

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: April 10, 2024

To: San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&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 .....8
- IV. The Scoring Methodology .....10
  - A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology .....11
  - B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology .....12
  - C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology .....12
  - D. Custom Metric 3, 4 and 5 Scoring Methodology.....12
  - E. Score Enhancement Methodology .....13
- Attachment A: Final EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points) .....15
- Attachment B: Custom Project Scores and Feedback .....17
- Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback .....20
- Attachment D: 2023 Performance Annual Ratings .....25

## 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 (PAs) based on the proportion of deemed savings and custom measures in each utility’s portfolio”.

A breakdown of SDG&E’s 2023 EAR performance score of 79.65/100 for measure packages<sup>2</sup> and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. SDG&E’s 2023 total points is a 3.14-point increase from its 2022 total points of 76.51. Scores for 2022 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

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

SDG&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	3.25	10%	3.25	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	2.95	30%	8.86	15	3.56	30%	10.67	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	7.95	25%	11.08	12.5	4.59	25%	11.47	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	2.73	25%	6.82	12.5	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>35.01</b>	<b>50</b>			<b>44.64</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: SDG&amp;E 2022 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

SDG&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	3.19	10%	3.19	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	2.64	30%	7.92	15	4.19	30%	12.56	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	4.75	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	2.92	25%	7.29	12.5	4.47	25%	11.17	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	3.75	25%	9.38	12.5	4.00	25%	10.00	12.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>32.78</b>	<b>50</b>			<b>43.73</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 9 scored dispositions.<sup>3</sup>

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points<sup>4</sup> resulted in SDG&E's custom project score increasing by 0.91 points from 2022 scores (43.73 in 2022 vs. 44.64 in 2023 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above). SDG&E continues to demonstrate timely submission of documentation and proactive collaboration.

<sup>3</sup> Some of the dispositions are for projects submitted in 2022 in addition to dispositions for projects submitted in 2023. This memo is for all dispositions issued in 2023.

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

## 1. Summary of 2023 Achievements

CPUC staff observed SDG&E to have improved in:

- **The proportion of gross savings impact issues continue to decrease.** SDG&E has shown a steady decrease in the number of issues related to gross savings impacts from 2021 to 2023, with 48 percent in 2021, 30 percent in 2022, and 24 percent in 2023 of total issues respectively. This indicates an improvement in their analysis assumptions and calculation methods for project submissions.
- **The proportion of documentation issues continue to decrease.** SDG&E has shown a consistent decrease in the number of deficiencies noted in their conformance with CPUC policy and program rules. In 2021, deficiencies made up 30 percent of total issues identified, which dropped to 20 percent in 2022 and further decreased to 16 percent in 2023. This indicates that SDG&E is making significant progress in improving its adherence to CPUC policy and program rules.
- **SDGE continues to improve its processes for submitting documentation in a timely manner.** All 9 projects (100 percent) were submitted early by seven or more days indicating SDGE's processes for reducing the time for custom projects to be submitted with appropriate documentation is continuing to improve.

## 2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

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

- **The number of issues regarding Program Influence increased.** In 2022 issues related to program influence comprised 10 percent of total issues. In 2023, the number of program influence related issues has increased to 28 percent, indicating that SDG&E has work to ensure that the proper chain of influence documentation is submitted and accurate.

## B. Measure Packages Review Overview

SDG&E's measure packages scores have increased compared to last year by 2.23 points (from 32.78 in 2022 to 35.01 in 2023 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above). SDG&E should continue its efforts to improve its performance.

### Summary of 2023 Achievements

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

- **SDG&E has continued to show enhanced internal QC processes and CPUC staff has noticed fewer errors with new submissions.** SDG&E has continued to make improvements to their internal QC processes which have been apparent in the quality and timeliness of their measure package submittals.
- **SDG&E has demonstrated initiative in developing new measure packages in 2023.** SDG&E continues to be a proactive and effective communicator with CPUC regarding plans to update measure packages or measure package plans adherence to scheduled timelines.

- **SDG&E continues to show strong collaboration and communication with CPUC staff.** SDG&E continues to show due diligence and collaboration outside of the measure package review process by leading the all-IOU monthly ex-ante calls in 2023 and the completion of SEER2 heat pump research.
- **SDG&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.

## 1. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

CPUC staff highlights the following recommendations for improvement which are centered on improved QC and communication considering the current transition to eTRM:

- **SDG&E should continue to focus on their quality assurance and quality control practices for measure package submissions.** While large errors in measure packages are less frequent, many measure packages had minor typos and inconsistent language that should be caught during the internal review process before CPUC submittal.
- **SDG&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, 9 SDG&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 is included in [Attachment B](#). [Attachment D](#) contains an embedded custom scores workbook that includes a tab with details on the individual project level disposition scores and feedback from the project reviewer.

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

Table 3: SDG&amp;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%	5.00	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	10.67	10.67	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	5.00	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	11.47	10.22	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	12.50	10.00	12.5
<b>Total</b>			<b>44.64</b>	<b>40.89</b>	<b>50</b>

## 1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2023, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 5.0 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This disposition score was based on the 9 custom project reviews completed in 2023. In 2023, SDG&E submitted project documentation for review for all 9 reviewed projects early. All projects (100 percent) were submitted seven days or earlier than required per timeline mandated in Senate Bill (SB) 1131 and Section 381.2 of the Public Utilities Code.<sup>6</sup> SDG&E continues to improve and continues to exceed expectations with regards to timeliness by submitting projects well ahead of the required submission due date.

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

In 2023, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 10.67 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 9 SDG&E custom project reviews. Of these 9 dispositions, no projects were approved without exception, 2 projects (22 percent) were rejected, 2 projects (22 percent) were marked Advisory, and no projects were marked Prospective.<sup>7</sup> The remaining 5 projects (56 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies which resulted in a loss of points under this metric.

Table 4 below summarizes the 25 action items identified across the 9 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.

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

<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 2 Advisory dispositions.

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
Issues Related to Gross Savings Impacts	Analysis assumptions	3	2	12%
	M&V plan	3	0	12%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>24%</b>
Process, Policy, Program Rules	Baseline	1	2	4%
	Eligibility	0	1	0%
	EUL/RUL	3	2	12%
	Measure cost	2	0	8%
	Self-generation	1	1	4%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>28%</b>
Documentation Issues	Continue Document Upload	3	1	12%
	Missing documents	1	4	4%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16%</b>
Issues Related to Net Impacts	Program influence	7	0	28%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28%</b>
Other Issues	Other 1 - Incorrect scope, savings and incentives in bimonthly	1	0	4%
	Other 2 - Program name in project documentation and bimonthly do not match	0	1	0%
	Other 3 - EPA non-compliant refrigerant used	0	1	0%
	Other 4 - Incorrect project classification	0	1	0%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4%</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

### 3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2023, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 5.0 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. At the portfolio level, SDG&E continues to bring measures, projects, or studies forward for discussion prior to CPUC staff review, including, clarification of Measure Application Type (MAT) for NMEC projects and guidance for baseline selection for agricultural projects and initiated discussion on CPUC dispositions by following up at bi-weekly or Ad Hoc meetings. In addition, during the July 19<sup>th</sup> meeting SDG&E

<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.

presented an overview of their team's structure and initiatives which was appreciated by new CPUC staff. SDG&E remains an active participant in the statewide meetings and initiated a forum to explore best practices and process improvement used in Lean Six-Sigma. These activities demonstrated that SDG&E exceeded expectations with regards to proactive collaboration under this metric.

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

In 2023, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 10.22 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Project and measure level disposition performance results reviewed under Metric 2 were used as a proxy for the level of QA/QC performed by the PA. As such, the number of dispositions proceeding without exception was weighed against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 9 dispositions issued, 0 projects proceeded without exception, 2 projects were rejected (22 percent), two reviews were advisory (22 percent) and 5 projects (56 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted in the review.<sup>11</sup> In contrast to the previous year, SDG&E demonstrated a decreased performance for this metric as it pertains to effective due diligence and QC of projects prior to submitting for review.

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

In 2023, SDG&E received a custom disposition score of 10.00 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 expectations, the alignment of program policy and procedures with the number of actual rejections and exceptions based on eligibility and attribution, and adaption to rule changes over time. All 9 projects reviewed were during the first six months of 2023. CPUC staff also noted that 28% percent of issues were related to Program Influence, which is a significant decline from the previous year where issues in that category comprised 10 percent of total issues.

In addition, SDG&E has ramped up two new programs that with custom and site-level Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) components that serve the industrial and agricultural customer segments.

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

SDG&E had 22 measure packages submitted in 2023. Eleven measure packages were reviewed and disposed. This end of year memo provides measure package feedback on the 11 measure packages which were reviewed and disposed.

The comments below are organized by the five scoring metric areas created in D.16-08-019.<sup>12</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 SDG&E during the review period. Measure packages were selected for

---

<sup>11</sup> There was also 1 Advisory disposition issued that are not included in this count.

<sup>12</sup> See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.

feedback from those that were led by SDG&E and were either disposed or reached approval status during the review period. CPUC staff acknowledges that 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 SDG&E for each metric both with and without the addition of any enhancement points.

Table 5: SDG&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>13</sup>	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	3.25	3.25	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	8.86	8.86	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	2.95	5
4	PA’s Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	11.08	7.95	12.5
5	PA’s Responsiveness	25%	6.82	6.82	12.5
<b>Total</b>			<b>32.78</b>	<b>27.84</b>	<b>50</b>

## 1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2023, SDG&E received a measure package disposition score of 3.25 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SDG&E generally met deadlines for submission of statewide measure packages in the review period and most measure packages received a ‘Yes’, indicating that minimum expectations were met for timeliness. Of note, the Packaged Terminal Air Conditioner or Heat Pump and Induction Cooking measure packages received high marks because of their early submission period for the DEER2024 measure package revision cycle. Additionally, the UL Type B LED measure package had a thorough comment period and the comment response timeliness was exceptional leading to high marks.

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

In 2023, SDG&E received a measure package disposition score of 8.86 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. The CPUC noticed improvements in the completeness and quality of SDG&E measure package submissions in 2023. The content, completeness, and quality of measure packages has generally met standards. The Supply Fan Controls, Duct Seal, and Economizer Controls measure packages were approved without comments. These updates had slightly more nuance than the straight-forward building vintage update and were well documented.

<sup>13</sup> Section IV.E provides details on the score enhancement methodology.

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

In 2023, SDG&E received a measure package disposition score of 2.95 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SDG&E has continued to collaborate with CPUC Staff effectively. The UL Type B LED and Smart Fan Controller measure packages required collaboration during both the measure package plan and measure package review phase. SDG&E facilitated comment review and additional requests from the review team with both CPUC staff and the measure developers. Additionally, SDG&E continued to lead the all-IOU monthly ex-ante call in 2023, earning enhancement points. All other measure packages met the minimum expectations of collaboration.

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

In 2023, SDG&E received a measure package disposition score of 6.82 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SDG&Es due diligence improved in 2023 in their measure package submissions. The Ductless Heat Pump and SEER Rated Air Conditioner and Heat Pump measure packages were complicated updates and SDG&E provided helpful insight during the measure package review process. In addition, SDG&E submitted the Supply Fan Controls measure package to add in new applicable building types, which was well documented during the planning and measure package review process. All other Measure Packages met minimum expectations for quality control.

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

In 2023, SDG&E received a measure package disposition score of 6.82 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SDG&E continues to respond to CPUC direction, and all measure packages met minimum expectations. Additionally, SDG&E has continued to be active with the reporting of embedded water energy savings and procedural measure packages like the No Savings measure package to help process implementer bonus payments. SDG&E has also led measure package development with the approval of the Smart Fan Controller and UL Type B LED Screw-In Retrofit 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>14</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 benefited 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

---

<sup>14</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”).

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

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

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

## **B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology**

This metric is related to the timeliness of submittals and a maximum of 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. 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 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 decided that SDG&E's efforts did rise to the level to be awarded "Enhancement" points.

- Metric 1 Timeliness: There were no added points for this metric.
- Metric 2 Content: There were no added points for this metric.
- Metric 3 Collaboration: SDG&E continued its proactive collaboration in the custom ex-ante area, participating in statewide forums and other meetings with the CPUC, other IOUs, 3PIs, and CalTF and facilitated the subgroup for the MLC update that was completed in 2023.
- Metric 4 Quality Assurance: SDG&E has been working internally on CPR process improvement by identifying gaps and improvement initiatives.
- Metric 5 Process: SDG&E also continues to maintain the Custom Disposition Database for statewide use.

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

- Metric 1 Timeliness: There were no added points for this metric.
- Metric 2 Content: There were no added points for this metric.
- Metric 3 Collaboration: SDG&E continued its proactive collaboration in the custom ex-ante area, participating in statewide forums and other meetings with the CPUC, other IOUs, 3PIs, and CalTF.
- Metric 4 Quality Assurance: SDG&E led the SEER2 Heat Pump curve research as stipulated by E-5221. SDG&E organized regular check-ins to document progress and allow for CPUC staff review.
- Metric 5 Process: There were no added points for this metric.

To produce the final measure package scores, the metric scores for the three 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 to reflect greater importance of different individual review items. The separate process scoring provides an avenue for assessing overall QA/QC processes and procedures put into place by SDG&E.<sup>15</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 SDG&E staff to discuss this memorandum and its final scores by April 30, 2024.

---

<sup>15</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>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	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>	<b>15</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>8.86</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>10.67</b>
	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>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	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>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>7.95</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>10.22</b>

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>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>6.82</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>
	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>		<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>29.83</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>40.89</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 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>16</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	9	SDG&E made notable efforts to comply with the SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation well before the 15 business days required. All 9 projects with dispositions issued were submitted 7 days or more early, indicating that SDG&E continues to make significant improvements to submitting documentation earlier than required.
<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%	10.67	9	Staff noted 25 deficiencies on projects selected for review on all 9 (100%) projects with dispositions. This indicated that SDG&E should update review checklists and internal QC procedures to assure errors are minimized.
<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	9	CPUC staff found that SDG&E made an effort to bring measures, projects, and studies forward for discussion prior to review. Topics reviewed during bi-weekly calls with CPUC staff were what was expected to demonstrate proactive collaboration. SDG&E are highly active in statewide groups and have taken on responsibilities to support multiple initiatives.
<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 ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.	12.5	25%	10.22	9	CPUC staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 9 projects reviewed in 2023, 2 projects (22 percent) were rejected, 2 projects (22 percent) were marked Advisory, and 5 projects (56 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies. Staff noted that the majority of the projects had exceptions noted indicating a decrease in the overall due diligence and QA/QC of reviewed projects.

<sup>16</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>16</sup> )
<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>10.00</b>	<b>9</b>	<p>All 9 projects reviewed were during the first six months of 2023. SDG&amp;E has ramped up two new programs that with custom and site-level Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) components that serve the industrial and agricultural customer segments.</p>

## 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 Detailed Reviews – Scored Measure Packages in 2023					EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWHC049	3	SEER Rated AC and HP HVAC Equipment, Residential	DEER2023 measure package update and SEER to SEER2 code-based revision. Minor comments on typos, formatting, and readability. Clarifying comments on SEER to SEER2 methodology and equipment rating metrics. Worked with measure package developer through the commenting phase to identify SEER to SEER2 'crosswalk' per the code change. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWLG020	1	UL Type B LED Screw-in Lamp HID Retrofits	New measure package submission. Minor language and readability comments relating to standard practice and eligibility sections. Clarifying comments on baseline and ISP criteria, preponderance of evidence data collection requirements, code lighting controls requirements, and HOU assumptions. Measure package was approved after an extensive comment review response process, but SDGE and the measure developer were timely and collaborative in their responses.	1	+	-	+	yes	yes

Measure Package Detailed Reviews – Scored Measure Packages in 2023						EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5	
SWHC059	1	Smart Fan Controller, Residential	New measure package submission. Minor language edits and readability comments. Clarifying comments on references for studies and sources, use of AOE considering there is a similar measure package and retention study review, and eligibility. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	no	yes	+	yes	yes	
SWHC050	3	Ductless Heat Pump, Residential	DEER2023 measure package update and SEER to SEER2 code-based revision. Minor clarifying comments on definitions and unclear language. Comment on Heating Seasonal Performance Factor and Energy Input Ratio relationships. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWHC009	4	Supply Fan Controls, Commercial	Mid-cycle measure package update to include university and hotel building types. Two minor clarifying comments on calculations. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	+	yes	+	yes	
SWHC027	4	Package Terminal Air Conditioner or Heat Pump, Under 24kBtu/hr	DEER2024 measure package revision. Minor comments on offering ID changes and Measure Application Type updates. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWAP015	3	Induction Cooking with or without Electric Range, Residential	DEER2024 measure package revision. Minor clarifying comments on building vintage language and data collection requirements. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	

Measure Package Detailed Reviews – Scored Measure Packages in 2023						EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5	
SWMI002	2	No Savings	DEER2024 measure package revision. Minor clarifying comments on building vintage language and applicable DEER values for the permutations. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	+	
SWSV001	6	Duct Seal, Residential	DEER2024 measure package revision. No comments during reivew. Measure package approved as submitted.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes	
SWSV005	3	Economizer Repair, Commercial	DEER2024 measure package revision. Minor clarifying comment on building vintage language . Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWSV010	3	Economizer Controls, Commercial	DEER2024 measure package revision. No comments during reivew. Measure package approved as submitted.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes	

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

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status: EAR Team Comments
SWHC049	3	SEER Rated AC and HP HVAC Equipment, Residential	Interim approval.
SWLG020	1	UL Type B LED Screw-in Lamp HID Retrofits	Interim approval.
SWHC059	1	Smart Fan Controller, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC050	3	Ductless Heat Pump, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC009	4	Supply Fan Controls, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC027	4	Package Terminal Air Conditioner or Heat Pump, Under 24kBtu/hr	Interim approval.
SWAP015	3	Induction Cooking with or without Electric Range, Residential	Interim approval.
SWMI002	2	No Savings	Interim approval.
SWSV001	6	Duct Seal, Residential	Interim approval.
SWSV005	3	Economizer Repair, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWSV010	3	Economizer Controls, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWAP008	3	Room Air Cleaner, Residential	EAR Review in progress.
SWHC014	4	Unitary Air-Cooled Air Conditioner or Heat Pump, Under 65 kBtu/hr, Commercial	EAR Review in progress.
SWHC013	4	Unitary Air-Cooled Air Conditioner, Over 65 kBtu/hr, Commercial	EAR Review in progress.
SWHC049	4	SEER Rated AC and HP HVAC Equipment, Residential	EAR Review in progress.
SWHC050	4	Ductless Heat Pump, Residential	EAR Review in progress.
SWSV013	4	Duct Optimization, Residential	EAR Review in progress.
SWLG020	2	UL Type B LED Screw-in Lamp HID Retrofits	EAR Review in progress.
SWAP007	3	Room Air Conditioner, Residential	EAR Review in progress.
SWMI004	1	Weather-Based Irrigation Controllers and Soil Moisture Sensor Systems, Residential and Commercial	EAR Review in progress.
SWMI005	1	Turf Removal, Commercial and Residential	EAR Review in progress.
SWMI003	1	High-Efficiency Toilets, Residential and Commercial	EAR Review in progress.

Process Adder	EAR Metrics					
	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SDGE continues to show collaboration as the monthly IOU meeting organizer and facilitator, including expanding the invite to CCAs and RENs.	1	No	No	+	No	No
SDG&E led the SEER2 Heat Pump curve research as stipulated by Resolution E-5221. SDG&E organized regular check-ins to document progress and collaborate on data review.	1	No	No	No	Yes	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)	5.00	3.56	5.00	4.09	4.00	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	1.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	3.56	5.00	4.59	5.00	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	10.67	5.00	11.47	12.50	44.64

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	4.19	4.75	4.47	4.00	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	4.19	5.00	4.47	4.00	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	12.56	5.00	11.17	10.00	43.73

Measure Package Scoring

2023 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	SDG&E "-"	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	
	SDG&E "+"	30%	27%	18%	27%	9%	
	SDG&E "Yes"	70%	64%	82%	73%	91%	
	Dispositions Score %	65%	59%	59%	64%	55%	
	Dispositions Score	3.25	2.95	2.95	3.18	2.73	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SDG&E "-"			0%	0%		
	SDG&E "+"			100%	0%		
	SDG&E "Yes"			0%	100%		
	Process Score %	0%	0%	100%	50%	0%	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	0.00	5.00	2.50	0.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	0.00	2.50	1.25	0.00	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	3.25	2.95	5.00	4.43	2.73	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	3.25	8.86	5.00	11.08	6.82	35.01

2022 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5
Direct Work product Review Score	SDG&E "-"	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%
	SDG&E "+"	28%	11%	28%	17%	0%
	SDG&E "Yes"	72%	84%	72%	83%	100%
	Dispositions Score %	64%	53%	64%	58%	50%
	Dispositions Score	3.19	2.64	3.19	2.92	2.50
Review Process Score Enhancements	SDG&E "-"			0%		0%
	SDG&E "+"			100%		0%
	SDG&E "Yes"			0%		100%
	Process Score %	0%	0%	100%	0%	50%

<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>0.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2.50</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>2.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.25</b>	
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Final Metric Score (1-5)</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>Total Points</b>
	<b>Metric Points with Weighting</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>7.92</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>7.29</b>	<b>9.38</b>	<b>32.78</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.