

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: March 30, 2022 (Revised December 19, 2022)

To: Southern California Edison Company (SCE)

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	9
IV.	The Scoring Methodology	11
	A. Measure Package 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	14
	E. Score Enhancement Methodology	14
	Attachment A: Final EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points)	16
	Attachment B Custom Project Scores and Feedback	18
	Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback	21
	Attachment D: 2021 Performance Annual Ratings	28

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 SCE’s 2021 EAR performance score of ~~75.02~~78.35/100 for Measure Packages² and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. SCE’s 2021 total points is a ~~41.06~~7.73 point decrease from its 2020 total points of 86.08. Scores for 2020 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

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

SCE 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	3.67	10%	3.67	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	3.75	30%	11.25	15	3.63	30%	10.88 <u>11.79</u>	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	2.58	10%	2.58 <u>5.00</u>	5	4.20	10%	4.20	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5	3.40	25%	8.50	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	2.58	25%	6.44	12.5	4.00	25%	38.58 <u>10.00</u>	12.5
Total				36.44 <u>38.86</u>	50			39.49 <u>39.49</u>	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: SCE 2020 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

SCE 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%	3.44	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	5.00	30%	11.25	15	4.27	30%	12.81	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	4.98	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	3.57	25%	10.94	12.5	4.30	25%	10.75	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	5.00	25%	10.66	12.5	4.50	25%	11.25	12.5
Total				41.27	50			44.81	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 33 scored dispositions.³

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points resulted in SCE's custom project score decreasing by ~~6.235.32~~ points from 2020 scores (44.81 in 2020 vs. ~~38.5839.49~~ in 2021 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above). While SCE continues to demonstrate efforts to improve its processes, performance has decreased in 2021.

1. Summary of 2021 Achievements

CPUC staff's observed SCE to have improved in:

- **SCE continues to improve its processes for submitting documentation in a timely manner.** Projects were submitted on the due date, with 29 projects (88 percent) submitted early by five or more days indicating SCE's processes for reducing the time for custom projects to be submitted with appropriate documentation is continuing to improve.
- **SCE continues to actively participate and take a lead role in Statewide Initiatives.** SCE was instrumental in helping lead the Statewide Coordination team, including managing the collaboration space for materials and dedicating staff resources to subgroup efforts.

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.

SCE also led discussions with stakeholders to clarify eligibility definitions and measure remaining useful life (RUL) calculations, as well as managed an external SharePoint site to enhance teamwork efforts across program administrators (PA).

- **SCE has focused on enhancing QA/QC practices** by expanding their internal engineering review of high-incentive, high-profile projects to cover all application reviews regardless of the project's kWh savings. They have also developed job aids and tools to improve the correctness of technical reviews.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

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

- **The number of issues regarding gross savings impacts remains high.** In 2020 there were 69 issues related to gross savings impacts which comprised 63 percent of all noted issues. In 2021, there were 35 issues regarding gross savings impacts which comprised 57 percent of all noted issues. SCE continues to exhibit a significant number of issues in the processes and procedures used to estimate gross savings impacts on submitted projects.
- **The number of issues in the Process, Policy, and Program rules area remains high.** In 2021 there were 17 issues identified across 33 dispositions which comprised 28 percent of all issues identified. There are noted deficiencies for measure effective useful life (EUL)/RUL estimation and measure type specification.

B. Measure Packages Review Overview

SCE's Measure Packages scores have decreased compared to last year by 4.832.41 points (from 41.27 in 2020 to 36.4438.86 in 2021 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above).

1. Summary of 2021 Achievements

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

- **SCE has done well to update measure packages based on the most recent policy.** The Residential Smart Thermostat is a dynamic measure and was well managed and updated with the latest data.
- **SCE has made significant improvements with the quality of the measure package submittals.** Errors have been minimal, and measures have been approved without comment for most of 2021.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

CPUC staff highlights the following recommendations for improvement:

- **Data collection and submittal.** SCE must be sure data collected and submitted for review is complete and clearly presented for the Measure Package review team to minimize delays.

- **Deemed efficient product be available to the general public.** SCE must make sure that a commercial product such as a conveyor toaster is available to the general public and not just a custom-made product for a single customer.

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, 33 SCE 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 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 SCE for each metric both with and without the addition of any Enhancement Points.

Table 3: SCE Custom Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring		Weight Factor		Max Points
			With Enhance Pts	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	5.00	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	10.88 11.79	10.88 11.79	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	4.20	4.20	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	8.50	8.50	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	10.00	10.00	12.5
Total			38.5839.49	38.5839.49	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2021, SCE 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 33 custom project reviews completed in 2021. In 2021, SCE submitted project documentation for review for all 33 reviewed projects on time and 29 of these 33 projects (88 percent) 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.⁴ SCE continues to exceed expectations with regards to timeliness by submitting projects on time and ahead of the required due date in many cases.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2021, SCE received a custom disposition score of ~~40.88~~11.79 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 33 SCE custom project reviews. Of the 33 dispositions issued, 9 projects (27 percent) were approved without exception, 10 projects (30 percent) were marked Advisory, and 2 projects (6 percent) were marked Prospective.⁵ However, 2 projects (6 percent) were rejected, and 10 projects (30 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies which resulted in a loss of points under this metric.

Table 4 summarizes the 61 action items identified across 33 scored dispositions⁶ issued between January 1, 2021, and December 31, 2021. These action items illustrate errors that impacted the project's net savings, documentation, and efficiency savings estimate calculations. An additional 20 notes or instructions were issued that were not related to any particular error in the project submittal.

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 10 Advisory and 2 Prospective dispositions.

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	21	2	60%
	Calculation method	5	2	14%
	M&V plan	9	0	26%
	Subtotals	35	4	57%
Process, Policy, Program Rules	Baseline	2	0	12%
	EUL/RUL	6	0	35%
	Measure type	7	2	41%
	Self-generation	2	0	12%
	Subtotals	17	2	28%
Documentation Issues	Continue Document Upload	4	8	100%
	Subtotals	4	8	2%
Issues Related to Net Impacts	Program influence	1	0	100%
	Subtotals	1	0	2%
Other Issues	Other - update quarterly submission	3	0	75%
	Other - bimonthly upload savings discrepancy	1	1	25%
	Other - bimonthly upload data error	0	2	0%
	Other - partial project	0	2	0%
	Other - withdrawn project	0	1	0%
	Subtotals	4	6	7%
Grand Total		61	20	100%

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

- **Non-IOU Energy Source not Accounted for** occurred on two projects (CPUC Project IDs 597 and 598) and lost significant EAR points due to the importance of this oversight on the project savings estimation.
- **M&V Plan not in Compliance** occurred on one project (CPUC Project ID 596) and lost significant EAR points due to the importance of this deficiency
- ~~Savings Calculations not Provided occurred on one project (CPUC Project ID 595) and lost meaningful EAR points due to the importance of providing savings calculations for reviewers to track savings methodology.~~
- **Issue with Parameter Assumptions** occurred on three projects (CPUC Project IDs 431_a, 432_a, and 454_a) and each project lost significant EAR points due to the importance of correctly documenting and parameter assumptions for reviewers.

- **Incorrect Measure EUL** was the most prevalent deficiency noted and occurred on ~~64~~⁶⁵ projects (CPUC Project IDs ~~644~~, 659, 664, 668, 675, and 676). Each project lost meaningful EAR points and had an additive impact on the portfolio due to the frequency of this deficiency.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2021, SCE 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, SCE made a significant effort to bring measures, projects, and studies forward for discussion prior to CPUC staff review. SCE was active with early opinion requests on bi-weekly calls that affect high profile projects and overarching issues affecting multiple projects. Issues discussed during bi-weekly calls included EnergyPro software bugs, public facing projects review tracker issues, process for issuing disposition updates, baseline for cannabis lighting projects, CPUC selection of strategic energy management (SEM) projects, clarification on the definition of add-on equipment (AOE) measures, emerging technology (ET) programs, clarification on past EAR memo comments, appropriate custom project climate zone weather data files, NMEC project review timing, California Advanced Home Program (CAHP) program influence documentation, on-bill financing (OBF) projects and incentives, role of NMEC rulebook and commercial calculated program rules, projects on Savings by Design (SBD) grandfather list, appropriate measure application type (MAT) designation for control upgrade project, simple payback (SPB) calculations for dual baseline projects, modified lighting calculator (MLC) calculations for deemed measures, SPB eligibility rule, listing of projects in post-installation review (IR) on bimonthly list, maritime lighting measures at ports, applicability of refrigerant avoided costs to custom projects, definition of advisory reviews, and IR package reviews for legacy projects. The depth and breadth of topics discussed indicates that SCE is being proactive by initiating discussions with CPUC staff prior to approving projects and processes and is keeping staff informed of potential issues with savings methodologies before they arise.

In addition, SCE continues to demonstrate leadership abilities by leading the Statewide Monthly Coordination meetings, particularly with helping to resolve problems that have the potential to impact all PAs. SCE continues to dedicate resources to prioritizing statewide initiatives, actively participating in monthly meetings, and sharing new initiatives. These actions demonstrate performance that exceeds CPUC staff's expectations compared to what is expected to demonstrate minimum proactive collaboration. CPUC staff believe SCE exceeded expectations with regard to proactive collaboration under this metric.

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

In 2021, SCE received a custom disposition score of 8.5 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. As such, the number of dispositions proceeding without exception was weighed against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 33 projects reviewed in 2021, 9 projects (27 percent) proceeded without exception, 10 projects (30 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted, and 2 projects (6 percent) were rejected. Compared to 2020 when SCE had 13 percent of projects rejected, findings from 2021 indicate a slight improvement in performance with regards to effective QC of projects prior to

submitting for review.

CPUC staff also looked at what procedure documents were in place and found that SCE continues to incorporate elements from the statewide documents into their processes as well as demonstrate a commitment to improving QC through processes to improve 3rd party reviews, internal trainings, focusing staff resources on medium and high incentive project reviews, and developing other improvements to streamline the overall QC processes. While these improvements are an indication that SCE is working towards improving their internal processes, the majority of projects submitted had exceptions noted, and the turnaround time for 3rd party review of projects was found to be the longest compared to other PAs. Overall CPUC staff believes SCE continues to make efforts to meet expectations for this metric but there is more work to be done to reduce turnaround time and improve the quality of project documentation submissions.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2021, SCE received a custom disposition score of 10.0 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 adaption to changes in rules over time. CPUC staff found that projects reviewed from January 2021 through December 2021 exhibited a strong upward trend in terms of project performance over time. (i.e. project submissions performed better over the course of the 2021 review period). Furthermore, SCE did not receive any project rejections in the latter half of 2021, indicating that program processes improved over the course of the year.

SCE demonstrated improvement through changes to program documents based on early opinion guidance, and technical policy oversight team updates based on CPUC staff directions. However the performance score for Metric 5 was driven in large part by the increase in the number of policy related issues documented across all project submissions. For this Metric SCE scored fairly well in all sub-categories (4 out of 5), however we noted that at the portfolio level, 28 percent of all actions on projects were policy (up from 12 percent the year prior) related indicating a need for improvement here.

CPUC staff continue to acknowledge SCE's commitment to leading the Statewide Monthly Coordination meetings to streamline the custom project review process across PAs. CPUC staff also recognize that SCE's plan to changing processes to accommodate more 3rd party implementors is forthcoming and expects this will assist in project reviews going forward. Based on these findings CPUC staff believe SCE is complying with the requirements under this metric.

B. Measure Packages Performance Review

SCE had 34 Measure Packages which were submitted in 2021, 33 were reviewed and disposed, and the remaining one is still under detailed review. This end of year memo provides Measure Package specific feedback on the 33 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 Detailed Review Table provides feedback on specific Measure Packages. The Measure Package Submissions Table lists all Measure Packages submitted by SCE or SCE Measure Packages that were disposed during the review period. Measure Packages were selected for feedback from those that were submitted by SCE 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 SCE for each metric both with and without the addition of any enhancement points.

Table 5: SCE 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%	3.67	2.42	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	11.25	7.50	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	2.58 5.00	2.58	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	12.50	6.82	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	6.44	6.44	12.5
			36.44 38.86	25.76	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2021, SCE received a Measure Package disposition score of 2.42 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SCE has largely met deadlines for submission of statewide Measure Packages in the review period, and most Measure Packages received a Yes, indicating that minimum expectations were met for timeliness. Measure Package SWWH028-01 received a (-) due to a delay in final resubmittal of the measure package addressing CPUC comments.

⁷ See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2021, SCE received a Measure Package 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 data provided and the methods used have been included with the submission but follow up meetings with reviewers have been necessary to clarify and correct inconsistencies. The Air-cooled chiller Measure Package lacked necessary data for immediate approval as a deemed measure, but subsequent analysis by SCE sufficed and the Measure Package was ultimately approved.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2021, SCE received a Measure Package disposition score of 2.58 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Most of the submittals received a yes and met minimum expectations. SCE has proactively engaged with CPUC during the development of new Measure Packages: Air-cooled Chillers Path B and Residential Ductless Heat Pump HVAC. They have submitted Measure Package plans not only when required for new measures, but also when early feedback would make the submittal process more efficient. In addition, SCE collaborated with BayREN to update the Residential Ductless HVAC Fuel Substitution Measure Package.

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

In 2021, SCE received a Measure Package disposition score of 6.82 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SCE has improved the quality of the measure package submittals since 2020. Three of the measure packages received a '+' indicating they exceeded the minimum expectation. Measure packages were updated with minimal errors.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2021, SCE received a Measure Package disposition score of 6.44 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SCE effectively responded to program needs with the retirement of multiple lighting measures and the addition of the Type B and C LED lighting Measure Package. CPUC staff and consultants have regularly and productively engaged with SCE and continue to rely on them to provide answers for the electric measure Measure Packages.

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](#).

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:

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").

‘+’ 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, 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 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 SCE's 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, and are summarized

here by metric as:

- Metric 1: Timeliness: SCE has been proactive when communicating timelines for measure package updates. They have provided options to CPUC that have benefited the overall efficiency of workflow.
- Metric 2: Content: SCE has improved on the quality and content of their measure submittals and have been responsive to program needs by consistently updating measure with the most recent policy.
- Metric 3: Collaboration: SCE has collaborated with CPUC on updates to the RACC and Fuel Substitution Calculator. ~~No adder points for Metric 3.~~
- Metric 4: Due Diligence: SCE has shown due diligence in communicating inconsistencies and updates to DEER when needed.
- Metric 5: No adder points for Metric 5.

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 SCE.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 SCE 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%	2.42	2.42	5	10%	5.00	5.00
	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%	2.50	7.50	15	30%	3.63	10.88
	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.										<u>3.93</u>	<u>11.79</u>
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration				5	10%	2.58	2.58	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%	2.73	6.82	12.5	25%	3.40	8.50

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%	2.58	6.44	12.5	25%	4.00	10.00
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%		25.76	50	100%		38.58 39.49

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 ¹⁰)
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	33	SCE complied with SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation before the 15 business days required. No projects were found to be late, and 29 projects (88 percent) were submitted early by 5 or more days, indicating that SCE is consistently exceeding expectations 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%	10.88 <u>11.79</u>	33	In 2021, 15 projects out of the 33 receiving a disposition (55 percent) had no significant issues detected during custom project review. Commission staff found that the remaining 15 projects had significant deficiencies such as M&V plan not found to be in compliance, missing savings calculations, incorrect measure application type, not accounting for non-IOU fuel sources, issues with parameter assumptions, and incorrect measure EUL. Commission staff determined that while 55 percent of all projects had zero deficiencies, the remaining 45 percent had significant deficiencies and therefore SCE is meeting only the minimum expectation for completeness and quality of 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%	4.20	33	Commission staff found that SCE made significant efforts to bring measures, projects, or studies forward for discussion prior to review. In addition, they took an active and engaged lead in statewide collaboration efforts and were champions of several statewide initiatives. staff found SCE to be highly active during bi-weekly calls and took a leadership role in resolving problems that affected all PAs.
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	12.5	25%	8.50	33	Commission staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 33 projects reviewed in 2021, 9 projects (27 percent) proceeded without exception, 10 projects (30 percent)

¹⁰ 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.

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	% of Total Points	Total Scored Points	# of Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level ¹⁰)
	technical review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.					were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted, and 2 projects (6 percent) were rejected. These findings resulted in lower than expected performance with regards to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review. Commission staff found that SCE had strong QC processes for 3rd party reviewers however turnaround time was the longest of all PAs. Additionally the majority of projects reviewed had exceptions noted, indicating that the QC processes are still in need of improvement.
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 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>	12.5	25%	10.00	33	SCE Projects reviewed from July 2021 through December 2021 exhibited a strong upward trend in terms of project performance over time. (i.e. project submissions performed better over the course of the 2021 review period). SCE demonstrated improvement through changes to program documents based on early opinion guidance, and technical policy oversight team updates based on CPUC directions. Both these efforts demonstrate compliance with CPUC policies as well as a willingness to improve internal processes. staff did note that SCE experienced an increase in policy issues compared to the previous year, indicating that there is still room for improvement.

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
SWAP011	2	Vending and Beverage Merchandise Controller	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWCR001	2	Anti-Sweat Heat Controls	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWCR002	2	Low-Temperature Display Case Doors with No Anti-Sweat Heaters	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWCR005	2	Auto Closer for Refrigerated Storage Door	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWCR007	2	Floating Head Pressure Controls, Multiplex	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWCR008	2	Floating Suction Controls, Multiplex	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWCR022	2	Efficient Adiabatic Condenser	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS023	1	Conveyorized Toaster, Commercial	New Measure Package for 2021. Reviewers commented on the validity of data for various offerings. SCE worked with reviewers to clarify comments. Measure Package was well managed.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages					EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWHC005	2	Water-Cooled Chiller	Measure Package submittal triggered by resolution. Measure Package reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC020	2	Air-Cooled Chiller	Measure Package submittal triggered by resolution. Measure Package reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC024	2	Cogged V-Belt for HVAC Fan, Commercial	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC029	2	Fan Controller for Air Conditioner, Residential	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC030	2	Whole House Fan, Residential	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC038	2	Brushless Fan Motor Replacement, Residential	Measure Package submittal triggered by resolution. Measure Package reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC041	2	Software-Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor	Measure Package submittal triggered by resolution. Measure Package reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC042	2	Evaporative Pre-Cooler System And Controls For Packaged HVAC Unit	Updates to include additional climate zones and sectors. Measure Package was well managed.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC044	2	Ductless HVAC, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Measure Package submitted in collaboration with BayREN to add offerings for measures without AC as an existing load. Measure Package revisions were delayed due to multiple meetings and clarifications needed by reviewers.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC049	2	HVAC, SEER-Rated AC and HP Equipment, Residential	Measure Package submittal triggered by resolution. Measure Package reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC050	2	Ductless Heat Pump, HVAC, Residential	Measure Package revised to update methodology and performance data to support high SEER measures. Measure Package was well managed.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages					EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWHC052	1	Air-Cooled Chiller, Path B	New Measure Package to support Path B Air Cooled chillers. Measure Package required multiple meetings with CPUC reviewers. Measure Package was in development for multiple	1	Yes	Yes	+	Yes	+
SWPR004	2	Circulating Block Heater	Minor updates to Measure Package. Reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWWB006	3	High Performance Crawlspace	Revisions to add offerings for Double wide mobile homes. SCE showed proactive response to the needs of the programs.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	+	Yes
SWWH014	3	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential	Revised Measure Package due to updated water heater calculator. Minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWWH025	3	Residential Heat Pump Water Heater, Fuel Substitution	Revisions to add offerings for smaller sized water heaters. SCE showed proactive response to the needs of the programs.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	+	Yes
SWWH025	4	Residential Heat Pump Water Heater, Fuel Substitution	Measure Package submittal triggered by resolution. Measure Package reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWWH027	2	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Measure Package submittal triggered by resolution. Measure Package reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWWH031	1	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial	New water heater Measure Package for commercial applications. Reviewers commented on eligibility and data gathering requirements. SCE worked with reviewers to modify language. Measure Package was well managed.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS007	3	Insulated Hot Food Holding Cabinet	2022 Measure Package Phase 2	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS010	2	Commercial Hand Wrap Machine	Costs updated for 2022. Minor comments on how baseline costs are presented in the Measure Package were resolved in collaboration with CPUC in a timely manner.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWFS009	2	Commercial Deck Oven, Electric	Costs updated for 2022. Minor comments on how baseline costs are presented in the Measure Package were resolved in collaboration with CPUC in a timely manner.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWRE005	1	Heat Pump Pool Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	New fuel substitution Measure Package submitted that adopts and updates calculation tool for pool heaters and covers from SWRE001-01 and SWRE004-01. Reviewed with significant comments, but eventually approved. SCE worked with the review team in a timely manner.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SWHC039	4	Smart Thermostat, Residential	Measure Package updated to align with PY2019 Impact Evaluation. SCE showed initiative and proposed the addition of Thermal Optimization for measure savings. SCE worked closely with CPUC to come to agreement of the appropriate TO savings to assign and the Measure Package	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages							EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5		
			was approved.								
SWWH028	1	Multi-Family and Commercial Large Heat Pump Water Heater– Fuel Substitution	New Fuel Substitution Measure Package. Reviewed with many comments, but SCE worked well with the review team to address eligibility and baseline. Comments led to delays in resubmitting measure package.	1	-	Yes	Yes	+	Yes		

Measure Package and Measure Package Plan Submission Status – All Measure Packages and Plans submitted in 2021

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status
SWAP011	2	Vending and Beverage Merchandise Controller	Interim approval.
SWCR001	2	Anti-Sweat Heat Controls	Interim approval.
SWCR002	2	Low-Temperature Display Case Doors with No Anti-Sweat Heaters	Interim approval.
SWCR005	2	Auto Closer for Refrigerated Storage Door	Interim approval.
SWCR007	2	Floating Head Pressure Controls, Multiplex	Interim approval.
SWCR008	2	Floating Suction Controls, Multiplex	Interim approval.
SWCR022	2	Efficient Adiabatic Condenser	Interim approval.
SWFS023	1	Conveyorized Toaster, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC005	2	Water-Cooled Chiller	Interim approval.
SWHC020	2	Air-Cooled Chiller	Interim approval.
SWHC024	2	Cogged V-Belt for HVAC Fan, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC029	2	Fan Controller for Air Conditioner, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC030	2	Whole House Fan, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC038	2	Brushless Fan Motor Replacement, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC041	2	Software-Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor	Interim approval.
SWHC042	2	Evaporative Pre-Cooler System And Controls For Packaged HVAC Unit	Interim approval.
SWHC044	2	Ductless HVAC, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWHC049	2	HVAC, SEER-Rated AC and HP Equipment, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC050	2	Ductless Heat Pump, HVAC, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC052	1	Air-Cooled Chiller, Path B	Interim approval.
SWPR004	2	Circulating Block Heater	Interim approval.
SWWB006	3	High Performance Crawlspace	Interim approval.
SWWH014	3	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH025	3	Residential Heat Pump Water Heater, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWWH025	4	Residential Heat Pump Water Heater, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWWH027	2	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.

Measure Package and Measure Package Plan Submission Status – All Measure Packages and Plans submitted in 2021

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status
SWWH031	1	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS007	3	Insulated Hot Food Holding Cabinet	Interim approval.
SWFS010	2	Commercial Hand Wrap Machine	Interim approval.
SWFS009	2	Commercial Deck Oven, Electric	Interim approval.
SWRE005	1	Heat Pump Pool Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWHC039	4	Smart Thermostat, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH028	1	Multi-Family and Commercial Large Heat Pump Water Heater– Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWLG019	1	LED, Lighting Horticulture	On Hold

Process Adder	EAR Metrics					
	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SCE has shown due diligence in communication inconsistencies and updates to DEER when needed.	1	No	No	No	+	No
SCE has been proactive when communicating timeline for measure package updates. They have provided options to CPUC that have benefited the overall efficiency of workflow.	1	Yes	No	No	No	No
SCE has improved on the quality and content of their measure submittals and have been responsive to program needs by consistently updating measure with the most recent policy.	1	No	Yes	No	No	No
<u>SCE has collaborated with CPUC on updates to the RACC and Fuel Substitution Calculator.</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>+</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>

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)	5.00	3.63 3.93	4.40	3.40	4.00	
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)	5.00	3.63 3.93	4.20	3.40	4.00	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	10.88 11.79	4.20	8.50	10.00	38.58 39.49

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	4.27	4.50	3.80	4.00	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	4.27	5.00	4.30	4.50	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	12.81	5.00	10.75	11.25	44.81

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

Measure Package Scoring

2021 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work product Review Score	SCE "-"	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	SCE "+"	0%	0%	3%	9%	3%	
	SCE "Yes"	97%	100%	97%	91%	97%	
	Dispositions Score %	48%	50%	52%	55%	52%	
	Dispositions Score	2.42	2.50	2.58	2.73	2.58	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCE "-"	0%	0%	0%	0%		
	SCE "+"	0%	0%	100%	100%		
	SCE "Yes"	100%	100%	0%	0%		
	Process Score %	50%	50%	100% 0%	100%	0%	
	Process Increase Score	2.50	2.50	5.00 0.00	5.00	0.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50 0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	1.25	1.25	2.50 0.00	2.50	0.00	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	3.67	3.75	5.00 2.58	5.00	2.58	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	3.67	11.25	5.00 2.58	12.50	6.44	36.44 38.86

2020 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work product Review Score	SCE "-"	29%	5%	0%	0%	0%	
	SCE "+"	17%	5%	24%	0%	8%	
	SCE "Yes"	54%	91%	76%	100%	92%	
	Dispositions Score %	44%	50%	62%	50%	54%	
	Dispositions Score	2.19	2.50	3.10	2.50	2.70	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCE "-"	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	SCE "+"	0%	0%	50%	50%	25%	
	SCE "Yes"	100%	100%	50%	50%	75%	
	Process Score %	50%	50%	75%	75%	63%	
	Process Increase Score	2.50	2.50	3.75	3.75	3.13	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	1.25	1.25	1.88	1.88	1.56	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	3.44	3.75	4.98	4.38	4.26	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	3.44	11.25	4.98	10.94	10.66	41.27

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 % score into a numeric value of up to five by directly applying the % 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.