

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: March 30, 2023 (revised June 21, 2023)

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: 2022 EX ANTE REVIEW (EAR) SCORING AND EVALUATION PERFORMANCE

---

## Table of Contents

I.	Summary of 2022 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages .....	2
II.	CPUC Staff Findings 2022 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 .....	13
	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: 2022 Performance Annual Ratings .....	28

## I. Summary of 2022 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 awards<sup>1</sup>. D.20-11-013 placed a moratorium on EAR awards but directed that EAR scoring shall continue. CPUC staff and consultants completed the 2022 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 2022 EAR performance score of 83.69/100 for Measure Packages<sup>2</sup> and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. SCE’s 2022 total points is a 5.34 point increase from its 2021 total points of 78.35. Scores for 2021 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

Table 1: SCE 2022 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

SCE 2022 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	2.75	10%	2.75	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	<del>8.63</del> 2.88	30%	8.63	15	4.22	30%	12.65	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	3.00	10%	3.00	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	<del>2.69</del> 5.00	25%	12.50	12.5	4.41	25%	11.03	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	<del>2.75</del> 5.00	25%	12.50	12.5	4.25	25%	10.63	12.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>39.38</b>	<b>50</b>			<b>44.31</b>	<b>50</b>

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 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%	11.79	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	2.58	10%	5.00	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%	10.00	12.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>38.86</b>	<b>50</b>			<b>39.49</b>	<b>50</b>

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 2022 Activities

### A. Custom Projects Review Overview

From the period beginning January 2022 to the end of December 2022, CPUC staff issued 17 scored dispositions.<sup>3</sup>

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points resulted in SCE’s custom project score increasing by 4.82 points from 2021 scores (39.49 in 2021 vs. 44.31 in 2022 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above). CPUC staff notes that SCE project submissions have decreased by approximately 50% between 2021 and 2022, however SCE continues to demonstrate efforts to improve its processes and performance has increased in 2022.

#### 1. Summary of 2022 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 16 projects (94 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.

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

- **SCE has focused on reducing the number of issues regarding gross savings impacts.** In 2021, there were 35 issues regarding gross savings impacts which comprised 57 percent of all noted issues. This was improved in 2022 with 5 issues related to gross savings impacts, comprising 15 percent of all noted issues.

## 2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

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

- **The number of issues in the Process, Policy, and Program rules area remains high.** In 2022 there were 11 issues identified across 17 dispositions which comprised 32 percent of all issues identified which is an increase from 2021. There are continued noted deficiencies for measure effective useful life (EUL)/RUL estimation.

## B. Measure Packages Review Overview

SCE's Measure Packages scores have increased compared to last year by 0.52 points (from 38.86 in 2021 to 39.38 in 2022 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above).

### 1. Summary of 2022 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 this has helped other areas of the measure package review process like timeliness.
- **SCE has continued to take a lead role in CPUC supported calculators.** The Fuel Substitution and Refrigerant Avoided Cost Calculators continue to be supported by SCE.
- **SCE has made significant improvements in collaborating with CPUC and review staff.** The LED Tube Type A and LED Tube Type B and C Measure Packages had multiple versions under review at the same time, with one version for Resolution E-5152 and one retroactive version to correct an error. SCE was proactive in collaborating with CPUC Staff to ensure the review process was clear.

### 2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

CPUC staff highlights the following recommendations for improvement:

- **There is room for more improvement in the QA/QC process for Measure Packages.** SCE should continue to focus and improve upon the existing QA/QC review processes for measure packages. While critical comments on Measure Packages were less frequent in 2022, there were many measures with typos and readability concerns.

### 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”.

**From the period beginning January 2022 to the end of December 2022, 17 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%	12.65	12.65	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	4.40	5
4	PA’s Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	11.03	11.03	12.5
5	PA’s Responsiveness	25%	10.63	10.63	12.5
<b>Total</b>			<b>44.31</b>	<b>43.71</b>	<b>50</b>

#### 1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2022, 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 17 custom project reviews completed in 2022. In 2022, SCE submitted project documentation for review for all 17 reviewed projects on time and 16 projects (94 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.<sup>4</sup> SCE continues to exceed expectations with regards to timeliness by submitting projects on time and ahead of the required due date in many cases.

<sup>4</sup> “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”.

## 2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2022, SCE received a custom disposition score of 12.65 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 17 SCE custom project reviews. Of the 17 projects with dispositions, 2 projects (12 percent) were approved without exception and three of the projects (18 percent), though Advisory only, did not have any exceptions. CPUC staff found that the remaining 12 projects (71 percent) had deficiencies such as incorrect calculation or analysis assumptions, incorrect EUL/RUL, incorrect or missing savings calculations, missing documentation, and insufficient program influence. As such, CPUC staff determined SCE is meeting only the minimum expectation for completeness and quality of submittals.

Table 4 summarizes the 34 action items identified across 17 scored dispositions<sup>5</sup> issued between January 1, 2022, and December 31, 2022. These action items illustrate errors that impacted the project's net savings, documentation, and efficiency savings estimate calculations.

---

<sup>5</sup> This table includes action items issued on 5 Advisory 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	3	7	9%
	Calculation method	2	1	6%
	Calculation tool	0	3	0%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15%</b>
Process, Policy, Program Rules	Baseline	0	3	0%
	CPUC Policy	2	0	6%
	Eligibility	1	0	3%
	ER preponderance of evidence	0	1	0%
	EUL/RUL	6	0	18%
	Incentive calculation	1	0	3%
	Measure cost	1	1	3%
<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>32%</b>	
Documentation Issues	Continue Document Upload	5	0	15%
	Missing required information	2	0	6%
	Project scope unclear	1	0	3%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24%</b>
Issues Related to Net Impacts	Program influence	5	0	15%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15%</b>
Other Issues	Other 1 - Incorrect address in bimonthly upload	1	0	3%
	Other 2 - Building type is incorrect in bimonthly upload	3	0	9%
	Other 3 - Incentive amount is incorrect in bimonthly upload	1	0	3%
	Other 4 - Project not eligible for On-Bill Financing	0	1	0%
	Other 5 - CPRs of HOPPs are advisory only	0	1	0%
	Other 6 - If project is connected to microgrid savings may not persist over measure life.	0	1	0%
	Other 7 - LED previously installed	0	1	0%
	Other 8 - Standard practice	0	1	0%
<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15%</b>	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>34</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

- **Incorrect Measure EUL/RUL** was found in 6 out of the 17 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 745, 746, 747, 748, 761, 805.

- **Incomplete Documentation of Program Influence** was found in 5 out of the 17 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 727, 745, 746, 747, 805.
- **Incorrect Analysis or Calculation** was found in 4 out of the 17 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 727, 768, 789, 805.

### **3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration**

In 2022, SCE received a custom disposition score of 4.4 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 process for issuing disposition updates, baseline for cannabis lighting projects, CPUC selection of strategic energy management (SEM) projects, clarification on past EAR memo comments, role of NMEC rulebook and commercial calculated program rules, appropriate measure application type (MAT) designation for control upgrade project, modified lighting calculator (MLC) calculations for deemed measures.

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, such as SEM programs, lighting NTG, lighting standard practice, and MLC inconsistencies. 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.

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

In 2022, SCE received a custom disposition score of 11.03 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. Of the 17 projects reviewed in 2022, 2 projects (12 percent) proceeded without exception, three of the projects (18 percent), though Advisory only, did not have any exceptions, 12 projects (71 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted, and 0 projects were rejected. CPUC staff found that SCE had strong QC processes for 3rd party reviewers. Compared to 2021 when SCE had 2 projects (6 percent) rejected, findings from 2022 indicate a slight improvement in performance with regards to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review. However, most projects reviewed had exceptions noted, indicating that the QC processes are still in need of improvement.

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 3<sup>rd</sup> party reviews. 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 2022, SCE received a custom disposition score of 10.63 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. When reviewed at the portfolio level, CPUC staff assessed the time series of rejections and expectations, the alignment of program policy and procedures with the number of actual rejections and exceptions based on eligibility and attribution, and the adaptation to changes in rules over time. CPUC staff found that projects reviewed from January 2022 through December 2022 exhibited an upward trend in terms of project performance over time. Furthermore, SCE did not receive any project rejections in the latter half of 2022, indicating that program processes improved over the course of the year.

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 3<sup>rd</sup> party implementors is forthcoming and expects this will assist in project reviews going forward. Based on these findings CPUC staff believe SCE is generally complying with the requirements under this metric.

## B. Measure Packages Performance Review

SCE submitted 41 Measure Packages in 2022, 40 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 40 which were reviewed and disposed.

The comments below are organized by the five scoring metric areas created in D.16-08-019.<sup>6</sup> 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.

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%	2.75	2.75	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	8.63	8.63	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	3.00	3.00	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	12.50	6.72	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	12.50	6.88	12.5
			<b>39.38</b>	<b>27.98</b>	<b>50</b>

### 1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2022, SCE received a Measure Package disposition score of 2.75 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. Several Measure Packages that were updated with Resolution E-5221 received a (+) for early submissions and expedited eTRM comment reviews, especially the Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case, Low-Temperature Display Case Doors with No Anti-Sweat Heaters, and Fan Motor Retrofit for a Refrigerated Display Case.

### 2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2022, SCE received a Measure Package disposition score of 8.63 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SCE has improved on the quality and completeness of measure package submittals in 2022 with most Measure Packages only consisting of a few minor clarifying comments. The Software-Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor, Evaporative Pre-Cooler System and Controls for Packaged HVAC Unit, and Whole House Fan Measure Packages were approved with no more than one minor comment. The Cooking Appliances, Fuel Substitution Measure Package required edits to the fuel substitution calculator prior to approval. However, SCE was quick to resolve the measure package with the review team.

### 3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2022, SCE received a Measure Package disposition score of 3.00 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: Business Energy Reports, which was approved in early 2023. 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 CPUC staff regarding measure package reviews in quick succession due to an error correction on the LED Tube, and LED Type B and C measure packages.

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

In 2022, SCE received a Measure Package disposition score of 6.72 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 2021. Three of the measure packages received a '+' indicating they exceeded the minimum expectation. Measure packages were updated with minimal errors, especially the two versions of the Smart Controlled Thermostat Measure Package.

#### **5. PA's Responsiveness**

In 2022, SCE received a Measure Package disposition score of 6.88 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 retroactive error correction and PY 2023 measure package for multiple lighting Measure Packages. CPUC staff and consultants have regularly and productively engaged with SCE and continue to rely on them to provide answers for the electric Measure Packages.

### **IV. The Scoring Methodology**

The 2022 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 2022. 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 2021 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.<sup>7</sup> 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 because 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:

- ‘+’ 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

---

<sup>7</sup> An example is the No Savings procedural measure package, which does not include any savings, costs, or permutations and therefore would not receive scoring for Metric 2 (“Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittal”). 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”).

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 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 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. Like 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. Like 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 2022 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. CPUC staff awarded SCE bonus points for Metric 1 Timeliness and Metric 3 Collaboration to reflect SCE staff’s positive efforts in these metric areas as discussed earlier. This included:

- Participated and led working groups to discuss issues and provide recommendations for the Strategic Energy Management (SEM) program in collaboration with IOUs, Program Implementers, and the CPUC staff.
- SCE has led the monthly coordination calls with other IOUs and CPUC staff to better facilitate collaboration and continuous improvement of the custom program project quality.

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: No adder points for Metric 1.
- Metric 2: Content: No adder points for Metric 2.
- Metric 3: Collaboration: No adder points for Metric 3.
- Metric 4: Due Diligence: SCE has continued support in updating the Refrigerant Avoided Cost Calculator.
- Metric 5: Process: SCE has continued support in updating the Fuel Substitution Calculator and the collaborative review process.

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.<sup>8</sup>

[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](mailto:rashid.mir@cpuc.ca.gov)) or Peter Biermayer ([peter.biermayer@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto: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, 2023.

---

<sup>8</sup> 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	2022 Score	2022 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2022 Score	2022 Points	
<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	
Timing and Timeliness of Submittals 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.									
<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>8.63</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>12.65</b>	
Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submittals. Submittal adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior CPUC 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.									
<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>4.40</b>	
Proactive Initiative of Collaboration PA efforts to bring either measures, projects, studies, questions, and/or savings calculation methods and 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 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.									
<b>4</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>6.72</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>4.41</b>	<b>11.03</b>	
Program Administrator's Due Diligence and Quality Assurance/Quality Control Effectiveness									



Metric	Measure Packages				Custom			
	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2022 Score	2022 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2022 Score	2022 Points
<p>CPUC 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 CPUC staff can evaluate the effectiveness of the PA internal QA/QC processes.</p>								
<p><b>5 Program Administrator’s Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements</b></p>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>6.88</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>10.63</b>
<p>This metric reflects the PAs ongoing efforts to improve their internal processes and procedures resulting in increased ex post evaluated gross and net savings impacts. CPUC 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 CPUC 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.</p>								
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>27.98</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>43.71</b>

## 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
<b>Metric 1</b>	<b>Timeliness and Timing of Submittals</b> Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	<b>5.0</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Metric 2</b>	<b>Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals</b> 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.	<b>15.0</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Metric 3</b>	<b>Proactive Initiation of Collaboration</b> 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.	<b>5.0</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Metric 4</b>	<b>Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness</b> 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.	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Metric 5</b>	<b>Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process &amp; Program Improvements (Course Corrections)</b> 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.	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	% of Total Points	Total Scored Points	# of Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level <sup>9</sup> )
<b>Metric 1</b>	<b>Timeliness and Timing of Submittals</b> Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5	10%	5.00	17	SCE complied with SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation before the 15 business days required. No projects were found to be late and 16 projects (94 percent) were submitted early by 5 or more days, indicating that SCE is consistently exceeding expectations with regards to timeliness.
<b>Metric 2</b>	<b>Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals</b> Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submitted documentation. In addition, this metric is an assessment of the utility's adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior CPUC staff disposition guidance.	15	30%	12.65	17	Of the 17 projects with dispositions 2 projects (12 percent) were approved without exception and three of the projects (18 percent), though Advisory only, did not have any exceptions. CPUC Staff found that the remaining 12 projects (71 percent) had deficiencies such as incorrect calculation or analysis assumptions, incorrect EUL/RUL, missing or incorrect savings calculations, missing documentation, and insufficient program influence. As such, CPUC staff determined SCE is meeting only the minimum expectation for completeness and quality of submittals.
<b>Metric 3</b>	<b>Proactive Initiation of Collaboration</b> 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%	5.00	17	CPUC 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. Staff found SCE to be active during bi-weekly calls and took a leadership role in resolving problems that affected all PAs such as SEM programs, lighting NTG, lighting standard practice, and MLC inconsistencies.
<b>Metric 4</b>	<b>Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness</b> CPUC staff expects the utility to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for its programs and measures. The depth and correctness of the utility's technical review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.	12.5	25%	11.03	17	CPUC staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 17 projects reviewed in 2022, 2 projects (12 percent) proceeded without exception, three of the projects (18 percent), though Advisory only, did not have any exceptions 12 projects (71 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted, and 0

<sup>9</sup> The Metric 1, 2, and 4 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 <sup>9</sup> )
						projects were rejected. CPUC staff found that SCE had strong QC processes for 3rd party reviewers. However, the majority of projects reviewed had exceptions noted, indicating that the QC processes are still in need of improvement.
<b>Metric 5</b>	<p><b>Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process &amp; Program Improvements (Course Corrections)</b>                      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>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>10.63</b>	<b>17</b>	SCE Projects reviewed from July 2022 through December 2022 exhibited a slight upward trend in terms of project performance over time. SCE demonstrated improvement through changes to program documents and technical policy oversight.

## 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
SWCR014	3	Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case	Measure package revision from E-5152 updating CZ2022 weather data, costs, and permutation revisions. Approved after two minor clarifying comments were quickly resolved by SCE.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH028	1	Large Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial and Multifamily, Fuel Substitution	New measure package. Several comments from the review team on federal standards, DEER water heater calculator, and data and modeling requests. SCE worked collaboratively with the review team to address all comments. The measure package had several rounds of comments with some comments focused on the base case descriptions and confusing language around the code requirements.	1	yes	-	+	yes	yes
SWCR002	3	Low-Temperature Display Case Doors with No Anti-Sweat Heaters	Measure package revision from E-5152 updating CZ2022 weather data, peak electric demand, costs, and permutation revisions. One minor comment, which was quickly resolved.	1	+	+	yes	yes	yes
SWCR003	2	Fan Motor Retrofit for a Refrigerated Display Case	Measure package revision from E-5152 updating CZ2022 weather data, references, and permutation updates. Several minor comments on non-technical text updates for clarity. Comments quickly addressed.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCA001	3	VFD Retrofit for Air Compressor	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include additional AOE offering and updated costs. Measure package approved after comments on assumption clarification and minor text edits.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCR010	3	Bare Suction Line Insulation	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include data collection requirements, updated Title 24 code requirements, updated assumptions and inputs, updated peak demand calculation, and CZ2022 weather data. Measure package approved after clarifying inputs and assumptions, references, and permutation files.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCR005	3	Auto Closer for Refrigerated Storage Door	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, updated costs, updated data collection requirements, removal of upstream delivery type, and updated sensitivity model for savings. Measure package approved after clarifying comments on gas impacts and minor text edits on assumptions.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWAP011	3	Vending and Beverage Merchandise Controller	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include updated offerings to align with DEER building types, updated costs, updated codes and standards, updated EnergyStar equipment, and updated interactive effects to DEER2023 values. Measure package approved after clarifying the measure case differences in the MP text and updating the program exclusions to disallow outdoor units.	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
SWCR008	3	Floating Suction Controls, Multiplex	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, updated data collection requirements, and several permutation updates. Measure package approved after minor text edits and controls assumptions.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCR022	3	Efficient Adiabatic Condenser	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include peak electric demand reduction calculation updates, CZ2022 weather data, and data collection requirements. Measure package approved after several minor comments on permutations, text edits, and measure case clarifications.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWFS023	2	Conveyor Toaster, Commercial	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include data collection requirements and permutation edits. Measure package approved after one minor clarifying comment.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWCR001	3	Anti-Sweat Heater Controls	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include peak electric demand reduction calculation updates, CZ2022 weather data, cost updates, and data collection requirements. Measure package approved after one minor comment to clarify the text in the codes and standards section.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWFS021	3	Fryer, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, cost updates, and data collection requirements. Measure package approved after a comment on two references, one which impacted the base case specification pre-heat value.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWFS022	2	Convection Oven, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, cost updates, and data collection requirements. Measure package approved after a few comments on updating the cost data.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCR004	2	ECM Retrofit for a Walk-in Cooler or Freezer	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, updated peak electric demand savings calculation, and cost updates. Measure package approved after minor permutation corrections, several text edits, and a reference update.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC041	3	Software-Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, updated peak electric demand calculation, updated costs, and updated code references. Measure package approved after one minor permutations comment.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWHC042	3	Evaporative Pre-Cooler System and Controls for Packaged HVAC Unit	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, updated calculations, updated codes and standards and updated costs. Measure package approved after minor permutation and text edits comments.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWLG011	4	LED, High or Low Bay	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include updated interactive effects using DEER2023 values, updated base case efficiencies to align with MLC v13.0.2, added data collection requirements, updated codes and standards, updated costs, and updated NTG values. Measure package approved after various text edits and confirming eligibility and code sections.	1	yes	yes	+	+	yes
SWRE005	2	Heat Pump Pool Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, updated data collection requirements, and cost updates. Measure package approved after various text edits comments and assumptions details.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC012	2	HVAC Occupancy Sensor, Classroom	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include updated code requirements, data collection requirements, updated setback schedules and calculations, cost updates, and CZ2022 weather data. Measure package approved after several comments on assumptions and text edits.	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
SWPR004	3	Circulating Block Heater	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include data collection requirements, cost updates, and additional data to back-up assumptions. Measure package approved after several text edit comments to confirm assumptions.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC046	2	Packaged Heat Pump Air Conditioner Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include code and standard updates, cost updates, CZ2022 weather data model runs, and various permutation updates. Measure package approved after several text edit comments, code clarifications, and assumption clarifications.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	yes
SWAP013	2	Cooking Appliances, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include cost updates, updated data collection requirements, and various permutation updates. Measure package approved after reference edits, fuel sub calculator edits, and general text edits.	1	yes	-	yes	yes	yes
SWWH031	2	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include DEER2023 measure values, updated refrigerant avoided cost calculations, updated data collection requirements, updated costs, and various permutation updates. Measure package approved after minor text edits and clarifying assumptions and efficiency levels of offerings.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC024	3	Cogged V-Belt for HVAC Fan, Commercial	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, updated EUL data, and updated state and federal codes and standards. Measure package approved after clarifying comments on EUL values, EFLH assumptions, and minor text edits.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	yes
SWLG009	3	LED, Tube	Measure package updated in response to E-4952 to update parking garage hours. Measure package approved after minor comments on preponderance of evidence for AR measure offerings and a reference update.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	+
SWLG018	2	LED, Tube, Type B and Type C	Measure package updated in response to E-4952 to update parking garage hours. Measure package approved after clarifying comments on the hours of use reference and data behind 1st and 2nd baseline savings values and preponderance of evidence for AR measure offerings.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	+
SWHC039	5	Smart Thermostat, Residential	Measure package updated in response to E-5221 to include updated savings based on recent evaluations, updated costs, updated eligibility requirements, and added data collection requirements. Measure package approved after various text edits and clarifying comments.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWAP014	2	Heat Pump Clothes Dryer, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Measure package updated with E-5151 to include added data collection requirements, updated measure case and base case descriptions with additional multifamily common area building types, added DEER2023 interactive effects, updated cost data, and updated code requirements. Measure package approved after one minor comment to correct the base case description language.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWHC039	6	Smart Thermostat, Residential	Measure package updated with E-5221 to include updated NTG value from most recent evaluation. Measure package approved with no comments.	1	+	+	yes	yes	+
SWLG009	4	LED, Tube	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include updated NTG values based on 2019 EM&V results, using DEER2023 interactive effect values, data collection requirements, and updated references to most recent building codes. Measure package approved after clarifying comments on program exclusions, text edits, and updated references to DEER2023 data.	1	yes	yes	+	+	yes
SWLG018	3	LED, Tube, Type B and Type C	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include updated NTG values based on 2019 EM&V results, using DEER2023 interactive effect values, data collection requirements, and updated references to most recent building codes. Measure package approved after clarifying comments on program exclusions and text edits.	1	yes	yes	+	+	yes
SWHO14	4	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include cost updates, DEER2023 savings and load shape updates, updated measure case efficiency parameter to reflect new requirements, updated RACC, and added data collection	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
			requirements. Measure package approved after minor text edits and clarifications on the hot water loads source data and reference.						
SWWH025	5	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include cost updates, updated measure offerings to align with DEER2023 values, added data collection requirements, applied updated DEER Water Heater Calculator version, updated RACC, and updated measure case and base case efficiency standards. Measure package approved after clarifications on the hot water loads source and reference data, various text edits, and clarifying the DEER Measure IDs in the permutations.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH027	3	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include cost updates, updated measure offerings to align with DEER2023 values, updated RACC, added data collection requirements, applied updated DEER Water Heater Calculator version, and updated measure case and base case efficiency standards. Measure package approved after text edits and clarifications and confirmation of the EUL ID.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH028	2	Large Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial and Multifamily, Fuel Substitution	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include cost updates, updated measure offerings to align with DEER2023 values, updated RACC, added data collection requirements, applied updated DEER Water Heater Calculator version, and updated measure case and base case efficiency standards. Measure package approved after minor text edits and updating text and references to v5.1 of the DEER Water Heater Calculator.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWFS016	2	Refrigerated Chef Base	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include cost updates, addition of EnergyStar requirements and standards to the baseline and measure case energy consumption values. Measure package approved after minor corrections in calculations, updating the dataset for the cost updates, minor text edits, and several clarifying comments on normalizing units, and sample size for EnergyStar.	1	yes	-	yes	yes	yes
SWHC029	3	Fan Controller for Air Conditioner, Residential	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include updated DEER2024 energy offering values, updated costs, and updated NTG ID. Measure package approved after minor text edit to clarify the applicable climate zones.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	+
SWHC030	3	Whole House Fan, Residential	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include updated DEER2023 measure offerings update, additions and removal of offerings, updated eligibility requirements, and updated costs. Measure package approved after internal comments about measure application type.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWHC038	3	Brushless Fan Motor Replacement, Residential	Measure package updated with E-5152 to include updated costs, updated measure offerings to DEER2024 values, and various text updates. Measure package approved after minor typo corrections, clarifying measure case and base case differences, updates to units, and adding transparency to assumptions behind saving values.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes



## Measure Package and Measure Package Plan Submission Status – All Measure Packages and Plans submitted in 2022

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status
SWCR014	3	Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case	Interim approval.
SWWH028	1	Large Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial and Multifamily, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWCR002	3	Low-Temperature Display Case Doors with No Anti-Sweat Heaters	Interim approval.
SWCR003	2	Fan Motor Retrofit for a Refrigerated Display Case	Interim approval.
SWCA001	3	VFD Retrofit for Air Compressor	Interim approval.
SWCR010	3	Bare Suction Line Insulation	Interim approval.
SWCR005	3	Auto Closer for Refrigerated Storage Door	Interim approval.
SWAP011	3	Vending and Beverage Merchandise Controller	Interim approval.
SWCR008	3	Floating Suction Controls, Multiplex	Interim approval.
SWCR022	3	Efficient Adiabatic Condenser	Interim approval.
SWFS023	2	Conveyor Toaster, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWCR001	3	Anti-Sweat Heater Controls	Interim approval.
SWFS021	3	Fryer, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWFS022	2	Convection Oven, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWCR004	2	ECM Retrofit for a Walk-in Cooler or Freezer	Interim approval.
SWHC041	3	Software-Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor	Interim approval.
SWHC042	3	Evaporative Pre-Cooler System and Controls for Packaged HVAC Unit	Interim approval.
SWLG011	4	LED, High or Low Bay	Interim approval.
SWRE005	2	Heat Pump Pool Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWHC012	2	HVAC Occupancy Sensor, Classroom	Interim approval.
SWPR004	3	Circulating Block Heater	Interim approval.
SWHC046	2	Packaged Heat Pump Air Conditioner Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWAP013	2	Cooking Appliances, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWWH031	2	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC024	3	Cogged V-Belt for HVAC Fan, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWLG009	3	LED, Tube	Interim approval.
SWLG018	2	LED, Tube, Type B and Type C	Interim approval.

## Measure Package and Measure Package Plan Submission Status – All Measure Packages and Plans submitted in 2022

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status
SWHC039	5	Smart Thermostat, Residential	Interim approval.
SWAP014	2	Heat Pump Clothes Dryer, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWHC039	6	Smart Thermostat, Residential	Interim approval.
SWLG009	4	LED, Tube	Interim approval.
SWLG018	3	LED, Tube, Type B and Type C	Interim approval.
SWWH014	4	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH025	5	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWWH027	3	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWWH028	2	Large Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial and Multifamily, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWFS016	2	Refrigerated Chef Base	Interim approval.
SWHC029	3	Fan Controller for Air Conditioner, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC030	3	Whole House Fan, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC038	3	Brushless Fan Motor Replacement, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWB007	1	Business Energy Reports	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC056	1	Variable Refrigerant Flow Systems, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Measure package plan reviewed.
SWLG021	1	LED, Fixture and Lamp Replacement, Statewide Offering	Measure package plan reviewed.

Process Adder	EAR Metrics					
	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SCE has shown continued support in updating the Fuel Substitution Calculator and collaborates with CPUC Staff during the development and review process of the new calculator.	1	No	No	No	No	+
SCE has shown continued support in updating the Refrigerant Avoided Cost Calculator and collaborates with CPUC Staff during the development and review process of the new calculator.	1	No	No	No	+	No

## Attachment D: 2022 Performance Annual Ratings

## Custom Scoring

2022 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	5.00	4.22	4.40	4.41	4.25	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.50	0.00	1.50	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	4.22	5.00	4.41	4.25	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	12.65	5.00	11.03	10.63	44.31

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	3.93	4.20	3.40	4.00	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.50	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	3.93	4.20	3.40	4.00	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	11.79	4.20	8.50	10.00	39.49

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

**Measure Package Scoring**

<b>2022 Annual Measure Package Ratings</b>		<b>Metric 1</b>	<b>Metric 2</b>	<b>Metric 3</b>	<b>Metric 4</b>	<b>Metric 5</b>
<b>Direct Work product Review Score</b>	<b>SCE "-"</b>	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%
	<b>SCE "+"</b>	10%	22%	20%	8%	10%
	<b>SCE "Yes"</b>	90%	70%	80%	92%	90%
	<b>Dispositions Score %</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>55%</b>
	<b>Dispositions Score</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>2.75</b>
<b>Review Process Score Enhancements</b>	<b>SCE "-"</b>				0%	0%
	<b>SCE "+"</b>				100%	100%
	<b>SCE "Yes"</b>				0%	0%
	<b>Process Score %</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>Process Increase Score</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	<b>Process Increase Weight</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.50</b>
	<b>Process Increase Wtd Score</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Final Metric Score (1-5)</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Metric Points with Weighting</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>8.63</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>12.50</b>	<b>12.50</b>
						<b>Total Points</b>
						<b>39.38</b>

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%	1000%	100%	0%	
	Process Increase Score	2.50	2.50	5.00	5.00	0.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	1.25	1.25	2.50	2.50	0.00	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	3.67	3.75	5.00	5.00	2.58	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	3.67	11.25	5.00	12.50	6.44	38.86

### 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.