

Lessons Learned from Other Stakeholder Collaboratives

1



CALIFORNIA

TECHNICAL FORUM

**ANNETTE BEITEL
ALEJANDRA MEJIA
MAY, 2014**

Overview

Using Information About Other Energy Efficiency Related Collaboratives to Inform the Structure of the Cal TF

- Research Methodology
- Formation Principles—Answering Questions Raised by Stakeholders:
 - Nonprofit vs. Contract Model
 - Advisory vs. Decision-Making Role
 - Consensus Decision-Making vs. Formal Voting
 - Conflict-of-Interest Policies
 - Value of Volunteer Peer Review
 - Opening Meetings
- Effective Launch and Implementation Best Practices
- Form Follows Function
- Case Studies
- Conclusion

Organizations Researched



3

- California DSM Measurement Advisory Council (**CADMAC**)
- The International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol (**IPMVP**) and the Efficiency Valuation Organization (**EVO**)
- California Board for Energy Efficiency (**CBEE**)
- California Measurement Advisory Council (**CALMAC**)
- Low Income Advisory Group, or Low Income Oversight Board (**LIOB**)
- The IOU's Energy Efficiency Program Advisory Groups (**PAGs**)
- The PAGs' Peer Review Groups (**PRGs**)
- California Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative (**RETI**)
- CEC's Demand Analysis Working Group (**DAWG**)
- The Uniform Methods Project (**UMP**)
- The current EE Program Coordination Groups (**PCGs**)
- **ASHRAE**
- The International Code Council (**ICC**)
- **LEED** (Leadership in Energy & Environment Design) Rating System
- Northwest Regional Technical Forum (**NW RTF**)
- Illinois Energy Efficiency Stakeholder Advisory Group (**SAG**)
- Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships (**NEEP**) EM&V Forum
- Connecticut's Energy Efficiency Board (**EEB**, formerly ECMB)
- Rhode Island Energy Efficiency and Resources Management Council (**RI EERMS**)
- Massachusetts's Energy Efficiency Advisory Council (**EEAC**)

Key Research Questions

4

- How and why was the group formed?
 - What were the organization's mission and goals?
 - Was the collaborative an independent and/or nonprofit entity?
- Who participated and on what basis?
 - Were participants compensated?
 - How were decisions taken?
 - What was the conflict of interest policy?
- How long did the collaborative last? Why did it end?
- What did it accomplish?
- What were the group's strengths and weaknesses?
 - What pitfalls should the Cal TF avoid?
 - What characteristics should the Cal TF replicate?

Formation Principles

- **Advisory** vs. Decision-Making Role
 - ❑ Consistent with majority practice of other EE collaboratives, including NW RTF.
 - ❑ Those who are accountable for taking actions and achieving results should have final decision-making authority.
- Nonprofit vs. **Contract Model**
 - ❑ Consistent with majority practice of other EE collaboratives.
 - ❑ Only organizations with broad missions and multiple responsibilities are independent nonprofits.
 - ❑ Independent non-profit formed using ratepayer funds more likely to draw criticism and legal challenges than a less formal collaborative that is not an independent legal entity.
- **Consensus Decision-Making** vs. Formal Voting
 - ❑ Consistent with majority practice of other EE collaboratives.
 - ❑ Strong preference of staff/DRA.
 - ❑ Facilitator ends discussion once issues and positions have been discussed, and does not try to seek 100% agreement, which would lead to process inefficiency.
 - ❑ Retains information/data supporting majority and minority positions, which is valuable as majority position not always right

Formation Principles

- **Conflicts-of-Interest Policies – Allow Conflicted Parties to Participate**
 - ❑ Consistent with majority practice of other EE collaboratives.
 - ❑ The majority of groups deal with varied interests by ensuring a balanced membership .
 - ❑ Conflicted parties can correct factual errors and often have valuable information to contribute.
 - ❑ Conflicted parties must disclose financial conflicts.
- **Value of Volunteer Peer Review**
 - ❑ Voluntary peer review consistent with peer review of all organizations studied.
 - ❑ Peer review by volunteer reviewers is consistently viewed as the highest standard for technical and scholarly work.
 - ❑ Volunteer peer reviewers usually do not draft language or manage projects—these roles are performed by paid staff. Instead, they provide review and comment on documents provided to them.
- **Initial Meetings Closed**
 - ❑ Follows the steps taken by the successful CADMAC and RETI collaboratives.
 - ❑ Allows stakeholders to be more forthright and effective in the critical initial stages.

Effective Launch and Implementation

7

Best Practices

- Respect regulatory authority
- Decision-makers should act on outputs
- Transparent and truly responsive
- No consolidation of control
- No “dog and pony show”

Cal TF Response

- The Cal TF has been **working closely with CPUC staff**
- Cal TF will **document changed positions** based on stakeholder input consistent
- TF Meetings will be **open, well-documented, publically available**
- **Need to clarify** what decisions the PAC and TF can make
- Continue to take **meaningful notes, respond** to comments and questions.

Effective Launch and Implementation

Best Practices

- Clearly defined mission
- Defined principles and measurable work scope
- Timeliness is essential to success
- Enforced code of conduct to support respectful collaboration
- Strong, independent leadership to drive for representative results

Cal TF Response

- **Succinct vision, mission, guiding principles**
- **2014 Cal TF Business Plan**
- Developed **process maps, timelines, templates, and checklists**
- **Code of Conduct** for PAC and TF Members.
- Defined **threshold qualifications for Cal TF Chair**

“Form Follows Function”

- The Cal TF still defining mission and work; finalizing organizational structure and process can follow to support work/mission.
- Several successful collaboratives started with work and limited organizational structure; structure and process evolved to support work.
 - ❑ The ETCC demonstrated value and later formalized organizational structure.
- Cal TF is starting with informal structure and can formalize organization later when Cal TF mission/work is better defined.

Case Study 1: Emerging Technologies Coordinating Council



10

- Started by the IOUs and CEC with CPUC oversight at the beginning of restructuring.
- Focused on work before formalizing organizational strategy: it operated for years before the Commission formally recognized it and prior to formalizing organization/governance.
- Now counts SMUD as a member and is finishing governance process to further expand membership.

Case Study 2: Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative



11

- Organizational and procedural elements established by small group before public launch of collaborative
- Clear goals established at outset.
- Solely consensus-based process that produced a very technical statewide transmission assessment.
- Strong leadership from Dave Olsen and Rich Ferguson was essential to the group's success

Case Study 3: Western HVAC Performance Alliance



12

- Established by explicit CPUC decision.
- “Advisory to IOUs.”
- Parties not conflicted out.
- Strong staff support, 1090 not raised as concern.
- Very broad support base: 199 member organizations across 25 different categories.
- Extensive use of volunteers: In five years, members have volunteered approximately 17,574 hours of subject matter expertise.

Conclusions

13

- **Research Improved Cal TF Model**
- **Modifications to Initial Cal TF Model**
 - Advisory instead of governance model
 - Consensus decision-making versus voting
 - TF Members may participate if they have financial conflicts-of-interest as long as disclosed
- **Key Strengths of NW RTF Model Retained**
 - Transparent
 - Well-documented
 - Peer Review by independent technical experts
- **Cal TF Poised for Success**