

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: March 30, 2021

To: San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E)

From: Rashid Mir and Peter Biermayer, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

Cc: R.13-11-005 Service Lists

Subject: 2020 EFFICIENCY SAVINGS AND PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE (ESPI)
PERFORMANCE SCORES

Table of Contents

I. Summary of 2020 ESPI Scores - Custom Projects and Workpapers 2

II. CPUC Staff Findings 2020 Activities 3

 A. Custom Projects Review Overview 3

 B. Workpapers Review Overview 5

III. Discussion 5

 A. Custom Projects Performance Review..... 6

 B. Workpapers Performance Review 9

IV. The Scoring Methodology..... 11

 A. Workpaper Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology 12

 B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology 13

 C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology 13

 D. Custom Metric 3, 4 and 5 Scoring Methodology 13

 E. Score Enhancement Methodology..... 14

Attachment A: Final ESPI Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points)..... 16

Attachment B: Custom Project Scores and Feedback..... 18

Attachment C: Workpaper Scores and Feedback 21

Attachment D: 2020 Performance Annual Ratings 23

I. Summary of 2020 ESPI Scores - Custom Projects and Workpapers

Pursuant to Decision (D).13-09-023, D.15-10-028, D.16-08-019, and D.20-11-013, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Staff and consultants score the investor-owned utilities (IOUs) based on their performance during the pre-approval phase (or “ex ante” phase) of developing an energy efficiency project or measure. The ex ante review scoring is a part of the Efficiency Savings and Performance Incentive (ESPI) mechanism. D.20-11-013 placed a moratorium on awards payable under the ESPI but directed that ex ante review scoring shall continue. CPUC Staff and consultants completed the 2020 ESPI performance review scoring as prescribed in Table 3 of D.16-08-019. Decision D.16-08-019 established consolidated metrics to evaluate and further direct the utilities. Ordering Paragraph 19 of this decision states that the ESPI scores “shall be weighted for the utility program administrators based on the proportion of deemed savings and custom measures in each utility’s portfolio”.

A breakdown of SDG&E’s 2020 ESPI performance score of 78.94/100 for workpapers¹ and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. SDG&E’s 2020 total points is an increase over its 2019² total points of 67.40. Scores for 2019 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

Table 1: SDG&E 2020 ESPI Scoring for Workpapers and Custom Projects

SDG&E 2020 ESPI Performance Scores and Points		Workpapers				Custom			
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	2.50	10%	2.50	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	2.86	30%	7.50	15	4.10	30%	12.31	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	4.17	25%	6.25	12.5	4.90	25%	12.25	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	2.86	25%	12.50	12.5	4.25	25%	10.63	12.5
Total				33.75	50			45.19	50

¹ A workpaper documents the data, methodologies, and rationale used to develop values for deemed measures. A workpaper is prepared and submitted by program administrators and approved by the CPUC.

² 2019 custom projects scoring began in July 2019.

Table 2: SDG&E 2019 ESPI Scoring for Workpapers and Custom Projects

SDG&E 2019 ESPI Performance Scores and Points		Workpapers				Custom			
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	2.50	10%	2.50	5	4.89	10%	4.89	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	2.86	30%	8.57	15	2.35	30%	7.03	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	3.10	10%	3.10	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	4.17	25%	10.42	12.5	4.00	25%	10.00	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	2.86	25%	7.14	12.5	3.50	25%	8.75	12.5
Total				33.63	50			33.77	50

The metric scoring area descriptions are expanded in [Attachment A](#). The final category scores are explained in more detail below as well as in [Attachment B](#) through [Attachment D](#) to this memo.

II. CPUC Staff Findings 2020 Activities

A. Custom Projects Review Overview

1. Summary of 2020 Achievements

From the period beginning January 2020 to the end of December 2020, SDG&E submitted 80 custom projects to CPUC Staff for review selection. CPUC Staff selected 37 of these projects for review and issued 36 scored dispositions. Only 1 project was selected for review in 2020 that had a disposition issued in 2021 due to timing of its selection.³

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points resulted in SDG&E's custom project score increasing by 11.42 points from 2019 scores⁴ (33.77 in 2019 vs. 45.19 in 2020 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above). Unlike the previous two ESPI cycles, SDG&E demonstrated notable efforts to improve its documentation and processes and as a result their performance has increased significantly this cycle.

³ Projects selected by CPUC Staff at the end of 2020 were reviewed and disposed in early 2021 and therefore are not included in the 2020 performance scoring. Disposition count of 36 also includes 2 late dispositions.

⁴ 2019 custom projects scoring began in July 2019.

CPUC Staff's observations include:

- **The proportion of Process, Policy and Program rules issues decreased significantly.** In 2019 the number of deficiencies noted in this area was 37 percent of total issues identified, whereas in 2020 the number of deficiencies dropped to 13 percent of total. This demonstrates that SDG&E is making strides to improve its conformance with CPUC policy and program rules.
- **The number of issues regarding eligibility has dropped significantly.** Custom Project Review found eligibility related deficiencies were one of the most prevalent areas in 2019 whereas SDG&E had no issues related to eligibility in 2020.
- **SDG&E continued to initiate discussions on project reviews to seek guidance and input from CPUC Staff.** CPUC staff received requests for early opinions on program influence screening, thermal energy storage at a campus chilled water plant, and central plant new construction on a college campus, as well as discussions surrounding review processes for High Opportunity Project & Programs (HOPPS) and Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) projects.
- Project review and approval policies aligned with the Statewide Custom Projects Guidance documents.
- By developing the methodology for the Savings by Design (SBD) weighted Effective Useful Life (EUL) Calculator, SDG&E improved estimates which are particularly important to estimating lifecycle savings. In 2019 approximately 44 percent of SDG&E projects had missing or incorrect EUL's provided, whereas in 2020 only 1 project (3 percent) experienced this deficiency.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

Areas that were most problematic, frequent, and/or need improvement include:

- **The proportion of gross savings impact issues increased significantly.** In 2019 SDG&E had 40 percent of all issues related to gross savings impacts. In 2020, the number of issues related to gross savings impacts increased to 62 percent of total issues. While SDG&E is showing improvement in QA/QC processes, the methods used to estimate gross savings impacts still result in deficiencies across a large number of total project submissions.
- SDG&E must ensure that projects, such as CPUC Project ID 409, have a robust up-front engineering estimating strategy and a measurement and verification (M&V) plan compatible with the expected project savings.
- SDG&E must clearly articulate calculation methodology, conform to CPUC policy regarding Savings by Design simulation modeling guidance, and provide robust up-front supporting calculations for NMEC projects.
- SDG&E must ensure that measurement and verification (M&V) plans for designated NMEC projects is consistent with the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) Site Level Technical Guidance.⁵

⁵ LBNL, "Site Level NMEC Technical Guidance: Program M&V Plans Utilizing Normalized Metered Energy Consumption Savings Estimation, Ver 2.0." 12-15-2019.
<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=6442463695>.

B. Workpapers Review Overview

1. Summary of 2020 Achievements

SDG&E's workpapers scores have increased compared to last year by 0.12 points (from 33.63 in 2019 to 33.75 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above). SDG&E continues to demonstrate efforts to improve its performance. CPUC Staff observed improvements in SDG&E's development and management of workpaper submissions in the following areas:

- **In-depth review and reporting of DEER anomalies.** SDG&E has systematically reviewed aspects of Database for Energy-Efficient Resources (DEER)⁶ or Preliminary Ex Ante Resource database (PEAR)⁷ and reported back anomalies in a clear succinct manner. This has been beneficial to all stakeholders.
- **Communication.** SDG&E is a proactive and effective communicator with CPUC regarding plans to update workpapers or workpaper plans and to assure there is no lack of understanding about intent or timing.

2. Summary of Areas of Improvement

CPUC Staff highlights the following recommendations for improvement which are centered on improved QC and communication in light of the current transition to eTRM:

- SDG&E should work to improve internal QC processes with workpaper database tables and coordinate effectively with CalTF to assure errors are addressed prior to submittal to CPUC for review.
- SDG&E should conform to workpaper submittal schedules and communicate quickly with CPUC when there are delays.
- SDG&E has played a limited role in the development and management of workpaper submissions during the review period. CPUC Staff encourages SDG&E to find a take more of a leadership role and collaborate with 3P Implementers and CalTF for workpaper submittals.

III. Discussion

The following sections of this memorandum provide a detailed description of the findings, including, areas of achievement, areas requiring improvement and scoring for both custom projects and workpapers.

⁶ The Database for Energy Efficient Resources contains information on selected energy-efficient technologies and measures.

⁷ The Preliminary Ex Ante Resource database contains proposed updates to DEER for vetting before being finalized in DEER.

A. Custom Projects Performance Review

Each year, CPUC Staff reviews a selected sample of custom project energy efficiency program applications. The review findings and directions to the PA are presented in documents referred to as “dispositions”. CPUC Staff acknowledges that prior to July of 2019 project applications were not always selected at random, rather selected based upon the type of projects that had past issues or projects where the CPUC expected to find deficiencies for various reasons. In 2020, projects were initially selected at random to adjust for this bias. However, due to the low numbers of projects submitted as ready for review, this became a challenge over the course of the year and CPUC staff had to adjust its selection based on customer incentive amounts, known past issues, measures not selected for review in the past six months, and new calculation methodologies. Projects were also selected to determine whether a utility has corrected issues from similar projects that CPUC Staff identified in the past, such as Savings by Design (SBD) projects using the EnergyPro software.

From the period beginning January 2020 to the end of December 2020, CPUC Staff selected 37 new SDG&E projects for review and of those 36 received dispositions and 1 projects’ disposition was issued in early 2021 due to the timing which it was selected.⁸ The comments below are organized by the five metric areas of scoring prescribed in D.16-08-019 with metric scores shown prior to any enhancement points. A summary table of all issued dispositions is included in [Attachment B](#). [Attachment D](#) contains an embedded custom scores workbook that includes a tab with details on the individual project level disposition scores and feedback from the project reviewer.

Table 3 below presents the custom disposition points given to SDG&E for each metric both with and without the addition of any Enhancement Points.

Table 3: SDG&E Custom Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Weight Factor	Custom Disposition Points		Max Points
			With Enhance Pts	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	5.0	5.0	5
	Content, Completeness, and Quality of				
2	Submittals	30%	12.31	12.31	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	4.20	5
4	PA’s Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	12.25	11.00	12.5
5	PA’s Responsiveness	25%	10.63	10.63	12.5
Total			45.19	43.14	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2020, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 5.0 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This disposition score was based on the 36 custom project reviews completed in 2020. In 2020, SDG&E submitted project documentation for review for all 36 reviewed projects early. 26 of these 36 projects (72 percent)

⁸ Projects selected by CPUC Staff at the end of 2020 were reviewed and disposed in early 2021 and therefore are not included in the 2020 performance scoring. The remaining projects selected include 2 late dispositions.

were submitted five days or earlier than required per timeline mandated in Senate Bill (SB) 1131 and Section 381.2 of the Public Utilities Code.⁹ SDG&E improved significantly compared to 2019 submissions and continues to exceed expectations with regards to timeliness by submitting projects well ahead of the required submission due date.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2020, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 12.31 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This disposition score was based on the completeness of the 36 SDG&E custom project reviews. Of these 36 dispositions, 15 projects (42 percent) were approved without exception. In addition, CPUC staff project reviews exceeding the SB-1131 deadline resulted in 2 projects (6 percent) marked as Late dispositions (advisory only; does not impact the project). However, 2 projects (6 percent) were rejected and 17 projects (47 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies which resulted in a loss of points under this metric.

Table 4 below summarizes the 46 action items identified across the 36 scored dispositions¹⁰ issued between January 1, 2020 and December 31, 2020. These action items illustrate errors that impacted the project's eligibility, documentation, and efficiency savings estimate calculations.

Table 4: Summary of Categorized Action Items for Custom Projects

Issue Area	Action Categories	Summary of CPUC	Summary of CPUC	Total	Percent of Total
		Staff Required Action by the PA:	Staff Notes or Instructions:		
Issues Related to Gross Savings Impacts	Analysis assumptions	10	0	10	31%
	Calculation method	14	0	14	44%
	Calculation tool	1	0	1	3%
	M&V plan	6	1	7	22%
	Subtotals	31	1	32	62%
Process, Policy, Program Rules	Baseline	1	0	1	14%
	EUL/RUL	1	0	1	14%
	Incentive calculation	1	0	1	14%
	Measure cost	1	0	1	14%
	Measure type	1	0	1	14%
	Self generation	2	0	2	29%
	Subtotals	7	0	7	13%
Documentation Issues	Missing required information	4	0	4	100%
	Subtotals	4	0	4	8%
Other Issues	Other 1 - Discrepancy between documentation and bi-monthly upload	0	1	1	11%
	Other 2 - Reporting inconsistency	2	0	2	22%
	Other 3 - Discrepancy between documentation and quarterly report	0	1	1	11%
	Other 4 - Project not started	0	1	1	11%
	Other 5 - Continue Document Upload	2	2	4	44%
	Subtotals	4	5	9	17%
	Grand Total	46	6	52	100%

⁹ “The electrical corporation or gas corporation shall make the project application supporting documentation available to the CPUC for review within 15 business days of the CPUC review selection date”.

¹⁰ This table includes action items issued on 2 late dispositions.

Specific examples of project and measure level deficiencies are provided below.

- **M&V Issue** was the most prevalent deficiency discovered and occurred in 4 out of the 36 projects reviewed (11 percent) which resulted in a significant reduction in points for these projects. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 318, 319, 408, and 422.
- **Issue with Parameter Assumptions** occurred on only one project reviewed (CPUC ID 422), however this project also had issues with M&V plans leading to a significant loss of points for this metric.
- **EUL Does not Exceed Simple Payback** occurred on only one project (CPUC ID 395) however this deficiency is notable and results in a significant loss of points for this project.
- **Measure Performance Less Than Baseline** occurred on only one project (CPUC ID 330) however this deficiency is notable and results in a significant loss of points for this project.
- **Savings Calculations Not Provided** occurred on two projects (CPUC IDs 395 and 583), which resulted in a significant loss of points for these projects.
- **Incorrect Baseline Value** occurred on only one project reviewed (CPUC ID 319) leading to a significant loss of points for this project due to the importance of this deficiency.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2020, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 4.2 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. At the portfolio level, SDG&E made efforts to bring measures, projects, or studies forward for discussion prior to CPUC Staff review. Additionally, topics such as SBD eligibility and submittal requirements, Retrocommissioning (RCx) measure savings approach, Industry Standard Practice (ISP) requirements, reporting savings for projects with post M&V, as well as numerous other topics were brought up for discussion during bi-weekly calls. CPUC staff also noted SDG&E's involvement in CPR stakeholder groups, helping to streamline the review process for small projects, providing feedback on the Communications Process document and the draft guidelines for M&V plans, and development of the Parallel Review by PA and CPUC Staff guidance. Additionally, SDG&E helped develop the weighted EUL calculator and led a statewide team of stakeholders to create the Statewide Technical Review Workbook. These activities demonstrated to CPUC staff that SDG&E exceeded expectations with regards to proactive collaboration under this metric and has taken significant steps to improve engagement with CPUC staff.

4. PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control (QA/QC)

In 2020, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 11.0 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Project and measure level disposition performance results reviewed under Metric 2 were used as a proxy for the level of QA/QC performed by the PA. As such, the number of dispositions proceeding without exception was weighed against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 36 dispositions issued, 15 projects (42 percent) proceeded without exception, while 17 projects (47 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted in the review. The

remaining 2 projects¹¹ (6 percent) were rejected. In contrast to last year where SDG&E had 17 percent of projects rejected, this year SDG&E demonstrated higher-than-expected performance for this metric as it pertains to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review.

CPUC Staff found that SDG&E had implemented several elements of QC into their processes, including the SBD checklist, reduced the number of supplemental data requests (SDRs) due to improved quality reviews, developed an internal tracking system, and took additional steps to improve general internal processes and methodologies. SDG&E also took the initiative to undergo a Lean Six-Sigma (LSS) process engagement to train problem solving skills to their staff and adopted an internal Corrective and Preventative Action Plan (CAPA) to further improve QA/QC processes. Overall CPUC Staff believes SDG&E made significant efforts to improve the QA/QC related to document submissions and internal practices and exceeded CPUC expectations for this metric.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2020, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 10.63 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. When reviewed at the portfolio level, CPUC Staff assessed the time series of rejections and expectations, the alignment of program policy and procedures with the number of actual rejections and exceptions based on eligibility and attribution, and adaption to rule changes over time. CPUC Staff found that projects reviewed from January 2020 through December 2020 exhibited a slight downward trend in terms of project performance over time (i.e., project submissions had more issues when submitted later in 2020 compared to earlier in the year). CPUC Staff also noted that 7 out of the 46 comments made on projects (15 percent) were related to Process, Policy, and Program Rules and were therefore out of compliance with CPUC policies and previous disposition guidance. SDG&E did develop internal guidance for programs/projects that go through advisory-only reviews, such as NMEC and HOPPS and therefore CPUC staff felt they met expectations for what was required under this Metric.

B. Workpapers Performance Review

SoCalGas had 2 workpapers which were submitted in 2020, one was reviewed and disposed, and the remaining one is still under detailed review. This end of year memo provides workpaper specific feedback on the one which were reviewed and disposed.

The comments below are organized by the five scoring metric areas created in D.16-08-019.¹² The narrative includes observations common to multiple workpapers and feedback related to the workpaper development process. Specific workpaper feedback is provided in [Attachment C](#), at the end of this document. The Workpaper Detailed Review Table provides feedback on specific workpapers. The Workpaper Submissions Table lists all workpapers submitted by SDG&E during the review period. Workpapers were selected for feedback from those that were led by SDG&E and were either disposed or reached approval status during the review period. CPUC Staff acknowledges that workpaper development may have been supported by multiple PAs; however, at this time, there is no mechanism for apportioning feedback among PAs. Therefore, feedback is only provided for the submitting PA, with the assumption that they are the lead PA. The scoring rubric

¹¹ There were also 2 Late dispositions issued.

¹² See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.

for workpapers is defined as follows:

- ‘+’ indicates a positive scoring impact which receives 100% of total points for the metric
- ‘-’ indicates a negative scoring impact which receives 0% of total points for the metric
- ‘Yes’ indicates meeting minimum expectation which receives 50% of total points for the metric
- ‘No’ indicates the review feedback is not applicable to a metric and does not impact the average

The assigned percentage scores were averaged across all the reviewed items.

Table 5 below presents the workpaper disposition points given to SDG&E for each metric both with and without the addition of any enhancement points.

Table 5: SDG&E Workpaper Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Weight Factor	Workpaper Disposition Points		Max Points
			With Enhance Pts	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	2.50	2.50	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	7.50	7.50	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	2.50	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	6.25	6.25	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	12.5	6.25	12.5
Total			33.75	25.00	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2010, SDG&E received a workpaper disposition score of 2.50 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SDG&E generally met deadlines for submission of statewide workpapers in the review period and all workpapers received a Yes, indicating that minimum expectations were met for timeliness.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2020, SDG&E received a workpaper disposition score of 7.50 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. The content, completeness, and quality of workpapers has generally met standards.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2020, SDG&E received a workpaper disposition score of 2.50 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Workpapers met the minimum expectations of collaboration which was required to ensure each workpaper met all PAs' needs, therefore all workpapers received a "Yes".

SDG&E is the lead for HVAC measure development; however, CPUC Staff engagement has been limited during the review period. CPUC Staff expects that the PAs manage workpaper development well, including the submission of a workpaper plan and schedule early in the development process, and that the schedules are managed to meet deadlines. SDG&E continued conversations with

CPUC for the phase change material commercial refrigeration measure workplan throughout the year, however the development of this workpaper ceased at the end of last year.

4. PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control

In 2020, SDG&E received a workpaper disposition score of 6.25 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. The quality of SDG&E's workpapers was adequate and averaged 50 percent of the direct work product points for this metric, meeting minimum expectations for workpaper quality control.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2020, SDG&E received a workpaper disposition score of 6.25 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SDG&E continues to respond to CPUC direction and the needs of programs to report embedded water energy savings with the Water Energy Nexus workpaper.

IV. The Scoring Methodology

The 2020 performance score was developed using five detailed scoring metrics for each directly reviewed work product (i.e., workpaper and custom project), as well as a scoring of the utility's internal due diligence processes, QA/QC procedures and methods, as well as program implementation enhancements to support improved forecasted values.

[Attachment A](#) summarizes the Metrics adopted in D.16-08-019 as well as the CPUC Staff developed scores and points for 2020. D.16-08-019 also directed that the custom and workpaper scores be weighted together into a final score based on the PA total claims for custom and deemed activities, respectively.

In accordance with D.13-09-023, the PAs' activities are assessed against a set of five metrics on a rating scale of 1 to 5. Once activities are assessed, the ratings for each are converted onto this scale, where 1 is the lowest score assigned and 5 is the highest score assigned. A maximum score on all metrics for both workpapers and custom projects will yield 100 points whereas a minimum score on all metrics would yield 20 points. The 1 to 5 rating scale is distinguished as follows:

1. Consistent underperformer in meeting the basic expectations.
2. Makes a minimal effort to meet CPUC expectations but needs dramatic improvement.
3. Makes effort to meet CPUC expectations, however improvement is required.
4. Sometimes exceeds CPUC expectations while some improvement is expected.
5. Consistently exceeds CPUC expectations.

As with the 2019 performance scores, the final scores were "built-up" from a metric-by-metric assessment of each reviewed work product. It is CPUC Staff's expectation that this detailed scoring approach, along with the detailed qualitative workpaper and custom project level feedback, is

consistent with the direction provided in D.13-09-023. We believe this scoring approach provides specific guidance to the utilities on how to improve their due diligence review and scores moving forward.

A “Direct Work Product Review” portion of each metric score was developed based upon the individual scoring of dispositions issued for custom project or workpapers. Each reviewed utility work product was first determined to have components either applicable or not applicable to a metric.¹³ If a metric was determined to be not applicable to a given disposition, the metric was identified as not applicable (“N/A”) and the metric was assigned a score equal to the average 1 to 5 score from the remaining applicable metrics. Assigning this average score to any “N/A” metrics essentially normalized the final score so that a disposition neither benefitted nor was penalized as a result of a non-applicable metric.

A. Workpaper Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology

For workpapers, if an item was determined to have activity applicable to a metric, the item was then assigned a qualitative rating as to the level of due diligence applied to the item. The scoring rubric for workpapers is defined as follows:

- ‘+’ indicates a positive scoring impact which receives 100% of total points for the metric
- ‘-’ indicates a negative scoring impact which receives 0% of total points for the metric
- ‘Yes’ indicates meeting minimum expectation which receives 50% of total points for the metric
- ‘No’ indicates the review feedback is not applicable to a metric and does not impact the average

The assigned percentage scores were averaged across all the reviewed items. Individual workpaper level disposition scoring, as well as related workpaper activities, are provided in [Attachment C](#). Note the following approach to scoring individual workpapers by metric:

- Metric 1 Timeliness: The workpaper submission schedule was designed to distribute the workpapers throughout the year. Workpapers receive “+” if schedule was followed.
- Metric 2 Content: Straightforward workpaper received a “Yes”, complex revisions received a “+”, unless there were errors in the content, which warranted a “-”.
- Metric 3 Collaboration: Straightforward consolidation effort workpaper received a “Yes”, initiative to work with other PAs and CPUC receives “+”.
- Metric 4 Quality Assurance: Workpapers that were complete, consistent, and without meaningful errors received a “Yes”. Those workpapers with inconsistencies between the data tables and narrative or where values were left undefined received a “-” score.
- Metric 5 Process: Workpaper responsiveness to program needs received a “Yes” for straightforward and “+” for complex workpaper submissions.

¹³ For example, workpapers and custom projects which do not involve measures which in some way are expected to utilize DEER values, assumptions or methods, in the development of new kWh, kW and therm savings values would not receive scoring for Metric 2 (“Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals”). Another example would be a minor workpaper which may not require proactive collaboration with CPUC Staff and therefore not receive a score for Metric 3 (“Proactive Initiation of Collaboration”).

For custom projects, each applicable metric was directly scored according to the unique metric scoring methodology outlined below. A project by project summary of the custom project scoring is included in a custom tables workbook which has been included as an embedded excel file in [Attachment D](#).

B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology

This metric is related to the timeliness of submittals and a maximum of 5 points is allocated to this metric based on the PA's responsiveness to requests and follow-up documentation required to complete the review. Scoring for this metric occurs at the individual project review stage.

Per Senate Bill (SB) 1131 requirement an allocation of 15 business days is given for the PA to submit materials following the date selected for review. PAs begin with a score of 5 and after 15 business days have passed, 1.0 point is deducted for each day the submittal is late.

C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology

This metric is related to content and completeness of submittals and a maximum of 15 points is allocated to this metric. Scoring occurs on each custom project during the individual project review stage. On a percentage basis Metric 2 is the single greatest determinant of the overall ESPI score. Scoring for Metric 2 is achieved through numerous areas throughout the custom project review workbook. PA's begin with a full score of 5 for each custom project in the review workbook with each noted deficiency reducing the points accordingly. Deficiencies are not weighted equally, with significant issues such as failure of the fuel substitution test or inadequate documentation of program influence receiving a heavier weighting compared to tests such as incorrect site location information. The scores from all custom projects are then averaged together to arrive at an average disposition score for Metric 2.

D. Custom Metric 3, 4 and 5 Scoring Methodology

Whereas Metrics 1 and 2 are assessed at the project level, Metrics 3, 4, and 5 are assessed at the portfolio level for each PA. As such, no individual custom project receives a unique score for these metrics. Additionally, unlike Metrics 1 and 2 which rely on deductions under each metric, scores for Metrics 3, 4, and 5 are awarded based on the PA's performance as it relates to the components of each metric.

For Metric 3, points are awarded when the PA proactively brought high impact or unique projects forward to CPUC Staff prior to developing a study or project. The final score for Metric 3 is therefore representative of the average performance of custom projects across the portfolio of projects.

Scoring for Metric 4 relies upon disposition results and findings identified under Metric 2 as well as the overall depth and correctness of the technical review team. The PA's performance on dispositions assists in serving as a proxy for quality control under Metric 4. In addition, several project specific elements such as whether changing market practices and updates to DEER were

considered, or if a project demonstrated evidence of review activities are used to assess the scoring for this metric. Similar to Metric 3, a final score is representative of the average performance of custom projects across the portfolio of projects.

With Metric 5, a review of process enhancement tools and techniques, tracking improved disposition performance over time, and highlights provided throughout the year by the PA assist in determining an average score related to process and programmatic improvements. Similar to Metrics 3 and 4, a final score is representative of the average performance of custom projects across the portfolio of projects.

E. Score Enhancement Methodology

The above process resulted in custom project and workpaper work product review scores. Next, PA-specific “Review Process Score Enhancements” were developed for each applicable metric based on observed policy and technical reviews or program implementation processes/procedures developed and implemented in 2020 in order to positively impact future project reviews. CPUC Staff believes it is important to provide ESPI “Enhancement” points for positive due diligence developments to recognize the effort and to provide additional encouragement even before a change in project-level results is observed.

In the custom scoring process CPUC Staff added “Enhancement” points in the area of Policy/Technical QA/QC for Metrics 3, 4, and 5 to reflect SDG&E staff’s positive efforts in these metric areas as discussed earlier. Those initiatives included:

- Took steps to implement a Lean Six Sigma approach for process improvements to both upgrade effectiveness and train staff.
- Developed internal tracking system of corrective and preventative actions based on mid-year ESPI feedback.
- Continued to participate alongside other PAs in statewide subgroups to provide feedback on the Communications Practice Document and guidelines for M&V plans, participated in the stakeholders subgroups, and developed Parallel Review by PA and CPUC staff guidance.
- Led a statewide team through bi-weekly meetings to develop the Technical Review Workbook.
- Assisted with developing the methodology and the SBD Weighted EUL Calculator for documenting weighted EULs for New Construction projects.
- Adopted an internal Corrective Action Plan (CAP) as part of QA/QC improvements.

Although these efforts may not yet be reflected in project specific disposition scores, CPUC Staff believes recognition of the efforts of SDG&E’s technical and policy review staff is warranted. These activities offer promise to improve the overall SDG&E performance in the future.

Workpaper scores also include “Review Process Score Enhancements.” Process issues represent critical deemed measure development topics where CPUC Staff believes improvement is needed or improvement has occurred, but those activities are not necessarily reflected in the areas of direct review. These activities, as discussed above, are noted in the narrative, but are summarized here by

metric as:

- Metric 1 Timeliness: There were no adder points for this metric.
- Metric 2 Content: There were no adder points for this metric.
- Metric 3 Collaboration: SDG&E has shown collaboration as the monthly IOU meeting organizer and facilitator.
- Metric 4 Quality Assurance: There were no adder points for this metric.
- Metric 5 Process: SDG&E has shown responsiveness as the monthly IOU meeting organizer and facilitator.

To produce the final workpaper scores, the metric scores for the two workpaper contributing areas were added together, using a 50 percent weight for the process issues score. The 50 percent weight given to the process review has the effect of being a “score enhancement” or increase to the direct review score. Furthermore, within each contributing area (direct and process review areas), CPUC Staff also assigned weights for individual items as a way to reflect greater importance of different individual review items. The separate process scoring provides an avenue for assessing overall QA/QC processes and procedures put into place by SDG&E.¹⁴

[Attachment D](#) contains custom and workpaper summary tables showing the components and total scores and points for each metric in each of the two component areas of scoring described above.

Questions or comments about the feedback or final scores should be directed to Rashid Mir (rashid.mir@cpuc.ca.gov) or Peter Biermayer (peter.biermayer@cpuc.ca.gov). Note that pursuant to D.13-09-023, CPUC Staff will schedule a meeting with SDG&E staff to discuss this memorandum and its final scores by April 30, 2021.

¹⁴ The guidance on scoring approach provided in D.13-09-023, at 74, provides that when only a small number of submissions are available for scoring and the submissions have varying impacts on the portfolio overall, that appropriate weighting should be allied to the submission and observed performance that should carry across multiple metrics. “Low scores for metrics that assess specific and important quantities (e.g., if the utility only uploads a small percentage of custom projects and receives a low score for Metric 1), will have a proportional impact on the total score the utility could receive for later metrics that measure the quality of custom project submittals.” “For example, doing an outstanding job on a large number of very low-impact, standardized projects will not make up for doing a poor job on a few projects that represent a major portion of portfolio dollars.”

Attachment A: Final ESPI Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points)

Metric	Workpapers				Custom			
	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2020 Score	2020 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2020 Score	2020 Points
1 Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	5	10%	2.50	2.50	5	10%	5.00	5.0
Timely submittals: all lists, inventories, plans, studies, workpapers and project/measure documentation; timing and advanced announcement of submittals (spreading out submission when available rather than holding and turning in large batches); timely follow-up PA responses to review disposition action items including intention to submit/re-submit with proposed schedule.								
2 Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	15	30%	2.50	7.50	15	30%	4.10	12.31
Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submittals. Submittal adherence to Commission policies, Decisions, and prior Commission staff dispositions and/or guidance. Do the submittals include all materials required to support the submittal proposed values, methods and results. Is the project or measure clearly articulated. Are proposed or utilized methods clearly explained including step-by-step method or procedure descriptions. Will the proposed or utilized approach provide accurate results. Are all relevant related or past activities and submittals appropriately noted or disclosed, analyzed or discussed. Are the pros/cons of alternate possible approaches or conclusions discussed to support that the chosen one is most appropriate.								
3 Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5	10%	2.50	2.50	5	10%	4.20	4.20
PA efforts to bring either measures, projects, studies, questions, and/or savings calculation methods and tools to Commission staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. Commission staff expects collaboration among the PAs to develop common or coordinated submissions and for the PAs to undertake joint or coordinated planning activities and study work. The PAs are expected to engage with CPUC staff in early discussions on unique or high profile, high impact measures or projects before program or customer commitments are made. The PAs are expected to engage with CPUC staff on planning and execution of studies that support proposed offerings, tools, or determination of proposed baselines or other programmatic assumption that can impact ex ante values to be utilized.								
4 Program Administrator's Due Diligence and Quality Assurance/Quality Control Effectiveness	12.5	25%	2.50	6.25	12.5	25%	4.40	11.00

<p>Commission staff expects the PA to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for their programs and measures. The PAs are expected to have a pro-active approach to reviewing existing measure and project assumptions, methods and values and updating those to take into account changes in market offerings, standard practice, updates to DEER methods and assumptions, changes to codes, standards and regulations, and other factors that warrant such updates. The depth and correctness of the PA's technical review of their ex ante parameters and values, for both Core, Local Government and Third Party programs, are included under this metric. The depth and correctness of the PA's technical review of their own staff and subcontractor work related to supporting deemed and custom measure and project submissions are included in this metric. Evidence of review activities is expected to be visible in submissions so that Commission staff can evaluate the effectiveness of the PA internal QA/QC processes.</p>									
5	Program Administrator's Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements	12.5	25%	2.50	6.25	12.5	25%	4.25	10.63
<p>This metric reflects the PAs ongoing efforts to improve their internal processes and procedures resulting in increased ex post evaluated gross and net savings impacts. Commission staff looks not only to the PA's internal QC/QA processes, but also whether individual programs and their supporting activities incorporate and comply with CPUC policies and prior Commission staff disposition guidance in their program rules, policies, procedures and reporting. This includes changes to program rules, offerings and internal operations and processes required to improve overall review and evaluation results. A particularly important area for focus is the improvement of net portfolio performance via the removal of measures and or participation with low program attribution (NTG).</p>									
Total		50	100%		25.00	50	100%		43.14

Attachment B: Custom Project Scores and Feedback

The table below lists the identification numbers associated with each disposition. All custom projects were scored using new metrics adopted in 2016. The metrics are shown in the Table below.

Table 3 2016 Adopted Performance Metrics

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted Performance Metrics	Maximum Points	Percent of Total Points
Metric 1	Timeliness and Timing of Submittals Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5.0	10%
Metric 2	Content, Completeness and Quality of Submittals Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submitted documentation. In addition, this metric is an assessment of the utility's adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior CPUC Staff disposition guidance.	15.0	30%
Metric 3	Proactive Initiation of Collaboration Utility's efforts to bring either measures, questions, and/or savings calculation tools to CPUC Staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC Staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. CPUC Staff expects collaboration among the utilities and for the program administrators to engage with CPUC Staff in early discussions on high profile, high impact measures well before customer commitments are made.	5.0	10%
Metric 4	Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness CPUC Staff expects the utility to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for its programs and measures. The depth and correctness of the utility's technical review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.	12.5	25%
Metric 5	Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process & Program Improvements (Course Corrections) This metric reflects the utility's efforts to improve, operationalize, and improve its internal processes which are responsible for the creation and assignment of ex ante parameters and values. CPUC Staff looks not only to the utility's internal QC/QA process, but also whether individual programs incorporate and comply with CPUC policies and prior CPUC Staff disposition guidance in its program rules, policies, and procedures.	12.5	25%

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	Percent of Total Points	Total Scored Points	# Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level ¹⁵)
Metric 1	Timeliness and Timing of Submittals Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5	10%	5.00	36	SDG&E complied with SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation before the 15 business days required. One project was found to be late and 26 projects (72 percent) were submitted early by 5 or more days.
Metric 2	Content, Completeness and Quality of Submittals Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submitted documentation. In addition, this metric is an assessment of the utility's adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior CPUC Staff disposition guidance.	15	30%	12.31	36	In 2020, out of 37 projects submitted and selected for review, 36 projects received dispositions. Out of those, 8 exhibited deficiencies including 4 projects where M&V plans were found to be out of compliance. Other deficiencies included a project where the EUL did not exceed the simple payback, parameter assumption issues, an incorrect baseline value, and several where savings calculations were not provided. Staff notes that SDG&E has submitted projects with significantly fewer issues in 2020 in contrast to 2019 and is showing improvement with regards to document submission.
Metric 3	Proactive Initiation of Collaboration Utility's efforts to bring either measures, questions, and/or savings calculation tools to CPUC Staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC Staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. CPUC Staff expects collaboration among the utilities and for the program administrators to engage with CPUC Staff in early discussions on high profile, high impact measures well before customer commitments are made.	5	10%	4.20	36	CPUC Staff found that SDG&E made significant efforts to bring measures, projects, and studies forward for discussion prior to review, such as requesting Early Opinions for Program influence and freerider forms, HOPPS whole building NMEC models, SBD central plant, and others. In addition, they took an active and engaged lead in statewide collaboration efforts and were champions of several statewide initiatives including the Weighted EUL calculator and the Statewide Technical Workbook. SDG&E exceeded expectations in this category by continuing its participation in CPR stakeholder groups, leading several statewide initiatives, and engaging with CPUC staff on planning and execution of studies for high profile projects.
Metric 4	Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness CPUC Staff expects the utility to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for its programs and measures. The depth and correctness of the utility's technical review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.	12.5	25%	11.00	36	CPUC staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 36 projects receiving dispositions in 2020, 15 projects (42 percent) proceeded without exception, 17 projects (47 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted, 2 were marked as Late Dispositions (6 percent), and 2 projects (6 percent) were rejected. Compared to 2019 when SDG&E had 17 percent of submissions rejected,

¹⁵ The Metric 1 and 2 scores for each of the individual custom projects are included in the final custom workbook which is embedded in Attachment D.

			<p>these findings demonstrate that SDG&E is exceeding expectations with regards to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review. Commission staff also found that SDG&E incorporated elements from the statewide documents into their processes (such as the SBD checklist) as well as demonstrated a commitment to improving their QC process through requirements to utilize internal signoffs on project reviews, initiated a Corrective and Preventive Action (CAPA) process, undertook a Lean Six-Sigma (LSS) initiative, and made other improvements to streamline QC processes.</p>			
<p>Metric 5</p>	<p>Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process & Program Improvements (Course Corrections) This metric reflects the utility's efforts to improve, operationalize, and improve its internal processes which are responsible for the creation and assignment of ex ante parameters and values. CPUC Staff looks not only to the utility's internal QC/QA process, but also whether individual programs incorporate and comply with CPUC policies and prior CPUC Staff disposition guidance in its program rules, policies, and procedures.</p>	<p>12.5</p>	<p>25%</p>	<p>10.63</p>	<p>36</p> <p>SDG&E Projects reviewed from January 2020 through December 2020 exhibited a slight downward trend in terms of project performance over time. (i.e. project submissions performed worse over the course of the 2020 review period). SDG&E did demonstrate improvement by developing and updating internal processes for reviewing NMEC and HOPPS projects as well as continuing to participate in Statewide Coordination meetings to improve custom project quality and streamline reviews. Additionally, SDG&E continues to make strides in reducing issues related to Program Policy, as only 13 percent of all issues identified were related to this category compared with 37 percent of projects during the previous ESPI cycle. These efforts demonstrate compliance with CPUC policies as well as a willingness to improve processes.</p>	

Attachment C: Workpaper Scores and Feedback

The table below lists the ID numbers associated with each workpaper submission or disposition and the workpaper review process “score enhancements” scoring area. The listed weight is used in the combining all the individual rows together into a single score for all the rows in the two scoring components (“direct review” and “process issues”); then each category total score gets equal weighting in the final total score for the metric. The PA may refer to the individual dispositions for more detailed descriptions of the specific actions staff required for each workpaper. The qualitative ESPI scoring feedbacks are designated as follows:

- ‘+’ indicates a positive (from midpoint) scoring impact on a metric,
- ‘-’ indicates a negative (from midpoint) scoring impact on a metric,
- ‘Yes’ indicates meeting expectation; neutral (midpoint) scoring impact on a metric,
- ‘No’ indicates the review feedback is not applicable to a metric.

Workpaper Reviews – Scored Workpapers				ESPI Metrics					
WP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWMI001	1	Water Energy Nexus	Workpaper was reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Workpaper Submission Status – All workpapers submitted in 2020				
WP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status: EAR Team Comments	
SWMI001	1	Water Energy Nexus	Interim approval.	
SWMI001	2	Water Energy Nexus	Detailed review in process.	

Process Adder

ESPI Metrics

	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SDG&E took the lead in developing the monthly agenda and meeting minutes for the calls between CPUC staff, Ex-Ante Consultants, IOU technical leads, and Cal TF staff, for PY2020.	1	No	No	+	No	+

Attachment D: 2020 Performance Annual Ratings

Custom Scoring

2020 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	5.00	4.10	4.20	4.40	4.25	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	4.10	5.00	4.90	4.25	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	12.31	5.00	12.25	10.63	45.19

2019 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	4.89	2.34	1.60	3.00	2.50	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	1.50	1.00	1.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	4.89	2.35	3.10	4.00	3.50	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	4.89	7.03	3.10	10.00	8.75	33.77

This [workbook](#) contains all of the SDG&E Custom Scoring tables.

Workpaper Scoring

2020 Annual Workpaper Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	SDG&E "-"	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	SDG&E "+"	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	SDG&E "Yes"	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
	Dispositions Score %	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	
	Dispositions Score	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SDG&E "-"			0%		0%	
	SDG&E "+"			100%		100%	
	SDG&E "Yes"			0%		0%	
	Process Score %	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	0.00	2.50	0.00	2.50	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	2.50	2.50	5.00	2.50	5.00	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.50	7.50	5.00	6.25	12.50	33.75

2019 Annual Workpaper Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5
Direct Workproduct Review Score	SDG&E "-"	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	SDG&E "+"	0%	14%	0%	0%	14%
	SDG&E "Yes"	100%	86%	100%	100%	86%
	Dispositions Score %	50%	57%	50%	50%	57%
	Dispositions Score	2.50	2.86	2.50	2.50	2.86
Review Process Score Enhancements	SDG&E "-"			0%	0%	
	SDG&E "+"			100%	33%	

	SDG&E "Yes"			0%	67%		
	Process Score %	0%	0%	100%	67%	0%	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	0.00	5.00	3.33	0.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	0.00	2.50	1.67	0.00	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	2.50	2.86	5.00	4.17	2.86	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.50	8.57	5.00	10.42	7.14	33.63

Explanations of scoring tables row entries

- The row labeled with PA “-“ lists the percent of workpaper reviews undertaken where the CPUC Staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the PA performance in this metric for the submission did not meet minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
- The row labeled with PA “+“ lists the percent of workpaper reviews undertaken where the CPUC Staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the PA performance in this metric for the submission exceeded minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
- The rows labeled with PA “Yes“ lists the percent of workpaper reviews undertaken where the CPUC Staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the PA performance in this metric for the submission exceeded met minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
- The “Dispositions Score %” row (and “Process Increase Score” for workpapers) indicates how the combination of the three rows of scores (+, -, and yes) sum into a total points multiplier for each metric. Each row contributes to the total based on the row count over the total count for all three rows.
- The “Disposition Score” (and “Process Increase Score” for workpapers) row converts the percent score into a numeric value of up to five by directly applying the percent to a value of 5.
- The custom row labeled with “Technical & Policy QC Increase” lists CPUC Staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall PA performance in putting into place quality assurance and/or quality control methods, documents and/or training for staff and contractors related to this metric area that are expected to improve the ability of review personnel to identify and cure issues going forward on projects started during 2016 but not yet seen in the custom review activity.
- The custom row labeled with “Implementation Increase” lists CPUC Staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall PA performance in putting into place new or changed program rules, eligibility criteria, incentive structures, application and implementation contract processes and procedures in 2016 related to this metric area that are expected to improve performance going forward on projects started but not yet seen in the custom review activity.

- The workpaper rows labeled with “Review Process Score Enhancements” lists CPUC Staff scoring for each metric based on an evaluation of the overall PA performance in putting into place quality assurance and/or quality control methods, documents and/or training for staff and contractors that are expected to improve the ability of review personnel to identify and cure issues going forward on workpapers. This score is weighted as an increase to the disposition score based on the fractional weight listed in the “Process Increase Weight” row.
- The “Final Metric Score” row indicates the total score for each metric as a sum of the Direct Work product Review Score plus the Review Process Score Enhancements (either as a simple sum for custom or a weighted value sum for workpapers) to provide a final metric score with the final score constrained between a maximum score of 5 and a minimum score of 1.
- The “Metric Points” row provides the point value derived from the Final Metric Score row. If the maximum point value associated with a metric is greater than 5 then the score is multiplied by the max point value divided by 5 to obtain the metric point value related to the final score.