

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: March 30, 2023

To: Southern California Gas (SoCalGas)

From: Rashid Mir and Peter Biermayer, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

Cc: R.13-11-005 Service Lists

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

---

## Table of Contents

I.	Summary of 2022 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages .....	2
II.	CPUC Staff Findings 2022 Activities .....	3
	A. Custom Projects Review Overview .....	3
	B. Measure Packages Review Overview .....	4
III.	Discussion .....	4
	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: 2022 Performance Annual Ratings .....	29

## I. Summary of 2022 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages

Pursuant to Decision (D).13-09-023, D.15-10-028, D.16-08-019, and D.20-11-013, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) staff and consultants score the investor-owned utilities (IOUs) based on their performance during the pre-approval phase (or “ex ante” phase) of developing an energy efficiency project or measure. The ex ante review (EAR) scoring is a part of the EAR awards<sup>1</sup>.

D.20-11-013 placed a moratorium on EAR awards but directed that EAR scoring shall continue. CPUC staff and consultants completed the 2022 EAR performance review scoring as prescribed in Table 3 of D.16-08-019. Decision D.16-08-019 established consolidated metrics to evaluate and further direct the utilities. Ordering Paragraph 19 of this decision states that the EAR scores “shall be weighted for the utility program administrators based on the proportion of deemed savings and custom measures in each utility’s portfolio”.

A breakdown of SoCalGas’ 2022 EAR performance score of 70.14/100 for Measure Packages<sup>2</sup> and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. SoCalGas’ 2022 total points is a 2.19 point decrease from its 2021 total points of 72.33. Scores for 2021 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

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

SoCalGas 2022 EAR Review Performance Scores and Points		Measure Packages				Custom			
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	2.99	10%	2.99	5	4.17	10%	4.17	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	8.53	30%	8.53	15	3.25	30%	9.75	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	2.99	10%	2.99	5	2.40	10%	2.40	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	2.89	25%	12.50	12.5	3.60	25%	9.00	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	2.65	25%	12.50	12.5	2.13	25%	5.31	12.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>39.51</b>	<b>50</b>			<b>30.63</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: SoCalGas 2021 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

SoCalGas 2021 EAR Review Performance Scores and Points		Measure Packages				Custom			
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	2.50	10%	2.50	5	4.14	10%	4.14	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	2.12	30%	6.35	15	4.46	30%	13.39	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	2.20	10%	2.20	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5	3.00	25%	7.50	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	12.50	25%	12.50	12.5	2.50	25%	6.25	12.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>38.85</b>	<b>50</b>			<b>33.48</b>	<b>50</b>

The metric scoring area descriptions are expanded in [Attachment A](#). The final category scores are explained in more detail below as well as in [Attachment B](#) through [Attachment D](#) to this memo.

## II. CPUC Staff Findings 2022 Activities

### A. Custom Projects Review Overview

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

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points resulted in SoCalGas's custom project score decreasing by 2.85 points from 2021 scores (33.48 in 2021 vs. 30.63 in 2022 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above). As with the previous EAR cycle, SoCalGas demonstrated a decrease in its project documentation and processes and as a result their performance continued to decrease this cycle.

#### 1. Summary of 2022 Achievements

CPUC staff observed SoCalGas to have improved in:

- **Issues related baseline.** SoCalGas is improving efforts to ensure baseline selections comply with CPUC policy.

#### 2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

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

- **The proportion of gross savings impact issues remains high.** In 2021 SoCalGas had 31

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

percent of all issues related to gross savings impacts. In 2022, the number of issues related to gross savings impacts increased to 36 percent of total issues. SoCalGas needs to improve analysis assumptions and calculation methodology to reduce the impact of deficiencies within project submissions.

- **The proportion of Process, Policy and Program rule issues remains high.** In 2021 the number of deficiencies noted in this area was 38 percent of total issues identified, whereas in 2022 the number of deficiencies decreased to 36 percent of total. Though the overall percentage decreased slightly SoCalGas has room for improvement with regards to conformance with CPUC policy and program rules.
- **Issues related to documenting program influence remain high.** In 2021 issues related to program influence comprised 15 percent of total issues. In 2022, the number of program influence related issues has decreased to 14 percent, indicating that SoCalGas still has work to ensure that the proper chain of influence documentation is submitted and accurate.

## **B. Measure Packages Review Overview**

SoCalGas' Measure Packages scores slightly increased compared to last year by 0.66 points (from 38.85 in 2021 to 39.51 for 2022 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above) which indicates that SoCalGas has generally maintained their practices for Measure Package submittals.

### **1. Summary of 2022 Achievements**

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

- SoCalGas continues to work closely with the CPUC staff and with the PAs to manage measure package submittals. This was demonstrated through the Pipe and Tank Insulation, Space Heating Boiler, and Water Heating Boiler measure package submittals with confirmation on guidance and two measure package approvals in 2022 for each measure package.
- SoCalGas has been a leader in measure package submittal through the eTRM with the first submittals of the SWWH017 and SWWH018. SoCalGas has continued to be responsive, clear, and timely with their eTRM submittals and measure package posts.

### **2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement**

CPUC staff highlights the following recommendations for improvement:

- SoCalGas should continue to focus on measure package QC before submitting to CPUC for review as there are still many minor comments and typos that hold up measure package approval.

## **III. Discussion**

The following sections of this memorandum provide a detailed description of the findings, including,

areas of achievement, areas requiring improvement and scoring for both custom projects and Measure Packages.

## A. Custom Projects Performance Review

Each year, CPUC staff reviews a selected sample of energy efficiency program custom project applications. The review findings and directions to the PA are presented in documents referred to as “dispositions”.

**From the period beginning January 2022 to the end of December 2022, 6 SoCalGas 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 submitted 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 reviewer.

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

Table 3: SoCalGas Custom Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Weight Factor	Custom Disposition Points		Max Points
			With Enhance Pts	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	4.17	4.17	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	9.75	9.75	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	2.40	2.40	5
4	PA’s Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	9.00	9.00	12.5
5	PA’s Responsiveness	25%	5.31	5.31	12.5
<b>Total</b>			<b>30.63</b>	<b>30.63</b>	<b>50</b>

### 1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2022, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 4.17 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 6 SoCalGas custom projects reviews completed in 2022. In 2022, SoCalGas submitted project documentation for review for 5 of these custom projects on time with two projects (33 percent) earlier than required, and 1 project was submitted late.<sup>4</sup> This is a slight improvement over last year which demonstrates SoCalGas effort to improve timeliness.

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

In 2022, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 9.75 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This score was based on the completeness of the 6 SoCalGas custom project reviews. Of the 6 dispositions issued, 0 projects were approved without exception, 0 projects were marked Advisory,

<sup>4</sup> “The electrical corporation or gas corporation shall make the project application supporting documentation available to the CPUC for review within 15 business days of the CPUC review selection date”.

and 0 projects were marked Prospective.<sup>5</sup> However, 2 projects (33 percent) were rejected, and 4 projects (67 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies which resulted in a loss of points under this metric.

Table 4 below summarizes the 22 action items identified across the 6 scored dispositions<sup>6</sup> issued between January 1, 2022, and December 31, 2022. These action items illustrate errors that impacted the project's eligibility, documentation, and efficiency savings estimate calculations.

Table 4: Summary of Categorized Action Items for Custom Projects

Issue Area	Action Categories	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Summary of CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Percent of Total Actions
Issues Related to Gross Savings Impacts	Analysis assumptions	3	0	14%
	Calculation method	4	0	18%
	Calculation tool	1	3	5%
	M&V plan	0	1	0%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36%</b>
Process, Policy, Program Rules	CPUC Policy	1	1	5%
	Eligibility	1	2	5%
	ER preponderance of evidence	1	0	5%
	EUL/RUL	1	0	5%
	Measure cost	4	0	18%
	PA program rules	0	3	0%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>36%</b>
Documentation Issues	Continue Document Upload	2	0	9%
	Missing required information	0	1	0%
	Project scope unclear	0	1	0%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9%</b>
Issues Related to Net Impacts	Program influence	3	0	14%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14%</b>
Other Issues	Other 1 - Bi-Monthly Savings	1	3	5%
	Other 2 - Incorrect address in bimonthly upload	0	1	5%
	Other 3 - Bi-Monthly project description	0	1	5%
	<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>5</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.

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

- **Analysis assumptions and calculation method issues** occurred on all six projects and resulted in a loss of EAR points due to the significance of these discrepancies.

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

In 2022, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 2.4 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. At the portfolio level, SoCalGas engaged with to get CPUC staff feedback on interpretation of policy or for guidance on how to handle bi-monthly uploads; for instance, the discussion about when is it appropriate to upload multiple sites for the same customer. In addition, SoCalGas did provide an update on the ramping down of legacy multi-family program and the ramping up of a new multi-family program. Finally, SoCalGas engaged with CPUC staff in submitting one Early Opinion during the first half of 2022.

For statewide initiatives, SoCalGas took a less active role during combined subgroups over the course of the year. CPUC staff determined that SoCalGas performed below the minimum expectations with regards to proactive collaboration under this metric.

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

In 2022, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 9.0 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Project and measure level disposition performance results reviewed under Metric 2 were used as a proxy for the level of QA/QC occurring by the PA. The number of dispositions proceeding without exception was weighed against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 6 projects receiving dispositions, 0 projects proceeded without exception, 4 projects (67 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions noted, and 2 projects (33 percent) were rejected. While the number of total projects were small, all were either allowed to proceed with noted exceptions or rejected. Due to this, CPUC staff determined SoCalGas has a lower-than-expected performance for this metric as it pertains to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review.

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

In 2022, SoCalGas received a custom disposition score of 5.31 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. When reviewed at the portfolio level, CPUC staff assessed the time series of rejections and expectations, the alignment of program policy and procedures with the number of actual rejections and exceptions based on eligibility and attribution, and the adaption to changes in rules over time. SoCalGas did not have any projects reviewed in the first half of the year and CPUC staff found that projects reviewed for the second half of the year exhibited a low performance. The lower performance score in Metric 5 was driven in large part by the substantial number of technical and policy related issues documented across all project submissions. For this component CPUC staff noted that at the portfolio level, 36 percent of all actions on projects were policy related indicating a need for improvement. Additionally, CPUC staff noted that 36 percent of actions noted on dispositions were related to issues potentially impacting future net to gross (NTG) values for the program. As such, CPUC staff determined that SoCalGas demonstrated minimal compliance with regards to this metric and that more work can be

done to address program policy issues and bring about substantive process improvements in the future.

## B. Measure Packages Performance Review

SoCalGas had 58 Measure Packages submitted in 2022. Fifty-four were reviewed and disposed, and the remaining four are still under detailed review. This end of year memo provides Measure Package specific feedback on the 54 which were reviewed and disposed.

The comments below are organized by the five scoring metric areas created in D.16-08-019.7 The narrative includes observations common to multiple Measure Packages and feedback related to the Measure Package development process. Specific Measure Package feedback is provided in [Attachment C](#) at the end of this document. The Measure Package Review Table provides feedback on specific Measure Packages. The Measure Package Submissions Table lists all Measure Packages submitted by SoCalGas during the review period. Measure Packages were selected for feedback from those that were led by SoCalGas 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 SoCalGas for each metric both with and without the addition of any enhancement points.

Table 5: SoCalGas Measure Package Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Weight Factor	Measure Package Disposition Points		Max Points
			With Enhance Pts	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	2.99	2.99	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	8.53	8.53	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	2.99	2.99	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	12.50	7.23	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	12.50	6.62	12.5
<b>Total</b>			<b>39.51</b>	<b>28.36</b>	<b>50</b>

### 1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2022, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 2.99 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SoCalGas has largely

<sup>7</sup> See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.



met deadlines for submission of statewide Measure Packages in the review period and most Measure Packages received a ‘Yes’, indicating that the minimum expectations were met for timeliness. Several Measure Packages received high ratings because of the necessity for submissions in quick succession for the Space Heating Boiler and Water Heating Boiler Measure Packages to approve 2023 and 2024 versions of the Measure Package for Resolution E-5221.

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

In 2022, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 8.53 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points.

SoCalGas has shown higher quality submittals in 2022 with most Measure Packages meeting expectations. Most Measure Packages consisted of minor edits and clarifications rather than corrections and errors. SoCalGas introduced new multifamily common area measures for the Clothes Dryer Measure Package, a new tier for the Door-Type Dishwasher Measure Package, and a new tier for the Heater for Pool or Spa Measure Package.

SoCalGas received a minus “-” on two Measure Package submittals. This was due to the lack in completeness and quality of the calculations and savings values that necessitated additional comments on the Low-Flow Showerhead and Ceiling Insulation Measure Packages. SoCalGas did receive several above expectation ratings “+” on Measure Packages for high-quality submittals that were approved without any comments or one minor comment.

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

In 2022, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 2.99 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Measure Packages met the minimum expectations of collaboration which was required to ensure each Measure Package met all PA’s needs and minimally received a “Yes” with six Measure Packages exceeding minimum expectations.

SoCalGas has been very proactive with providing the CPUC staff with updates and preliminary work products on upcoming Measure Packages via the Measure Package Plan process. In addition, SoCalGas worked collaboratively with CPUC staff on a variety of Measure Package specific issues, for example, the removal of Accelerated Replacement and Upstream delivery permutations, meetings to discuss the Title 24 requirements for the Pipe and Tank Insulation Measure Packages, and the submittal and approval process for two versions of Space Heating and Water Heating Boiler Measure Packages per the Resolution. SoCalGas continues to work with the CPUC to provide solutions to Measure Package comments and questions.

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

In 2022, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 7.23 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA’s Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points.

The quality of SoCalGas Measure Packages has improved from the 2021 submissions. SoCalGas has clearly identified and updated DEER values and NTG updates for measures as they are offered in

programs for longer than two years, especially the Tankless Water Heater, Storage Water Heater, and Wall Furnace Measure Packages.

## 5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2022, SoCalGas received a Measure Package disposition score of 6.62 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. CPUC staff and consultants have regularly and productively engaged with SoCalGas and continue to rely on them to provide answers for the gas Measure Packages, specifically with new Measure Packages like the Gas Heat Pump Water Heater and Solar Thermal Water Heating System. SoCalGas continues to show responsiveness and initiative when developing new measures, adding measure tiers, and updating measures with new study data. In addition, SoCalGas has continued to support the Food Service program by spending resources to support Food Service implementers in the development of new Measure Packages.

## IV. The Scoring Methodology

The 2022 performance score was developed using five detailed scoring metrics for each directly reviewed work product (i.e., Measure Package and custom project), as well as a scoring of the utility's internal due diligence processes, QA/QC procedures and methods, as well as program implementation enhancements to support improved forecasted values.

[Attachment A](#) summarizes the Metrics adopted in D.16-08-019 as well as the CPUC staff developed scores and points for 2022. D.16-08-019 also directed that the custom and Measure Package scores be weighted together into a final score based on the IOU total claims for custom and deemed activities, respectively.

In accordance with D.13-09-023, the PA's activities are assessed against a set of five metrics on a rating scale of 1 to 5. Once activities are assessed, the ratings for each are converted onto this scale, where 1 is the lowest score assigned and 5 is the highest score assigned. A maximum score on all metrics for both Measure Packages and custom projects will yield 100 points whereas a minimum score on all metrics would yield 20 points. The 1 to 5 rating scale is distinguished as follows:

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

As with the 2021 performance scores, the final scores were "built-up" from a metric-by-metric assessment of each reviewed work product. It is CPUC staff's expectation that this detailed scoring approach, along with the detailed qualitative Measure Package and custom project level feedback, is consistent with the direction provided in D.13-09-023. We believe this scoring approach provides specific guidance to the utilities on how to improve their due diligence review and scores moving forward.

A "Direct Work Product Review" portion of each metric score was developed based upon the

individual scoring of dispositions issued for custom project or Measure Packages. Each reviewed utility work product was first determined to have components either applicable or not applicable to a metric.<sup>8</sup> If a metric was determined to be not applicable to a given disposition, the metric was identified as not applicable (“N/A”) and the metric was assigned a score equal to the average 1 to 5 score from the remaining applicable metrics. Assigning this average score to any “N/A” metrics essentially normalized the final score so that a disposition neither benefitted nor was penalized because of a non-applicable metric.

For custom projects, each applicable metric was directly scored according to the unique metric scoring methodology outlined below. A project-by-project summary of the custom project scoring is included in a custom tables workbook which has been included as an embedded excel file in [Attachment D](#).

## A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology

For Measure Packages, if an item was determined to have activity applicable to a metric, the item was then assigned a qualitative rating as to the level of due diligence applied to the item. The scoring rubric for Measure Packages is defined as follows:

- ‘+’ indicates a positive scoring impact which receives 100% of total points for the metric
- ‘-’ indicates a negative scoring impact which receives 0% of total points for the metric
- ‘Yes’ indicates meeting minimum expectation which receives 50% of total points for the metric
- ‘No’ indicates the review feedback is not applicable to a metric and does not impact the average

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

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

---

<sup>8</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”).

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

This metric is related to the timeliness of submittals and a maximum of five points is allocated to this metric based on the PA's responsiveness to requests and follow-up documentation required to complete the review. Scoring for this metric occurs at the individual project review stage.

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

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

This metric is related to content and completeness of submittals and a maximum of 15 points is allocated to this metric. Scoring occurs on each custom project during the individual project review stage. On a percentage basis Metric 2 is the single greatest determinant of the overall EAR score. Scoring for Metric 2 is achieved through numerous areas throughout the custom project review workbook. PA's begin with a full score of 5 for each custom project in the review workbook with each noted deficiency reducing the points accordingly. 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, 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 2022 to positively impact future project reviews. CPUC staff believes it is important to provide EAR “Enhancement” points for positive due diligence developments to recognize the effort and to provide additional encouragement even before a change in project-level results is observed. In the custom scoring process, CPUC staff decided that SoCalGas’ efforts did not rise to the level to be awarded “Enhancement” points.

Measure Package scores also include “Review Process Score Enhancements.” Process issues represent critical deemed measure development topics where CPUC staff believes improvement is needed or improvement has occurred, but those activities are not necessarily reflected in the areas of direct review. These activities, as discussed above, are noted in the narrative, 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: There were no added points for this metric.
- Metric 4: QA/QC: SCG has continued to lead new Food Service Measure Packages as the Food Service lead.
- Metric 5: Process improvements: SCG has led the process improvement of updating Measure Packages with embedded water energy savings in the eTRM.

To produce the final Measure Package scores, the metric scores for the two Measure Package contributing areas were added together, using a 50 percent weight for the process issues score. The 50 percent weight given to the process review has the effect of being a “score enhancement” or increase to the direct review score. Furthermore, within each contributing area (direct and process review areas), CPUC staff also assigned weights for individual items 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 SoCalGas.<sup>9</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.

---

<sup>9</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.”

Questions or comments about the feedback or final scores should be directed to Rashid Mir ([rashid.mir@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:rashid.mir@cpuc.ca.gov)) or Peter Biermayer ([peter.biermayer@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:peter.biermayer@cpuc.ca.gov)). Note that pursuant to D.13-09-023, CPUC staff will schedule a meeting with SoCalGas staff to discuss this memorandum and its final scores by April 30, 2023.

## Attachment A: Final EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points)

Metric		Measure Packages				Custom			
		Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2022 Score	2022 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2022 Score	2022 Points
<b>1</b>	<b>Timing and Timeliness of Submittals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>4.17</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>2.84</b>	<b>8.53</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>9.75</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>2.99</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.40</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>2.89</b>	<b>7.23</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>9.00</b>

Metric	Measure Packages				Custom			
	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2022 Score	2022 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2022 Score	2022 Points
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 Program Administrator’s Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>6.62</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>2.13</b>	<b>5.31</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>28.36</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>30.63</b>



## Attachment B: Custom Project Scores and Feedback

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

*Table 4 2016 Adopted Performance Metrics*

<b>Metric</b>	<b>2016 CPUC Adopted Performance Metrics</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>	<b>% of Total Points</b>
<b>Metric 1</b>	<b>Timeliness and Timing of Submittals</b> Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	<b>5.0</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Metric 2</b>	<b>Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals</b> Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submitted documentation. In addition, this metric is an assessment of the utility's adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior CPUC staff disposition guidance.	<b>15.0</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Metric 3</b>	<b>Proactive Initiation of Collaboration</b> Utility's efforts to bring either measures, questions, and/or savings calculation tools to CPUC staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. CPUC staff expects collaboration among the utilities and for the program administrators to engage with CPUC staff in early discussions on high profile, high impact measures well before customer commitments are made.	<b>5.0</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Metric 4</b>	<b>Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness</b> CPUC staff expects the utility to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for its programs and measures. The depth and correctness of the utility's technical review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Metric 5</b>	<b>Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process &amp; Program Improvements (Course Corrections)</b> This metric reflects the utility's efforts to improve, operationalize, and improve its internal processes which are responsible for the creation and assignment of ex ante parameters and values. CPUC staff looks not only to the utility's internal QC/QA process, but also whether individual programs incorporate and comply with CPUC policies and prior CPUC staff disposition guidance in its program rules, policies, and procedures.	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25%</b>

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	% of TOTAL POINTS	TOTAL SCORED POINTS	# of Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level)
<b>Metric 1</b>	<b>Timeliness and Timing of Submittals</b> Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5	10%	4.17	6	In general, SoCalGas complied with SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation before the 15 business days required. Of the 6 projects with dispositions in 2022, CPUC staff found 1 project (17 percent) to be late and two projects (33 percent) were found to be submitted prior to the 15 business days.
<b>Metric 2</b>	<b>Content, Completeness and Quality of Submittals</b> Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submitted documentation. In addition, this metric is an assessment of the utility's adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior CPUC staff disposition guidance.	15	30%	9.75	6	Out of the 6 projects submitted and selected for review, all projects had deficiencies for a total of 22 deficiencies. The more significant deficiencies were around the use of Energy Pro Lite, which is not an accurate tool for capturing savings in MF buildings, incorrect project costs, and not demonstrating program influence. These deficiencies were significant and resulted in the loss of points under this metric. In addition, because all submitted projects had deficiencies, CPUC staff notes that SoCalGas is lacking in efforts to improve the quality and completeness of their submittals.
<b>Metric 3</b>	<b>Proactive Initiation of Collaboration</b> Utility's efforts to bring either measures, questions, and/or savings calculation tools to CPUC staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. CPUC staff expects collaboration among the utilities and for the program administrators to engage with CPUC staff in early discussions on high profile, high impact measures well before customer commitments are made.	5	10%	2.40	6	CPUC staff did not find that SoCalGas made minimal effort to bring measures, projects, or studies forward for discussion prior to review. SoCalGas submitted one Early Opinion for Matchmaster at the beginning of 2022. CPUC staff noted an increase in custom project activity in the second half of 2022, however, few large projects or studies and tools submitted for review. CPUC staff notes SoCalGas did initiate conversations about their ramp down of the legacy multi-family program and the ramp up of the new program, and while SoCalGas was active in early subgroup meetings, they appeared less active in combined subgroups. As such, SoCalGas performed below the minimum expectations for demonstrating proactive collaboration.
<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	12.5	25%	9.00	6	CPUC staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 6 projects receiving dispositions in 2022, 4 projects (67 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions noted, and 2 projects (33 percent) were rejected. These findings resulted in lower-

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	% of TOTAL POINTS	TOTAL SCORED POINTS	# of Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level)
	review of its ex-ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.					than-expected performance with regards to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review.
<b>Metric 5</b>	<p><b>Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process &amp; Program Improvements (Course Corrections)</b></p> <p>This metric reflects the utility's efforts to improve, operationalize, and improve its internal processes that 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>5.31</b>	<b>6</b>	SoCalGas did not submit any projects that were reviewed in the first half of 2022. For projects reviewed from July 2022 through December 2022, CPUC staff noted several issues related to Gross Savings Impacts as well as Process, Policy, and Program Rules. Two of the projects reviewed (33 percent) were rejected and the remaining 4 projects (67 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies. As such, CPUC staff notes SoCalGas performance for this metric is not meeting minimum expectations

## Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback

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

- ‘+’ indicates a positive (from midpoint) scoring impact on a metric,
- ‘-’ indicates a negative (from midpoint) scoring impact on a metric,
- ‘Yes’ indicates meeting expectation; neutral (midpoint) scoring impact on a metric,
- ‘No’ indicates the review feedback is not applicable to a metric.

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages 2022				EAR Metrics					
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWWH017	3	Hot Water Pipe Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Measure Package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2020 data. Minor error corrections noted.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH018	3	Hot Water Tank Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Measure Package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2020 data. Comments to address error in "MFm" building savings being mapped to Building "Res". Minor error corrections noted.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH026	2	Water Heater Pipe Wrap, Residential	Measure Package updates from E-5152 with updated CZ2022 weather data, calculations and NTG value. SoCalGas worked closely with reviewers to clarify inputs and assumptions and were proactive with their responses. Measure package approved.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH033	1	Gas Heat Pump Water Heater, Multifamily	New Measure Package with major comments on measure case assumptions, models, baseline, and savings. SoCalGas worked collaboratively to provide post-processing scripts and additional data to the reviewers. Measure package ultimately approved after all questions and comments were satisfactorily addressed by SoCalGas.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	+
SWWH034	1	Solar Thermal Water Heating System, Multifamily	New Measure Package with several minor comments to clarify assumptions, technology details, and baseline conditions. SoCalGas worked quickly to address all comments. Measure package approved.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	+
SWWH016	3	Domestic Hot Water Loop Temperature Controller, Multifamily & Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 with updated CZ2022 weather data, DI NTG update, updated hot water load curve for MF buildings, added upstream delivery. Measure package approved after minor comments on references, data collection requirements, and measure package details around assumptions used.	1	yes	yes	yes	+	yes
SWWH015	3	Demand Control for Centralized Water Heater Recirculation Pump, Multifamily & Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 with updated CZ2022 weather data, DI NTG update, updated hot water load curve for MF buildings, added upstream delivery. Measure package approved after minor comments on references, data collection requirements, and measure package details around assumptions used.	1	yes	yes	yes	+	yes

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages 2022				EAR Metrics					
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWAP003	4	Clothes Dryer, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 with updated DEER2023 residential interactive effects, removed <= 2 yrs NTG ID, added offerings for multifamily common area dryer. Measure package approved after minor comments on references, DEER category/sub-category mis-match, clarifications on assumptions, D1 test procedures, and text edits.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH019	4	Faucet Aerator, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water. Measure package approved after several minor comments on a missing cost reference, density equations, text edits, and clarifications on standard case code requirements	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWFS011	5	Fryer, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include updated NTG value for downstream delivery types and data collection requirements. Measure package approved after comments on labor cost values, and minor reference updates.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC002	3	Intermittent Pilot Light, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather files, add data collection requirements, clarify eligible products and program exclusion requirements, updated calculations to align with SWHC001. Measure package approved after minor text edits.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWHC048	3	Packaged Air Conditioner Heat Recovery, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather files and miscellaneous text edits. Measure package approved after minor text edits and comments on references.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWAP006	4	Dishwasher, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include new DEER2023 residential dishwasher measures, updated building HVAC to align with DEER, updated costs, updated water usage and embedded energy savings of water values, added data collection requirements. Measure package approved after very minor clarifying questions.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWFS018	4	Undercounter Dishwasher, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water, NTG updates, and updated cost data. Measure package approved after clarifying DI costs and references, minor text edits, and confirmation of data collection requirements.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH003	2	TSV with and without an Integrated Low-Flow Showerhead, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water and minor text edits. Measure package approved after minor text edits, adding clarity to tables and values, and reference comments.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	yes
SWWH023	2	Diverting Tub Spout with TSV, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water, various calculation updates, removal of HTR NTG and minor text edits. Measure package approved after minor text edits, adding clarity to tables and values, and reference comments.	1	yes	yes	+	+	yes
SWFS002	3	Door-Type Dishwasher, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include new tier 1 measure offerings, updated cost data, and embedded energy savings of water. Measure package approved after one minor reference update.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWFS013	2	Low-Flow Pre-Rinse Spray Valve	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water, updated cost data, and baseline updates to current code. Measure package approved after several comments including minor typos, incorrect baseline and code update, aligning measure package baseline updates to permutation file, reference updates, and cost data edits.	1	yes	-	yes	yes	yes

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages 2022				EAR Metrics					
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWRE001	2	Pool Cover, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water, updated calculator to include CZ2022 weather data, added downstream offering. Measure package approved after several clarifying comments on assumptions, eligibility, data collection requirements, and minor reference updates.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWAP005	2	Ozone Laundry, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water and updated NTG ratio. Measure package approved after several comments including minor typos and text edits, calculations and units edits, and questions about assumptions and eligibility requirements.	1	yes	yes	yes	+	yes
SWRE004	3	Pool Heater, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include updated CZ2022 weather data, updated state and federal code and standards, and various updates to permutation files. Measure package approved after minor text edit comments and comments about tiered efficiency impacts on cost data.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH012	3	Storage Water Heater, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2023 measure value updates, NTG updates for NR and AR offerings, and cost updates. Measure package approved after minor text edit and reference comments.	1	yes	yes	yes	+	yes
SWAP004	3	Clothes Washer, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include updates to DEER2023 EnergyPlus modeling and RASS2019 data, embedded energy savings of water, cost updates, removal of top-loading offering due to no qualifying units in the market. Measure package approved after minor formula unit corrections and correcting the DEER measure values.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC001	3	Wall Furnace, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data, NTG update, direct install delivery type added, and other minor permutation updates. Measure package approved after minor comments on baseline efficiency, and cost data reference.	1	yes	yes	yes	+	yes
SWWH002	3	Low-Flow Showerhead, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water and minor text edits. Measure package approved after several comments including, needing second baseline savings equation update, data requirements, and minor text edits.	1	yes	-	yes	yes	yes
SWWH013	3	Tankless Water Heater, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include updating offerings to DEER2023 water heater measure values, updated NTG for NR and AR offerings, and cost updates. Measure package approved after several minor text edits.	1	yes	yes	yes	+	yes
SWWH004	3	Laminar Flow Restrictor, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water. Measure package approved after minor text edits, clarifications, and reference files.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC047	3	Gas Fireplace, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather files, data collection requirements, updating calculations and updating cost data. Measure package approved after several comments clarifying references and minor text edits.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWRE003	2	Heater for Pool or Spa, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include additional Tier 2 offerings, CZ2022 weather files, and additional delivery types. Measure package approved after minor comments on references, a better representation of cost data analysis, and text edits.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWWH020	4	Low-Flow Showerhead, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water, new flow rate offerings, new measure application and delivery types. Measure package approved after comments on minor text edits, references, eligibility requirements, and exclusions.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages 2022				EAR Metrics					
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWFS005	3	Steamer, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water, updated calculations, and updated cost data. Measure package approved after minor assumptions and clarification comments.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWWH001	3	Faucet Aerator, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water. Measure package approved after minor comments on text edits, clarifications, and references.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC011	2	Furnace, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2023 furnace measure offerings, added building types, and added delivery types. Measure package approved after minor permutation errors, text edits, and clarifying comments on cost data and eligibility sections.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH033	2	Gas Heat Pump Water Heater, Multifamily	Measure package updates to adjust baseline efficiency due to Version 1 disposition. Other updates include cost updates and energy savings due to boiler code efficiency. Measure package approved after comments on references and data sources, clarifying questions on assumptions and calculation approaches, and minor text edits.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWFS003	2	Combination Oven, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include embedded energy savings of water, updated cost data, and updated eligibility requirements. Measure package approved after comments clarifying assumptions, minor reference comments, data collection requirements, and EnergyStar implications.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	+
SWWH007	5	Storage Water Heater, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2023 water heater measure offerings and cost updates. Measure package approved after minor text edits, reference updates, and clarifying questions.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH005	5	Boiler, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2023 measure offerings and cost updates. Measure package approved after several clarifying comments on assumptions and DEER measure offerings, eligible products, and data collection requirements.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	yes
SWWH010	2	Boiler, Multifamily	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2023 measure offerings, added new MAT and delivery types, added data collection requirements, and updated costs. Measure package approved after one minor comment.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWBE001	3	Greenhouse Heat Curtain	Measure package updates from E-5152 to update MAT to BW and added data collection requirements. Measure package approved after one minor comment on permutations.	1	+	+	yes	yes	yes
SWBE002	3	Greenhouse Infrared Film	Measure package updates from E-5152 to update MAT to BW and added data collection requirements. Measure package approved after one minor comment on permutations.	1	+	+	yes	yes	yes
SWWH006	7	Tankless Water Heater, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2023 measure offerings and cost updates. Measure package approved after comments on code references, data collection requirements, and clarifying comments on assumptions.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWWH005	6	Boiler, Commercial	Measure package updates from E-5221 to update NTG ratio. Measure package approved without comments.	1	+	+	yes	+	yes
SWWH017	4	Hot Water Pipe Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Measure package updates from E-5221 to update EUL and add data collection requirements. Measure package reviewed after clarifying code applicability and minor text edits.	1	+	yes	+	yes	yes
SWWH018	4	Hot Water Tank Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Measure package updates from E-5221 to update EUL and add data collection requirements. Measure package reviewed after clarifying code applicability and minor text edits.	1	+	yes	+	yes	yes

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages 2022				EAR Metrics					
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWBE006	2	Ceiling Insulation, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2024 measure offerings, CZ2022 weather data, updated NTG ID, updated MAT per E-5221, updated delivery types, and updated costs. Measure package approved after various text edits, clarifying NTG ID, typos, and adding a complete offerings list.	1	yes	-	yes	yes	yes
SWBE007	2	Wall Insulation, Residential	Measure package updates to from E-5152 to include DEER2024 measure offerings, CZ2022 weather data, updated NTG ID, updating costs, and updated MAT per E-5221. Measure package approved after edits on applicable building vintage in the eligibility section and cost analysis.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC031	3	Furnace, Residential	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2023 furnace measure offerings, CZ2022 weather data, and added data collection requirements. Measure package approved after minor text edits, clarifications on normalizing unit, and updating cost data comments.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	yes
SWHC004	4	Space Heating Boiler, Commercial & Multifamily	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2023 measure offering updates, updates to peak demand calculation, CZ2022 weather data, cost updates, OA reset control strategies for non-DEER measure offerings. Measure package approved after climate zone typo in permutations, cost data edits, and including the federal standard reference.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	yes
SWHC004	5	Space Heating Boiler, Commercial & Multifamily	Measure package updates from E-5221 to update NTG ratio. Measure package approved without comments.	1	+	yes	+	yes	yes
SWWH011	2	Central Storage Water Heater, Multifamily	Measure package updates from E-5152 to include DEER2023 measure offerings, updated various permutation-based fields, and updated costs. Measure package approved with no comments.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes
SWAP017	3	Oven, Gas, Residential	Measure package updates include additional wall oven offering, various permutation updates, updated NTG ID, and added data collection requirements. Measure package approved after clarifying interactive effects and a minor text edit.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes



## Measure Package Submission Status – All Measure Packages submitted in 2022

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status: EAR Team Comments
SWWH017	3	Hot Water Pipe Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWWH018	3	Hot Water Tank Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWWH026	2	Water Heater Pipe Wrap, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH033	1	Gas Heat Pump Water Heater, Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWWH034	1	Solar Thermal Water Heating System, Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWWH016	3	Domestic Hot Water Loop Temperature Controller, Multifamily & Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH015	3	Demand Control for Centralized Water Heater Recirculation Pump, Multifamily & Commercial	Interim approval.
SWAP003	4	Clothes Dryer, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH019	4	Faucet Aerator, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS011	5	Fryer, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC002	3	Intermittent Pilot Light, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC048	3	Packaged Air Conditioner Heat Recovery, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWAP006	4	Dishwasher, Residential	Interim approval.
SWFS018	4	Undercounter Dishwasher, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH003	2	TSV with and without an Integrated Low-Flow Showerhead, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH023	2	Diverting Tub Spout with TSV, Residential	Interim approval.
SWFS002	3	Door-Type Dishwasher, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS013	2	Low-Flow Pre-Rinse Spray Valve	Interim approval.
SWRE001	2	Pool Cover, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWAP005	2	Ozone Laundry, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWRE004	3	Pool Heater, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH012	3	Storage Water Heater, Residential	Interim approval.
SWAP004	3	Clothes Washer, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC001	3	Wall Furnace, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH002	3	Low-Flow Showerhead, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH013	3	Tankless Water Heater, Residential	Interim approval.

## Measure Package Submission Status – All Measure Packages submitted in 2022

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status: EAR Team Comments
SWWH004	3	Laminar Flow Restrictor, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC047	3	Gas Fireplace, Residential	Interim approval.
SWRE003	2	Heater for Pool or Spa, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH020	4	Low-Flow Showerhead, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS005	3	Steamer, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH001	3	Faucet Aerator, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC011	2	Furnace, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH033	2	Gas Heat Pump Water Heater, Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWFS003	2	Combination Oven, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH007	5	Storage Water Heater, Residential	Interim approval.
SWWH005	5	Boiler, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH010	2	Boiler, Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWBE001	3	Greenhouse Heat Curtain	Interim approval.
SWBE002	3	Greenhouse Infrared Film	Interim approval.
SWWH006	7	Tankless Water Heater, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH005	6	Boiler, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWWH017	4	Hot Water Pipe Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWWH018	4	Hot Water Tank Insulation, Nonresidential and Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWBE006	2	Ceiling Insulation, Residential	Interim approval.
SWBE007	2	Wall Insulation, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC031	3	Furnace, Residential	Interim approval.
SWHC004	4	Space Heating Boiler, Commercial & Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWHC004	5	Space Heating Boiler, Commercial & Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWWH011	2	Central Storage Water Heater, Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWAP017	3	Oven, Gas, Residential	Interim approval.
SWFS001	3	Convection Oven, Commercial	Detailed review in progress.
SWWH034	2	Solar Thermal Water Heating System, Commercial and Multifamily	Detailed review in progress.

## Measure Package Submission Status – All Measure Packages submitted in 2022

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status: EAR Team Comments
SWFS024	1	Hot Food Holding Bins, Electric, Commercial	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC054	1	Heat Recovery Ventilation, Residential	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC057	1	Space Heating Gas Absorption Heat Pump, Multifamily	Detailed review in progress.
SWFS003	3	Combination Oven, Commercial	Detailed review in progress.
SWFS026	1	Cooktop, Commercial	Detailed review in progress.
SWRE006	1	Solar Thermal Pool Heating, Commercial & Multifamily	Measure package plan reviewed.
SWHC058	1	Patio Heater, Residential and Commercial	Measure package plan reviewed.
SWFS025	1	Radiant Conveyor Toaster, Electric, Commercial	Measure package plan reviewed.
SWFS027	1	Soup Warmer, Electric	Measure package plan reviewed.
SWFS028	1	Steam Table, Electric, Commercial	Measure package plan reviewed.
SWFS029	1	Rotisserie, Gas, Commercial	Measure package plan reviewed.
SWHC001	4	Wall Furnace, Residential	Measure package plan reviewed.
SWFS012	2	Exhaust Hood Demand Control Ventilation, Commercial	Measure package plan reviewed.

Process Adder	EAR Metrics					
	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SCG continued to work collaboratively with stakeholders and support food service implementers for new measure packages even at the request of electric measure offerings.	1	No	No	No	+	No
SCG continued to work collaboratively with the CPUC to ensure the embedded energy savings of water values from measure packages are correctly applied in the eTRM and align with the CET fields	1	No	No	No	No	+

## Attachment D: 2022 Performance Annual Ratings

### Custom Scoring

2022 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	4.17	3.25	2.40	3.60	2.13	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	4.17	3.25	2.40	3.60	2.13	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	4.17	9.75	2.40	9.00	5.31	30.63

2021 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	4.14	4.46	2.20	3.00	2.50	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	4.14	4.46	2.20	3.00	2.50	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	4.14	13.39	2.20	7.50	6.25	33.48

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

## Measure Package Scoring

2022 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	SCG "-"	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	
	SCG "+"	20%	20%	20%	16%	6%	
	SCG "Yes"	80%	75%	80%	84%	94%	
	Dispositions Score %	60%	57%	60%	58%	53%	
	Dispositions Score	2.99	2.84	2.99	2.89	2.65	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCG "-"			0%	0%	0%	
	SCG "+"			0%	100%	100%	
	SCG "Yes"			0%	0%	0%	
	Process Score %	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.50	2.50	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	2.99	2.84	2.99	5.00	5.00	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.99	8.53	2.99	12.50	12.50	39.51

2021 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Workproduct Review Score	SCG "-"	0%	15%	0%	0%	0%	
	SCG "+"	0%	0%	23%	19%	23%	
	SCG "Yes"	100%	85%	77%	81%	77%	
	Dispositions Score %	50%	42%	62%	60%	62%	
	Dispositions Score	2.50	2.12	3.08	2.98	3.08	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCG "-"			0%	0%	0%	
	SCG "+"			100%	100%	100%	
	SCG "Yes"			0%	0%	0%	
	Process Score %	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	0.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	2.50	2.12	5.00	5.00	5.00	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.50	6.35	5.00	12.50	12.50	38.85

### Explanations of scoring tables row entries

1. The row labeled with *IOU* "-" lists the percent of Measure Package reviews undertaken where the CPUC staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission did not meet minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
2. The row labeled with *IOU* "+" lists the percent of Measure Package reviews undertaken where the CPUC staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission exceeded minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
3. The rows labeled with *IOU* "Yes" lists the percent of Measure Package reviews undertaken where the CPUC staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission exceeded met minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
4. The "Dispositions Score %" row (and "Process Increase Score" for Measure Packages) indicates how the combination of the three rows of scores (+, -, and yes) sum into a total points multiplier for each metric. Each row contributes to the total based on the row count over the total count for all three rows.
5. The "Disposition Score" (and "Process Increase Score" for Measure Packages) row converts the percent score into a numeric value of up to five by directly applying the percent to a value of 5.
6. The custom row labeled with "*Technical & Policy QC Increase*" lists CPUC staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU performance in putting into place quality assurance and/or quality control methods, documents and/or training for staff and contractors related to this metric area that are expected to improve the ability of review personnel to identify

and cure issues going forward on projects started during 2016 but not yet seen in the custom review activity.

7. The custom row labeled with “*Implementation Increase*” lists CPUC staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU performance in putting into place new or changed program rules, eligibility criteria, incentive structures, application and implementation contract processes and procedures in 2016 related to this metric area that are expected to improve performance going forward on projects started but not yet seen in the custom review activity.
8. The Measure Package rows labeled with “*Review Process Score Enhancements*” lists CPUC staff scoring for each metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU performance in putting into place quality assurance and/or quality control methods, documents and/or training for staff and contractors that are expected to improve the ability of review personnel to identify and cure issues going forward on Measure Packages. This score is weighted as an increase to the disposition score based on the fractional weight listed in the “Process Increase Weight” row.
9. The “Final Metric Score” row indicates the total score for each metric as a sum of the Direct Work product Review Score plus the Review Process Score Enhancements (either as a simple sum for custom or a weighted value sum for Measure Packages) to provide a final metric score with the final score constrained between a maximum score of 5 and a minimum score of 1.
10. The “Metric Points” row provides the point value derived from the Final Metric Score row. If the maximum point value associated with a metric is greater than 5 then the score is multiplied by the max point value divided by 5 to obtain the metric point value related to the final score.