language is an option for the Commission to adopt, but that they’re also looking for input from this stakeholder group and that a consensus approach is preferred.*
* Would minimum and maximum savings threshold be assigned upfront or as ex-poste?
  + *The option 4 proposal is for assignment at scale up, when the Tier 2 Advice Letter is filed. Each MTI would have its own thresholds, so it’s not a one size fits all discussion. The goal is for parties to be justified in moving forward with a 10 year horizon. As Tom Echman would say, “how much credit do you need to move forward”).*
* Do C&S and RAs not include MTI due to limited budget?
  + *In the Northwest, C&S and MTI are integrated. The C&S team works on potentially a hundred state and federal codes and standards; whereas NEEA’s MT portfolio is more focused. There is a 2-5x difference on what C&S needs to work on as opposed to MTIs. This isn’t how things need to work in CA. There may be many things that the C&S administrator is working on that MTI is not. Of the dozens of MTIs operating in NEEA territory, only 2/3 have C&S logic built in, despite lots of C&S activities*
* Under the TRC framework, ‘we all win’; it’s only in the case of the PAC where this is an issue. Since both TRC and PAC are referenced in the Final Decision language, we need to optimize for both. Furthermore, the 25% minimum threshold is a starting point.

Members and participations provided the following support for Option 4:

* Market theory as presented by MTA is that the market rises. It’s not a zero sum game because the ocean rises and the market broadens beyond widgets
  + *That is an important point because the purpose of MTA is to accelerate and enhance the amount of EE and speed with which it’s accrued.*
* By way of example, in year 1 there could be an assumption that say 25% goes to C&S and 25% to MTI, and 50% decided by a Delphi panel. This provides a balance between certainty and incentivizing good behavior
  + *MTI would be credited with some minimum threshold as a percentage of the ratepayer funded activity, and there would also be a maximum amount that MTI could claim – so that C&S could also have a minimum percentage to count on. The actual percentage would be determined by third party evaluation post C&S adoption.*
* Option 4 optimizes for a fundamental tension between savings and accuracy. If attribution can be reasonably agreed upon in a narrow way – say 70/30 upfront, the only way to increase net savings is to increase the scale of savings, which requires collaboration. And the Delphi panel helps ensure accuracy. Therefore, option 4 is a compelling blending of the two objectives of incentivizing good behavior and ensuring reasonable accuracy.
* Option 4 fosters collaboration, rigor, and communication. Need to be mindful of attribution to RAs and C&S to ensure all parties can go after as many savings as possible.

Members and participations provided the following concerns about Option 4:

* The proposal seems to ‘breaks with California’s longstanding EM&V tradition’ by crediting a program with some level of savings before implementation. Furthermore, crediting C&S upfront is meaningless because C&S is subject to ex-poste evaluations. The member also expressed doubt that the Commission would award C&S 25%.
  + *Under this proposal, MTI and C&S would be awarded credit based on whether the logic model shows a market intervention strategy that was implemented and evaluated, and if the intervention made it feasible for C&S to be passed. Similar to the “CASE” report. This approach doesn’t back away from 3P evaluation of attribution of C&S, but rather creates certainty in savings forecasts so investments in MTI can be done based on credit allocation (this all assumes C&S is a necessary part of the logic model). Goal is to create certainty to allow investments to go forward. The theory is that MT enables an expanded market that fosters collaboration among RA, C&S, and MTI.*
* The approach seems ‘arbitrary’ and pointed to the mechanism for C&S attribution, whereby the IOUs receive a fraction of total savings based on the efforts of the DOE, Commission, advocates, and other parties receiving attribution.
  + *The proposal is for sharing of savings ex-poste, so does not to discount or minimize other parties’ actions, so already net of adjustments*
* Does option 4 account for how cost-effectiveness is calculated in California?

J. Raab then transitioned from Option 4 to Option 1.

### Presentation on Option 1 (Evaluate After C&S Adoption): NRDC, PG&E & SCE

### [See NRDC explication, and slides from PG&E/NRDC, and from SCE]

J. Raab noted that there are three versions of Option 1 – from NRDC, PG&E, and SCE. The variations can be seen in the presentations posted to the meeting webpage (see link above, under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”). M. Chhabra presented NRDC’s presentation during the meeting, followed by P. Eilert and R. Higa providing verbal remarks.

M. Chhabra presented a slide deck detailing his proposal for Option 1. This presentation is available on the meeting webpage (see link above, *Option 1—NRDC explanation (9.22.20),* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”). Before his presentation, M. Chhabra noted that the spreadsheet posted on CAEECC showed the old option language, and requested the language be changed to “forecast”.

Noting that option 1 and 4 both include forecasts and evaluations, J. Raab asked M. Chhabra to highlight his perspective on the main differences between options 1 and 4:

1. There is no guarantee of savings
2. There are midterm milestones where MTI can revisit and correct future baselines up or down as better data is available.
3. There is need more guidance on development rigorous baselines.

J. Raab asked P. Eilert and R. Higa to provide verbal comments on elements that are unique or add to M. Chhabra’s presentation.

P. Eilert noted that all the option 1 proponents agree that early partnership is essential; and that many changes could elapse between now and 2035 when some MTIs may produce savings. He mentioned that there are many discussions about filling gaps in C&S, which are usually identified after rulemaking begins, and C&S team must respond immediately. He asserted gaps should be minimal assuming IOUs are funded at a significant level. The best way to get out of a “morass of splitting savings” is to ensure continued focused on big, bold, complicated, novel initiatives; this ensures value to ratepayers and success of MT. Lastly, he asserted his belief that option 1 provides a more rigorous evaluation process than option 4.

R. Higa noted a confusion over how option 4’s splitting attribution method fits within the EM&V model. To the extent that RAs and C&S have had MTIs embedded for decades, it’s important to look at the baseline and look for additionality and find ways for the “ocean to rise”. He also noted that California has unique EE issues and frameworks that may make implementation of Option 1 challenging. For example, C&S follows the lead of CEC, and the CEC doesn’t conduct a consensus-based ANSI code development process; this is unlike ASHRAE and ICC. He referred participants and members to his slide deck to see a list of other differences. He then invited C. Yin to provide remarks. She explained that MT is already happening within existing RA programs.

### Discussion and feedback on Option 1

Members posed the following clarifying questions and comments on M. Chhabra’s presentation, and the verbal remarks of P. Eilert, R. Higa, and C. Yin:

* Do the IOUs forecast savings for C&S when proposing savings and budgets?
  + *Under the measure selection process, there’s an evaluation process that appears to be similar to what would happen under MTI, at least at a high level. At a high level there are probably many similarities. What is different is C&S gets savings ex-poste of what’s attributable. There are no upfront assumptions that IOUs will receive a certain amount of savings. What’s missing in this discussion is how to operationalize these frameworks, and that likely warrants a separate longer conversation.*
* There appears to be a difference in whether the savings forecast process happens collaboratively or separately across C&S and MTI. The member summarized that option 4 offers a total market savings forecast; purportedly through collaboration across C&S, RA, and MTI. Whereas in option 1, the MTI simply does its estimates for a given initiative, and C&S conducts forecasts separately
* All influencers should be part of the analysis; attribution should not be limited to RA, C&S, and MTI.
* Goal is for MTA to take a whole range of measures and make them cost effective and market-ready, although the measures may not be CE until it reaches thresholds like turning into code.
* Goal of MTA is to run markets that multiples where we’ve already been. Paradigm differences between option 1 and 4 illustrate the need to think about MTA as potential to organize markets that are being attacked by RAs and C&S, but don’t have a strategic market framework. The MTA will need to sit down with all parties to do strategic planning, before introducing a new technology or market intervention.

As a next step, a member suggested each group create a couple of examples – one for a new program and another for a C&S initiative – to explore the implications and think through how to operationalize each plan. See next steps section below for the detailed gameplan for this sub-WG.

**Setting Goals for MTIs and Other EE Efforts**

***Report Back from Goals Sub-WG, Margie***

M. Gardner provided a presentation, which is posted to the meeting webpage (see link above, *Goal Setting sub-WG Status,* under “Documents Posted Before the Meeting”). The presentation focuses on three WG recommendations 1) that CPUC set MTIs savings at the portfolio level, 2) that savings goal be based on set of initiatives within portfolio, and 3) that savings goals be long term with annual reporting of progress. Members and participants posed the following questions and comments:

* The Decision discussed overall CE and goals, but looking at MTI at a portfolio level is different from the RA portfolio, where the goal is to defer procurement of other resources. A member expressed concern about holding the MTA to a portfolio level goal, where naturally there may be investment in types of initiatives that will be harder or easier to achieve, which could be at the detriment of harder-to-achieve savings opportunities.
  + *This brings up questions like whether the MTA will also be taking on other goals like education and training, diversity, etc.*
  + *C. Torok spoke to the intent of the Decision. Initially goals will be based on individual initiative, and each initiative will have milestones and goals agreed upon ahead of time. The Commission is not opposed to aggregating initiatives to give the Administrator flexibility, but the intent was for each initiative to be held to its own filed and approved plan. Another clarification to make about the Decision is that the Judge asked for the first tranche of MTIs to be approved via Application, and after that the process would likely be moved to a Tier 2 Advice Letter.*
* There may be important work that’s not expressed in kWh that MTI’s should be doing, i.e. EE newsletters. NEEA’s Board allocated a maximum of 10% to allocate to “infrastructure” items for things that needed doing. J. Harris proposed devising a framework to incentivize the MTA to promote activities that truly transform the market; and suggested that evaluating individual MTIs may help with this.
* Why did the WG recommend the CPUC set overall energy savings goals for MTIs when it’s really a bottom up process where MTIs are defined to identify gaps, and goals and savings are set and evaluated at MTI level? Doesn’t this create misalignment? Goals ensure the work targets the largest gap between market and economic potential.
  + *Look at whole set of initiatives and keep other set of goals. The process is not top down or in a vacuum because the CPUC sets goals based on bottom-up initiatives*
  + *C. Torok: an important question for this group, and ultimately the Commission to consider is what yardstick to measure the MTA against; we cannot set specific savings goals at this time, but what goals should we be holding this MTA to? This group should be thinking about this issue and building it into our processes.*
* Usually savings Potential precedes Goals; it’s hard to determine goals without knowing the potential. The way the MTA is scoped in the Decision gives the MTA many resources to conduct a study to determine potential through indicators and economics around diffusion theory. It will be interesting to see what coordination plays out between MTA and GuideHouse and the official Goals & Potential Study; and the LBNL DR Potential Study conducted through a separate proceeding. The member suggested considering what Joint Commission collaboration might be beneficial across proceedings.
* The MTA goal setting process is very different from traditional RA goals and potential setting. Suggest deferring to MTA initially so they can work through a few years of piloting, before the CPUC sets goals. If the CPUC is the ultimate arbitrator of goal setting, it may create prescriptive expectations of market transformation, and failures will be considered failures as with RA, whereas with MT, failures show us where to focus effort.
  + *C. Torok: The Market Transformation Administrator will have a huge amount of authority, so will need to have criteria to evaluate performance. It appears today’s discussion has moved towards consensus that each MTI will be vetted and have forecasted savings and milestones that support that savings achievement, and that we can aggregate that goal for the Administrator. But is that all we’ll use to evaluate their performance? Not sure that will hold enough water.*
  + A member agreed and suggested that there are many criteria you can apply that aren’t necessarily tied to a savings metric.
* J. Raab asked what precisely are we trying to solve in this MTWG with respect to goals? How do we evaluate the MTA’s performance? Savings goals may not be the only criteria, or even the best criteria. The MTWG has also been asked to figure out how goals should be set for MTIs vis-a-vis RAs and C&S. He noted that this focus is narrower than the initial focus on savings attribution and goal-setting. Now there are additional issues of whether to apply portfolio goals, and if so, are they top-down or bottom-up. Most seem to agree on a bottom-up approach, with some flexibility for the MTA to have a portfolio approach to goals for sub-buckets or initiatives. Another item for discussion is whether to think about non-savings goals, and how to assess the MTA overall. These are all important issues, but which issues are critical now, which can we defer, and how are they related?
* Attribution needs to be addressed now because it drives goals. In addition, the Commission needs to have authority over the MTA given the budget, so there needs to be as many criteria as possible – whether that’s goals, savings, or CE. This criterion will help with solicitation and contracting. The criteria don’t need to be prescriptive, but a set of principles are essential prior to rolling out the program.
* How would the CPUC set savings goals? Will an EM&V contractor make recommendations?
  + M. Gardner responded that the proposal provides some guidance for goal setting; for example, by working with the Board and MTA
* J. Harris provided insight into the Northwest experience: the first three years there weren’t savings goals whatsoever; they focused on the ability to intervene in the market. There were other goals (though perhaps informal), focused on getting up and running. A reasonable expectation for CA, as noted in the Final Decision, could be focused on set up, getting stakeholders engaged, and putting processes in place. NEEA experience showed that good goals can ensure the portfolio focuses on “really hard things” balanced with a likelihood of savings in near-term.
* What types of evaluation does the Northwest do, and what types of market indicators does the NW use?
  + J. Harris: Market progress indicators need to be MTI-specific, and goals need to roll up from individual MTIs. You need to look at which markets you want to engage in, and what types of opportunities - early/mid/late stage. Those are the types of recommendations I’d make for goal setting. Overlay risk – how much failure can you accept and how much risk do you want to take on.

***Discussion of Overall Goals framing and sub-WG emerging recommendations***

J. Raab summarized that the MTWG appeared to be converging on having MTIs savings goals set at the portfolio level but based a summation of MTIs under the MTA’s umbrella (potentially with savings goals for sub-buckets of initiatives as well). J.Raab also summarized that the sub-WG should also consider whether to think about proposing non-savings goals, as well as how to assess the MTA overall (particularly when it may take many years before savings are known).

**Review & Revise Proposed Multi-Meeting Strategy & Timing**

J. Raab proposed a strategy for next steps for both Savings Attribution and Goals. See the “Wrap Up and Next Steps” section for detail.

J. Raab noted that the prospectus includes a few other topics:

* How to ensure minimal duplication or negative overlap between MTI administered by the MTA and other EE efforts – J. Raab suggested delaying this for a month or two
* (Optional and only if directed by ED): further flesh out the proposed CE framework for MTI

**Wrap Up and Next Steps**

The following next steps were identified over the course of the meeting, discussed with the MTWG members who provided feedback, and then refined slightly after the meeting after discussions between the Facilitation Team and CAEECC Co-Chairs:

**Savings Attribution sub-WG**

For MTIs and C&S Savings Attribution

* Option 1 and Option 4 “huddles—those who are currently supporting each option”
  + Further explicate options through a one pager (Option 1 has done that but not Option 4)
  + Develop a matrix with different components/design features to more clearly show similarities and differences, also develop two use cases (pre-existing and no pre-existing C&S activities) (to be scoped by one person from each Option and J. Raab ahead of huddles and then filled out by huddles)
  + Huddles schedule their own meetings (once Facilitation Team checks w/MTWG members to see if anyone else wants to join huddles)

For MTIs and RAs Savings Attribution

* Sub-WG to discuss further how to operationalize the proposed the proposed approach of subtracting savings for RAs from total savings to calculate savings for MTIs. This would include further discussion of using CEDARs as main source of RA savings; calculating free-riders; and other issues mentioned during the discussion (and captured in the meeting summary above).

Next Sub-WG Meeting

* Note: The next sub-WG meeting on Savings Attribution will be in the day/slot originally reserved for the next full MTWG—October 21st from 9-noon
* This sub-WG will review and further discuss/develop both the MTIs and C&S and MTIs and RAs issues/proposals discussed above.

**Goals sub-WG**

* Sub-WG meets again in early November to flesh out approach to setting savings goals, to discuss other goals besides savings should be developed (if any), and how to evaluate MTA performance in the near-term (i.e., before actual savings for MTIs are known).

**MTWG members**

* Review meeting summary
* Fill out doodle polls
* Register for October/November sub-WGs and November MTWG
* Participate in Option 1 and Option 4 huddles and sub-WG meetings (see above for details)
* Option 1 and Option 4 huddle leads to meet w/facilitator to work on common approach/material (i.e. matrix and use cases) before huddles

**Facilitation Team**

* Develop meeting summary (this document) and circulate to MTWG for review
* Email MTWG members with update on process going forward, feedback on meeting summary, and to see if anyone wants to join subWGs and/or huddle
* Send doodle polls to the Goals Sub-WG to meet in early November ahead of next full MTWG
* Email the Savings Sub-WG to register for the 10/21 Savings sub-WG
  + Update the CAEECC website to show that the 10/21 meeting has changed from a full MTWG to a Savings sub-WG
* J. Raab to work with one representative from each huddle on a matrix and use cases ahead of the huddles
* Facilitate the sub-WGs but not the huddles
* Change the language to “forecast” in Option 1 of the *Preferences for Savings MTAs and Codes & Standards v3 (9.18.20)* spreadsheet; and update the criteria language

**Schedule**:

* Early/mid October: huddles to meet
* 10/21 Savings sub-WG to meet
* Early November: Goals sub-WG to meet
* 11/16 next full MTWG

**Appendix A: Meeting Registrants**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9.22.20 Market Transformation Working Group II Meeting** | | |
| **Member Organization** | |  | | --- | | **First Name** | | |  | | --- | | **Last Name** | |
| CEC | |  | | --- | | Brian | | Samuelson |
| CEDMC | Serj | Berelson |
| CEDMC | Greg | Wikler |
| CEE | Bernie | Kotlier |
| Code Cycle | Dan | Suyeyasu |
| CPUC | Christie | Torok |
| CPUC | Hal | Kane |
| CSE | Stephen | Gunther |
| CSE | Raghav | Murali |
| Don Arambula Consulting | Don | Arambula |
| Energy Solutions | Teddy | Kisch |
| Enervee | Anne | Arquit Niederberger |
| Jay Luboff Consulting | Jay | Luboff |
| NEEA | Jeff | Harris |
| NRDC | Lara | Ettenson |
| NRDC | Mohit | Chhabra |
| PG&E (lead) | Jonathan | Burrows |
| Don Arambula proxy | Frank | Spasaro |
| Public Advocate's Office | Ashlyn | Kong |
| Resource Innovations | Margie | Gardner |
| SBUA | Ivan | Jimenez |
| SCE | Brandon | Sanders |
| SCE | Randall | Higa |
| SDG&E (registered but canceled today) | Doug | White |
| Sheetmetal Workers Local 104 | Randy | Young |
| SoCalGas | Erin | Brooks |
| SoCalRen | Julie | Tan |
| The Energy Coalition | Marc | Costa |
| PG&E | Pat | Eilert |
|  | | |
| **Other Participants/Stakeholders Attending** | | |
| **Organization** | **First** | **Last** |
| DVNL | Nick | Brod |
| vision 2020 | Ted | Pope |
| Tyler & Associates | Craig | Tyler |
| PG&E (not official rep) | Andrew | Doeschot |
| WRCOG | Anthony | Segura |
| CAEECC Facilitator | Katie | Abrams |
| CAEECC Facilitator | Jonathan | Raab |
| Yinsight/SCE | Carol | Yin |
|  |  |  |