

**CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review**

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SCE_23_Other_I_881 [REDACTED]
CMPA Directory Link	<a href="https://deereources.info/cmpa/projects/20851">https://deereources.info/cmpa/projects/20851</a>
PA	SCE
PA Application ID	[REDACTED]
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	SCE-13-SW-003D
PA Program Name	Industrial Strategic Management Program SEM
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	8/1/2023
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	6/20/2023
First PA Upload	
Second PA Upload	
Third PA Upload	
Fourth PA Upload	
Fifth PA Upload	
Sixth PA Upload	
Seventh PA Upload	
Eighth PA Upload	
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	Whole building behavioral operational and process efficiency optimization
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	Actual projects are to be determined and more details on potential projects are available in the Opportunity Register file if a project is selected kWh savings and incentive value listed in bi-monthly upload list are placeholder values based on what the customer sites have worked with PI to initially estimate and reviewed by PI these savings are based on total site energy use strategic goals from the site and their corporate managers PIs past experience at similar sites and communication with site staff at the beginning of the program This kWh value will change at year-end depending on the number of projects actually completed at the site kWh savings will be calculated at year-end stage for each project using the approved SEM Demand Savings calculator
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	[REDACTED]
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	[REDACTED]
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	[REDACTED]
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	[REDACTED]
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	[REDACTED]
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	[REDACTED]
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	[REDACTED]
Project Documentation Incentive \$ (to Customer)	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	[REDACTED]
PA Primary Reviewer Name	[REDACTED]
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Project Manager	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)	
CPUC Staff Recommendation:	Advisory
For rejection, action required:	N/A
M&V Review:	Post M&V Review (M&V Results and Final Calculations) Required

Action Number:	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Action Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	The project documentation included a note explaining why a top-down model would not be feasible for this site and that bottoms-up approach will be used. The reviewer found that explanation as reasonable. However, the reviewer's comments including detailed documentation on the bottoms-up approach in the Post M&V Phase such as: energy efficiency goals and assumptions used, documentation of quantiles, documentation on of non-plate, when possible.	Calculation method		
2	This application [REDACTED] applied on the same facility, which was calculated based on the total number of separate accounts at the facility. The calculation of multiple models when the M&V bounds is supplied by multiple meters is not a requirement of the M&V Guidelines and an option for use. Although it is suggested that the meters may result in a better model resolution, however, the evaluator's request through documentation on to provide the impact of the meters on each separate account accurately. The evaluator believed that aggregating all separate accounts together and calculating the impact of the meters on all meters may present a simple alternative to the application's use of bottoms-up approach to calculate the savings.	Analysis assumptions		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	The provided project documentation did not include the M&V application UFI/eggs Savings Report 1, the did not complete the report. The reviewer's request to upload those files at the Post M&V phase. The evaluator's request through documentation on to provide the details of the implementation and the dates of implementation at the end of the performance period and including any technical evaluation notes that have been documented.	Continue Document Upload		
2	The provided project documentation did not include the proposed bottoms-up calculation for this site. The reviewer's request to calculate and to be uploaded for the evaluator's review at the Post M&V phase for the reviewer.	Continue Document Upload		

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.

<p><b>Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted</b></p>	<p>The PA must make revisions or changes as noted in CPUC Staff's review comments before signed agreement with customer. 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>▪ EUI/RUL</li> <li>▪ Measure Type</li> <li>▪ Program Influence</li> </ul>
<p><b>Application rejected.</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>Advisory.</b></p>	<p>The PA is not formally required to follow instructions or recommendations given in an Advisory review. However issues found will affect ESPI scoring and may come up again in Ex-Post review.</p>