

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: March 30, 2022 (Revised October 11, 2022)

To: Southern California Gas (SoCalGas)

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

Cc: R.13-11-005 Service Lists

Subject: 2021 EX ANTE REVIEW (EAR) SCORING AND EVALUATION PERFORMANCE

Table of Contents

- I. Summary of 2021 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages 2
- II. CPUC Staff Findings 2021 Activities 3
 - A. Custom Projects Review Overview 3
 - B. Measure Packages Review Overview 4
- III. Discussion 5
 - A. Custom Projects Performance Review 5
 - B. Measure Packages Performance Review 8
- IV. The Scoring Methodology 10
 - A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology 12
 - B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology 12
 - C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology 12
 - D. Custom Metric 3, 4 and 5 Scoring Methodology 13
 - E. Score Enhancement Methodology 13
- Attachment A: Final EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points) 15
- Attachment B: Custom Project Scores and Feedback 17
- Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback 20
- Attachment D: 2021 Performance Annual Ratings 26

I. Summary of 2021 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages

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 (EAR) scoring is a part of the EAR awards¹.

D.20-11-013 placed a moratorium on EAR awards but directed that EAR scoring shall continue. CPUC staff and consultants completed the 2021 EAR 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 EAR 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 SoCalGas’ 2021 EAR performance score of 72.323/100 for Measure Packages² and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. SoCalGas’ 2021 total points is a 6.451 point decrease from its 2020 total points of 78.74. Scores for 2020 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

Table 1: SoCalGas 2021 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

SoCalGas 2021 EAR Review Performance Scores and Points		Measure Packages				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	2.40	10%	2.540	5	4.14	10%	4.14	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	2.12	30%	6.35	15	4.46	30%	13.39	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	2.20	10%	2.20	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5	3.00	25%	7.50	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	12.50	25%	12.50	12.5	2.50	25%	6.25	12.5
Total				38.87	50			33.48	50

¹ The EAR awards were part of the Efficiency Savings and Performance Incentive (ESPI) awards.

² A Measure Package documents the data, methodologies, and rationale used to develop values for deemed measures. A Measure Package is prepared and submitted by program administrators and approved by the CPUC.

Table 2: SoCalGas 2020 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

SoCalGas 2020 EAR Review Performance Scores and Points		Measure Packages				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	5.00	30%	8.30	15	2.33	30%	13.86	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	4.77	5	1.00	10%	4.60	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	4.06	25%	12.08	12.5	3.50	25%	9.00	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	3.48	25%	11.13	12.5	3.5	25%	7.50	12.5
Total				38.78	50			39.96	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 2021 Activities

A. Custom Projects Review Overview

From the period beginning January 2021 to the end of December 2021, CPUC staff issued 14 scored dispositions.³

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points resulted in SoCalGas's custom project score decreasing by 6.48 points from 2020 scores (39.96 in 2020 vs. 33.48 in 2021 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above). Unlike the previous EAR cycle, SoCalGas demonstrated a decrease in its project documentation and processes and as a result their performance has decreased significantly this cycle.

1. Summary of 2021 Achievements

CPUC staff observed SoCalGas to have improved in:

- **Issues related to M&V plans has dropped significantly.** Whereas issues related to M&V plan compliance comprised 22 percent of all issues during 2020, CPUC staff found only one instance of this issue in 2021 marked as a note on a project. SoCalGas is improving efforts to ensure M&V plans are in compliance and do not impact gross savings.

³ Some of the dispositions are for projects submitted at the end of 2020. Some projects that were selected in 2021 had dispositions issued in 2022. The memo is for dispositions issued in 2021.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

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

- **The proportion of gross savings impact issues remains high.** In 2020 SoCalGas had 32 percent of all issues related to gross savings impacts. In 2021, the number of issues related to gross savings impacts decreased only slightly to 31 percent of total issues. SoCalGas needs to improve analysis assumptions and calculation methodology to reduce the impact of deficiencies within project submissions.
- **The proportion of Process, Policy and Program rule issues increased significantly.** In 2020 the number of deficiencies noted in this area was 25 percent of total issues identified, whereas in 2021 the number of deficiencies increased to 38 percent of total. For the past three years the number of Process, Policy, and Program related issues has steadily increased indicating that SoCalGas has room for improvement with regards to conformance with CPUC policy and program rules.
- **Issues related to documenting program influence remain high.** In 2020 issues related to program influence comprised 11 percent of total issues. In 2021, the number of program influence related issues has risen to 15 percent, indicating that SoCalGas still has work to ensure that the proper chain of influence documentation is submitted and accurate.

B. Measure Packages Review Overview

SoCalGas' Measure Packages scores have slightly decreased compared to last year by 0.04 points (from 38.79 in 2020 to 38.75 for 2021 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above) which indicates that SoCalGas has generally maintained their practices for Measure Package submittals.

1. Summary of 2021 Achievements

CPUC staff observed improvements in SoCalGas' development and management of Measure Package submissions in the following areas:

- SoCalGas continues to work closely with the CPUC staff and of the PAs to manage measure package submittals. This was demonstrated with the collaboration with Southern California Edison (SCE) on the Smart Thermostat (SWHC039) measure inclusion of gas savings and through collaborations with the CPUC staff to review new study data for the greenhouse and food services measures.
- SoCalGas has been a leader in measure package submittal through the eTRM with the first submittals of the SWWH017 and SWWH018.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

CPUC staff highlights the following recommendations for improvement:

- SoCalGas should assure that the technologies are viable and that they are adhering to CPUC policies; often these proposed technologies are not ready for a deemed approach due to lack of testing and site data. This was specifically applicable to the Dry Well Steam Table and Infrared BBQ Grill measures.

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 Measure Packages.

A. Custom Projects Performance Review

Each year, CPUC staff reviews a selected sample of energy efficiency program custom project 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. Projects using Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) methods were starting to show up on the ready to review list and were selected for review to look for issues with this relatively new program delivery strategy.

From the period beginning January 2021 to the end of December 2021, 14 SoCalGas projects received dispositions. 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 submitted 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 reviewer.

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

Table 3: SoCalGas 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%	4.14	4.14	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	13.39	13.39	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	2.20	2.20	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	7.50	7.50	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	6.25	6.25	12.5
Total			33.48	33.48	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2021, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 4.14 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 14 SoCalGas custom projects reviews completed in 2021. In 2021, SoCalGas submitted project documentation for review for 11 of these custom projects on time and 3 projects were submitted late. Only 1 of the 14 projects receiving dispositions (7 percent) was submitted earlier than required per timeline mandated in Senate Bill (SB) 1131 and Section 381.2 of the Public Utilities Code.⁴ Unlike the previous year, SoCalGas has experienced difficulty meeting expectations in 2021 with regards to timeliness by submitting projects on time and was unable to submit project documentation earlier than required as was done in past years.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2021, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 13.39 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This score was based on the completeness of the 14 SoCalGas custom project reviews. Of the 14 dispositions issued, 3 projects (21 percent) were approved without exception, 3 projects (21 percent) were marked Advisory, and 2 projects (14 percent) were marked Prospective.⁵ However, 1 project (7 percent) was rejected and 5 projects (36 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies which resulted in a loss of points under this metric.

Table 4 below summarizes the 13 action items identified across the 14 scored dispositions⁶ issued between January 1, 2021, and December 31, 2021. 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 Staff Required Action by the PA:	Summary of CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Percent of Total Actions
Issues Related to Gross Savings Impacts	Analysis assumptions	2	1	50%
	Calculation method	2	1	50%
	M&V plan	0	1	0%
	Subtotals	4	3	31%
Process, Policy, Program Rules	Baseline	1	1	20%
	EUL/RUL	1	0	20%
	Incentive Calculation	3	0	60%
	Measure type	0	1	0%
	Self-Generation	0	1	0%

⁴ “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”.

⁵ The objective of Advisory reviews is not to approve project savings claims, but to provide early feedback for implementation and to inform CPUC staff-led evaluation. NMEC project reviews are Advisory. The guidance for Prospective reviews applies to future projects that are not already in the PA's pipeline of projects. CPUC staff use Prospective reviews to provide feedback on new programs.

⁶ This table includes action items issued on 3 Advisory and 2 Prospective dispositions.

	Subtotals	5	3	38%
Documentation Issues	Continue Document Upload	0	2	0%
	Subtotals	0	2	0%
Issues Related to Net Impacts	Program influence	2	0	100%
	Subtotals	2	0	15%
Other Issues	Other - update quarterly submission	2	0	100%
	Other - Advisory review	0	1	0%
	Subtotals	2	1	15%
	Grand Total	13	9	100%

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

- **Measure efficiencies less than existing equipment** occurred on one project (CPUC Project ID 612) and resulted in the minimum number of EAR points for this project due to the significance of this discrepancy.
- **Missing savings calculations** occurred at the measure level on one project (CPUC Project ID 693) which resulted in significant EAR point reductions for this metric due to the importance of this deficiency.
- **Lack of clarity in descriptions of methodology** occurred at the measure level on two projects (CPUC Project IDs 601 and 612) and resulted in meaningful reduction of points for the projects due to the significance of this deficiency.
- **Incorrect Measure EUL** occurred at the measure level within one project (CPUC Project ID 612) and resulted in a significant loss of EAR points due to the significant of this deficiency.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2021, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 2.2 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. At the portfolio level, CPUC staff did not find that SoCalGas made a significant effort to bring measures, projects, and studies forward for discussion prior to CPUC staff review. CPUC staff noted few topics reviewed during bi-weekly calls, many bi-weekly calls were cancelled, and noted a drop-off with custom project activity during the year. Furthermore, SoCalGas did not bring forward any studies to support proposed offerings or tools and did not submit many large projects or early opinion requests.

For statewide initiatives, SoCalGas took a less active role during combined subgroups over the course of the year. CPUC staff determined that SoCalGas performed below the minimum expectations with regards to proactive collaboration under this metric.

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

In 2021, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 7.5 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 occurring by the PA. The number of dispositions proceeding without

exception was weighed against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 14 projects receiving dispositions, 3 projects (21 percent) proceeded without exception, 5 projects (36 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions noted, and 1 project (7 percent) was rejected. While the number of total projects were small, the majority were either allowed to proceed with noted exceptions or rejected. Due to this, CPUC staff determined SoCalGas has a lower-than-expected performance for this metric as it pertains to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review.

CPUC staff noted that current QC processes met the minimum expectations and that SoCalGas is expecting to put new processes in place to obtain better project information and reduce review time. Overall CPUC staff determined that SoCalGas made efforts to meet minimum expectations for this metric, however updates to QC practices that result in no rejections and fewer issues related to gross savings would be beneficial to improving this score in the future.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2021, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 6.25 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 the adaptation to changes in rules over time. CPUC staff found that projects reviewed from January 2021 through December 2021 exhibited a slight upward trend in terms of project performance over time (i.e., project submissions had fewer issues when submitted later in 2021 compared to earlier in the year). The lower performance score in Metric 5 was driven in large part by the substantial number of policy related issues documented across all project submissions. For this Metric SoCalGas scored poorly in the policy component (there they scored a 2 out of 5). For this component CPUC staff noted that at the portfolio level, 38 percent of all actions on projects were policy related indicating a need for improvement. Additionally, CPUC staff noted that similar to the previous year, 15 percent of actions noted on dispositions were related to issues with free ridership, potentially impacting future net to gross (NTG) values for the program. Also, SoCalGas neglected to follow CPUC staff direction and did not list a significant number of residential new construction (RNC) projects on the bi-monthly list. As such, CPUC staff determined that SoCalGas demonstrated minimal compliance with regards to this metric and that more work can be done to address program policy issues and bring about substantive process improvements in the future.

B. Measure Packages Performance Review

SoCalGas had 31 Measure Packages which were submitted in 2021, 26 were reviewed and disposed, and the remaining five are still under detailed review. This end of year memo provides Measure Package specific feedback on the 26 which were reviewed and disposed.

The comments below are organized by the five scoring metric areas created in D.16-08-019.⁷ The narrative includes observations common to multiple Measure Packages and feedback related to the Measure Package development process. Specific Measure Package feedback is provided in [Attachment C](#) at the end of this document. The Measure Package Review Table provides feedback

⁷ See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.

on specific Measure Packages. The Measure Package Submissions Table lists all Measure Packages submitted by SoCalGas during the review period. Measure Packages were selected for feedback from those that were led by SoCalGas and were either disposed or reached approval status during the review period. CPUC staff acknowledges that Measure Package 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 for Measure Packages 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 Measure Package disposition points given to SoCalGas for each metric both with and without the addition of any enhancement points.

Table 5: SoCalGas Measure Package Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Weight Factor	Measure Package Disposition Points		Max Points
			With Enhance Pts	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	2.540	2.540	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	6.35	6.35	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	3.08	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	12.50	7.45	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	12.50	7.69	12.5
Total			38.875	27.0697	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2021, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 2.540 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SoCalGas has largely met deadlines for submission of statewide Measure Packages in the review period and ~~most~~ Measure Packages received a Yes, indicating that the minimum expectations were met for timeliness.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2021, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 6.35 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points.

SoCalGas introduced new multifamily measures for the pipe insulation and tank insulation Measure Packages, a new tier for the Commercial Fryer Measure Package, and consolidated the Gravity Furnace Measure Package to include wall type furnaces. The Measure Packages were well articulated; however, the data and methods were not always clear and required multiple meetings with CPUC to review and revise.

CPUC encourages development of Measure Packages for new technologies, however, SoCalGas has submitted Measure Packages that lacked the robust technical and market data that would qualify

those for a deemed approach. SoCalGas should complete the necessary data collection and vetting of technologies for deemed savings prior to future Measure Package development.

SoCalGas received a minus “-“ on four Measure Package submittals. This mainly due to the lack in completeness and quality of the data provided to support the approval of the Dry Well Steam Table (SWFS024) and Infrared BBQ Grill (SWAP019) measures, as well as lack of clarity on the data supporting the eligibility of the Wall Furnace (SWHC001) and Gas Oven (SWAP017) measures.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2021, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 3.08 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Measure Packages met the minimum expectations of collaboration which was required to ensure each Measure Package met all PA’s needs and minimally received a “Yes” with eight Measure Packages exceeding minimum expectations.

SoCalGas has been very proactive with providing the CPUC staff with updates and preliminary work products on upcoming Measure Packages via the Measure Package plan process. In addition, SoCalGas worked with SCE to complete the addition of gas savings to the approved Smart Thermostat measure. Though the Measure Packages were not approved, SoCalGas was proactive in engaging with CPUC on the Dry Well Steam Table and Infrared BBQ Grill measures.

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

In 2021, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 7.45 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 SoCalGas Measure Packages has improved from the 2020 submissions. SoCalGas has identified areas missing DEER impact data for certain climate zones and continues to provide NTG updates for measures as they are offered in programs for longer than two years.

5. PA’s Responsiveness

In 2021, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 7.69 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA’s Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. CPUC staff and consultants have regularly and productively engaged with SoCalGas and continue to rely on them to provide answers for the gas measure Measure Packages. SoCalGas continues to show responsiveness and initiative when developing new measures, adding measure tiers, and updating measures with new study data.

IV. The Scoring Methodology

The 2021 performance score was developed using five detailed scoring metrics for each directly reviewed work product (i.e., Measure Package 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 2021. D.16-08-019 also directed that the custom and Measure Package scores be weighted together into a final score based on the IOU total claims for custom and deemed activities, respectively.

In accordance with D.13-09-023, the PA's 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 Measure Packages 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 2020 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 Measure Package 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 Measure Packages. Each reviewed utility work product was first determined to have components either applicable or not applicable to a metric.⁸ 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.

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](#).

⁸ For example, Measure Packages 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 Measure Package which may not require proactive collaboration with CPUC staff and therefore not receive a score for Metric 3 (“Proactive Initiation of Collaboration”).

A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology

For Measure Packages, 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 Measure Packages 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 Measure Package level disposition scoring, as well as related Measure Package activities, are provided in [Attachment C](#). Note the following approach to scoring individual Measure Packages by metric:

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

B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology

This metric is related to the timeliness of submittals and a maximum of five 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 EAR 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 Measure Package work product review scores. Next, utility-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 2021 in order to positively impact future project reviews. CPUC staff believes it is important to provide EAR "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 decided that SoCalGas' efforts did not rise to the level to be awarded "Enhancement" points.

Measure Package 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 added points for this metric.
- Metric 2: Content: There were no added points for this metric.
- Metric 3: Collaboration: SCG continued to work collaboratively with the CPUC and other PAs to develop new measures and to update existing measures with new study data.
- Metric 4: SCG shows consistent effort to introduce new measures and methods for measure development.
- Metric 5: Process improvements: SCG has shown responsiveness to program improvements by being an active part of the eTRM process improvements.

To produce the final Measure Package scores, the metric scores for the two Measure Package 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 SoCalGas.⁹

[Attachment D](#) contains custom and Measure Package 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 SoCalGas staff to discuss this memorandum and its final scores by April 30, 2022.

⁹ 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 EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points)

Metric		Measure Packages				Custom			
		Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2021 Score	2021 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2021 Score	2021 Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	5	10%	2.540	2.540	5	10%	4.14	4.14
	Timely submittals: all lists, inventories, plans, studies, Measure Packages 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%	2.12	6.35	15	30%	4.46	13.39
	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%	3.08	3.08	5	10%	2.20	2.20
	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%	2.98	7.45	12.5	25%	3.00	7.50

Metric		Measure Packages				Custom			
		Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2021 Score	2021 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2021 Score	2021 Points
	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.								
5	Program Administrator's Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements	12.5	25%	3.08	7.69	12.5	25%	2.50	6.25
	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.								
Total		50	100%		27.06 27.069 7	50	100%		33.48

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 4 2016 Adopted Performance Metrics

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted Performance Metrics	Maximum Points	% 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	% of TOTAL POINTS	TOTAL SCORED POINTS	# of Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level)
Metric 1	Timeliness and Timing of Submittals Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5	10%	4.14	14	In general SoCalGas complied with SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation before the 15 business days required. Commission staff found 3 projects (21 percent) to be late and 10 projects (71 percent) submitted on the due date. Only 1 project was found to be submitted prior to the 15 business days required indicating the SoCalGas is meeting the minimum requirements with regards to timeliness.
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%	13.39	14	Out of the 14 projects submitted and selected for review, three projects had significant deficiencies including measure efficiency being < than existing equipment, savings calculations not provided, lack of clarity in methodology description, and incorrect Measure EUL. While these deficiencies were significant to result in the loss of EAR points under this metric, staff noted that these 3 projects represent a small fraction of the total projects submitted and therefore SoCalGas is making efforts to improve the quality and completeness of their submittals.
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%	2.20	14	Commission staff did not find that SoCalGas made minimal effort to bring measures, projects, or studies forward for discussion prior to review. CPUC staff noted a drop-off in custom project activity and few large projects being submitted or studies and tools submitted for review. Few topics were reviewed during bi-weekly calls with Commission staff, and while SoCalGas was active in early subgroup meetings, they appeared less active in combined subgroups. As such, SoCalGas performed below the minimum expectations for demonstrating proactive collaboration.
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	12.5	25%	7.50	14	Commission staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 14 projects receiving dispositions in 202, 3 projects (21 percent) proceeded without exception, 5 projects (36 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions noted, and 1 project (7 percent) was rejected. These findings resulted in lower than expected

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	% of TOTAL POINTS	TOTAL SCORED POINTS	# of Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level)
	review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.					performance with regards to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review.
Metric 5	<p>Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process & Program Improvements (Course Corrections)</p> <p>This metric reflects the utility's efforts to improve, operationalize, and improve its internal processes that 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>	12.5	25%	6.25	14	SoCalGas projects reviewed from July 2021 through December 2021 exhibited a slight upward trend in terms of project performance over time (i.e., project submissions had fewer issues when submitted later in 2021 compared to earlier in the year). Commission staff noted the number of issues related to Process, Policy, and Program Rules was 38 percent which is a significant decrease compared to last year where this category comprised 25 percent of all issues across a larger sample of projects.

Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback

The table below lists the ID numbers associated with each Measure Package submission or disposition and the Measure Package 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 IOU may refer to the individual dispositions for more detailed descriptions of the specific actions staff required for each Measure Package. The qualitative EAR 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.

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages				EAR Metrics					
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWAP006	2	Dishwasher, Residential	Measure Package updates to include DEER2020 data. Minor error corrections noted.	1	Yes	Yes	+	Yes	Yes
SWAP006	3	Dishwasher, Residential	Measure Package updates error in "MFm" building savings being mapped to Building "Res". Reviewed without comments.	1	Yes	Yes	+	+	Yes
SWAP017	2	Oven, Gas, Residential	Measure Package updated with additional testing data as requested by Measure Package reviewer. SCG worked closely with reviewers to clarify testing results and were proactive with their responses.	1	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWAP019	1	Infrared BBQ Grill, Residential	New Measure Package with major comments on statistical significance of the measure providing savings. Measure Package rejected.	1	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWBE001	2	Greenhouse Heat Curtain	Measure Package updates include new energy savings modeling due to expiration of DEER measures. SCG worked collaboratively with reviewers to supply additional modeling and post-processing files to complete this review. ISP study results incorporated. Reviewed with comments.	1	Yes	Yes	+	Yes	+
SWBE002	2	Greenhouse Infrared Film	Measure Package updates include new energy savings modeling due to expiration of DEER measures. SCG worked collaboratively with reviewers to supply additional modeling and	1	Yes	Yes	+	Yes	+

			post-processing files to complete this review. ISP study results incorporated. Reviewed with comments.							
SWFS002	2	Door Type Dishwasher, Commercial	Measure Package updated to revise Tier 2 offerings to new Version 3.0 for ENERGY STAR Commercial Dishwasher specifications. Reviewed with minor comments.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS011	3	Fryer, Commercial	Measure Package updated to include additional Tier 2 measure. Measure Package was well managed.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	+	+	
SWFS011	4	Fryer, Commercial	Measure Package updated EUL years via EUL ID: Cook-GasFryer. No comments.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS017	2	Automated Conveyor Broiler, Commercial	Measure Package updated NTG measures being offered for greater than 2 years. Reviewed without comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS018	2	Undercounter Type Dishwasher, Commercial	Measure Package updated to revise Tier 2 offerings to new Version 3.0 for ENERGY STAR Commercial Dishwasher specifications. Reviewed with minor comments.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS018	3	Undercounter Type Dishwasher, Commercial	Error correction due to a miscalculation. No other parameters changed.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS019	2	Underfired Broiler, Commercial	Measure Package updated NTG measures being offered for greater than 2 years. Reviewed without comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS024	1	Dry Well Steam Table, Commercial	New Measure Package with major comments on statistical significance of limited data and the measure is lacking testing protocol and minimal efficiency standards. Measure Package rejected.	1	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC001	2	Wall Furnace, Residential	Update previous gravity wall furnace Measure Package to include new offering for fan type wall furnace. Reviewers required clarifications from SCG regarding the eligibility of the larger offerings and the Measure Package required revisions for grammatical and consistency errors. SCG showed initiative in consolidating the Measure Package to include wall type furnaces.	1	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	+
SWHC002	2	Intermittent Pilot Light, Residential	Measure Package updated NTG measures being offered for greater than 2 years. Reviewed without comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC004	3	Space Heating Boiler, Commercial & Multifamily	Measure Package updated NTG ratio for downstream commercial boiler rebates due to E-5082. Reviewed with comments, which required collaboration with PG&E on SWHC004-02 PA adoptions.	1	Yes	Yes	+	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC031	2	High Efficiency Furnace	Measure Package updates to DEER2020 data to use PA "Any" data instead of IOU-specific savings mapped to CZ, per CPUC direction. Large delay in resubmissions.	1	-Yes	Yes	+	+	+	Yes

SWHC047	2	Gas Fireplace, Residential	Measure Package updated NTG measures being offered for greater than 2 years. Reviewed without comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC048	2	Packaged Air Conditioner Heat Recovery, Commercial	Measure Package updated NTG measures being offered for greater than 2 years. Reviewed without comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWRE004	2	Pool or Spa Heater, Residential	Measure Package updated NTG measures being offered for greater than 2 years. Reviewed without comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWWH005	4	Boiler, Commercial	Measure Package update using DEER2014 measure ID and savings values per DEER2023 scoping memo direction. Retroactive update. Reviewed with a few comments.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWWH006	6	Tankless Water Heater, Commercial	Measure Package update using DEER2014 measure ID and savings values per DEER2023 scoping memo direction. Retroactive update. Reviewed with a few comments.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWWH017	2	Hot Water Pipe Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Measure Package updated to include MF measures. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	+	+	
SWWH018	2	Hot Water Tank Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Measure Package updated to include MF measures. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	+	+	
SWWH024	2	Central Boiler Dual Setpoint Controller, Multifamily	Measure Package updated NTG measures being offered for greater than 2 years. Reviewed without comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Measure Package Submission Status – All Measure Packages submitted in 2021

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status: EAR Team Comments
SWAP006	2	Dishwasher, Residential	Interim approval.
SWAP017	2	Oven, Gas, Residential	Interim approval.
SWFS011	3	Fryer, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS017	2	Automated Conveyor Broiler, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS019	2	Underfired Broiler, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC001	2	Wall Furnace, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC002	2	Intermittent Pilot Light, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC047	2	Gas Fireplace, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC048	2	Packaged Air Conditioner Heat Recovery, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWRE004	2	Pool or Spa Heater, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH017	2	Hot Water Pipe Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWWH018	2	Hot Water Tank Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWWH024	2	Central Boiler Dual Setpoint Controller, Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWFS002	2	Door Type Dishwasher, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS018	2	Undercounter Type Dishwasher, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS024	1	Dry Well Steam Table, Commercial	Rejected.
SWHC004	3	Space Heating Boiler, Commercial & Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWAP019	1	Infrared BBQ Grill, Residential	Rejected.
SWHC031	2	High Efficiency Furnace	Interim approval.
SWAP006	3	Dishwasher, Residential	Interim approval.
SWBE001	2	Greenhouse Heat Curtain	Interim approval.
SWBE002	2	Greenhouse Infrared Film	Interim approval.
SWFS011	4	Fryer, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS018	3	Undercounter Type Dishwasher, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH005	4	Boiler, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH006	6	Tankless Water Heater, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH017	3	Hot Water Pipe Insulation, Nonresidential & Multifamily	Detailed review in process.

SWWH018	3	Hot Water Tank Insulation, Nonresidential & Multifamily	Detailed review in process.
SWWH033	1	Gas Heat Pump Water Heater, Multifamily	Detailed review in process.
SWWH026	2	Water Heater Pipe Wrap, Residential	Detailed review in process.
SWWH032	1	Solar Thermal Water Heating System, Residential	Detailed review in process.

Process Adder	EAR Metrics					
	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SCG continued to work collaboratively with the CPUC and other PAs to develop new measures and to update existing measures with new study data.	1	No	No	+	No	No
SCG shows consistent effort to introduce new measures and methods for measure development	1	No	No	No	+	No
SCG has shown responsiveness to program improvements both in the addition of new measures and new tiers for measures but in being an active part of the eTRM process improvements.	1	No	No	No	No	+

Attachment D: 2021 Performance Annual Ratings

Custom Scoring

2021 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	4.14	4.46	2.20	3.00	2.50	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	4.14	4.46	2.20	3.00	2.50	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	4.14	13.39	2.20	7.50	6.25	33.48

2020 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	4.96	4.62	3.60	3.60	3.00	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	4.62	4.60	3.60	3.00	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	13.86	4.60	9.00	7.50	39.96

This [workbook](#) contains all of the SoCalGas Custom Scoring tables.

Measure Package Scoring

2021 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	SCG "-"	4%	15%	0%	0%	0%	
	SCG "+"	0%	0%	23%	19%	23%	
	SCG "Yes"	96%	85%	77%	81%	77%	
	Dispositions Score %	48%	42%	62%	60%	62%	
	Dispositions Score	2.40	2.12	3.08	2.98	3.08	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCG "-"			0%	0%	0%	
	SCG "+"			100%	100%	100%	
	SCG "Yes"			0%	0%	0%	
	Process Score %	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	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	2.50	2.50	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	2.540	2.12	5.00	5.00	5.00	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.540	6.35	5.00	12.50	12.50	38.875

2020 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	SCG "-"	0%	11%	0%	10%	0%	
	SCG "+"	0%	21%	16%	3%	16%	
	SCG "Yes"	100%	68%	84%	87%	84%	
	Dispositions Score %	50%	55%	58%	47%	58%	
	Dispositions Score	2.50	2.77	2.89	2.33	2.89	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCG "-"			0%	0%	0%	
	SCG "+"			50%	100%	25%	
	SCG "Yes"			50%	0%	75%	
	Process Score %	0%	0%	75%	100%	63%	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	0.00	3.75	5.00	3.13	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	0.00	1.88	2.50	1.56	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	2.50	2.77	4.77	4.83	4.45	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.50	8.30	4.77	12.08	11.13	38.78

Explanations of scoring tables row entries

1. The row labeled with *IOU* “-“ lists the percent of Measure Package reviews undertaken where the CPUC staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission did not meet minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
2. The row labeled with *IOU* “+“ lists the percent of Measure Package reviews undertaken where the CPUC staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission exceeded minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
3. The rows labeled with *IOU* “Yes“ lists the percent of Measure Package reviews undertaken where the CPUC staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission exceeded met minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
4. The “Dispositions Score %” row (and “Process Increase Score” for Measure Packages) 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.

5. The “Disposition Score” (and “Process Increase Score” for Measure Packages) row converts the percent score into a numeric value of up to five by directly applying the percent to a value of 5.
6. The custom row labeled with “*Technical & Policy QC Increase*” lists CPUC staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU 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.
7. The custom row labeled with “*Implementation Increase*” lists CPUC staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU 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.
8. The Measure Package rows labeled with “*Review Process Score Enhancements*” lists CPUC staff scoring for each metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU 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 Measure Packages. This score is weighted as an increase to the disposition score based on the fractional weight listed in the “Process Increase Weight” row.
9. 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 Measure Packages) to provide a final metric score with the final score constrained between a maximum score of 5 and a minimum score of 1.
10. 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.