

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



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

To: Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)

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

Cc: R.13-11-005 Service Lists

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

Table of Contents

I.	Summary of 2022 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages.....	2
II.	CPUC Staff Findings 2022 Activities	3
	A. Custom Projects Review Overview.....	3
	B. Measure Packages Review Overview	4
III.	Discussion	5
	A. Custom Projects Performance Review.....	5
	B. Measure Packages Performance Review.....	9
IV.	The Scoring Methodology.....	11
	A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology.....	13
	B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology	13
	C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology	13
	D. Custom Metric 3, 4, and 5 Scoring Methodology	14
	E. Score Enhancement Methodology.....	14
	Attachment A: Final EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points)	17
	Attachment B Custom Project Scores and Feedback.....	19
	Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback.....	22
	Attachment D: 2022 Performance Annual Ratings	27

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 awards¹. 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 PG&E’s 2022 EAR performance score of 74.6974.39/100 for Measure Packages² and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. PG&E’s 2022 total points is a 2.912.64 point increase from its 2021 total points of 71.78. Scores for 2021 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

Table 1: PG&E 2022 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

PG&E 2022 EAR Performance Scores and Points		Measure Packages				Custom			
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	3.38 <u>3.44</u>	10%	3.38	5	4.50 <u>4.20</u>	10%	4.50 <u>4.20</u>	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	5.00	30%	15.00	15	3.52	30%	10.57	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	2.50	25%	6.25	12.5	4.49	25%	11.24	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	2.50	25%	6.25	12.5	3.00	25%	7.50	12.5
Total				35.88	50			38.51 <u>38.81</u>	50

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

² A Measure Package documents the data, methodologies, and rationale used to develop values for deemed measures. A Measure Package is prepared and submitted by program administrators and approved by the CPUC.

Table 2: PG&E 2021 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

PG&E 2021 EAR Performance Scores and Points		Measure Packages				Custom			
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	1.92	10%	1.92	5	4.87	10%	4.87	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	4.81	30%	14.42	15	3.98	30%	11.94	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	4.00	10%	4.00	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	2.50	25%	6.25	12.5	3.60	25%	9.00	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	2.50	25%	6.25	12.5	3.25	25%	8.13	12.5
Total				33.84	50			37.94	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 [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 50 scored dispositions.³

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points resulted in PG&E’s custom project score increasing by ~~0.87~~~~0.57~~ points from its 2021 scores (37.94 in 2021 vs. ~~38.81~~~~38.51~~ in 2022) as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above. While certain aspects of project submission have improved, PG&E must continue to work to improve its overall performance.

1. Summary of 2022 Achievements

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

- **Improvements in Documentation Submission Timeline.** In 2022, PG&E continued to submit most projects (~~88~~ percent) on time or earlier than required by Senate Bill (SB) 1131. Furthermore, 60 percent of their submissions were submitted five or more days earlier than required, signaling that PG&E is continuing to improve its document submission processes to meet timeline requirements.
- **Consistent collaboration** through active participation in statewide initiatives and subgroups, and proactively introducing topics to CPUC staff on bi-weekly calls.

³ 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.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

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

- **Issues in Program Influence Documentation.** The proportion of issues regarding program influence remains high with this sole issue comprising 6 percent of all actions noted in 2022. PG&E continues to experience issues related to Program Influence and needs to work on providing sufficient documentation in the future.
- **Issues in Process, Policy, and Program Rules.** In 2021 there were 49 issues related to Process, Policy, and Program rules which comprised 40 percent of all issues noted. In 2022, this problem area remains high, with 59 issues noted comprising 34 percent of all issues noted. Specifically, PGE has struggled with correct EUL/RUL selection and has not instituted a system whereby previous CPUC guidance is considered.

B. Measure Packages Review Overview

PG&E's Measure Packages scores have increased compared to last year by 2.04 points (from 33.84 in 2021 to 35.88 in 2022) as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above.

1. Summary of 2022 Achievements

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

- PG&E has demonstrated initiative in developing new measure packages in 2022, which are still in the measure package development phase. In addition, they lead the annual effort to update the statewide Measure Package Rulebook.
- PG&E has continued to show enhanced internal QC processes and CPUC staff has noticed less errors with new submissions. Additionally, the CPUC and PG&E collaborated to optimize comment and review procedures through the eTRM platform.
- PG&E has shown an increased level of collaboration with the CPUC in 2022 with eTRM messages, email messages, and ad-hoc phone calls to discuss specific measure package comments in more detail.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

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

- PG&E has been slow to submit or resubmit Measure Packages after receiving comments from the CPUC, specifically for VFD on Well Pumps and Booster Pump measure packages. These two measure packages required a resubmittal to bring in calculations and savings values from the prior evaluation. PG&E initially proposed a timeline that would not fit within the approval schedule for Resolution E-5221. However, PG&E worked collaboratively with CPUC reviewers to identify a path forward to resolve the measure package revision within the confines of the Resolution schedule. CPUC staff would

encourage PG&E to continue to adhere to submittal schedules and communicate delays in schedule immediately.

- PG&E can continue to improve readability and typos in measure package submittals. There were many small typos and comments in measure packages approved by Resolution E-5221 that delayed 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, 50 PG&E projects received dispositions. The comments below are organized by the five metric areas of scoring prescribed in D.16-08-019 with metric scores shown prior to any enhancement points. A summary table of all issued dispositions, along with the dispositions individual score and feedback from the reviewer, is included in [Attachment B](#). [Attachment D](#) contains an embedded custom scores workbook that includes a tab with details on the individual project level disposition scores and feedback from the project reviewer.

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

Table 3: PG&E 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%	4.50 4.20	4.50 4.20	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	10.57	10.57	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	4.50	5
4	PA’s Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	11.24	9.99	12.5
5	PA’s Responsiveness	25%	7.50	7.50	12.5
Total			38.81 38.51	37.06 36.76	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2022, PG&E received a custom disposition score of ~~4.50~~4.20 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 50 PG&E custom project reviews completed in 2022. Out of these 50 projects reviewed, 41 projects (~~82~~ percent) were submitted on time or early while ~~69~~ projects (~~128~~ percent) were submitted

late. Additionally, 30 of the projects (60 percent) were submitted five days or earlier than required per the timeline mandated in Senate Bill 1131 and Section 381.2 of the Public Utilities Code⁴. Though PG&E continues to experience issues with late submissions most project documentation is submitted on time or earlier than required, demonstrating that PG&E continues to meet expectations with regards to timeliness.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2022, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 10.57 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This disposition score was based on the completeness of the 50 PG&E custom project reviews. Of these 50 dispositions issued, 1 project (2 percent) was approved without exception, 10 projects (20 percent) were marked Advisory, and 2 projects (4 percent) were marked Prospective.⁵ Of the remaining projects, 6 projects (12 percent) were rejected, and the remaining 31 projects (62 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies which resulted in a loss of points under this metric. Though PG&E improved with no deficiencies in the fuel substitution test

Table 4 below summarizes the 174 action items identified across the 50 scored dispositions⁶ 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	27	3	16%
	Calculation method	11	3	6%
	Calculation tool	3	2	2%
	M&V plan	7	2	4%
	Subtotals	48	10	28%
Process, Policy, Program Rules	Baseline	9	7	5%
	CPUC Policy	6	4	3%
	Did not follow previous CPUC guidance	10	0	6%
	Eligibility	3	2	2%
	ER preponderance of evidence	5	5	3%
	EUL/RUL	10	0	6%
	Incentive calculation	3	3	2%

⁴ “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”.

⁵ 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.

⁶ This table includes action items issued on 10 Advisory and 2 Prospective dispositions.

Issue Area	Action Categories	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Summary of CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Percent of Total Actions
	Measure cost	6	5	3%
	Measure type	4	1	2%
	PA program rules	2	3	1%
	Self generation	1	0	1%
	Subtotals	59	30	34%
Documentation Issues	Continue Document Upload	23	3	13%
	Missing required information	18	5	10%
	Project scope unclear	1	0	1%
	Subtotals	42	8	24%
Issues Related to Net Impacts	Program influence	11	8	6%
	Subtotals	11	8	6%
Other Issues	Other 1 - Incentive amount incorrect in bi-monthly upload	3	3	2%
	Other 2 - Update savings and incentives for next quarterly submission	1	1	1%
	Other 3 - Building type is incorrect	2	0	1%
	Other 4 - Project address is incorrect	2	5	1%
	Other 5 - Measure description is incorrect	0	2	0%
	Other 6 - Non IOU fuel analysis needs improvement	0	2	0%
	Other 7 - ISOP program does not allow CPR before project implementation	0	1	0%
	Other 8 - Advisory review of SEM Cycle 1	2	1	1%
	Other 9 - Electric penalty not included in bimonthly upload	0	1	0%
	Other 10 - Some documentation difficult to read	0	2	0%
	Other 11 - R^2 value below guidance	1	2	1%
	Other 13 - Bi-Monthly Savings	3	4	2%
	Subtotals	14	24	8%
Grand Total		174	80	100%

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

provided below.

- **Incorrect Measure EUL/RUL** was found in 9 out of the 50 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a significant reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 749, 755, 757, 770, 771, 772, 798, 801, 813.
- **Incomplete Documentation of Program Influence** was found in 11 out of the 50 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a significant reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 680, 682, 724, 732, 742, 743, 744, 771, 772, 764, 528_a.
- **Incorrect Analysis or Calculation** was found in 14 out of the 50 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a significant reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 680, 682, 770, 771, 772, 749, 750, 765, 769, 767, 777, 793, 797, 801.
- **Incomplete or Missing Documentation** was found in 15 out of the 50 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a significant reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 680, 682, 735, 770, 771, 772, 773, 765, 740, 749, 751, 752, 763, 765, 801.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2022, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 4.5 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. At the portfolio level, CPUC staff determined that PG&E made efforts to bring measures, projects, and studies forward for discussion prior to CPUC staff review. In bi-weekly calls, PG&E brought forward topics regarding industry standard practice (ISP) for horticultural lighting, on bill financing (OBF) treatment under E-5115, incremental measure costs for residential new construction (RNC), two EOs for Residential New Construction (RNC) programs, Review Protocol (RP2.0) pilot project tracker and scoring⁷ and Lessons Learned, updates to the modified lighting calculator (MLC), and sharing early opinion (EO) responses with other PAs.

Like last year, PG&E staff took an active and engaged role in statewide collaboration efforts and took the lead on the Statewide Small Lighting EO. They also remained active in subgroup calls and as such CPUC staff determined that PG&E exceeded the minimum expectations under this metric and applaud their efforts to proactively collaborate.

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

In 2022, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 9.99 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Project and measure level disposition performance results reviewed under Metric 2 were used as a proxy for the level of QA/QC performed by the PA. Of the 50 projects reviewed, 1 project (2 percent) proceeded without exception, while 31 projects (62 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted in the review. CPUC staff found 6 projects (12 percent) were also rejected. Most

⁷ Review Protocol (RP 2.0) is a tool that PG&E developed to pilot assessing a project free-ridership score at the project review stage.

projects either being rejected or proceeding with exceptions noted resulted in lower-than-expected performance with regards to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review.

CPUC staff found that PG&E's QC procedures were well laid out, and that procedures for new third-party programs were being put in place. However, plans for quality assurance (QA) and continuous improvement were not well documented. Overall CPUC staff believes PG&E made efforts to meet CPUC staff's expectations for this metric but compared with 2021 improvement is still needed with QA/QC processes to reduce the number of rejections from submitted project documentation and to better document quality assurance initiatives.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2022, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 7.50 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. When reviewed at the portfolio level, CPUC staff assessed the time series of rejections and exceptions, the alignment of program policy and procedures with the number of actual rejections and exceptions based on eligibility and attribution, and adaptation to rule changes over time. CPUC staff found that projects reviewed between July 2022 through December 2022 exhibited a slight downward trend in terms of project performance over time (i.e. project submissions performed more poorly over the course of the 2022 review period). PG&E continues to experience issues related to Program Policy, as 34 percent of all issues identified in 2022 were related to this category, which is a slightly smaller percentage from 2021. Most notable were 10 actions associated with not following previous CPUC guidance. Additionally, CPUC Staff noted 11 actions related to Program Influence issues which was up from last year. PG&E failed to effectively implement their on-bill financing (OBF) screening process which resulted in ineligible projects having to come through CPR without the needed program influence documentation. These combined actions demonstrate lower-than-expected compliance with CPUC policies and as such CPUC staff determined that PG&E complied with the minimum elements of this metric, but that improvement is warranted.

B. Measure Packages Performance Review

PG&E submitted 17 Measure Packages in 2022 and all 17 were reviewed and disposed. This end of year memo provides Measure Package specific feedback on the 17 reviewed and disposed measure packages in 2022.

The comments below are organized by the five scoring metric areas created in D.16-08-019.⁸ The narrative includes observations common to multiple Measure Packages and feedback related to the Measure Package development process. Specific Measure Package feedback is provided in [Attachment C](#) at the end of this document. The Measure Package Detailed Review Table provides feedback on specific Measure Packages. The Measure Package Submissions Table lists all Measure Packages submitted by PG&E or PG&E Measure Packages that were disposed during the review period. Measure Packages were selected for feedback from those that were submitted by PG&E and were either disposed or reached approval status during the review period. CPUC staff acknowledges that Measure Package development may have been supported by multiple PAs; however, at this time, there is no mechanism for apportioning feedback among PAs. Therefore,

⁸ See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.

feedback is only provided for the submitting PA, with the assumption that they are the lead PA. The scoring rubric for Measure Packages is defined as follows:

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

The assigned percentage scores were averaged across all the reviewed items.

Table 5 below presents the Measure Package disposition points given to PG&E for each metric both with and without the addition of any Enhancement Points.

Table 5: PG&E 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%	3.38	3.38	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	15.00	7.94	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	3.24	5
4	PA’s Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	6.25	6.25	12.5
5	PA’s Responsiveness	25%	6.25	6.25	12.5
Total			35.88	27.06	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2022, PG&E received a Measure Package disposition score of 3.38 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. PG&E has improved their response time to resubmit Measure Packages after receiving comments from the Measure Package review team, specifically for the Medium-Temperature Case Doors, Compressor Retrofit, Multiplex, and Ultra-Low Temperature Freezer. In addition, these three Measure Packages were some of the first eTRM submittals for Resolution E-5152 to updates. Early Measure Package submittals and quick resubmittals help the Ex-Ante Team continue moving measure packages forward towards approval, particularly during the Resolution update period. Since the mid-year, PG&E has improved in timeliness and effectively communicated any delivery changes in the monthly Measure Package submission schedule.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2022, PG&E received a Measure Package disposition score of 7.94 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. PG&E’s content, completeness, and quality of Measure Packages has generally met standards and has improved from the mid-year memo.

The Water Pump Upgrade Measure Package submission required several resubmittals until approval. In addition, the CPUC received resubmittals with unexpected changes that were not discussed on the scheduled calls to review the comments on this Measure Package. This led to the Water Pump

Upgrade Measure Package to be in the revision process for over a year. CPUC comments coming back with different changes than expected after several communications. However, there are other Measure Packages that did not require any review comments or one minor clarification, including Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case with Doors, Medium-Temperature Case Doors, and the Ice Machine measure packages. The remaining Measure Packages were triggered by updates in Resolution E-5152 and did not require significant technical revisions and met expectations for content.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2022, PG&E received a Measure Package disposition score of 3.24 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Measure Packages met or exceeded the minimum expectations of collaboration which was required to ensure each Measure Package met all PAs' needs.

PG&E proactively reached out to CPUC during the development of two Measure Packages: VFD on Well Pump, <= 300 hp and Enhanced Variable Frequency Drive on Irrigation Pump to address substantial Ex Ante comments in a timely manner to reach approval by the Resolution deadline, which required several emails and discussions. PG&E reached out to the CPUC staff during the early phase of eTRM Measure Package comments to clarify comments and responses on the Floating head Pressure Controls, Multiplex and Low-Temperature Coffin to Reach-In Display Case Conversion Measure Packages.

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

In 2022, PG&E received a Measure Package disposition score of 6.25 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. PG&E Measure Packages have generally improved in quality control in 2022. Many Measure Packages had several minor typos and small corrections that should have been caught before CPUC submittal. While there were proactive and swift corrections made on the VFD on Well Pump, <= 300 hp and Enhanced Variable Frequency Drive on Irrigation Pump Measure Packages, the initial submittals did not include savings updates from the latest evaluation.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2022, PG&E received a Measure Package disposition score of 6.25 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This metric reflects PG&E's leadership in the continuous improvement of programs through the introduction of new Measure Packages, proactively identifying Measure Packages that have dated elements, and nominating irrelevant Measure Packages for sunseting. PG&E has been actively engaged in developing new measures, which will come to fruition in 2023.

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 PA total claims for custom and deemed activities, respectively.

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

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

As with the 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.⁹ If a metric was determined to be not applicable to a given disposition, the metric was identified as not applicable (“N/A”) and the metric was assigned a score equal to the average 1 to 5 score from the remaining applicable metrics. Assigning this average score to any “N/A” metrics essentially normalized the final score so that a disposition neither benefitted nor was penalized as a result of a non-applicable metric.

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

⁹An 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”).

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.

B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology

This metric is related to the timeliness of submittals and a maximum of 5 points is allocated to this metric based on the PA’s responsiveness to requests and follow-up documentation required to complete the review. Scoring for this metric occurs at the individual project review stage.

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

C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology

This metric is related to content and completeness of submittals and a maximum of 15 points is allocated to this metric. Scoring occurs on each custom project during the individual project review

stage. On a percentage basis Metric 2 is the single greatest determinant of the overall EAR score. Scoring for Metric 2 is achieved through numerous areas throughout the custom project review workbook. PA's begin with a full score of 5 for each custom project in the review workbook with each noted deficiency reducing the points accordingly. Deficiencies are not weighted equally, with significant issues such as failure of the fuel substitution test or inadequate documentation of program influence receiving a heavier weighting compared to tests such as incorrect site location information. The scores from all custom projects are then averaged together to arrive at an average disposition score for Metric 2.

D. Custom Metric 3, 4, and 5 Scoring Methodology

Whereas Metrics 1 and 2 are assessed at the project level, Metrics 3 and 5 are assessed at the portfolio level for each PA. As such, no individual custom project receives a unique score for these metrics. Additionally, unlike Metrics 1 and 2 which rely on deductions under each metric, scores for Metrics 3 and 5 are awarded based on the PA's performance as it relates to the components of each metric.

For Metric 3, points are awarded when the PA proactively brought high impact or unique projects forward to CPUC staff prior to developing a study or project. The final score for Metric 3 is therefore representative of the average performance of custom projects across the portfolio of projects.

Scoring for Metric 4 relies upon disposition results and findings identified under Metric 2 as well as the overall depth and correctness of the technical review team. The PA's performance on dispositions assists in serving as a proxy for quality control under Metric 4. In addition, several project specific elements such as whether changing market practices and updates to DEER were considered, or if a project demonstrated evidence of review activities are used to assess the scoring for this metric. Like Metric 3, a final score is representative of the average performance of custom projects across the portfolio of projects.

With Metric 5, a review of process enhancement tools and techniques, tracking improved disposition performance over time, and highlights provided throughout the year by the PA assist in determining an average score related to process and programmatic improvements. Similar to Metrics 3 and 4, a final score is representative of the average performance of custom projects across the portfolio of projects.

E. Score Enhancement Methodology

The above process resulted in custom project and Measure Package work product review scores. Next, PA-specific "Review Process Score Enhancements" were developed for each applicable metric based on observed policy and technical reviews or program implementation processes/procedures developed and implemented in 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 added “Enhancement” points Collaboration for Metric 3 and Due Diligence for Metric 4 to reflect PG&E staff’s positive efforts in these metric areas as discussed earlier. This included:

- Tips and Lessons Learned (TLLs) from the RP2 implementation, PG&E proactively engaged with 3P program and project developers to enhance their program level improvement and compliance.
- Active participation in the NMEC working group and small lighting subgroup.

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

To produce the final Measure Package scores, the metric scores for the two Measure Package contributing areas were added together, using a 50 percent weight for the process issues score. The 50 percent weight given to the process review has the effect of being a “score enhancement” or increase to the direct review score. Furthermore, within each contributing area (direct and process review areas), CPUC staff also assigned weights for individual items as a way to reflect greater importance of different individual review items. The separate process scoring provides an avenue for assessing overall QA/QC processes and procedures put into place by PG&E.¹⁰

[Attachment D](#) contains custom and Measure Package summary tables showing the components and total scores and points for each metric in each of the two component areas of scoring described above.

Questions or comments about the feedback or final scores should be directed to Rashid Mir (rashid.mir@cpuc.ca.gov) or Peter Biermayer (peter.biermayer@cpuc.ca.gov). Note that

¹⁰ 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.”

pursuant to D.13-09-023, CPUC staff will schedule a meeting with PG&E staff to discuss this memorandum and its final scores by April 30, 2022.

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
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	5	10%	3.38	3.38	5	10%	4.50 4.20	4.50 4.20
	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.								
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	15	30%	2.65	7.94	15	30%	3.52	10.57
	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.								
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5	10%	3.24	3.24	5	10%	4.50	4.50
	PA efforts to bring either measures, projects, studies, questions, and/or savings calculation methods and tools to CPUC staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. CPUC staff expects collaboration among the PAs to develop common or coordinated submissions and for the PAs to undertake joint or coordinated planning activities and study work. The PAs are expected to engage with CPUC staff in early discussions on unique or high profile, high impact measures or projects before program or customer commitments are made. The PAs are expected to engage with CPUC staff on planning and execution of studies that support proposed offerings, tools, or determination of proposed baselines or other programmatic assumption that can impact ex ante values to be utilized.								
4	Program Administrator's Due Diligence and Quality Assurance/Quality Control Effectiveness	12.5	25%	2.50	6.25	12.5	25%	3.99	9.99

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.								
5	Program Administrator's Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements	12.5	25%	2.50	6.25	12.5	25%	3.00	7.50
	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.								
Total		50	100%		27.06	50	100%		36.76 37.06

Attachment B Custom Project Scores and Feedback

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

Table 3 2016 Adopted Performance Metrics

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted Performance Metrics	Maximum Points	Percent of Total Points
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 CPUC 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 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.	5.0	10%
Metric 4	Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness CPUC staff expects the utility to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for its programs and measures. The depth and correctness of the utility's technical review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.	12.5	25%
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. 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.	12.5	25%

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	Percent of Total Points	Total Scored Points	# Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level ¹¹)
Metric 1	Timeliness and Timing of Submittals Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5	10%	4.250	50	PG&E generally complied with SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation before the 15 business days required. Staff found 69 projects (128 percent) to be late with four projects found to be over 20 days late. The remaining 441 projects (882 percent) were submitted on time or earlier, with 30 projects (60 percent) being submitted by 5 days or more. Staff noted that this was an increase in timeliness compared to last year when 21 percent of projects were submitted late and 51 percent of projects were submitted by 5 days or more.
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 CPUC Staff disposition guidance.	15	30%	10.57	50	In 2022, 47 projects out of the 50 receiving a disposition (94 percent) had exceptions noted during custom project review for a total of 174 exceptions. Those projects had significant deficiencies such as missing or incorrect savings calculations, incorrect baseline values, lack of clarity in measure descriptions, incomplete documentation of program influence, and incorrect cost calculations, and incorrect measure life. As such, CPUC staff had noted that PG&E is only slightly exceeding the minimum expectation for completeness and quality of submittals.
Metric 3	Proactive Initiation of Collaboration Utility's efforts to bring either measures, questions, and/or savings calculation tools to CPUC staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. CPUC staff expects collaboration among the utilities and for the program administrators to engage with CPUC staff in early discussions on high profile, high impact measures well before customer commitments are made.	5	10%	5.00	50	CPUC Staff found that PG&E made significant efforts to bring measures, projects, or studies forward for discussion prior to review. PG&E was highly active bringing seven Early Opinion requests before CPUC for review and were engaged on bi-weekly calls and took active part in the MLC updates and feedback. Though the new RNC workflow Early Opinion was withdrawn, PG&E was collaborative with the implementer and coordinated effectively with CPUC.
Metric 4	Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness CPUC Staff expects the utility to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for its programs and measures. The depth and	12.5	25%	11.24	50	CPUC staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 50 projects reviewed, 1 project (2 percent) proceeded without exception, while 31 projects (62 percent) were allowed to proceed

¹¹ The Metric 1, 2 and 4 scores for each of the individual custom projects are included in the final custom workbook which is embedded in Attachment D.

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	Percent of Total Points	Total Scored Points	# Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level ¹¹)
	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.					with exceptions as noted in the review. CPUC staff found 6 projects (12 percent) were also rejected. The significant majority of projects either being rejected or proceeding with exceptions noted resulted in lower than expected performance with regards to effective QC of projects prior to submitting for review.
Metric 5	<p>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. 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>	12.5	25%	7.50	50	PG&E Projects reviewed from July 2022 through December 2022 exhibited a slight downward trend in terms of project performance over time (i.e. project submissions performed more poorly over the course of the 2022 review period). PG&E continues to experience issues related to Program Policy, as 34 percent of all issues identified in 2022 were related to this category, which is a slightly smaller percentage from 2021. Most notable were 10 actions associated with not following previous CPUC guidance. Additionally, CPUC Staff noted 11 actions related to Program Influence issues which was up from last year. PG&E failed to effectively implement their on-bill financing (OBF) screening process which resulted in ineligible projects having to come through CPR without the needed program influence documentation. These combined actions demonstrate lower-than-expected compliance with CPUC policies and as such CPUC staff determined that PG&E complied with the minimum elements of this metric but that improvement is warranted.

Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback

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

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

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages						EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5	
SWCR012	2	Compressor Retrofit, Multiplex	Update due to E-5152 using CZ2022 weather data, updated costs and added DI delivery channel. Two minor comments on the permutation building type for downstream offerings and clarifying the temperature delta for the measure case that were quickly resolved and approved.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWCR007	3	Floating Head Pressure Controls, Multiplex	Update due to E-5152 using CZ2022 weather data, updated costs and removal of Com building type. Two minor comments on EUL/RUL typo and updating EE Policy Manual to Version 6. Comments were quickly resolved and approved.	1	+	yes	+	yes	yes	
SWCR019	2	Low-Temperature Coffin To Reach-In Display Case Conversion	Update due to E-5152 using CZ2022 weather data, updated costs and added DI delivery channel. Several minor comments on text clarifications, grammatical updates, equation typo and updating EE Policy Manual to Version 6. Comments were quickly resolved and approved.	1	+	yes	+	yes	yes	
SWCR014	3	Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data updates, updated costs, and various permutation updates. Measure package approved after two minor clarifying comments.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWCR021	2	Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case With Doors	Update due to E-5152 using CZ2022 weather data, updated costs and added DI delivery channel. Two minor comments on data collection requirements and the permutation file for residential building types. Comments were quickly resolved and approved.	1	+	+	yes	yes	yes	

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages						EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5	
SWCR015	2	Medium-Temperature Case Doors	Update due to E-5152 using CZ2022 weather data, updated costs and added DI delivery channel. No comments from CPUC. Measure package was approved as written.	1	+	+	yes	yes	yes	
SWCR017	3	Ultra-Low Temperature Freezer	Update due to E-5152 using CZ2022 weather data and updated costs. Several minor comments addressing a formula correction, assumption clarifications, and a permutation mismatch of use-and-sub-category. All comments were quickly resolved and approved.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	yes	
SWWP004	2	Water Pump Upgrade	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include updated cost data, added data collection requirements, updated baseline pump PEI values, new measure offerings, and updated calculations. Measure package approved after minor text edits, confirming eligibility requirements, and many meetings and resubmissions about delta PEI values and hours of use data support.	1	yes	-	yes	yes	yes	
SWFS006	2	Ice Machine, Commercial	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include embedded water energy savings and measure case descriptions. Measure package approved after one minor comment about the effective year for water energy nexus savings.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes	
SWHC006	2	Demand Control Ventilation for Single Zone HVAC	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include updated costs, updated peak demand calculations, CZ2022 weather data updates, and clarification of Title 24 standards. Measure package approved after a few minor text edits and permutation file comments.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWHC023	3	Enhanced Ventilation for Packaged HVAC	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include peak demand calculation updates, updated energy savings calculations with CZ2022 weather data, and updated costs. Measure package approved after several minor typos and clarifying comments on references.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWCR018	3	Reach-In Refrigerator or Freezer, Commercial	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include updated CZ2022 weather data, updated savings with EnergyStar v5.0 specs, and updated costs. Measure package approved after two minor text edits.	1	yes	+	yes	yes	yes	
SWCR020	2	Medium-Temperature Open Display Case Retrofit	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include updated cost data and updated calculations. Measure package approved after calculations and text edits on the suction temperature and compression factor and text edits in the eligibility section.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWHC018	3	VSD for HVAC Fan Controls, Commercial	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include updated peak demand calculations, CZ2022 weather data updates, updated costs, updated code language, and updated	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages						EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5	
			first baseline EUL value. Measure package approved after confirming eligibility requirements, various text edits, and confirmation of the EUL value.							
SWPR006	2	VSD for Ventilation Fan, Agricultural	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include CZ2022 weather data updates, updated costs, and added data collection requirements. Measure package approved after small typo edits and clarifying assumptions and calculations.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
SWWP002	3	Variable Frequency Drive On Irrigation Pump, <= 300 hp	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include added data collection requirements, updated EUL, updated NTG ID, and updated GSIA value. Measure package approved after clarifying EUL, requesting savings updates from latest evaluation, and a few text edits.	1	yes	-	+	yes	yes	
SWWP005	3	Enhanced Variable Frequency Drive on Irrigation Pump	Measure package revision with E-5152 to include added data collection requirements, updated EUL, updated NTG ID, and updated GSIA value. Measure package approved after clarifying EUL, requesting savings updates from latest evaluation, and a few text edits.	1	yes	-	+	yes	yes	

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

MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments
SWCR012	2	Compressor Retrofit, Multiplex	Interim approval.
SWCR007	3	Floating Head Pressure Controls, Multiplex	Interim approval.
SWCR019	2	Low-Temperature Coffin To Reach-In Display Case Conversion	Interim approval.
SWCR014	3	Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case	Interim approval.
SWCR021	2	Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case With Doors	Interim approval.
SWCR015	2	Medium-Temperature Case Doors	Interim approval.
SWCR017	3	Ultra-Low Temperature Freezer	Interim approval.
SWWP004	2	Water Pump Upgrade	Interim approval.
SWFS006	2	Ice Machine, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWHC006	2	Demand Control Ventilation for Single Zone HVAC	Interim approval.
SWHC023	3	Enhanced Ventilation for Packaged HVAC	Interim approval.
SWCR018	3	Reach-In Refrigerator or Freezer, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWCR020	2	Medium-Temperature Open Display Case Retrofit	Interim approval.
SWHC018	3	VSD for HVAC Fan Controls, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWPR006	2	VSD for Ventilation Fan, Agricultural	Interim approval.
SWWP002	3	Variable Frequency Drive On Irrigation Pump, <= 300 hp	Interim approval.
SWWP005	3	Enhanced Variable Frequency Drive on Irrigation Pump	Interim approval.
SWWB002	2	Universal Audit Tool	Measure package plan reviewed. Measure package in development.
SWWB008	1	All-Electric Homes, Residential, New Construction	Measure package plan reviewed. Measure package in development.

Process Adder	EAR Metrics					
	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
PG&E collaborated with the CPUC and led the Statewide Rulebook update.	1	No	No	+	No	No
PG&E collaborated with CPUC and IOUs to lead the ISP study process with a particular focus on their agricultural VFD water pump measure packages	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)	4.250	3.52	4.50	3.99	3.00	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	4.250	3.52	5.00	4.49	3.00	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	4.250	10.57	5.00	11.24	7.50	38.581

2021 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	4.37	3.98	4.00	3.60	3.25	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	4.87	3.98	4.00	3.60	3.25	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	4.87	11.94	4.00	9.00	8.13	37.94

This [workbook](#) contains all of the PG&E Custom Scoring tables

Measure Package Scoring

2022 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5
Direct Work Product Review Score	PG&E "-"	0%	178%	0%	0%	0%
	PG&E "+"	35%	24%	29%	0%	0%
	PG&E "Yes"	65%	59%	71%	100%	100%
	Dispositions Score %	68%	56%	65%	50%	50%
	Dispositions Score	3.38	2.65	3.24	2.50	2.50
Review Process Score Enhancements	PG&E "-"		0%	0%		
	PG&E "+"		100%	100%		
	PG&E "Yes"		0%	0%		
	Process Score %	0%	100%	100%	0%	0%
	Process Increase Score	0.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	2.50	2.50	0.00	0.00
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	3.38	5.00	5.00	2.50	2.50
	Metric Points with Weighting	3.38	15.00	5.00	6.25	6.25
Total Points						35.88

2021 0 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5
Direct Work Product Review Score	PG&E "-"	23%	8%	0%	0%	0%
	PG&E "+"	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%
	PG&E "Yes"	77%	92%	92%	100%	100%
	Dispositions Score %	38%	46%	54%	50%	50%
	Dispositions Score	1.92	2.31	2.69	2.50	2.50
Review Process Score Enhancements	PG&E "-"		0%	0%		
	PG&E "+"		100%	100%		
	PG&E "Yes"		0%	0%		
	Process Score %	0%	100%	100%	0%	0%

20210 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	2.50	2.50	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	1.92	4.81	5.00	2.50	2.50	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	1.92	14.42	5.00	6.25	6.25	33.84

Explanations of scoring tables row entries

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

- The “Metric Points” row provides the point value derived from the Final Metric Score row. If the maximum point value associated with a metric is greater than 5 then the score is multiplied by the max point value divided by 5 to obtain the metric point value related to the final score.