

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: March 27, 2019

To: Southern California Edison Company (SCE)

From: Peter Lai, CPUC

Cc: R.12-01-005 and R.13-11-005 Service Lists

Subject: 2018 Efficiency Savings and Performance Incentive (ESPI) Performance Scores

Table of Contents

I. Summary of 2018 ESPI Scores- Custom Projects and Workpapers 2

II. Commission Staff Findings 2018 Activities 3

 A. Custom Projects Review Overview..... 3

 B. Workpaper Review Overview 4

III. Discussion 5

 A. Custom Projects Performance Review 5

 B. Workpapers Performance Review..... 7

IV. The Scoring Methodology 9

Attachment A: Final ESPI Performance Scores 13

Attachment B Custom Project Scores and Feedback..... 15

Attachment C: Workpaper Scores and Feedback 17

Attachment D: 2018 Performance Annual Ratings 23

I. Summary of 2018 ESPI Scores- Custom Projects and Workpapers

Pursuant to Decision (D).13-09-023, D.15-10-028 and D.16-08-019, Commission 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. This performance score is a component of the annual Efficiency Savings and Performance Incentive (ESPI) awarded to each utility. Commission Staff and consultants completed the 2018 ESPI performance review scoring as prescribed in Table 3 of D.16-08-019. Decision D.16-08-019 established consolidated metrics on which the utilities are evaluated. Ordering Paragraph 19 of this decision states that the ESPI scores “shall be weighted for the utility program administrators based on the proportion of deemed¹ savings and custom measures in each utility’s portfolio.” The scores contained in this memo are final, and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) shall use the total final performance points from the table below together with the weighting² for each category to calculate the 2018 Efficiency Savings and Performance Incentive (ESPI) performance review component award.

A breakdown of SCE’s 2018 total ESPI performance score of 80.70/100 for workpapers and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. SCE’s 2018 total points increased over its 2017 total points of 60.14. Scores for 2017 are provided in Table 2 below. The increase of 20 points is attributable to one custom project disposition that was reviewed in 2018. SCE’s commitment and effort to improve the custom projects review was recognized in this project and appropriately they deserve a 50/50 score. SCE additionally received Enhancement³ points to recognize internal due diligence activities and process improvements implemented in 2018 but not fully reflected in the custom projects review process. However, as the total custom projects score is capped at 50 points these additional Enhancement points did not serve to increase SCE’s score further.

Table 1: 2018 SCE ESPI Scoring for Workpapers and Custom Projects

SCE 2018 ESPI Ex-Ante Review Performance Scores and Points		Workpapers				Custom			
		2018 Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	2018 Points	Max Points	2018 Metric Score*	Metric Weight Factor	2018 Points	Max Points
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring								
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	2.32	10%	2.32	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	3.00	30%	9.00	15	5.00	30%	15.00	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	4.38	10%	4.38	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and Quality Assurance/Quality Control Effectiveness	1.00	25%	2.50	12.5	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5
Total				30.70	50			50.00	50

¹ Deemed savings are a set of predetermined savings values for efficiency measures that are developed from commonly accepted data sources and analytical methods.

² D16-08-019 Ordering Paragraph 19 specifies that “Energy Savings Performance Incentive scores shall be weighted for the utility program administrators based on the proportion of deemed savings and custom measures in each utility’s portfolio.” Therefore, the final score cannot be determined until the utilities have submitted and Commission Staff has compiled their final 2017 savings claims and published for each utility the weights for the custom and deemed categories.

³ Enhancement points are awarded for each metric based on observed policy and technical reviews or program implementation processes/procedures developed and implemented within a program year that positively impact future project reviews.

Table 2: 2017 ESPI Scoring for Workpapers and Custom Projects

SCE 2017 ESPI Performance Scores and Points		Workpapers				Custom			
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	2017 Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	2017 Points	Max Points	2017 Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	2017 Points	Max Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	4.12	10%	4.12	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	2.70	30%	8.10	15	3.59	30%	10.77	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	1.53	10%	1.53	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and Quality Assurance/Quality Control Effectiveness	0.94	25%	2.35	12.5	3.23	25%	8.08	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements	1.80	25%	4.49	12.5	4.28	25%	10.70	12.5
Total				20.59	50			39.55	50

The metric scoring area descriptions are expanded in [Attachment A](#). The final category scores are explained in more detail below as well as in Attachments B through D to this memo. As required by the ESPI decision D. 13-09-023, the relative weighting of performance during custom project development versus workpaper (or deemed) development of the performance component of the ESPI will be published by Commission Staff in June 2019 after reviewing the utilities' final 2018 savings claims to be filed on May 1, 2019.

II. Commission Staff Findings 2018 Activities

A. Custom Projects Review Overview

In 2018, Commission Staff issued one custom project disposition, one review waiver⁴ and a memorandum with guidance on a project. No new projects were selected for review in 2018. Commission Staff and consultants continued working and clearing projects in the review pipeline that had been selected for review in the previous years. Since only one disposition and one waiver were issued in 2018, most of the custom project review activities upon which ESPI scores are based were focused on meetings between SCE and Commission Staff where various ongoing projects and policy issues were discussed.

The review disposition resulted in SCE's custom projects review score increasing by 10.45 points over 2017 scores (39.55 in 2017 vs. 50.0 in 2018). The review disposition, comments and resulting scores for each metric are provided in Attachment B. SCE also received bonus points as part of the Review Process Score Enhancement for internal due diligence activities and process improvements implemented in 2018 but not fully reflected in the custom projects review process. However, custom projects review scores are capped at 50 points and thus SCE's score did not increase based on the Enhancement points

1. Summary of 2018 Achievements

SCE continues to demonstrate efforts to improve its performance. Commission Staff's observations include:

- SCE staff continues to collaborate, hold productive discussions to clarify various Commission Staff guidance. For example, SCE staff initiated collaborative discussions regarding 1) restarting their pumps program, 2) piloting a custom program concept, and 3) a horticultural measure low

⁴ Review waivers are issued where Commission staff have not conducted an in-depth review of all of the submitted project documentation. CPUC staff neither approves nor disapproves any aspects of the project. The project application is directed to proceed without further Commission staff review.

rigor industry standard practice (ISP) study. The goal of these discussions was to make sure the approaches were reasonable in advance of implementation.

- SCE has implemented an early project review protocol. The objective of this effort will be to find project deficiencies early in a project's development phase rather than later after the customer's expectations have been set.
- SCE staff took the statewide lead role in collaborating with staff to develop an approach to operationalize Senate Bill (SB) 1131 (Hertzberg, 2018) mandated custom projects review timeline. Additionally, SCE staff expressed a willingness to work with other program administrators to prioritize the development of statewide-standardized documentation for custom projects. Both of these activities are an integral part of streamlining the custom projects review.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

Areas in need of improvement include:

- For the systematic errors in the EnergyPro™ calculation tool, SCE must take more care to review the results provided by the tool and not rely only on vendors or other agency's reviews to ensure the accuracy of the tool. Additionally, SCE should decrease the time needed to comply with Commission Staff dispositions and to communicate to program implementation staff and customers regarding the systematic errors.
- SCE should ensure that projects, such as a statewide HVAC project at multiple sites of one customer, have a credible calculation methodology and measurement and verification (M&V) plan in place prior to project approval so that the final M&V results are based on a well thought-out and agreed upon methodology that aligns with initial stipulated savings estimates.

B. Workpaper Review Overview

1. Summary of 2018 Achievements

SCE's workpapers scores have increased compared to last year by 10.01 points from 20.60 in 2017 to 30.70 in 2018. Commission Staff observed improvements and continued commitment to improving performance in the following areas:

- On behalf of the investor-owned utilities (IOU), SCE took responsibility for assembling the IOU workpaper submission plan with enhancements. SCE also owned the work of leading the development of the Smart Communicating Thermostat (SCT) workpaper and for leading the IOU effort to update the refrigeration measure models. This leadership is vital for the ongoing improvement of workpapers.
- SCE has proactively submitted workpaper development plans and updates for the Smart communicating Thermostats (SCT) and the statewide refrigeration model revisions.
- SCE submitted all Phase 1⁵ workpapers for the 2019 program by November of 2018 which allowed Commission Staff to better manage the Phase I work load.
- SCE, along with the other three IOUs, have collaborated to develop statewide-consolidated standardized documentation and processes for several deemed measures / workpapers, including the Resource Savings Rulebook and the first statewide workpapers for food services.
- SCE collaborated with stakeholders to present two workpaper training sessions for third party contractors and led an effort to produce a statewide "Frequently Asked Questions" document for third party contractors.

⁵ Phase 1 is updated workpapers affected by DEER resolution or for new workpapers to be included in the 2019 and 2020 program year. Phase 2 is new workpapers or workpaper revisions due to non-DEER/resolution changes.

2. Summary of Areas of Improvement

Commission Staff highlight the following additional recommendations for improvement:

- SCE needs to take a leadership role and demonstrate strong commitment to effectively and timely communicate to their program advisors who can meaningfully engage with the implementer community to communicate changes that effect deemed savings estimates. SCE's hesitancy to communicate information to implementers is posing a barrier to creative solutions on effective and timely communication with the market stakeholders.
- SCE should examine current deemed measure workpapers and program offerings and consider improvements that reflect current industry standard practice, including measures that have been removed from the 2018 Potential and Goals Study.⁶
- SCE should examine its current body of ongoing research and ensure that workpaper savings values are developed using the most current research as well as research carried out in accordance with Commission directed protocols.
- SCE should improve response time in implementing research studies so that workpapers can be updated with less disruption to the market.

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 workpapers.

A. Custom Projects Performance Review

Each year, Commission Staff reviews a selected sample of custom project energy efficiency program applications. The review findings and directions to the program administrators are presented in documents referred to as "dispositions." Commission Staff acknowledges that the project applications are not selected at random, rather selected based upon the type of projects that had past issues or projects where the CPUC expected to find deficiencies for various reasons. Projects were also selected to determine whether a utility has corrected issues from similar projects that Commission Staff reviews identified in the past.

In 2018, Commission Staff issued one SCE disposition and selected no new SCE projects for review. Commission Staff issued one project review waiver and one project related memoranda. Most of the custom project review activities were focused on meetings between SCE and Commission Staff where various ongoing projects and policy issues were discussed.

The CPUC has selected a new contractor to assist staff with the custom projects review and expects more significant review activities to start in the second quarter of 2019.

1. Issues Related to Gross Savings Impacts

There were no issues related to gross savings impacts in the review disposition of CPUC Project ID 0043, a metals fabricating project. The documentation provided for this project, illustrated the IOU had proactively reviewed project assumptions, methods, and values, demonstrating its due diligence and

⁶ 2018 Potential and Goals Study is available at: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/General.aspx?id=6442452619>.

quality assurance and quality control efforts.

While no custom project disposition was issued to SCE in 2018 on this issue (and thus it is not reflected in SCE's custom review score), Commission Staff feel it is important to reiterate the point highlighted in the mid-year ESPI memoranda, issued on July 30, 2018, that calculation methodologies and measurement and verification (M&V) plans continue to be an area needing improvements due to their impact on the reliability of the forecasted savings estimates.

- In 2017, Commission Staff reviewed two PG&E and two SDG&E Savings by Design projects (CPUC Project ID numbers 0061 and 0127) that used the EnergyPro™ software tool for their savings impact analysis. The pre-project review found that the EnergyPro™ tool is flawed. It became evident the statewide IOU team for this program had not vetted this tool before using it in this program. Commission Staff and staff consultant had two meetings in early 2018 with the statewide utility staff and the software developer. Of the 22 issues originally identified, seven have been adequately corrected, six have been partially corrected, and nine are still outstanding. When utilizing analysis tools to estimate savings for custom projects, utility staff must take more care to review the tool's results and not rely on vendor or other agency's reviews to ensure the accuracy of the results for the range of uses expected within the IOU's program. Commission Staff also note that many of the errors identified in the dispositions are user input errors in the EnergyPro™ software. User input errors are a sign that the software users may not have the expertise to perform the modelling and that the SCE technical reviewers may not have the expertise to review the simulation models created by the implementation teams. Additionally, the IOUs appeared slow in communicating the software tool error to program staff and customers. SCE should have stopped using the tool to estimate savings for new projects and followed Commission Decision 15-10-028 Section 3.2.3.4 direction on grandfathering of impacted pipeline projects when it became aware of the errors. These issues must be addressed by the statewide team.
- For CPUC Project ID 0155, which is a statewide HVAC project at multiple sites of one customer, Commission Staff found the proposed calculation methodology was flawed with errors identified in the spreadsheet supporting the analysis. Commission Staff were disappointed that despite having two IOUs (SCE and SDG&E) review this submittal, these errors were not identified. In the latter part of 2018, SCE staff began taking steps to resolve the issues with the project implementer. SCE is continuing to work with the program implementer at this time to resolve these issues.

2. Process, Policy, Program Rules

SCE staff continues their efforts on updating its Customized Calculated Savings Guidelines. This provides clarity and transparency to third-party implementers and customers so that everyone is clearly aware of the rules.

3. Documentation Issues

In the first six months of 2018 documentation issues were not significant. Commission Staff note again that no new projects were selected for review in 2018 and documentation issues for ongoing projects under review in this period have been previously resolved.

4. Issues Related to Net Impacts

Commission Staff have observed that SCE is making a diligent effort in this area and encourage SCE to persist in its efforts. In 2018 SCE created an Influence Job Aide Tool to improve the quality and consistency of how it evaluates program influence. SCE staff also indicated that it is now mandatory that Project Feasibility Studies contain strong evidence of program influence. As a reminder, the documentation needs to demonstrate how the program enabled the customer to adopt an alternative action that improves final efficiency and provides incremental savings benefits to ratepayers over what the customer was otherwise planning to implement. The evidence of program influence should outweigh evidence that suggests the customer would have chosen the efficient alternative absent the program information or financial support.

B. Workpapers Performance Review

SCE submitted 81 workpapers for deemed measures in 2018. The comments below are organized by the 5 metric areas of scoring. A table of all submitted and reviewed workpapers, along with feedback of each reviewed workpaper, is included in [Attachment C](#).

1. Timeliness

There is inconsistency in SCE's submittals of lists, inventories, plans, studies, and workpaper disposition responses. While SCE submitted workpaper and workpaper revisions in response to Database for Energy-Efficient Resources (DEER) 2019 updates well in advance of the January 1, 2019 due date, it has lagged in its efforts to follow past Commission Staff dispositions that require study updates.

For example, on January 2017 Commission Staff issued direction to SCE to research and update the industry standard practice (ISP) for interior and exterior lighting fixtures to reflect DEER 2018 updates, as well as the rapid shift under way in lighting markets to LEDs. SCE did not submit any revised Phase 1 workpapers⁷. Another example is residential and small commercial water heaters. Federal regulations require residential and small commercial water heaters to be rated under a revised testing and reporting standard as of December 2017. Commission Staff was expecting revised workpapers to be submitted as part of Phase 1 that reflected these code changes. Instead, Commission Staff had to issue a uniform disposition covering all IOUs' water heating workpapers, regardless of whether revisions were submitted as part of Phase 1.

SCE resubmitted workpapers for deemed LED measures in a timely fashion once final interim values were developed in collaboration with PG&E. However, SCE was the lead for an important measure, Smart Communicating Thermostats (SCTs) which experienced significant delays. While SCE provided a workpaper plan, the SCT research timelines were not managed well. The delayed research required the CPUC to issue an extension to avoid market disruptions. This was factored into both individual workpaper scoring and the process adder score.

⁷ Phase 1 workpapers are submitted to Commission staff for review by January 1 of a program year. They are updates to workpapers affected by DEER resolution changes released in September of year N, new workpapers with January 1, Program Year N+2 start date, and changes to existing DEER values or workpapers for January 1, Program Year N+1.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

As with Metric 1, there is some inconsistency in the content. In the first half of 2018, Commission Staff reviewed the connected automatic smart power strips (APS) workpaper and found serious shortcomings in the supporting information in the preliminary review. Subsequent updates to the research in collaboration with the workpaper consultant subject matter expert (SME), yielded satisfactory results although the workpaper was withdrawn for other reasons.

SCE revised the residential pool pump workpaper using more recent data characterizing the participant population. The data sources were robust and the analysis sound and easy to follow in the calculation spreadsheets. SCE was responsive to Commission Staff questions. SCE was also quick to provide data sources documenting the preponderance of evidence (PoE) data collection.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

SCE has improved its efforts to provide Commission Staff with updates and preliminary work products on upcoming workpapers. Examples are the recently submitted workplans for development of workpapers covering advanced HVAC ventilation controls for buildings and space usages that require high amounts of outside air and for SCTs.

SCE collaborated with the other IOUs and Commission Staff to present two successful workpaper training sessions in November 2018 geared to third party contractor bidders. In addition to the general planning and attendance activities of the training sessions, SCE prepared a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document to be publicly posted. The FAQs are intended to be a living document and updated overtime.

SCE has been helpful to Commission Staff as it transitions to a new workpaper consultant. Some of the additional assistance includes providing estimates of individual workpaper contributions to portfolio savings and provided a list of high priority measures.

These efforts have been recognized in the process adder scoring.

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

Commission Staff maintains its concerns on this metric.

SCE's research plan to support the development of industry standard practice (ISP) baselines for exterior lighting appears to now have a major focus on identifying population based existing conditions, equipment currently installed in the market. Commission Staff direction was to complete research that supports a forward looking standard practice baseline. An existing condition may only be used in accelerated replacement applications and does not represent a standard practice baseline. Furthermore, Commission direction is that project files for each accelerated replacement project must include documentation of actual existing conditions in the project files. Therefore, a population-based study of existing conditions is not useful since the actual existing conditions are available to perform more accurate savings estimates.

Additionally, the SCE study plan proposes to investigate recent sales; however, Commission Staff has made clear that this alone will not yield a "forward looking" ISP, which is what is needed to

establish reliable forecasted savings for future claims. Also, in a recently submitted workpaper development plan for residential HVAC fan controllers, SCE references only an older emerging technology study and does not consider previous Commission Staff review nor does it consider any of the more recent research of this technology.

SCE, as the lead for the SCT measure, was responsible for the planning and execution of the research required to develop the revised workpaper. The original study project research was to be completed by October. However, the timelines were not managed and at the last minute, the CPUC had to issue an extension to avoid market disruptions. Orderly markets require smooth and well announced transitions which requires driving research to a successful conclusion in a timely manner.

5. IOU's Responsiveness

Commission Staff encourages SCE to revise their deemed savings programs to remove out-of-date and standard technologies.

Earlier in 2018, Commission Staff was concerned that SCE was still offering incentives for CFLs¹ and linear fluorescent technologies even as the Commission's Potential and Goals Study have removed or greatly reduced these measures for 2018 and beyond. Commission Staff are also aware of heat pump water heater rebates being offered to residential customers with efficiency levels well below the DEER minimum measure efficiency requirements. These issues have since been addressed.

SCE also assumed responsibility for leading the development of the SCT workpaper and for leading the IOU effort to update the refrigeration measure models. This leadership is vital for the ongoing improvement of workpapers.

As the statewide IOU lead, SCE submitted a consolidated enhanced workpaper plan on behalf of all the IOUs. The workpaper was organized by measures and identified the workpapers associated with that measure, planned workpaper submission dates, an inventory of reasons for the update, and a comment history. While there is room for additional improvements in the next submission plan, the workpaper plan was useful to Commission Staff.

IV. The Scoring Methodology

The 2018 performance score was developed using 5 detailed scoring metrics for each directly reviewed work product (i.e., workpaper 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 Commission Staff developed scores and points for 2018. D.16-08-019 also directed that the custom and workpaper scores be weighted together into a final score based on the IOU total claims for custom and deemed activities, respectively. The weights for custom and deemed scores will be developed and published by Commission Staff in June 2019 based upon the IOUs final 2018 savings claims to be filed on May 1, 2019.

In accordance with D.16-08-019, the IOUs' 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 workpapers and custom projects will yield 100 points whereas a minimum score on all metrics would yield 20 points. The 1-5 rating scale is distinguished as follows:

1. Consistent underperformer in meeting the basic expectations;
2. Makes a minimal effort to meet Commission expectations but needs dramatic improvement;
3. Makes effort to meet Commission expectations, however improvement is required;
4. Sometimes exceeds Commission expectations while some improvement is expected; and
5. Consistently exceeds Commission expectations.

As with the 2017 performance scores, the final scores were “built-up” from a metric-by-metric assessment of each reviewed work product. It is Commission Staff’s expectation that this detailed scoring approach, along with the detailed qualitative workpaper and custom project level feedback, is consistent with the direction provided in D.16-08-019. 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 projects or workpapers. Each reviewed IOU work product was first determined to have components either applicable or not applicable to a metric⁸. 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 or was penalized as a result of a non-applicable metric.

For workpapers, 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 as either deficient (or “-“), apparent but minimal (or “yes”), or superior (or “+”). Each of the qualitative ratings were then mapped to a quantitative score percentage level of 0%, 50% and 100%, respectively. The assigned percentage scores were averaged across all the reviewed items. Individual workpaper level disposition scoring, as well as related workpaper activities, are provided in [Attachment C](#).

For custom projects, each applicable metric was directly scored using the 1 to 5 rating scale described above. A project by project summary of the custom project scoring is included in [Attachment B](#).

The above process resulted in custom project and workpaper work product review scores. Next, utility-specific “Review Process Score Enhancements” were developed for each applicable metric based on observed policy and technical reviews or program implementation processes/procedures developed and implemented in 2018 in order to positively impact future project reviews. Commission Staff believes it is important to provide ESPI “Enhancement” points for positive due diligence developments to recognize the effort and to provide additional encouragement even before a change in project-level

⁸ For example, workpapers and custom projects which do not involve measures which in some way are expected to utilize DEER values, assumptions or methods, in the development of new kWh, kW and therm savings values would not receive scoring for metric 9 (“Professional care and expertise in the use and application of adopted DEER values and DEER methods”). Another example would be a minor workpaper or small custom project may not receive a score for metric 4 (“Efforts to bring high profile, high impact, or existing (with data gaps) projects and/or measures to Commission Staff in the formative stage for collaboration or input ”)

results is observed.

In previous years in the custom scoring process, Commission Staff added “Enhancement” points to reflect SCE staff’s positive efforts in the metric areas. However, for 2018 the scoring of the one Commission Staff issued disposition resulted in SCE receiving the maximum score possible. Any “Enhancement” points would have resulted in exceeding the maximum 50 points possible for the custom scoring. Nevertheless, Commission Staff wishes to acknowledge SCE’s positive efforts in 2018:

- SCE implemented a mandatory early screening process for all custom projects to identify and mitigate issue during the project development phase prior to reviewing projects after they are fully developed.
- SCE developed a roles and responsibilities matrix to clearly define the roles of individuals within the many groups in SCE to improve communication through a project lifecycle.
- SCE created an Influence Job Aide to improve the quality and consistency of how to evaluate program influence.
- SCE rolled out a revised Project Feasibility Study document updated with feedback from Commission Staff and other stakeholders.
- SCE conducted training sessions with stakeholders to ensure they are kept abreast of updates and to better understand the custom program.
- SCE program staff reached out to Commission Staff to receive feedback on 1) restarting its pumps program, 2) piloting a new custom program concept, and 3) a horticultural measure low rigor ISP study to ensure the proposed approaches were reasonable.

Although these efforts may not yet be reflected in project specific disposition scores, Commission Staff believes recognition of the efforts of SCE’s technical and policy review staff is warranted. These activities offer promise to improve the overall SCE performance in the future.

Workpaper scores also include “Review Process Score Enhancements.” Process issues represent critical deemed measure development topics where Commission 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, include items such as:

- SCE took responsibility for gathering workpaper submission plans from all of the IOUs, organizing the material and adding enhancements from previous versions, to produce a joint IOU workpaper submission plan.
- SCE collaborated with stakeholders to present two workpaper training sessions for third party contractors and is leading an effort to produce a statewide Frequently Asked Questions document for third party contractors.

To produce the final workpaper scores, the metric scores for the two workpaper contributing areas were added together, using a 50% weight for the process issues score. The 50% 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), Commission Staff also assigned weights for individual items as a way to reflect greater importance of different individual review items. The separate process scoring provides an avenue for assessing overall QA/QC processes and procedures put into place by SCE.⁹

⁹ The guidance on scoring approach provided in D.13-09-023, at 74, provides that when only a small number of submissions are available for scoring and the submissions have varying impacts on the portfolio overall, that appropriate weighting

[Attachment D](#) contains custom and workpaper 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 Peter Lai (peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov). Note that pursuant to D.13-09-023, Commission Staff will schedule a meeting with SCE staff to discuss this memorandum and its final scores by April 30, 2019.

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 1a), 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 ESPI Performance Scores

Metric		Workpapers				Custom			
		Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2018 Score	2018 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2018 Score	2018 Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	5	10%	2.32	2.32	5	10%	5.00	5.00
	Timely submittals: all lists, inventories, plans, studies, workpapers and project/measure documentation; timing and advanced announcement of submittals (spreading out submission when available rather than holding and turning in large batches); timely follow-up PA responses to review disposition action items including intention to submit/re-submit with proposed schedule.								
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	15	30%	3.00	9.00	15	30%	5.00	15.00
	Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submittals. Submittal adherence to Commission policies, Decisions, and prior Commission Staff dispositions and/or guidance. Do the submittals include all materials required to support the submittal proposed values, methods and results. Is the project or measure clearly articulated? Are proposed or utilized methods clearly explained including step-by-step method or procedure descriptions. Will the proposed or utilized approach provide accurate results. Are all relevant related or past activities and submittals appropriately noted or disclosed, analyzed or discussed. Are the pros/cons of alternate possible approaches or conclusions discussed to support that the chosen one is most appropriate.								
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5	10%	4.38	4.38	5	10%	5.00	5.00
	PA efforts to bring either measures, projects, studies, questions, and/or savings calculation methods and tools to Commission Staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before Commission Staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. Commission Staff expects collaboration among the PAs to develop common or coordinated submissions and for the PAs to undertake joint or coordinated planning activities and study work. The PAs are expected to engage with Commission 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 Commission Staff on planning and execution of studies that support proposed offerings, tools, or determination of proposed baselines or other programmatic assumption that can impact ex ante values to be utilized.

4	Program Administrator’s Due Diligence and Quality Assurance/Quality Control Effectiveness	12.5	25%	1.00	2.50	12.5	25%	5.00	12.50
<p>Commission Staff expects the PA to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for their programs and measures. The PAs are expected to have a pro-active approach to reviewing existing measure and project assumptions, methods and values and updating those to take into account changes in market offerings, standard practice, updates to DEER methods and assumptions, changes to codes, standards and regulations, and other factors that warrant such updates. The depth and correctness of the PA's technical review of their ex ante parameters and values, for both Core, Local Government and Third Party programs, are included under this metric. The depth and correctness of the PA's technical review of their own staff and subcontractor work related to supporting deemed and custom measure and project submissions are included in this metric. Evidence of review activities is expected to be visible in submissions so that Commission Staff can evaluate the effectiveness of the PA internal QA/QC processes.</p>									
5	Program Administrator’s Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements	12.5	25%	5.00	12.50	12.5	25%	5.00	12.50
<p>This metric reflects the PAs ongoing efforts to improve their internal processes and procedures resulting in increased ex post evaluated gross and net savings impacts. Commission Staff looks not only to the PA's internal QC/QA processes, but also whether individual programs and their supporting activities incorporate and comply with CPUC policies and prior Commission Staff disposition guidance in their program rules, policies, procedures and reporting. This includes changes to program rules, offerings and internal operations and processes required to improve overall review and evaluation results. A particularly important area for focus is the improvement of net portfolio performance via the removal of measures and or participation with low program attribution (NTG).</p>									
Total		50	100%	30.70	50	100%	50.00		

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 Review Metrics

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted Performance Metrics	Maximum Points	% of TOTAL POINTS
Metric 1	Timeliness and Timing of Submittals Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5.0	10%
Metric 2	Content, Completeness and Quality of Submittals Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submitted documentation. In addition, this metric is an assessment of the utility's adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior Commission Staff disposition guidance.	15.0	30%
Metric 3	Proactive Initiation of Collaboration Utility's efforts to bring either measures, questions, and/or savings calculation tools to Commission Staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before Commission Staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. Commission Staff expects collaboration among the utilities and for the program administrators to engage with Commission Staff in early discussions on high profile, high impact measures well before customer commitments are made.	5.0	10%
Metric 4	Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness Commission Staff expects the utility to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for its programs and measures. The depth and correctness of the utility's technical review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.	12.5	25%
Metric 5	Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process & Program Improvements (Course Corrections) This metric reflects the utility's efforts to improve, operationalize, and improve its internal processes which are responsible for the creation and assignment of ex ante parameters and values. Commission 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 Commission Staff disposition guidance in its program rules, policies, and procedures.	12.5	25%

43		
Metric	SCORE	Commission Staff Specific Comments on Each Metric
Metric 1	N/A	N/A
Metric 2	15.0	SCE submitted documentation after collaborating with Commission Staff and thus the submittals were highly comprehensive.
Metric 3	5.0	SCE was very proactive in reaching out to Commission Staff to get guidance and clarity on disposition requirements.
Metric 4	12.5	In the documentation provided for this project, the PA demonstrated they had proactively reviewed project assumptions, methods, and values, demonstrating its due diligence and QA/QC efforts.
Metric 5	N/A	N/A

Attachment C: Workpaper Scores and Feedback

The table below lists the ID numbers associated with each workpaper submission or disposition and the workpaper review process “score enhancements” scoring area. The listed weight is used in the combining all the individual rows together into a single score for all the rows in the two scoring components (“direct review” and “process issues”); then each category total score gets equal weighting in the final total score for the metric. The IOU may refer to the individual dispositions for more detailed descriptions of the specific actions staff required for each workpaper. The qualitative ESPI 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.

Workpaper Detailed Reviews				ESPI Metrics					
WP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SCE13LG111	1	LED High and Low Bay Fixtures	Positive: SCE submitted short form workpaper based on PG&E's approved PGECOLTG178 in a timely manner. Opportunities: Workpaper was last updated in 2015 and should have been updated pursuant to CPUC staff directed ISP research in time for incorporation into 2018 deemed and custom savings values. In February 2017, CPUC staff issued a custom project disposition that directed SCE to collaborate with other PAs and complete and ISP study for interior and exterior lighting by October 1, 2017 (in time to incorporate results into 2018 deemed and custom savings values). At this time, SCE is still in the planning stages and expects to complete the work by the fall of 2018 (about a year later than directed). Some of the delay appears to be due to an increase in scope to investigate current existing conditions (which would serve as a first baseline only in AR claims).	1.00	-	no	no	-	-
SCE17LG086	0	Interior Linear Fluorescent Fixture	See comment on SCE13LG111	1.00	-	no	no	-	-
SCE17LG097	1	LED Street Lighting	Positive: SCE submitted workpaper in compliance with direction in recent CPUC decision for AR of streetlights being sold to local jurisdictions. Their second workpaper for NR applications was submitted in compliance with PG&E interim approved workpaper.	1.00	+	+	no	no	no
SCE17LG105	1	LED Exterior Landscape Lighting Fixture	Positive: SCE submitted workpaper a new short form workpaper, SCE17LG134, adopting PG&E's approved workpaper in place of this workpaper. Opportunities: CPUC staff was expecting and update to this workpaper to reflect previous direction to update ISP. In February 2017, CPUC staff issued a custom project disposition that directed SCE to collaborate with other PAs and complete and ISP study for interior and exterior lighting by October 1, 2017 (in time to incorporate results into 2018 deemed and custom savings values). At this time, SCE is still in the planning stages and expects to complete the work by the fall of 2018 (about a year later than directed). Some of the delay appears to be due to an increase in scope to investigate current existing conditions (which would serve as a first baseline only in AR claims).	1.00	-	no	no	-	no
SCE17LG114	1	LED Exterior Light Fixture with Motion Sensor	See comment for SCE17LG105	1.00	-	no	no	-	no

Attachment C: Workpaper Scores and Feedback

SCE17LG120	1	LED Exterior Fixture below 24 ft.		1.00	-	no	no	-	no
SCE17WH001	0	Heat Pump Water Heater	Opportunities: Starting 2018, residential and small commercial water heaters are required by Federal standards to be tested and rated with a Uniform Energy Factor (UEF). However, it appears that all IOU programs are still defining measures using the outdated Energy Factor (EF). As part of the Phase 1 disposition, CPUC staff developed measure definitions using UEF, but no workpapers had been submitted by mid-year following this direction.	1.00	-	no	no	no	no
SCE17LG133	2	LED A-Lamps	SCE was the lead for the revised residential lighting workpapers. The workpapers were revised for 2019 to reflect updated costs and more granular bins. The workpapers were submitted on time. Content has not been reviewed at this time.	1.00	yes	no	no	no	+
SCE17LG103	1	Interior LED Downlight Fixtures		1.00	yes	no	no	no	+
SCE17LG127	2	LED PAR Lamps		1.00	yes	no	no	no	+
SCE17LG129	1	LED Candelabra Lamps	See comment on SCE17LG133	1.00	yes	no	no	no	+
SCE17LG130	1	LED Globe Lamps		1.00	yes	no	no	no	+
SCE17LG131	2	LED BR-R Lamps		1.00	yes	no	no	no	+
SCE17CS014	2	Tier 2 Advanced Smart Connected Power Strip	On the revised workpaper, research was revised to the satisfaction of the subject matter expert, however, the measure was withdrawn.	1.00	no	yes	no	no	no
SCE17HC026	1	Window Evaporative Coolers	Text was misleading and required revision. SCE addressed all comments in the EAR Team Guidance with two clarifications which were made at EAR team request.	1.00	no	-	no	no	+
SCE17HC029	1	Residential HVAC Quality Maintenance	No issues. Corrected delivery method.	1.00	no	no	no	no	+
SCE17HC029	2	Residential HVAC Quality Maintenance	No issues. Addressed impacts to duct measures.	1.00	no	no	no	no	+
SCE17HC054	0	Residential Smart Communicating Thermostat	While SCE provided a workpaper plan and kept the Commission aware of progress, the smart thermostat research timelines were not managed well, delaying workpaper submission by six months. The delayed research required the CPUC to issue an extension to avoid market disruptions. An assessment of the quality of the final research will be assessed in later ESPI scores since the research is incomplete at this time.	1.00	-	yes	yes	-	+
SCE17WH001	2	Heat Pump Water Heater	Used conversion factor to change EF to UEF as directed in previous dispositions.	1.00	yes	no	yes	no	no
SCE17WP001	1	Residential Variable Speed Swimming Pool Pump	SCE revised the pool pump workpaper using more recent and robust data sources that well characterized the participant population. The analysis was sound and easy to follow. SCE quickly provided data related to documenting preponderance of evidence data collection.	1.00	no	+	no	Yes	+
SCE17LG133	1	LED A-Lamps	Positive: SCE submitted a workpaper based on PG&E's final PGECOLTG165 in a timely manner. Opportunities: Initial 2018 submissions did not consider that Title 20 requirements would generally prohibit the sale of incandescent A-lamps and MR-16 lamps in California on 1/1/2018.	1.00	-	no	no	no	no
SCE17LG103	0	Interior LED Downlight Fixtures		1.00	-	no	no	no	no
SCE17LG127	1	LED PAR Lamps		1.00	-	no	no	no	no
SCE17LG129	0	LED Candelabra Lamps	See comment on SCE17LG133	1.00	-	no	no	no	no
SCE17LG130	0	LED Globe Lamps		1.00	-	no	no	no	no
SCE17LG131	1	LED BR-R Lamps		1.00	-	no	no	no	no
SCE17CS014	1	Tier 2 Advanced Smart Connected Power Strip	Opportunities: Research was not performed in a way that was consistent with directed M&V development and staff review requirements.	1.00	+	-	-	-	-

Workpaper Submissions			
WP ID	Rev	Title	Comments
SCE13LG111	1	LED High and Low Bay Fixtures	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG103	0	Interior LED Downlight Fixtures	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG086	0	Interior Linear Fluorescent Fixture	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG129	0	LED Candelabra Replacements	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG130	0	LED Globe Lamps	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG127	1	LED PAR Lamps	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG131	1	LED BR-R Lamps	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG133	1	LED A-Lamps	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG120	1	LED Exterior Fixture below 24 ft.	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG114	1	LED Exterior Light Fixture with Motion Sensor	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG097	1	LED Street Lighting	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17WH001	0	Heat Pump Water Heaters	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17LG105	1	LED Exterior Landscape Lighting Fixture	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17CS014	0	Tier 2 Advanced Smart Connected Power Strip	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17RN029	0	Ultra Low Temperature Freezer	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG118	0	LED Troffer Retrofit Kit	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC005	0	Whole House Fan	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17WP004	1	Faucet Aerator and Low Flow Showerhead	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17WP001	0	Residential Pool Pump VFD	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in 2017
SCE17HC049	0	ProgTstat_NRes	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17MI005	0	Basic Path Enhancement for Whole House	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC030	1	Air - Cooled Packaged Chillers	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC043	0	Water Cooled Chillers	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17RN024	1	Refrigerated Storage Auto Closer	Review waived - interim approval
SCE13CC005	5	Electric Griddle	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17RN023	1	Refrigeration Floating Suction and Head Pressure Controls	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC055	0	Circulating Block Heater	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17RN009	1	Anti-Sweat Heat (ASH) Controls	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17RN003	1	Insulation of Bare Refrigeration Suction Lines	Review waived - interim approval

SCE17WH001	0	Heat Pump Water Heater	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17CC002	0	Commercial Electric Steamers	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17CC006	0	Commercial Electric Combination Ovens	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC039	1	VFD Retrofit to Central Plant Systems	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17CC003	0	Insulated Hot Food Holding Cabinets	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17CC004	0	Commercial Electric Fryers	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17CC008	0	Exhaust Hoods Demand Controlled Ventilation	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17WP008	1	Commercial Variable Speed Swimming Pool Pump	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17CC007	0	Commercial Ice Machines	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC040	0	Cogged V-belt	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17CC016	0	Commercial Dishwashers	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC012	1	Commercial Air-cooled Unitary Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps <65 kBtu/h	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC035	1	Commercial Air-cooled Unitary Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps >=65 kBtu/h	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17AP018	0	High Efficiency Dishwasher - Residential	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17CC014	1	Commercial Hand Wrap Machines	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17RN011	0	Evaporator Fan Motors	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG097	2	LED Street Lighting	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17WP015	0	Water Pump Upgrade	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC068	0	Single Package Vertical Heat Pump	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17WP010	0	High Performance Circulator Pump	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17RN018	0	Low ASH Display Doors	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG103	1	Interior LED Downlight Fixtures	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG127	2	LED PAR Lamps	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG129	1	LED Candelabra Lamps	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG130	1	LED Globe Lamps	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG131	2	LED BR-R Lamps	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17CS014	1	Tier 2 Advanced Smart Connected Power Strip	Detailed review – resubmit - scored in detailed review section
SCE17CC017	0	Refrigerated Chef Bases	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17AP003	0	Energy Star Clothes Washers	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG133	2	LED A-Lamps	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17WP004	1	Faucet Aerator and Low Flow Showerhead	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG017	1	Upstream Interior 3-way and Dimmable CFLs	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG072	1	Upstream Interior 3-way and Dimmable CFLs	Review waived - interim approval

SCE17HC055	2	Circulating Block Heater	Not yet reviewed - 2019 Phase 1 submission
SCE17CC001	0	Commercial Reach In Refrigerators and Freezers	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG111	0	LED High-Bay and Low-Bay Fixtures	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG134	0	LED Outdoor Area and Street Lighting	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC013	1	Direct Evaporative Coolers Final	Not yet reviewed - 2019 Phase 1 submission
SCE17HC017	1	Direct-indirect Evaporative Coolers	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17WP016	0	Recirc Pump Control	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17HC007	1	High Efficiency PTACHP 24kBtuh	Not yet reviewed - 2019 Phase 1 submission
SCE17PR005	1	Air Compressor VSD	Not yet reviewed - 2019 Phase 1 submission
SCE17HC028	1	BFM ResCentralAC	Review waived - interim approval
SCE17LG133	2	LED A-Lamps	See notes in Workpaper Review Section
SCE17LG103	1	Interior LED Downlight Fixtures	
SCE17LG127	2	LED PAR Lamps	
SCE17LG129	1	LED Candelabra Lamps	See notes in Workpaper Review Section
SCE17LG130	1	LED Globe Lamps	
SCE17LG131	2	LED BR-R Lamps	
SCE17CS014	2	Tier 2 Advanced Smart Connected Power Strip	See notes in Workpaper Review Section
SCE17HC026	1	Window Evaporative Coolers	See notes in Workpaper Review Section
SCE17HC029	1	Residential HVAC Quality Maintenance	See notes in Workpaper Review Section
SCE17HC029	2	Residential HVAC Quality Maintenance	See notes in Workpaper Review Section
SCE17HC054	0	Residential Smart Communicating Thermostat	See notes in Workpaper Review Section
SCE17WH001	2	Heat Pump Water Heater	See notes in Workpaper Review Section
SCE17WP001	1	Residential Variable Speed Swimming Pool Pump	See notes in Workpaper Review Section

Process Adders		Metric					
		Weight	1	2	3	4	5
1	PAs are required to submit all workpapers subject to the most recent DEER update before January 1 of the subsequent year. PG&E submitted workpaper and workpaper revisions in response to DEER2019 updates, meeting the January 1, 2019 due date. SCE began P1 submissions early and completed submissions ahead of the deadline.	1	+	no	no	no	no
2	PAs are expected to conduct well designed research as the basis for workpaper revisions. The PA's scope includes all the activities required for successful research including planning, oversight of the research and incorporation of the findings into the workplan. While SCE provided a workpaper plan and kept the Commission aware of progress, the smart thermostat research timelines were not managed well, delaying workpaper submission by six months. The delayed research required the CPUC to issue an extension to avoid market disruptions. An assessment of the quality of the final research will be assessed in later ESPI scores since the research is incomplete at this time.	1	-	no	no	-	no
3	PAs are required to submit workpaper submission plans each year. SCE assumed responsibility on behalf of all the PAs to compile the proposed workpaper submissions into a single statewide plan. The plan included active and inactive workpapers organized by measure type and flagged by key characteristics. SCE provided a subsequent update which included estimates projected energy savings by workpaper.	1	yes	no	no	no	+
4	SCE collaborated with the other PAs and the CPUC to present two successful workpaper training sessions in November 2018 geared to third party contractor bidders.	1	no	no	yes	no	no
5	SCE prepared a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document to be publicly posted. The FAQs are intended to be a living document and updated overtime	1	no	no	no	no	+
6	SCE as well as the other PAs have been helpful and patient with the new workpaper and DEER consultants during this transition period to a new team.	1	no	no	+	no	no

Attachment D: 2018 Performance Annual Ratings

Custom Scoring

2018 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	N/A Adjusted Disposition Score (1-5)	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.50	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	
Total Score	N/A Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	Total Points
	N/A Adjusted Metric points	5.00	15.00	5.00	12.50	12.50	50.00

2017 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	Dispositions Score	4.56	3.08	5.00	2.22	1.77	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	2.50	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	3.59	5.00	3.23	4.28	Total Points
	Metric points	5.00	10.77	5.00	8.08	10.70	39.55

Workpaper Scoring

2018 Annual Workpaper Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	SCE "-"	62%	20%	0%	86%	15%	
	SCE "+"	5%	40%	0%	0%	85%	
	SCE "Yes"	33%	40%	100%	14%	0%	
	Dispositions Score %	21%	60%	50%	7%	85%	
	Dispositions Score	1.07	3.00	2.50	0.36	4.23	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCE "-"	33%	0%	0%	100%	0%	
	SCE "+"	33%	0%	50%	0%	100%	
	SCE "Yes"	33%	0%	50%	0%	0%	
	Process Score %	50%	0%	75%	0%	100%	
	Process Increase Score	2.50	0.00	3.75	0.00	5.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	1.25	0.00	1.88	0.00	2.50	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	2.32	3.00	4.38	1.00	5.00	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.32	9.00	4.38	2.50	12.50	30.70

2017 Annual Workpaper Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	SCE "-"	40%	42%	79%	100%	62%	
	SCE "+"	55%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	SCE "Yes"	5%	58%	21%	0%	38%	
	Dispositions Score %	57%	29%	11%	0%	19%	
	Dispositions Score	2.87	1.45	0.53	0.00	0.96	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCE "-"	40%	0%	40%	25%	50%	
	SCE "+"	40%	0%	20%	0%	17%	
	SCE "Yes"	20%	100%	40%	75%	33%	
	Process Score %	50%	50%	40%	38%	33%	
	Process Increase Score	2.50	2.50	2.00	1.88	1.67	
Total Score	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Final Metric Score (1-5)	4.12	2.70	1.53	0.94	1.80	Total Points
	Metric points	4.12	8.10	1.53	2.35	4.49	20.59

Explanations of scoring tables row entries

1. The row labeled with *IOU* “-“ lists the percent of workpaper reviews undertaken where the Commission Staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission did not meet minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
2. The row labeled with *IOU* “+“ lists the percent of workpaper reviews undertaken where the Commission Staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission exceeded minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
3. The rows labeled with *IOU* “Yes“ lists the percent of workpaper reviews undertaken where the Commission Staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission exceeded met minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
4. The “Dispositions Score %” row (and “Process Increase Score” for workpapers) indicates how the combination of the three rows of scores (+, -, and yes) sum into a total points multiplier for each metric. Each row contributes to the total based on the row count over the total count for all three rows.
5. The “Disposition Score” (and “Process Increase Score” for workpapers) row converts the % score into a numeric value of up to five by directly applying the % to a value of 5.
6. The custom row labeled with “*Technical & Policy QC Increase*” lists Commission Staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU performance in putting into place quality assurance and/or quality control methods, documents and/or training for staff and contractors related to this metric area that are expected to improve the ability of review personnel to identify and cure issues going forward on projects started during 2016 but not yet seen in the custom review activity.
7. The custom row labeled with “*Implementation Increase*” lists Commission Staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU performance in putting into place new or changed program rules, eligibility criteria, incentive structures, application and implementation contract processes and procedures in 2016 related to this metric area that are expected to improve performance going forward on projects started but not yet seen in the custom review activity.
8. The workpaper rows labeled with “*Review Process Score Enhancements*” lists Commission Staff scoring for each metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU performance in putting into place quality assurance and/or quality control methods, documents and/or training for staff and contractors that are expected to improve the ability of review personnel to identify and cure issues going forward on workpapers. This score is weighted as an increase to the disposition score based on the fractional weight listed in the “Process Increase Weight” row.
9. The “Final Metric Score” row indicates the total score for each metric as a sum of the Direct Work product Review Score plus the Review Process Score Enhancements (either as a simple sum for custom or a weighted value sum for workpapers) to provide a final metric score with the final score constrained between a maximum score of 5 and a minimum score of 1.
10. The “Metric Points” row provides the point value derived from the Final Metric Score row. If the maximum point value associated with a metric is greater than 5 then the score is multiplied by the max point value divided by 5 to obtain the metric point value related to the final score.