

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: April 10, 2024

To: Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)

From: Lisa Paulo and Peter Biermayer, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

Cc: R.13-11-005 Service Lists

Subject: 2023 EX ANTE REVIEW (EAR) SCORING AND EVALUATION PERFORMANCE

---

## Table of Contents

- I. Summary of 2023 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages .....2
- II. CPUC Staff Findings 2023 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 .....10
- IV. The Scoring Methodology .....12
  - A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology .....13
  - B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology .....14
  - C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology .....14
  - D. Custom Metric 3, 4, and 5 Scoring Methodology .....14
  - E. Score Enhancement Methodology .....15
- Attachment A: Final EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points) .....17
- Attachment B Custom Project Scores and Feedback .....19
- Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback .....22
- Attachment D: 2023 Performance Annual Ratings .....27

## I. Summary of 2023 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 2023 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 PG&E’s 2023 EAR performance score of 78.23/100 for measure packages<sup>2</sup> and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. PG&E’s 2023 total points is a 3.84 point increase from its 2022 total points of 74.39. Scores for 2022 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

Table 1: PG&E 2023 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

PG&E 2023 EAR 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	3.59	10%	3.59	5	4.85	10%	4.85	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	5.00	30%	15.00	15	4.26	30%	12.78	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	2.78	25%	6.94	12.5	4.05	25%	10.13	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	2.78	25%	6.94	12.5	3.20	25%	8.00	12.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>37.47</b>	<b>50</b>			<b>40.76</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: PG&amp;E 2022 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

PG&E 2022 EAR 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	3.38	10%	3.38	5	4.20	10%	4.20	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	5.00	30%	15.00	15	3.52	30%	10.57	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	2.50	25%	6.25	12.5	4.49	25%	11.24	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	2.50	25%	6.25	12.5	3.00	25%	7.50	12.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>35.88</b>	<b>50</b>			<b>38.51</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 2023 Activities

### A. Custom Projects Review Overview

From the period beginning January 2023 to the end of December 2023, CPUC staff issued 40 scored dispositions.<sup>3</sup>

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points<sup>4</sup> resulted in PG&E's custom project score increasing by 2.25 points from its 2022 scores (38.51 in 2022 vs. 40.76 in 2023) as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above. While certain aspects of project submission have improved, PG&E must continue to work to improve its overall performance.

#### 1. Summary of 2023 Achievements

CPUC staff's observed PG&E to have improved in:

- **Improvements in Documentation Submission Timeline.** In 2023, PG&E continued to submit most projects (90 percent) on time or earlier than required by Senate Bill (SB) 1131. Furthermore, 70 percent of their submissions were submitted five or more days earlier than required, signaling that PG&E is continuing to improve its document submission processes to meet timeline requirements.
- **Consistent collaboration** through active participation in statewide initiatives and subgroups, and proactively introducing topics to CPUC staff on bi-weekly calls.

<sup>3</sup> Some of the dispositions are for projects submitted at the end of 2022. Some projects that were selected in 2023 had dispositions issued in 2023. The memo is for dispositions issued in 2023.

<sup>4</sup> Section IV.E provides details on the score enhancement methodology.

## 2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

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

- **Issues Related to Gross Savings Impacts.** In 2023, 32 issues related to Gross Savings Impacts that comprised 28 percent of all issues noted. Most of these issues were related to analysis assumptions and calculation methodology.
- **Issues in Program Influence Documentation.** The proportion of issues regarding program influence remains high with this sole issue comprising 9 percent of all actions noted in 2023. PG&E continues to experience issues related to Program Influence and needs to work on providing sufficient documentation in the future.
- **Issues in Process, Policy, and Program Rules.** In 2022, there were 59 issues related to Process, Policy, and Program rules that comprised 34 percent of all issues noted. In 2023, this problem area remains high, with 47 issues noted comprising 41 percent of all issues noted. Specifically, PGE has struggled with correct EUL/RUL and baseline selection.

## B. Measure Packages Review Overview

PG&E's measure packages scores have increased compared to last year by 1.59 points (from 35.88 in 2022 to 37.47 in 2023) as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above.

### 1. Summary of 2023 Achievements

CPUC staff observed improvements in PG&E's development and management of measure package submissions in the following areas:

- **PG&E has demonstrated initiative in developing new measure packages in 2023.** These measure packages are still in the measure package development phase. In addition, they lead the annual effort to update the statewide Deemed Rulebook.
- **PG&E has continued to show enhanced internal QC processes and CPUC staff has noticed fewer errors with new submissions.** The improvement in measure package quality has coincided with increased collaboration on measure package questions and comments.
- **PG&E has continued to be prompt and timely with their measure package submittals.** This was especially apparent for the DEER2024 measure package update cycle.
- **PG&E should continue to provide coordination and communication on sunseting measures.** There has been a recent focus on sunseting measure packages due to low uptake or eligibility reasons with the addition of the Sunset List on eTRM.

### 2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

CPUC staff highlight the following recommendations for improvement which are centered on timeliness:

- **There is room for improvement in the QA/QC process for measure packages.** While there has been improved measure package quality, PG&E should continue to focus on measure package QC before submitting to CPUC for review as there are still many minor comments and typos that hold up measure package approval.
- **PG&E can improve cover sheet QC.** With the enhancement to integrate the cover sheet to the eTRM in the Fall of 2023, there should be more focus on providing more detail in the cover sheet than what the eTRM automatically provides when measure package changes lead to substantial changes to savings.

### 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 2023 to the end of December 2023, 40 PG&E 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, along with the dispositions individual score and feedback from the reviewer, 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 PG&E for each metric both with and without the addition of any Enhancement Points.

Table 3: PG&E 2023 Custom Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Weight Factor	Custom Disposition Points		Max Points
			With Enhance Pts <sup>5</sup>	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	4.85	4.85	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	12.78	11.28	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	4.50	5
4	PA’s Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	10.13	10.13	12.5
5	PA’s Responsiveness	25%	8.00	8.00	12.5
<b>Total</b>			<b>40.76</b>	<b>38.76</b>	<b>50</b>

<sup>5</sup> Section IV.E provides details on the score enhancement methodology.

## 1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2023, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 4.85 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 40 PG&E custom project reviews completed in 2023. Out of these 40 projects reviewed, 38 projects (95 percent) were submitted on time or early while 2 projects (5 percent) were submitted late. Additionally, 29 of the projects (72.5 percent) were submitted five days or earlier than required per the timeline mandated in Senate Bill 1131 and Section 381.2 of the Public Utilities Code<sup>6</sup>. The two projects that were submitted late were early on in the year and PG&E has since submitted all project documentation on time or earlier than required, demonstrating that PG&E continues to meet expectations with regards to timeliness.

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

In 2023, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 11.28 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 40 PG&E custom project reviews. Of these 40 dispositions issued, 3 project (7.5 percent) was approved without exception, 20 projects (50 percent) were marked Advisory, and 1 project (2.5 percent) was marked Prospective.<sup>7</sup> Of the remaining projects, 2 projects (5 percent) were rejected, and the remaining 14 projects (35 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies which resulted in a loss of points under this metric. Though PG&E improved with no deficiencies in the fuel substitution test

Table 4 below summarizes the 116 action items identified across the 40 scored dispositions<sup>8</sup> issued between January 1, 2023, and December 31, 2023. These action items illustrate errors that impacted the project's eligibility, documentation, and efficiency savings estimate calculations.

Table 4: Summary of Categorized Action Items for Custom Projects

Issue Area	Action Categories	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action <sup>9</sup> by the PA:	Summary of CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions <sup>10</sup> :	Percent of Total Actions
	Analysis assumptions	17	6	15%

<sup>6</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”.

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> This table includes action items issued on 20 Advisory and 1 Prospective dispositions.

<sup>9</sup> For Action items, the PA must make revisions or changes as noted in CPUC Staff's review comments before signed agreement with customer.

<sup>10</sup> Notes or Instructions are informational observations that do not require revision by the PA but should be considered for similar projects moving forward. They may also include documentation of pre-installation items to inform possible post-installation review(s). They are typically minor suggestions or clarifications that should not affect ESPI scoring.

Issue Area	Action Categories	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action <sup>9</sup> by the PA:	Summary of CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions <sup>10</sup> :	Percent of Total Actions
Issues Related to Gross Savings Impacts	Calculation method	6	6	5%
	Calculation tool	1	0	1%
	M&V plan	8	2	7%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>28%</b>
Process, Policy, Program Rules	Baseline	8	1	7%
	CPUC Policy	4	1	3%
	Did not follow previous CPUC guidance	3	0	3%
	Eligibility	3	0	3%
	ER preponderance of evidence	2	1	2%
	EUL/RUL	9	1	8%
	Incentive calculation	0	3	0%
	Measure cost	5	1	4%
	Measure type	6	0	5%
	PA program rules	2	0	2%
	Self generation	5	2	4%
<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>41%</b>	
Documentation Issues	Continue Document Upload	8	8	7%
	Missing documents	7	1	6%
	Missing required information	2	3	2%
	Project scope unclear	2	0	2%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16%</b>
Issues Related to Net Impacts	Program influence	10	5	9%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9%</b>
Other Issues	Other 1 - Reasons not documented for projects screened out of OBF-AP program	2	0	2%
	Other 2 - No clarity on program model for prior project phase	1	0	1%
	Other 3 - Inadequate maintenance plan for NMEC project	1	0	1%
	Other 4 - Incorrect address in bimonthly	1	2	1%
	Other 5 - Incorrect savings in bimonthly	1	0	1%
	Other 6 - Incorrect scope in quarterly report	1	0	1%
	Other 7 - OBF loan term finalized prior to addressing savings issues	0	1	0%
	Other 8 - Update savings and incentives in quarterly submission	0	1	0%
	Other 9 - Incentives in project files and bimonthly do not match	0	1	0%

Issue Area	Action Categories	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action <sup>9</sup> by the PA:	Summary of CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions <sup>10</sup> :	Percent of Total Actions
	Other 10 - Fractional savings not based on MLC	0	1	0%
	Other 11 - Update savings in quarterly submission	0	1	0%
	Other 12 - Measures are being implemented at another plant associated with facility	0	2	0%
	Other 13 - Maintenance plan for NMEC project not signed by customer	0	1	0%
	Other 14 - Program name in bimonthly and PFS do not match	0	1	0%
	Other 15 - Incorrect project classification in bimonthly	0	1	0%
	Other 16 - Assumptions in project documentation and savings analysis do not match	0	1	0%
	Other 17 - All measures included in project are to-code measures	0	1	0%
	Other 18 - Select measures are to-code BRO measures	0	1	0%
	Other 19 - CPUC project ID not appropriate with measure type	0	1	0%
	Other 20 - Customer maintenance activities	1	0	1%
		<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>100%</b>

Though PG&E improved with no deficiencies in the fuel substitution test, they continue to struggle with EUL/RUL and documentation. Specific examples of project and measure level deficiencies are provided below.

- **Incorrect Measure EUL/RUL** was found in 9 out of the 40 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a significant reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 800, 829, 825, 869, 874, 875, 885, 895 and 905.
- **Incomplete Documentation of Program Influence** was found in 8 out of the 40 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a significant reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 800, 833, 786, 837, 823, 824, 847 and 848.
- **Incorrect Analysis or Calculation** was found in 18 out of the 40 projects receiving

dispositions which resulted in a significant reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 800, 825, 831, 832, 833, 837, 865, 866, 867, 869, 870, 874, 875, 877, 884, 894, 898 and 899.

- **Incomplete or Missing Documentation** was found in 8 out of the 50 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a significant reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 786, 824, 831, 832, 833, 841, 889 and 905.

### 3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2023, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 4.5 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. At the portfolio level, CPUC staff determined that PG&E made efforts to bring measures, projects, and studies forward for discussion prior to CPUC staff review. PG&E brought forth one new Early Opinion and finalized three EOs.

PG&E remained active in statewide initiatives and have led the NMEC PCG and have taken leadership roles in statewide initiative to update guidance documents and custom best practices. As such, CPUC staff determined that PG&E continues to exceed the minimum expectations under this metric.

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

In 2023, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 10.13 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Project and measure level disposition performance results reviewed under Metric 2 were used as a proxy for the level of QA/QC performed by the PA. Of the 40 projects reviewed, 3 projects (7.5 percent) were approved without exception, 20 projects (50 percent) were marked Advisory, and 1 project (2.5 percent) was marked Prospective. Of the remaining projects, 2 projects (5 percent) were rejected, and the remaining 14 projects (35 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies. 40% of the projects either being rejected or proceeding with exceptions noted resulted in lower-than-expected performance with regards to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review.

CPUC staff found that PG&E's QC procedures have improved from 2022 and are well documented. PG&E has reduced the number of project rejections and as such has met CPUC expectations for this metric.

### 5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2023, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 8.00 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 exceptions, the alignment of program policy and procedures with the number of actual rejections and exceptions based on eligibility and attribution, and adaptation to rule changes over time. CPUC staff found that projects reviewed between July 2023 through December 2023 exhibited no significant change in trend in terms of project performance over time. PG&E continues to experience issues related to Program Policy, as 41 percent of all issues identified in 2023 were related to this category, which is a higher percentage (34 percent) from 2021. Most notable were 9 actions associated with incorrect measure life and 8

action items associated with incorrect baseline. Additionally, CPUC Staff noted 32 actions related to Gross Savings Impact issues. PG&E has implemented improvements for their OBF and SEM programs by establishing new resources and workflow. These combined actions demonstrate lower-than-expected compliance with CPUC policies and as such CPUC staff determined that PG&E complied with the minimum elements of this metric, but that improvement is warranted.

## **B. Measure Packages Performance Review**

PG&E submitted 19 measure packages in 2023 and 18 were reviewed and disposed. This end of year memo provides measure package specific feedback on the 18 reviewed and disposed measure packages in 2023.

The comments below are organized by the five scoring metric areas created in D.16-08-019.<sup>11</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 PG&E or PG&E measure packages that were disposed during the review period. Measure packages were selected for feedback from those that were submitted by PG&E 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 PG&E for each metric both with and without the addition of any Enhancement Points.

---

<sup>11</sup> See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.

Table 5: PG&amp;E Measure Package Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Weight Factor	Measure Package Disposition Points		Max Points
			With Enhance Pts <sup>12</sup>	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	3.59	3.59	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	15.00	7.92	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	2.78	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	6.94	6.94	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	6.94	6.94	12.5
<b>Total</b>			<b>37.47</b>	<b>28.17</b>	<b>50</b>

## 1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2023, PG&E received a measure package disposition score of 3.59 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. PG&E has improved their response time to resubmit measure packages after receiving comments from the measure package review team, specifically for the All-Electric Homes measure package, which is one of the more complicated measure packages. In addition, PG&E submitted DEER2024 measure packages before the expected date for the Ultra-Low Temperature Freezer, Floating Head Pressure Controls, and Display Case refrigeration measure packages. Since the mid-year, PG&E has improved in timeliness and effectively communicated any delivery changes in the monthly measure package submission schedule.

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

In 2023, PG&E received a measure package disposition score of 7.92 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. PG&E's content, completeness, and quality of measure packages has generally met standards and has improved from the mid-year memo.

PG&E met the expectations for content, completeness, and quality of measure package submissions for most submissions. The new submittal of the Lifecycle Refrigerant Management measure package was well-documented and well-written receiving above expectations marks from the review team. The measure package plan phase for this new addition to the deemed portfolio was extensive and PG&E did a great job bringing in measure package plan feedback into the measure package submission. Additionally, all the DEER2024 measure package revisions did not require significant technical review and met expectations for content.

## 3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2023, PG&E received a measure package disposition score of 2.78 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Measure packages met or exceeded the minimum expectations of collaboration which was required to ensure each measure package met all PA's needs.

PG&E proactively reached out to CPUC during the development of two measure packages: Lifecycle Refrigerant Management and All-Electric Homes to address substantial Ex Ante

<sup>12</sup> Section IV.E provides details on the score enhancement methodology.

comments and multiple measure package plan reviews in a timely manner. While the DEER2024 measure package update cycle did not require much proactive collaboration, PG&E met the minimum expectations for all submissions.

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

In 2023, PG&E received a measure package disposition score of 6.94 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. PG&E measure packages have generally improved in quality control in 2023. Fewer measure packages had minor typos and small corrections compared to 2022. In addition, the Water Pump Upgrade and Lifecycle Refrigerant Management had an ISP study and very thorough measure package plan review respectively that received great attention from the PG&E team to reach approval. All other measure package submission met minimum expectations.

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

In 2023, PG&E received a measure package disposition score of 6.94 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This metric reflects PG&E's leadership in the continuous improvement of programs through the introduction of new measure packages, proactively identifying measure packages that have dated elements, and nominating irrelevant measure packages for sunseting. PG&E has been actively engaged in developing new measures like the Lifecycle Refrigerant Management, VFD on Rod Beam Pump, and All-Electric Homes measure packages.

Additionally, PG&E provided initial feedback to support the development of a New Construction guidance document that will come to fruition in 2024 through the measure package review and comment process for the Reach-In Refrigerator and Ice Machine measure packages.

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

The 2023 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 2023. D.16-08-019 also directed that the custom and measure package scores be weighted together into a final score based on the PA total claims for custom and deemed activities, respectively.

In accordance with D.13-09-023, the 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 2022 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>13</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 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:

- ‘+’ 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

---

<sup>13</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”).

[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 “-“.
- 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 5 points is allocated to this metric based on the PA’s responsiveness to requests and follow-up documentation required to complete the review. Scoring for this metric occurs at the individual project review stage.

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

## **C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology**

This metric is related to content and completeness of submittals and a maximum of 15 points is allocated to this metric. Scoring occurs on each custom project during the individual project review stage. On a percentage basis Metric 2 is the single greatest determinant of the overall 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. 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 2023 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 added "Enhancement" points for Metric 2 "Content, Completeness and Quality of Submittals" and Metric 3 "Collaboration" to reflect PG&E staff's positive efforts in these metric areas as discussed earlier. This included:

- Metric 1 Timeliness: There were no added points for this metric.
- Metric 2 Content: Responding to CPUC comments and finalizing the enhanced RP2 tool.
- Metric 3 Collaboration: Onsite visits with CPUC staff and consultants for projects under review; Updating and maintaining ISP and Baseline Wiki pages and video trainings.
- Metric 4 Due Diligence: There were no added points for this metric.
- Metric 5 Process Improvements: There were no added points for this metric.

Measure package scores also include "Review Process Score Enhancements." Process issues represent critical deemed measure development topics where CPUC staff believes improvement is needed or improvement has occurred, but those activities are not necessarily reflected in the areas of

direct review. These activities, as discussed above, are noted in the narrative, but are summarized here by metric as:

- Metric 1 Timeliness: There were no adder points for this metric.
- Metric 2 Content: PG&E led the conversation within the stakeholder group on statewide ISP studies, specifically focusing on the water pump measure package list.
- Metric 3 Collaboration: PG&E collaborated with the CPUC and led the Statewide Rulebook update.
- Metric 4 Due Diligence: There were no adder points for this metric.
- Metric 5 Process Improvements: There were no adder points for this metric.

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 PG&E.<sup>14</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 Lisa Paulo ([lisa.paulo@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:lisa.paulo@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 PG&E staff to discuss this memorandum and its final scores by April 30, 2024.

---

<sup>14</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	2023 Score	2023 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2023 Score	2023 Points
<b>1</b>	<b>Timing and Timeliness of Submittals</b>	5	10%	3.59	3.59	5	10%	4.85	4.85
	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>Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals</b>	15	30%	2.64	7.92	15	30%	3.76	11.28
	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>Proactive Initiative of Collaboration</b>	5	10%	2.78	2.78	5	10%	4.50	4.50
	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>Program Administrator's Due Diligence and Quality Assurance/Quality Control Effectiveness</b>	12.5	25%	2.78	6.94	12.5	25%	4.05	10.13

Metric		Measure Packages				Custom			
		Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2023 Score	2023 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2023 Score	2023 Points
	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.								
<b>5</b>	<b>Program Administrator's Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements</b>	12.5	25%	2.78	6.94	12.5	25%	3.20	8.00
	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. 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.								
<b>Total</b>		50	100%		28.17	50	100%		40.76

## Attachment B Custom Project Scores and Feedback

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

Table 3 2016 Adopted Performance Metrics

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted Performance Metrics	Maximum Points	Percent of Total Points
<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	Percent of Total Points	Total Scored Points	# Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level <sup>15</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%	4.85	50	PG&E generally complied with SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation before the 15 business days required. Staff found 2 projects (5 percent) to be late with one project found to be 5 days late. The remaining 38 projects (95 percent) were submitted on time or earlier, with 29 projects (72.5 percent) being submitted earlier by 5 days or more. Staff noted that this was an increase in timeliness compared to last year when 18 percent of projects were submitted late.
<b>Metric 2</b>	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%	10.57	50	In 2023, 32 projects out of the 40 receiving a disposition (80 percent) had exceptions noted during during custom project review for a total of 116 exceptions. Those projects had significant deficiencies such as missing or incorrect analysis assumptions, inadequate M&V plan, incorrect baseline lack of clarity in measure descriptions, incomplete documentation of program influence, and incorrect cost calculations, and incorrect measure life. As such, CPUC staff had noted that PG&E is only slightly exceeding 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%	4.50	50	Commission Staff found that PG&E made significant efforts to bring measures, projects, or studies forward for discussion prior to review. PG&E was active bringing four Early Opinion requests before CPUC for review and were engaged on bi-weekly and monthly statewide calls. PGE is active in the NMEC PCG and SEM collaboration working groups provides regular training and resourcing needs.
<b>Metric 4</b>	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	12.5	25%	11.24	50	Commission staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 40 dispositions issued, 3 project (7.5 percent) was approved without exception, 20 projects (50 percent) were marked Advisory, and 1 project (2.5 percent) was marked Prospective. Of the

<sup>15</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	Percent of Total Points	Total Scored Points	# Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level <sup>15</sup> )
	ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.					remaining projects, 2 projects (5 percent) were rejected, and the remaining 14 projects (35 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies. The significant majority of projects either being rejected or proceeding with exceptions noted resulted in lower than expected performance with regards to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review.
<b>Metric 5</b>	<p><b>Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process &amp; Program Improvements (Course Corrections)</b></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>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>50</b>	PG&E continues to experience issues related to Program Policy, as 41 percent of all issues identified in 2023 were related to this category, which is a higher percentage (34 percent) from 2021. Most notable were 9 actions associated with incorrect measure life and 8 action items associated with incorrect baseline. Additionally, CPUC Staff noted 32 actions related to Gross Savings Impact issues. PG&E has implemented improvements for their OBF and SEM programs by establishing new resources and workflow.

## 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 PA 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	
SWSV014	1	Lifecycle Refrigerant Management, Residential	New measure package submission. No comments from review team. Measure package approved	1	no	+	+	+	yes	
SWPR008	1	VFD on Rod Beam Pump	New measure package submission. Clarifying comments on building vintage and operating hours. Minor typo in the affinity law exponent portion of the calculations. Measure package was approved after comment response review.	1	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWWB008	1	All-Electric Homes, Residential, New Construction	New measure package submission. Clarifying comments on measure package narrative readability in costs and weighted methodology sections, clarifying comments on reference studies and sources, and clarifying comments on Title 20 and Title 24 code requirements. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	+	yes	+	yes	yes	
SWCR017	4	Ultra-Low Temperature Freezer	DEER2024 measure package revision. Measure package approved without comment.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWCR007	4	Floating Head Pressure Controls, Multiplex	DEER2024 measure package revision. Measure package approved without comment.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWCR020	3	Medium-Temperature Open Display Case Retrofit	DEER2024 measure package revision. Measure package approved without comment.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages										
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	EAR Metrics					
					1	2	3	4	5	
SWCR021	3	Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case With Doors	DEER2024 measure package revision. One minor typo in the building vintage section. Measure package approved after comment review.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCR015	3	Medium-Temperature Case Doors	DEER2024 measure package revision. Measure package approved without comment.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCR012	3	Compressor Retrofit, Multiplex	DEER2024 measure package revision. Measure package approved without comment.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWPR001	2	Ventilation Fan, Agricultural	Mid-cycle measure package submission to add new offerings. Clarifying comments on the electric and gas impact profile IDs. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCR019	3	Low-Temperature Coffin To Reach-In Display Case Conversion	DEER2024 measure package revision. Measure package approved without comment.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWB008	2	All-Electric Homes, Residential, New Construction	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on RACC and Fuel Sub Calculators and the removal of an old reference. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCR018	4	Reach-In Refrigerator or Freezer, Commercial	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on building vintage text and program eligibility. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	+
SWFS006	3	Ice Machine, Commercial	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on program eligibility. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	+
SWHC018	4	VSD for HVAC Fan Controls, Commercial	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on data collection requirements and building vintage text. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC006	3	Demand Control Ventilation for Single Zone HVAC	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on building vintage text and program eligibility. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWP004	3	Water Pump Upgrade	DEER2024 measure package update. Measure package update included results of ISP study. Clarifying comments on building vintage language, data collection requirements and removing unnecessary language. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	+	yes	yes
SWHC023	4	Enhanced Ventilation for Packaged HVAC	DEER2024 measure package revision. Measure package approved without comment.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes



## Measure Package and Measure Package Plan Submission Status – All Measure Packages and Plans submitted in 2023

MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments
SWSV014	1	Lifecycle Refrigerant Management, Residential	Interim approval.
SWPR008	1	VFD on Rod Beam Pump	Interim approval.
SWWB008	1	All-Electric Homes, Residential, New Construction	Interim approval.
SWCR017	4	Ultra-Low Temperature Freezer	Interim approval.
SWCR007	4	Floating Head Pressure Controls, Multiplex	Interim approval.
SWCR020	3	Medium-Temperature Open Display Case Retrofit	Interim approval.
SWCR021	3	Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case With Doors	Interim approval.
SWCR015	3	Medium-Temperature Case Doors	Interim approval.
SWCR012	3	Compressor Retrofit, Multiplex	Interim approval.
SWPR001	2	Ventilation Fan, Agricultural	Interim approval.
SWCR019	3	Low-Temperature Coffin To Reach-In Display Case Conversion	Interim approval.
SWWB008	2	All-Electric Homes, Residential, New Construction	Interim approval.
SWCR018	4	Reach-In Refrigerator or Freezer, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS006	3	Ice Machine, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC018	4	VSD for HVAC Fan Controls, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC006	3	Demand Control Ventilation for Single Zone HVAC	Interim approval.
SWWP004	3	Water Pump Upgrade	Interim approval.
SWHC023	4	Enhanced Ventilation for Packaged HVAC	Interim approval.
SWSV014	2	Lifecycle Refrigerant Management, Residential	Under detailed review.
SWBE013	1	Efficient Doors, Residential	Measure package plan review in progress.
SWBE014	1	Door Sweeps and Door Sealing, Residential	Measure package plan review in progress.

Process Adder	EAR Metrics					
	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
PG&E collaborated with the CPUC and led the v4.0 Statewide Rulebook update and monthly newsletter.	1	No	No	+	No	No
PG&E collaborated with CPUC and IOUs to lead and complete the ISP study on their agricultural VFD water pump measure packages	1	No	+	No	No	No

## Attachment D: 2023 Performance Annual Ratings

## Custom Scoring

2023 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	4.85	3.76	4.50	4.05	3.20	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	4.85	4.26	5.00	4.05	3.20	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	4.85	12.78	5.00	10.13	8.00	40.76

2022 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	4.50	3.52	4.50	3.99	3.00	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	4.50	3.52	5.00	4.49	3.00	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	4.50	10.57	5.00	11.24	7.50	38.81

**Measure Package Scoring**

<b>2023 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>PG&amp;E "-"</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	<b>PG&amp;E "+"</b>	44%	6%	11%	11%	11%
	<b>PG&amp;E "Yes"</b>	56%	94%	89%	89%	89%
	<b>Dispositions Score %</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>56%</b>
	<b>Dispositions Score</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.78</b>
<b>Review Process Score Enhancements</b>	<b>PG&amp;E "-"</b>		0%	0%		
	<b>PG&amp;E "+"</b>		100%	100%		
	<b>PG&amp;E "Yes"</b>		0%	0%		
	<b>Process Score %</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	<b>Process Increase Score</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.00</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>2.50</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Final Metric Score (1-5)</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.78</b>
	<b>Metric Points with Weighting</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>6.94</b>	<b>6.94</b>
<b>Total Points</b>						<b>37.47</b>

<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>PG&amp;E "-"</b>	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%
	<b>PG&amp;E "+"</b>	35%	24%	29%	0%	0%
	<b>PG&amp;E "Yes"</b>	65%	59%	71%	100%	100%
	<b>Dispositions Score %</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	<b>Dispositions Score</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.50</b>
<b>Review Process Score Enhancements</b>	<b>PG&amp;E "-"</b>		0%	0%		
	<b>PG&amp;E "+"</b>		100%	100%		
	<b>PG&amp;E "Yes"</b>		0%	0%		
	<b>Process Score %</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>

<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>Process Increase Score</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.00</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>2.50</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Final Metric Score (1-5)</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.50</b>	Total Points
	<b>Metric Points with Weighting</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>6.25</b>	<b>6.25</b>	<b>35.88</b>

### Explanations of scoring tables row entries

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

- 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.