

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: March 30, 2022

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: 2021 EX ANTE REVIEW (EAR) SCORING AND EVALUATION PERFORMANCE

Table of Contents

- I. Summary of 2021 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages 2
- II. CPUC Staff Findings 2021 Activities 3
 - A. Custom Projects Review Overview 3
 - B. Measure Packages Review Overview..... 4
- III. Discussion 5
 - A. Custom Projects Performance Review..... 5
 - B. Measure Packages Performance Review 10
- IV. The Scoring Methodology 12
 - A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology..... 13
 - B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology..... 14
 - C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology..... 14
 - D. Custom Metric 3, 4, and 5 Scoring Methodology 14
 - E. Score Enhancement Methodology 15
- Attachment A: Final EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points) 17
- Attachment B Custom Project Scores and Feedback 19
- Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback 22
- Attachment D: 2021 Performance Annual Ratings..... 26

I. Summary of 2021 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 2021 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 2021 EAR performance score of 71.78/100 for Measure Packages² and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. PG&E’s 2021 total points is a 9.20 point decrease from its 2020 total points of 80.98. Scores for 2020 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

Table 1: 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

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 2020 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

PG&E 2020 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	2.50	10%	2.50	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	3.90	30%	7.50	15	4.28	30%	12.85	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5.00	10%	5.00	5	4.20	10%	4.20	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	3.37	25%	10.80	12.5	4.00	25%	10.00	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	4.51	25%	12.50	12.5	4.25	25%	10.63	12.5
Total				38.30	50			42.68	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 2021 Activities

A. Custom Projects Review Overview

From the period beginning January 2021 to the end of December 2021, CPUC staff issued 63 scored dispositions.³

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points resulted in PG&E's custom project score decreasing by 4.74 points from its 2020 scores (42.68 in 2020 vs. 37.94 in 2021) 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 2021 Achievements

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

- **Improvements in Documentation Submission Timeline.** In 2021, PG&E continued to submit the majority of projects (56 percent) earlier than required by Senate Bill (SB) 1131. Furthermore, 51 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 2020. Some projects that were selected in 2021 had dispositions issued in 2022. The memo is for dispositions issued in 2021.

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 2021. 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 2020 there were 77 issues related to Process, Policy, and Program rules which comprised 39 percent of all issues noted. In 2021, this problem area remains high, with 49 issues noted comprising 40 percent of all issues noted. While PG&E has shown progress in Baseline Determination and EUL/RUL reporting compared to last year, more effort is needed to ensure issues such as following previous CPUC guidance are reduced.

B. Measure Packages Review Overview

PG&E's Measure Packages scores have decreased compared to last year by 4.46 points (from 38.30 in 2020 to 33.84 in 2021 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above).

1. Summary of 2021 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 a new Measure Package which was reviewed and approved for 2021 and for 2022 – Duct Optimization. In addition, they lead the annual effort to update the statewide Measure Package Rulebook.
- PG&E has instituted internal QC processes and CPUC staff has noticed less errors with new submissions and they have taken the lead of correcting errors to existing Measure Packages and resubmitting with minor changes, even when they are not the Measure Package lead.

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 Ultra-low temperature freezer and Residential Duct Seal. CPUC staff would encourage PG&E to adhere to submittal schedules and communicate delays in schedule immediately.
- PG&E must keep CPUC staff informed of all Measure Package development through Measure Package plans. Plans must include detailed schedules that are updated in a timely manner as the Measure Package development process evolves.

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”. CPUC staff acknowledges that prior to July of 2019, project applications were not always selected at random, rather selected based upon the type of projects that had past issues or projects where the CPUC expected to find deficiencies for various reasons. In 2020, projects were initially selected at random to adjust for this bias. However, due to the low numbers of projects submitted as ready for review, this became a challenge over the course of the year and CPUC staff had to adjust its selection based on customer incentive amounts, known past issues, measures not selected for review in the past six months, and new calculation methodologies. Projects were also selected to determine whether a utility has corrected issues from similar projects that CPUC staff identified in the past, such as Savings by Design (SBD) projects using the EnergyPro software. Projects using Normalized Metered Energy Consumption (NMEC) methods were starting to show up on the ready to review list and were selected for review to look for issues with this relatively new program delivery strategy.

From the period beginning January 2021 to the end of December 2021, 63 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%	4.87	4.37	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	11.94	11.94	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	4.00	4.00	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	9.00	9.00	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	8.13	8.13	12.5
Total			37.94	37.44	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2021, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 4.37 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 63 PG&E custom project reviews completed in 2021. Out of these 63 projects reviewed, 35 projects (56 percent) were submitted early while 13 projects (21 percent) were submitted late⁴. Additionally, 32 of the 63 projects receiving dispositions (51 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 Code⁵. PG&E continues to experience issues with late submissions though the majority of 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 2021, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 11.94 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 63 PG&E custom project reviews. Of these 63 dispositions issued, 7 projects (11 percent) were approved without exception, 11 projects (17 percent) were marked Advisory, and no projects were marked Prospective.⁶ However, 3 projects (5 percent) were rejected, and the remaining 42 projects (67 percent) were approved with noted deficiencies which resulted in a loss of points under this metric.

Table 4 below summarizes the 122 action items identified across the 63 scored dispositions⁷ issued between January 1, 2021, and December 31, 2021. These action items illustrate errors that impacted the project's eligibility, documentation, and efficiency savings estimate calculations.

⁴ The remaining 15 projects were submitted on the required due date.

⁵ "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".

⁶ 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.

⁷ This table includes action items issued on 11 Advisory dispositions.

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	24	1	69%
	Calculation method	7	4	20%
	Calculation tool	1	0	3%
	M&V plan	3	0	9%
	Subtotals	35	5	29%
Process, Policy, Program Rules	Baseline	5	2	10%
	CPUC Policy	0	1	0%
	Did not follow previous CPUC guidance	16	0	33%
	Eligibility	3	0	6%
	ER preponderance of evidence	2	2	4%
	EUL/RUL	11	0	22%
	Fuel substitution	3	0	6%
	Incentive calculation	3	0	6%
	Measure cost	4	2	8%
	Self-generation	2	1	4%
Subtotals	49	8	40%	
Documentation Issues	Continue document upload	10	6	56%
	Missing required information	7	0	39%
	Project scope unclear	1	0	6%
	Subtotals	18	6	15%
Issues Related to Net Impacts	Program influence	7	2	100%
	Subtotals	7	2	6%
Other Issues	Other - update quarterly submission	5	0	38%
	Other - follow RP2.0 Pilot Implementation Plan	2	0	15%
	Other - data missing in bimonthly upload	4	0	31%
	Other - bimonthly upload savings discrepancy	2	0	15%
	Other - Advisory Review	0	4	0%
	Subtotals	13	4	11%
Grand Total		122	25	100%

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

- **Fuel Substitution Test Failed** for three sampled projects (CPUC Project IDs 641, 691 and 635), and due to the importance of this test, the project received the minimum points under this metric.
- **Non-IOU Energy Source Not Accounted for** occurred on one project (CPUC Project ID

584) and resulted in the loss of significant EAR points for this metric due to the importance of accounting for all energy sources included in a project.

- **EUL Does not Exceed Simple Payback** occurred on one project (CPUC ID 725) and resulted in the loss of significant EAR points for this metric due to the importance of this deficiency.
- **M&V Plan Not in Compliance** occurred on one project (CPUC Project ID 637) and resulted in meaningful deduction of EAR points for this project.
- **Measure Efficiency less than Existing Equipment** occurred on one project (CPUC Project ID 718) and resulted in significant loss of EAR points for this project.
- **Incorrect Baseline Value** was found as a deficiency on four projects (CPUC Project IDs 614, 652, 685, and 658) and due to the importance of this element the projects received a significant deduction of points under this metric.
- **Incorrect Measure EUL** was found in 4 out of the 63 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a significant reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 637, 625, 653, and 685.
- **Incorrect Measure RUL** was found in 10 out of the 63 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 588, 589, 606, 605, 617, 618, 625, 636, 685, and 658). While individually the deductions were small, this was the most prevalent deficiency found across all projects.
- **Incomplete Documentation of Program Influence** occurred on one sampled project (CPUC Project IDs 615), and due to the importance of this test, the projects received the minimum points under this metric.
- **Lack of Clarity in Descriptions of Methodology** occurred on three projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a meaningful loss of EAR points for these projects (CPUC Project IDs 637, 614, and 710).

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2021, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 4.0 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 University of California campuses, horticultural lighting, on bill financing (OBF) treatment under E-5115, incremental measure costs for residential new construction (RNC), EnegyPro software bugs, weather files for use in custom projects, verification of Public Purpose Program charges in project documentation packages, adjusting COVID-19 impacts in project savings claims, Residential New Construction (RNC) project effective useful life (EUL), Review Protocol (RP2.0) pilot project tracker and scoring⁸, updates to CBECC-Res software for the RNC program, all-electric RNC ISP, updates to the modified lighting calculator (MLC), calculation approaches for the manufactured home component of the Advanced Energy Rebuild (AER) program, interface between statewide upstream lighting program and MLC, Savings By Design (SBD) projects scheduled to complete after 2021, sharing early opinion (EO) responses with

⁸ 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.

other PAs, CalMac weather data tool, hard to reach (HTR) geographical data, simple payback (SPB) for fuel substitution projects, multifamily high-rise alternative baseline, NMEC for outdoor lighting, project feasibility study (PFS) requirements for small projects, MLC measure costs for second baseline, and Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER) peak days on all Climate Zone 2022 weather files. However, several of these initiatives and ISP studies stalled and PG&E must make improvements to their processes to follow-up on projects brought before CPUC for guidance. Additionally they must work to improve the Energy Pro tool which received much discussion but did not yield improvements during 2021.

Similar to last year, PG&E staff took an active and engaged role in statewide collaboration efforts and took the lead on coordinating the COVID reporting memo and weather data research. 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 2021, PG&E 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 performed by the PA. As such, the number of dispositions proceeding without exception was weighed against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 63 projects reviewed, 7 projects (11 percent) proceeded without exception, while 42 projects (67 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted in the review. Another 3 projects⁹ (5 percent) were rejected, resulting in a rejection rate that was significantly lower than the previous year. While this demonstrates that PG&E is making efforts to improve project submission documentation that results in fewer rejections, the vast majority of projects required exceptions, indicating that more work is needed to reduce errors in project submissions.

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 that improvement is 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 2021, PG&E received a custom disposition score of 8.13 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 January 2021 and December 2021 exhibited a slight downward trend in terms of project performance over time (i.e. project submissions had more issues when submitted later in 2021 compared to earlier in the year). CPUC staff noted that similar to last year, 40 percent of issues noted

⁹ There were also 11 Advisory dispositions issued.

on submissions were related to Process, Policy, and Program Rules. While the number of issues related to EUL/RUL reporting and Baseline determination were lower, most of the policy related issues were focused on a failure to follow previous CPUC staff guidance which is a significant increase in this issue compared to last year. Additionally, there were 7 action items related to program influence issues, indicating a need to improve compliance with CPUC policies. Overall CPUC staff determined that PG&E complied with elements of this metric, but that improvement is warranted to improve project submissions and avoid ex-ante savings impacts and potential program influence issues. The RP2.0 pilot is focusing attention on program influence during initial project reviews, which should help with this metric in the future.

B. Measure Packages Performance Review

PG&E had 14 Measure Packages which were submitted in 2021, 13 were reviewed and disposed, and the remaining one is still under detailed review. This end of year memo provides Measure Package specific feedback on the 13 which were reviewed and disposed.

The comments below are organized by the five scoring metric areas created in D.16-08-019.¹⁰ The narrative includes observations common to multiple Measure Packages and feedback related to the Measure Package development process. Specific Measure Package feedback is provided in [Attachment C](#) at the end of this document. The Measure Package Detailed Review Table provides feedback on specific Measure Packages. The Measure Package Submissions Table lists all Measure Packages submitted by PG&E or PG&E Measure Packages that were disposed during the review period. Measure Packages were selected for feedback from those that were submitted by PG&E and were either disposed or reached approval status during the review period. CPUC staff acknowledges that Measure Package development may have been supported by multiple PAs; however, at this time, there is no mechanism for apportioning feedback among PAs. Therefore, feedback is only provided for the submitting PA, with the assumption that they are the lead PA. The scoring rubric for Measure Packages is defined as follows:

‘+’ indicates a positive scoring impact which receives 100% of total points for the metric

‘-’ indicates a negative scoring impact which receives 0% of total points for the metric

‘Yes’ indicates meeting minimum expectation which receives 50% of total points for the metric

‘No’ indicates the review feedback is not applicable to a metric and does not impact the average

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

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

¹⁰ See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.

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%	1.92	1.92	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	14.42	6.92	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	5.00	2.69	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			33.84	24.03	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2021, PG&E received a Measure Package disposition score of 1.92 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. PG&E has been slow to resubmit Measure Packages after receiving comments from the Measure Package review team, specifically for the Ultra-Low Temperature Freezer and Residential Duct Seal. This can often cause a backup of Measure Packages for the Measure Package review team if the submittal schedules are not adhered to or if communication of delays in schedule are not communicated. Since the mid-year, PG&E has improved in timeliness effectively communicated any delivery changes in the monthly Measure Package submission schedule.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2021, PG&E received a Measure Package disposition score of 6.92 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. PG&E's content, completeness, and quality of Measure Packages has generally met standards.

Two of the Measure Packages required substantial effort with original research or the synthesis of newly available research. Of note was the Duct Optimization Measure Package which was a newly developed work paper. The remaining Measure Packages did not require significant technical revisions and were triggered by updates in DEER and met expectations for content.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2021, PG&E received a Measure Package disposition score of 2.69 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: Duct Optimization and Ultra-Low Temperature Freezers. PG&E submitted a Measure Package plan for the Duct Optimization Measure Package and collaborated with CPUC staff through a series of meetings to get the Measure Package finalized and approved. PG&E reached out to the CPUC staff to discuss updates to the Ultra-Low Temperature Freezers to include large capacity units. Ultimately PG&E withdrew the proposed larger capacity units due to lack of supporting data.

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

In 2021, 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 through the first half of the year. Any required updates were minimal. One exception was the Duct Sealing Measure Package which CPUC staff noted an error in savings units. Though a solution was developed to account for the discrepancy, it took PG&E multiple iterations to finalize the Measure Package.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2021, 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 including the duct service measures.

IV. The Scoring Methodology

The 2021 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 2021. 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 2020 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.¹¹ If a metric was determined to be not applicable to a given disposition, the metric was identified as not applicable (“N/A”) and the metric was assigned a score equal to the average 1 to 5 score from the remaining applicable metrics. Assigning this average score to any “N/A” metrics essentially normalized the final score so that a disposition neither benefitted nor was penalized as a result of a non-applicable metric.

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

A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology

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

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

The assigned percentage scores were averaged across all the reviewed items Individual Measure Package level disposition scoring, as well as related Measure Package activities, are provided in [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 “+”.

¹¹ For example, Measure Packages and custom projects which do not involve measures which in some way are expected to utilize DEER values, assumptions or methods, in the development of new kWh, kW and therm savings values would not receive scoring for Metric 2 (“Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals”). 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”).

- Metric 4 Quality Assurance: Measure Packages that were complete, consistent, and without meaningful errors received a “Yes”. Those Measure Packages with inconsistencies between the data tables and narrative or where values were left undefined received a “-“ score.
- Metric 5 Process: Measure Package responsiveness to program needs received a “Yes” for straightforward and “+” for complex Measure Package submissions.

B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology

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

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

C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology

This metric is related to content and completeness of submittals and a maximum of 15 points is allocated to this metric. Scoring occurs on each custom project during the individual project review stage. On a percentage basis Metric 2 is the single greatest determinant of the overall EAR score. Scoring for Metric 2 is achieved through numerous areas throughout the custom project review workbook. PA’s begin with a full score of 5 for each custom project in the review workbook with each noted deficiency reducing the points accordingly. 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, 4, 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, 4, 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. Similar to 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 2021 in order 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 in the area of Policy/Technical QA/QC for Metrics 1 to reflect PG&E staff’s positive efforts in this metric area as discussed earlier. This included:

- Continued effort to submit documentation for project review in a timely manner, with over 51 percent of projects submitted 5 or more days earlier than required.

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 used best practices during 3P measure adoption to QC over 35 measure packages.
- 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.¹²

[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 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.

¹² The guidance on scoring approach provided in D.13-09-023, at 74, provides that when only a small number of submissions are available for scoring and the submissions have varying impacts on the portfolio overall, that appropriate weighting should be allied to the submission and observed performance that should carry across multiple metrics. “Low scores for metrics that assess specific and important quantities (e.g., if the utility only uploads a small percentage of custom projects and receives a low score for Metric 1), will have a proportional impact on the total score the utility could receive for later metrics that measure the quality of custom project submittals.” “For example, doing an outstanding job on a large number of very low-impact, standardized projects will not make up for doing a poor job on a few projects that represent a major portion of portfolio dollars.”

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

Metric		Measure Packages				Custom			
		Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2021 Score	2021 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2021 Score	2021 Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	5	10%	1.92	1.92	5	10%	4.37	4.37
	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%	2.31	6.92	15	30%	3.98	11.94
	Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submittals. Submittal adherence to Commission policies, Decisions, and prior Commission staff dispositions and/or guidance. Do the submittals include all materials required to support the submittal proposed values, methods and results. Is the project or measure clearly articulated. Are proposed or utilized methods clearly explained including step-by-step method or procedure descriptions. Will the proposed or utilized approach provide accurate results. Are all relevant related or past activities and submittals appropriately noted or disclosed, analyzed or discussed. Are the pros/cons of alternate possible approaches or conclusions discussed to support that the chosen one is most appropriate.								
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	5	10%	2.69	2.69	5	10%	4.00	4.00
	PA efforts to bring either measures, projects, studies, questions, and/or savings calculation methods and tools to Commission staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. Commission staff expects collaboration among the PAs to develop common or coordinated submissions and for the PAs to undertake joint or coordinated planning activities and study work. The PAs are expected to engage with 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%	3.60	9.00

Metric	Measure Packages				Custom			
	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2021 Score	2021 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2021 Score	2021 Points
Commission staff expects the PA to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for their programs and measures. The PAs are expected to have a pro-active approach to reviewing existing measure and project assumptions, methods and values and updating those to take into account changes in market offerings, standard practice, updates to DEER methods and assumptions, changes to codes, standards and regulations, and other factors that warrant such updates. The depth and correctness of the PA's technical review of their ex ante parameters and values, for both Core, Local Government and Third Party programs, are included under this metric. The depth and correctness of the PA's technical review of their own staff and subcontractor work related to supporting deemed and custom measure and project submissions are included in this metric. Evidence of review activities is expected to be visible in submissions so that Commission staff can evaluate the effectiveness of the PA internal QA/QC processes.								
5 Program Administrator's Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements	12.5	25%	2.50	6.25	12.5	25%	3.25	8.13
This metric reflects the PAs ongoing efforts to improve their internal processes and procedures resulting in increased ex post evaluated gross and net savings impacts. Commission staff looks not only to the PA's internal QC/QA processes, but also whether individual programs and their supporting activities incorporate and comply with CPUC policies and prior Commission staff disposition guidance in their program rules, policies, procedures and reporting. This includes changes to program rules, offerings and internal operations and processes required to improve overall review and evaluation results.								
Total	50	100%		24.03	50	100%		37.44

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 ¹³)
Metric 1	Timeliness and Timing of Submittals Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5	10%	4.37	63	PG&E complied with SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation before the 15 business days required. staff found 13 projects (21 percent) to be late with two projects found to be over 20 days late. The remaining 50 projects (79 percent) were submitted on time or earlier, with 32 projects (51 percent) being submitted by 5 days or more. staff noted that this was a slight decrease in timeliness compared to last year when 14 percent of projects were submitted late and 70 percent of projects were submitted early.
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%	11.94	63	In 2021, 38 projects out of the 63 receiving a disposition (60 percent) had no significant issues detected during custom project review. Additionally, 2 projects had only minor deficiencies detected at the measure level, such as missing photo evidence of equipment, or measure performance < baseline. However Commission staff found that the remaining 23 projects had significant deficiencies such as missing savings calculations, incorrect baseline values, not accounting for non-IOU fuel sources, measure efficiency less than existing equipment, lack of clarity in measure descriptions, incomplete documentation of program influence, and failed fuel substitution tests. Commission staff determined that while the majority of all projects had zero or minor deficiencies, the remaining projects had significant deficiencies and therefore 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%	4.00	63	Commission 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 Early Opinion requests before CPUC for review, were engaged on bi-weekly calls, and took the lead on coordinating the COVID-19 reporting memo and weather data research projects. CPUC staff did note that while active, follow-up on Early Opinion and Industry Standard Practice (ISP) items were slow, and several initiatives appeared stalled indicating room for improvement on follow-through.

¹³ The Metric 1 and 2 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 ¹³)
Metric 4	<p>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.</p>	12.5	25%	9.00	63	Commission staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 63 projects reviewed, 7 projects (11 percent) proceeded without exception, while 42 projects (67 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted in the review. Commission staff found 3 projects (5 percent) were also rejected. The overwhelming 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%	8.13	63	PG&E Projects reviewed from July 2021 through December 2021 exhibited a slight downward trend in terms of project performance over time (i.e. project submissions performed more poorly over the course of the 2021 review period). PG&E continues to experience issues related to Program Policy, as 40 percent of all issues identified in 2021 were related to this category, which is a similar percentage as was found in 2020. Most notable were 16 actions associated with not following previous CPUC guidance. Additionally, CPUC staff noted 7 actions (6 percent) related to Program Influence issues. 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	
SWAP001	2	Refrigerators and Freezers, Residential	Measure Package to update changes to savings in multiple CZs and other minor updates.	1	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWAP003	3	Clothes Dryer, Residential	Measure Package revised to fix inconsistencies and update costs. Measure Package was well managed.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWAP004	2	Clothes Washer, Residential & Multifamily	Measure Package updated to account for missing CZs. Measure Package was well managed and PGE provided necessary clarifications on number of wash cycles.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWCR017	2	Ultra-Low Temperature Freezer	Measure Package revised to update NTG. PGE considered the addition of large freezers but was unable to provide the backup data. This caused delays to the Measure Package review. Minor error corrections were updated.	1	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWHC004	2	Space Heating Boiler, Commercial	Measure Package was well managed a with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWPR002	2	VFD For Glycol Pump Motor	Updated NTG as required by Resolution E-5082. Material and labor cost update using RSMeans 2020. Measure Package was well managed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWSV001	3	Duct Seal, Residential	Measure Package review noted the incorrect units for savings listed in the EAD tables and in the Measure Package. Once a workaround was developed to fix this error it took two iterations to get this Measure Package finalized and caused multiple delays.	1	-	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages						EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5	
SWSV001	4	Duct Seal, Residential	Updates triggered by DEER Resolution. Measure Package was reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWSV013	1	Duct Optimization	Measure Package plan was submitted for this Measure Package and was well collaborated and managed with PGE and the Measure Package review team.	1	Yes	Yes	+	Yes	Yes	
SWSV013	2	Duct Optimization	Updates triggered by DEER Resolution. Measure Package was reviewed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWWB004	2	Home Energy Reports	Measure Package updated to clarify language on savings calculations and holdback. PGE provided necessary updates. Measure Package was well managed.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWWP002	2	VFD on Ag Pump	Updated NTG as required by Resolution E-5082. Material and labor cost update using RSMMeans 2020. Measure Package was well managed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SWWP005	2	Enhanced VFD On Irrigation Pump	Updated NTG as required by Resolution E-5082. Measure Package was well managed with minimal comment.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Measure Package and Measure Package Plan Submission Status – All Measure Packages and Plans submitted in 2021

MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments
SWAP001	2	Refrigerators and Freezers, Residential	Interim approval.
SWAP003	3	Clothes Dryer, Residential	Interim approval.
SWAP004	2	Clothes Washer, Residential & Multifamily	Interim approval.
SWCR017	2	Ultra-Low Temperature Freezer	Interim approval.
SWHC004	2	Space Heating Boiler, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWPR002	2	VFD For Glycol Pump Motor	Interim approval.
SWSV001	3	Duct Seal, Residential	Interim approval.
SWSV001	4	Duct Seal, Residential	Interim approval.
SWSV013	1	Duct Optimization	Interim approval.
SWSV013	2	Duct Optimization	Interim approval.
SWWB004	2	Home Energy Reports	Interim approval.
SWWP002	2	VFD on Ag Pump	Interim approval.
SWWP005	2	Enhanced VFD on Irrigation Pump	Interim approval.
SWWP004	2	Water Pump Upgrade	Detailed review in process.

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 used best practices during 3P measure adoption to QC over 35 measure packages.	1	No	+	No	No	No

Attachment D: 2021 Performance Annual Ratings

Custom Scoring

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

2020 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	4.59	4.28	4.20	4.00	3.25	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	4.28	4.20	4.00	4.25	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	12.85	4.20	10.00	10.63	42.68

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

Measure Package Scoring

2021 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%
	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
	Metric Points with Weighting	1.92	14.42	5.00	6.25	6.25
Total Points						33.84

2020 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5
Direct Work Product Review Score	PG&E "-"	0%	6%	0%	21%	0%
	PG&E "+"	0%	12%	0%	6%	30%
	PG&E "Yes"	100%	82%	100%	73%	70%
	Dispositions Score %	50%	50%	67%	36%	75%
	Dispositions Score	2.50	2.65	3.33	1.82	3.74
Review Process Score Enhancements	PG&E "-"			0%	0%	0%
	PG&E "+"			100%	0%	0%
	PG&E "Yes"			0%	100%	100%
	Process Score %	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%

2020 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
	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	2.50	5.00	4.32	5.00	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.50	7.50	5.00	10.80	12.50	38.30

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.