

## CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE 19 T C 307 [REDACTED] NMEC
CMPA Directory Link	[REDACTED]
PA	SDGE
PA Application ID	[REDACTED]
PA Application Executed Date	10/31/2018
PA Program ID	SDGE4061
PA Program Name	Facility Assessment Services Program
PA Program Year	2018
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	1/14/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	10/25/2019
Second PA Upload	11/25/2019
Third PA Upload	#N/A
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	Monitoring Based Retrocommissioning
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	Implementer will utilize International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol (IPMVP) option C compliant NMEC analysis for customer's energy savings analysis, validation, and verification, and make recommendations for lighting schedule adjustments, HVAC "CDD" adjustments, and HVAC "HDD" adjustments in order to achieve continued savings.
PA Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	[REDACTED]
PA Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	[REDACTED]
PA Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	[REDACTED]
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$ [REDACTED]
PA Proposed Total Payment to Implementer \$ (not to include the above incentive to customer)	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	See note 1 below
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	See note 1 below
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	See note 1 below
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	Dan Bertini
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	SBW Consulting
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	Pete Jacobs
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	BMI
PA Primary Reviewer Name	Rod Houdyshel

<b>PA Primary Reviewer Firm</b>	SDG&E		
<b>CPUC Staff Project Manager</b>	Peter Lai CPUC/Energy Division		
<b>CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)</b>			
<b>CPUC Staff Recommendation Marked "X":</b>			
	Application ready to proceed without exception		
x	Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted		
	Application rejected.		
	Application not ready for review, revised and resubmit as noted		
<b>Action Number:</b>			<b>Due Date</b>
1	NMEC programs should follow LBNL Draft Guidance v1.0 3/1/18. Please revise the M&V plan to include the following topics: 1) Why an Option C M&V approach is suitable given the expected program design and scope of associated energy efficiency measures. 2) Additional building characteristics and information on monitoring infrastructure that may be collected to inform M&V activities. 3) Why the model is expected to characterize energy well for the target building and or system types it will be applied to, given the program design. 4) How measure implementation dates will be tracked and documented to establish the baseline and reporting periods for avoided energy use and normalized savings calculations, and documentation of savings. 5) How sites will be tracked to identify site/customer participation in multiple concurrent programs. 6) How the model is implemented, e.g., in a packaged tool (provide the tool name and provider name, version number), coded in R or SAS, or other implementation	M&V Plan	Within 30 days of this disposition
2	Reviewer did an independent analysis of the baseline data and noted an a potential non-routine event during the last month of the baseline period. Please investigate the potential non-routine event and update the baseline model as necessary.	Analysis method	Prior to first year performance period report.
3	Please submit first year performance report at the conclusion of the first year performance period	Continue Document Upload	After first year performance period.

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date
1	Initial review of NMEC project was conducted to check project eligibility and verify baseline model. PA reported annual savings were projected based on one month of post-implementation data. Savings will be reviewed by Commission Staff after conclusion of the first year performance period.		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

CPUC Staff Recommendation Definitions	
CPUC Staff Recommendation	Definition
Application ready to proceed without exception	The PA will continue to upload application documents to the CMPA directory through the implementation and claims phases of the project. The PA may proceed to approve the project without waiting for CPUC Staff response. A project is waived from further review at the post-installation stage by CPUC staff, but the PA is responsible for post-installation (IR) review. There will not be conditional approval.
Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted	<p>The PA must make revisions or changes as noted in CPUC Staff's review comments. The PA will continue to upload application documents to the CMPA directory through the implementation and claims phases of the project. The PA may proceed to approve the project without waiting for CPUC Staff response. If CPUC Staff decides to perform IR review of a project, CPUC Staff will notify the PA. The scope will be limited to determine if the project was carried out consistent with the application and notes provided during pre-installation review and to obtain information pertaining to whether the eligibility criteria or metrics should be revised.</p> <p>Unless the scope of work presented in project application has changed at IR review, the project will not be reviewed again in the areas specified below. Scope change is defined by substantial changes include significant modifications to the proposed equipment type, size, quantity, configuration, the expansion of a project to include additional retrofits, or the splitting of a project into multiple phases.</p> <p>The following areas will not be reviewed again by CPUC Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calculation Tool</li> <li>• Calculation Methodology</li> <li>• M&amp;V Plan</li> <li>• Baseline</li> <li>• Eligibility</li> <li>• EUL/RUL</li> <li>• Measure Type</li> <li>• Program Influence</li> </ul>
Application rejected.	<p>The application is rejected as submitted. The PA shall promptly inform the applicant as to the reasons why the project was rejected and the specific recommendations for the conditions under which the project would be approved. CPUC Staff shall provide the reasons for the rejection or request for modification, including each basis as to why the project is rejected, or modification is requested. In addition, CPUC Staff shall provide specific recommendations for the conditions under which the project would be approved.</p> <p>If any party to the project is unsatisfied with the Commission's directions for the project, a dispute resolution process may be initiated by that party. The Commission shall adopt rules for the conduct of the dispute resolution process. – Section 381.2 (g) (3) (F)</p>

<b>Application not ready for review, revised and resubmit as noted</b>	The application has deficiency in the supporting documentation and the PA has provided incomplete documentation. The complete documentation has been defined in the Statewide Custom Projects Guidance Document. Please note that this is not a final recommendation from CPUC staff. This recommendation is limited to two requests per application.
--	---