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**Sent:** Friday, July 08, 2016 3:51 PM
**To:** Best, Carmen; Skala, Pete
**Subject:** R0901019 RRIM Energy Division Data Response 07

# Risk Reward Incentive Mechanism Rehearing – R.09-01-019

Energy Division Data Response 07

Updated: 7/8/2016

Intro: SCE, SDG&E, and SCG submitted data requests to the Energy Division for the 2006-2008 Risk Reward Incentive Mechanism Rehearing. In an effort to ensure all parties have equal access to both the requested information and the responses, Energy Division requests the parties to post these responses on their respective web sites and distribute the link to all parties in R. 09-01-019.

Please note: The 2006-2008 Energy Efficiency Evaluation Report webpage, <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/General.aspx?id=4288>, has been updated with a link to the document, “CPUC and PG&E Analysis of 2006-2008 EE Portfolio – 9/16/2015”.

| # | Requesting Party | Question | Response |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | SDGE | ***Re: The ERT Interactive Effects Viewer.*** *The “ERT Interactive Effects Results Viewer” provides negative therm interactive effect information which was the basis for developing negative therm interactive effects values contained in the ERT database.* 1. Please provide the assumptions, data, input sheets, and model(s) used to develop the estimates contained in the “ERT Interactive Effects Results Viewer.” The data requested should be sufficient to recreate the values shown in the “ERT Interactive Effects Results.” If any of the information noted above is in excel or computerized format, please provide with all working cells intact (i.e., formulas, macros, etc.)
2. Please include: (a) any building energy simulation model input files used to determine negative therm interactive effects; (b) a description of the input parameter selection process and related source documents which support the calculation of negative interactive effects for CFL installations; (c) a detailed description of the weighting methodology used in calculating the final interactive effect values as identified in the “ERT Interactive Effects Results Viewer,” and any supporting documents; and (d) the table that was used to organize the modeling, including the summary of the input parameters for the full set of model input files used to calculate the results in the “ERT Interactive Effects Results Viewer.”
3. If the information and/or documentation requested above cannot be provided or is unavailable, please explain why. Please also explain whether this information once existed, and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate date(s) can be provided if actual dates are unknown.
 | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 2 | SDGE | ***Re: The SDG&E Upstream Lighting Program.*** *For the SDG&E upstream lighting program, please provide details on the methodologies used to combine the NTG values, including any data weights for each method used to derive the final IOU-specific NTG values for the Upstream CFL program. Include: (a) documentation of dropped scores, as well as the individual evaluator’s assumptions on the selection of weights used to derive the final NTG; (b) the data weights for each method used to derive the final IOU-specific NTG values for the Upstream CFL program; (c) the individual evaluator’s notes and reasoning on the selection of weights used to derive the final NTG values, and; (d) for econometrically-derived, channel-specific NTG values used in the determination of the final NTG values, the standard errors of the final estimates, and the results of alternative models that were reviewed prior to the final specifications.* 1. If the information and/or documentation requested above cannot be provided or is unavailable, please explain why.
2. Please also explain whether this information once existed, and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate date(s) can be provided if actual dates are unknown.
 | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 3 | SDGE | ***Re: Page 118 of Section 8.3 Invoice/Application Verification contained in Final Evaluation Report: Upstream Lighting Program EMV report assigns quality scores.*** *Different types of documents were determined to have different levels of “quality” for verification of invoices for utility upstream lighting programs. A set of metrics along with quality scores were developed as the basis for developing invoicing verification scores.* *Excerpt from the Report: “For each invoice/application, we compared program tracking data to what was provided in either paper or electronic form. In addition to quantity of IOU-discounted products shipped, we attempted to verify the following key metrics:* * *Manufacturer name*
* *Measure name*
* *Product type*
* *Retailer name and location*
* *Per unit rebate*
* *Total rebate paid*
* *Shipment and sales dates*

*“We also documented the source of the information used to verify each metric. Different types of documents were determined to have different “quality” for verification purposes. For each of the metrics listed above, we assigned a quality score based on the type and source of documents received (Table 65).”* 1. Please provide the detailed process and rationale used in selecting the type of source document categories and the selection of associated source document scores as indicated on Table 65: Quality Scores Assigned to Type/Score of Documentation.

If the information and/or documentation requested above cannot be provided or is unavailable, please explain why. Please also explain whether this information once existed, and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate date(s) can be provided if actual dates are unknown. | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 4 | SDG&E | ***Re: Page 119 of Section 8.3.2 Invoice/Application Verification Detailed Results Final Evaluation Report: Upstream Lighting Program EMV report.*** *Both Table 66 Invoice Verification Results and Table 67: Invoice Verification Results – Simple Average provide both “raw” and “wt.” % by IOU.* *Excerpt from the Report: The results from the invoice/application verification assessment are shown in Table 66. Recall that an invoice was considered verified when both product and retailer name/location matched, and then the quantity adjustment was applied. Using this restrictive definition, the overall invoice verification rate was determined to be 91% without taking into account documentation quality (i.e., the type and/or source of the documentation provided by the IOUs). When documentation quality is taken into account, the overall invoice verification rate is reduced to 72%.**cid:image001.jpg@01D1D930.8A3287C0**For comparative purposes, Table 67 shows the results when the simple average of the three metrics –product type, quantity and retailer name/location – is used to determine the overall invoice verification rate. As shown, the overall invoice verification rate is higher, at 95%, and the quality-weighted invoice verification rate is 86%.**cid:image002.jpg@01D1D930.8A3287C0*1. Please provide additional detail and qualitative rationale as to how the weights (“wt.”) were developed.
2. If the information and/or documentation requested above cannot be provided or is unavailable, please explain why. Please also explain whether this information once existed, and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate date(s) can be provided if actual dates are unknown.
 | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 5 | SDG&E | ***Re: Page 13 of Section 2.1.13 Leakage contained in Final Evaluation Report: Upstream Lighting Program EMV report.*** *Footnote 11 of the above-cited section states that, “Leakage can also occur prior to the sale and/or installation of IOU-discounted products (e.g., IOU-discounted products re-routed at distribution centers to retailers located outside of IOU service territories, re-sale of IOU discounted products on eBay or through other means, etc.). This evaluation was unable to determine quantitative estimates of this type of leakage; qualitative evidence from manufacturers and retail buyers indicates that leakage prior to sales is not significant.”* 1. Please provide, in detail, the rationale and any supporting data used to support the claim that “leakage prior to sales is not significant,” as reflected in footnote 11.
2. If the information and/or documentation requested above cannot be provided or is unavailable, please explain why. Please also explain whether this information once existed, and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate date(s) can be provided if actual dates are unknown.
 | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 6 | SDG&E | ***Re:******Page 13 of Section 2.1.13 Leakage contained in Final Evaluation Report: Upstream Lighting Program EMV report.*** *“Stores located within 10 miles of non-IOU service territories (e.g., SMUD, LADWP, Mexico) were considered to be more vulnerable to leakage than other stores.”* 1. Please provide, in detail, the rationale and any calculation used to select or determine the above-mentioned 10 mile radius.
2. In addition, please provide any other methodology or calculation which was performed to determine the vulnerability radius that was ultimately rejected in the final analysis.
3. If the information and/or documentation requested above cannot be provided or is unavailable, please explain why. Please also explain whether this information once existed, and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate date(s) can be provided if actual dates are unknown.
 | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 7 | SDG&E | ***Re: Page 167 of 8.8.4.2 Lack of market knowledge contained in Final Evaluation Report: Upstream Lighting Program EMV report****. The above-titled report states,* ***“****Lighting Program managers dislike overstocks because it increases the chances that store managers might ship their excess CFLs outside the program, resulting in CFL ‘leakage.’”* 1. Please provide, in detail, the rationale and any supporting evidence used to support the following conclusions of this statement: (a) Lighting Program managers dislike overstocks and (b) store managers might ship their excess CFLs outside the program resulting in CFL leakage due to the overstock.
 | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 8 | SDG&E | ***Re: Page 14 of Section 2.1.13 Leakage contained in Final Evaluation Report: Upstream Lighting Program EMV report.*** *The above-cited section states, “Leakage rates for CFLs were applied for energy efficient fixtures and LEDs based on the assumption that products distributed through similar channels would be purchased by IOU and non-IOU customers with similar patterns.”* 1. Please provide, in detail, the rationale and any supporting evidence used to support the above-quoted assumption.
2. If the information and/or documentation requested above cannot be provided or is unavailable, please explain why.

Please also explain whether this information once existed, and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate date(s) can be provided if actual dates are unknown. | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 9 | SCG | The following data requests are based on ***the 2006-2008 EM&V Report titled “MAJOR COMMERCIAL CONTRACT GROUP VOLUME***.**”** **Page 13, Section 1.4.3 “Activity 3: Full Evaluation Net Analysis”** states:“A full evaluation analysis of net savings was conducted for each of the five programs in the Major Commercial contract group. An evaluation plan and handbook was written to describe a complete set of data collection, data analysis and reporting procedures necessary to estimate and document net energy (kWh and therms) savings and peak demand savings for each sampled measure. Important elements of the net analysis included….”1. Please provide the evaluation plan, handbooks, as well as all documentation that supports the evaluation plan. This response should include all correspondence and alternative evaluation plans that were potentially considered, as well as an explanation of the rationale for the final plan.

If the requested information or documentation in (a) is not provided, please explain why. Please include in your explanation whether this information or documentation once existed and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate dates can be provided if actual dates are not available or known. | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 10 | SCG | **Page 22, Section 2.3.1 “Recruitment”** states: “The recruitment process also collected contact information for the IOU Representative and customer’s staff who were involved in the evaluation work and vendors who may have influenced the customer’s decision to participate in the program.”Please provide, in detail, the rationale or the methodology used to select the persons involved in the recruitment process referred to in the statement.  | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 11 | SCG | **Page 22, Section 2.3.1 “Recruitment”** states: “After the recruitment contact was completed, the final recruitment disposition was documented, whether the recruitment was successful or not. Documentation also included special conditions that had to be met to successfully recruit the participant and other recruitment-related information that was passed along to the assigned site lead. In addition, a confirmation letter was prepared and sent to appropriate parties.”a. Please provide all recruitment disposition documentation details. b. Please describe in detail the special conditions that had to be met to successfully recruit the participant. Provide all source documents which were used to develop the special conditions.c. Please provide in detail any the other recruitment-related information that was passed along to the assigned site leads. d. If the requested information or documentation for (a) through (c) is not provided, please explain why. Please include in your explanation whether this information or documentation once existed and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate dates can be provided if actual dates are not available or known. | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 12 | SCG | **Page 22, Section 2.3.2 “Spillover Survey”** states: “The recruiter also administered a spillover survey for each measure that was successfully recruited. The purpose of the spillover survey was to identify non-rebated measure(s) or measure components implemented during the 2006–08 program cycle that the customer attributed to participation in the 2006–08 program (including audits, education, and training) but that was not specifically recommended. The scope of spillover was determined by the knowledge and influence of the decision maker. Spillover applied to measures or measure components installed at the same site as direct measures and at other facilities of the customer located in any IOU service areas. Due to schedule constraints the spillover survey was not administered to sites with indirect measures.”a. Please provide all documents, including written communications or correspondence, related to the development of the spillover survey. If the requested information or documentation is not provided, please explain why. Please include in your explanation whether this information or documentation once existed and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate dates can be provided if actual dates are not available or known.b. In the statement, “The scope of spillover was determined by the knowledge and influence of the decision maker,” please explain in detail how the scope of spillover is determining by knowledge and influence of the decision maker.c. Please provide detailed rationale for not administering spillover surveys to sites with indirect measures. How were indirect measures addressed if there no spillover surveys provided? | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 13 | SCG | **Page 22, Section 2.3.3 “Rigor Level Assignment”** states:**“**The rigor level was the expected reliability of the savings (gross and net) estimates. Each sampled direct measure was assigned a gross rigor level by the SBW Project Manager in consultation with ED technical advisors.”1. Please provide any and all documents that explain and/or support the way in which the gross rigor levels were assigned.

If the requested information or documentation for (a) is not provided, please explain why. Please include in your explanation whether this information or documentation once existed and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate dates can be provided if actual dates are not available or known. | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 14 | SCG | **Page 22, Section 2.3.3 “Rigor Level Assignment”** states:“A rigor level was not assigned to indirect measures. Due to project schedule constraints, a simplified analysis was performed for these measures, which was not associated with either the basic or enhanced rigor levels”.a. Please provide all documentation in support of the alternative “simplified rigor analysis,” described above. If the requested information or documentation is not provided, please explain why. Please include in your explanation whether this information or documentation once existed and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate dates can be provided if actual dates are not available or known.b. Please explain, what biases, if any, are introduced by applying different rigor levels to the measures. | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 15 | SCG | **Page 22, Section 2.3.3 “Rigor Level Assignment”** states:“In general the evaluation of a measure with an enhanced rigor level was consistent with IPMVP3 Option B or D. The evaluation of a measure with a basic rigor level was consistent with IPMVP Option A.”Footnote: The International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol (IPMVP) that specifies alternative measurement and analysis methods that can be used to estimate gross energy savings from a measure installed under a program being evaluated.a. Please explain the rationale and all documents that were used to support using the IPMVP protocol. b. Please list any other alternative protocols that were considered | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 16 | SCG | **Page 99, Section 5.3 “Accounting for Partial Free Ridership” states:**“Partial free-ridership can occur when, in the absence of the program, the participant would have installed something more efficient than the program-assumed baseline efficiency but not as efficient as the item actually installed as a result of the program.”1. Please provide any and all survey documents that support the claim that of Partial Free Ridership occurred in the above-mentioned program.

If the requested information or documentation for (a) is not provided, please explain why. Please include in your explanation whether this information or documentation once existed and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate dates can be provided if actual dates are not available or known. | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 17 | SCG | **Page 158, “Section J.3.2 SCG3503 Program”** states:“Since this program is not strictly an audit program, savings were claimed for utility involvement other than audit recommendations. The evaluation team based its decision as to whether a measure was an indirect measure on the basis that the utility involvement had to be instrumental in the measure implementation. If the measure would have been implemented in exactly the same way without any utility involvement, the measure did not qualify as an indirect measure.”a. Please provide any and all documents and/or guidelines that were used as a basis for determining what should or should be included as an “indirect measure.” If the requested information or documentation is not provided, please explain why. Please include in your explanation whether this information or documentation once existed and when it was deleted, discarded, or otherwise lost. Approximate dates can be provided if actual dates are not available or known.b. Please explain how those documents or guidelines, if any, support the above-stated basis for determining “indirect measures.”  | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
| 18 | SCE | Scenario 7 (Evaluated Net Savings) in the Final Energy Division Scenario Analysis Report (SAR) includes evaluated Net-to-Gross Ratios (NTGR) ratios to estimate net savings. Energy Division estimated net-to-gross ratios for technologies and programs leveraging the 2006-2008 evaluation reports. In this data request, we are seeking the assumptions, data, input sheets, staff notes, memos and model(s) used to develop the final NTGR estimates that were applied in the SAR. The data requested should be sufficient to recreate the final recommended NTGR estimates for SCE in the Energy Division SAR. | This additional information would require additional consultant resources to perform the work requested. Currently there is no funding mechanism or budget to perform this work. |
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