

RTR Appendix

Southern California Edison, Pacific Gas and Electric, Southern California Gas, and San Diego Gas and Electric (“Joint Utilities” or “Joint IOUs”) developed Responses to Recommendations (RTR) contained in the evaluation studies of the 2013-2015 Energy Efficiency Program Cycle. This Appendix contains the Responses to Recommendations in the report:

RTR for the 2013-2014 Statewide WE&T Program: Program Theory and Logic Model Update; Centergies Data Needs; and Critical WE&T Data Needs (Opinion Dynamics Corporation, Calmac ID #SDG0278.01, ED WO #2057)

The RTR reports demonstrate the Joint Utilities’ plans and activities to incorporate EM&V evaluation recommendations into programs to improve performance and operations, where applicable. The Joint IOUs’ approach is consistent with the 2013-2016 Energy Division-Investor Owned Utility Energy Efficiency Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V) Plan¹ and CPUC Decision (D.) 07-09-043².

Individual RTR reports consist of a spreadsheet for each evaluation study. Recommendations were copied verbatim from each evaluation’s “Recommendations” section.³ In cases where reports do not contain a section for recommendations, the Joint IOUs attempted to identify recommendations contained within the evaluation. Responses to the recommendations were made on a statewide basis when possible, and when that was not appropriate (e.g., due to utility-specific recommendations), the Joint IOUs responded individually and clearly indicated the authorship of the response.

The Joint IOUs are proud of this opportunity to publicly demonstrate how programs are taking advantage of evaluation recommendations, while providing transparency to stakeholders on the “positive feedback loop” between program design, implementation, and evaluation. This feedback loop can also provide guidance to the evaluation community on the types and structure of recommendations that are most relevant and helpful to program managers. The Joint IOUs believe this feedback will help improve both programs and future evaluation reports.

-

¹ Page 336, “Within 60 days of public release of a final report, the program administrators will respond in writing to the final report findings and recommendations indicating what action, if any, will be taken as a result of study findings. The IOU responses will be posted on the public document website.” The Plan is available at <http://www.energydataweb.com/cpuc>.

² Attachment 7, page 4, “Within 60 days of public release, program administrators will respond in writing to the final report findings and recommendations indicating what action, if any, will be taken as a result of study findings as they relate to potential changes to the programs. Energy Division can choose to extend the 60 day limit if the administrator presents a compelling case that more time is needed and the delay will not cause any problems in the implementation schedule, and may shorten the time on a case-by-case basis if necessary to avoid delays in the schedule.”

³ Recommendations may have also been made to the CPUC, the CEC, and evaluators. Responses to these recommendations will be made by Energy Division at a later time and posted separately.

Response to Recommendations (RTR) in Impact, Process, and Market Assessment Studies

Study Title: 2013-2014 Statewide WE&T Program: Program Theory and Logic Model Update; Centergies Data Needs; and Critical WE&T Data Needs
Program: WE&T
Author: Opinion Dynamics Corporation
Calmac ID: SDG0278.01
ED WO: 2057
Link to Report: http://calmac.org/publications/2013-2014_WET_PTLM_and_Critical_Data_Gap_Assessment.pdf

Item #	Page	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations	Recommendation Recipient	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)
1	1-2	The new Centergies Logic Model in this report shows how the Centers' current activities and strategies support traditional and new program goals. The activities are divided into two parts. One set of activities supports the traditional goals of the Centers, and the second set supports the newer goals generated by the CA Strategic Plan and the Needs Assessment. However, there is no indication in the theory or model currently to determine the relative importance of the traditional versus new program goals to the State or to the rate payer.	<p>Policy direction needed to guide level of emphasis for skills building and market building: The Centergies program has expanded its activities to address new goals; however it is uncertain at this time how much of an emphasis should be placed on the new goals versus the traditional goals. The program needs policy direction to help them determine how much of an emphasis to place on skills building versus market building.</p> <p>Currently the program activities allocate 45% to skills building and 55% to market building. The IOU program team should be involved in determining the level of emphasis that should be placed on these two critical foci. This decision will also require that clear criteria for each focus are well-defined</p>	IOUs and CPUC	Accepted w/ Modifications	The statewide WE&T program strives to provide a training portfolio that prioritizes offerings based on marketplace and industry trends, needs, demands and opportunities. This portfolio should include both "skills building" and "market building" offerings that are meaningful and relevant to the intended audience. We also believe the definition and measurement of "skills building" and "market building" should be consistent and measurable for the statewide IOU WE&T programs. These two categories should be complemented by other categories to best describe classes, content and audience. The balance of "skills building", "market building", or any other categories should be based on regional needs. It is possible for the same training class to offer "skill building" as well as "market building" information in a single design. The IOUs will continue to assess market conditions and deliver a balanced training portfolio according to the criteria outlined in this response.

Item #	Page	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations	Recommendation Recipient	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)
2	1-2	There needs to be some recognition of what activities, strategies and goals are achievable given the Centers' limited resources and the current Program Performance Metrics (PPMs). Notably, providing courses that align with Adult Learning Principles and skill-building are more costly than courses that largely focus on presenting and disseminating information. One of the three current PPMs monitors the number of classes offered rather than the level of training offered. If PPMs continue to only cover the number of courses then the Centers will naturally focus on the cheapest way to get a large number of classes to the market.	Revisit PPMs for alignment with skills and market building goals: The PPMs should be revisited by the CPUC and the Centergies program to determine whether they align with the goals for skills building and market building. For example, the program should not just track the number of classes it offers but the number offered for skills building versus market building. Also, the PPMs could be more outcome oriented such that they track whether the classes are designed to propel students to implement their new learnings into their job.	IOUs and CPUC	Accepted w/ Modifications	WE&T does need better metrics, however feels that the number of classes, even distinguished between skills and market building, is limiting and provides minimal insight into impact of activities. The IOUs support outcome oriented research and performance metrics, such as expected learning level, and achievement of identified learning goals. More exploration is needed to uncover any potential increase to program cost to undertake these new tracking and research activities, and the IOUs welcome discussing this with the CPUC.
3	2	We reviewed the Centers current data collection efforts in light of what the Centers need to collect as evidentiary support for its Theory and Logic. The Centers are inconsistent in their data tracking and collection efforts and these should be modified to better support the Theory. As such, the study provides a number of suggestions for how the Centers can collectively improve data tracking and collection efforts in support of its Theory and Logic.	Revise and enhance registration data collection: The study team and the IOUs collectively identified five key variables to add to mandatory registration requirements and a potential rolling update of participant profiles including questions that allow us to determine the following: 1. Market Actor or End-User; 2. Home zip code (determines disadvantaged worker reach); 3. Employment status; 4. Industry; and 5. Occupation. These five variables and the purpose they serve are well-defined with suggested question designs in the body of the report (See Section 3.10).	IOUs and CPUC	Accepted w/ Modifications	The IOUs agree that collecting additional program participant information can be useful and meaningful in helping inform and support WE&T program design and implementation. However, before determining collection criteria, additional consideration is needed to determine which data is most valuable, the most effective collection method, and potential barriers to customer participation. Determination of "Employment Status" is a potential barrier to participation, and will not be included in the registration data collected by the IOU WE&T Program teams. A mechanism to evaluate the collected data and to maintain integrity of the information should be implemented consistently throughout the IOU programs. The IOUs welcome discussing this with the CPUC.

Item #	Page	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations	Recommendation Recipient	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)
4	2		<p>Revise and enhance center course tracking databases: The study team recommends changes for each IOU to ensure that appropriate and consistent data is captured across all Centers such as common categories to help categorize courses by sector and learning level. The detailed recommendations per IOU are included in the body of the report (See Section 3.10).</p>	All IOUs	Accepted	The IOUs agree that collecting appropriate and consistent program participant information is useful in helping inform the categorization of courses by sector, learning objectives, required skills, etc. However, categories such as learning level (e.g. “beginner”, “intermediate”, “advanced”) are relative terms, and should be used with caution, considering the intended audience, and more discussion is required throughout the IOU programs. The IOUs will work to implement these recommendations in 2016.
5	2		<p>Revise and enhance course feedback surveys: Each Center administers a survey at the end of each course for feedback. Each Center has different survey design and data collection and analysis procedures. The study team recommends that the Centers move to one survey design, data collection and analysis method so that this data can be analyzed electronically and on a statewide level. The Centers should develop a concrete plan to ensure this is implemented in 2014. The plan should include a core set of questions that are consistent across all Centers (See Section 3.10 for more detail)</p>	All IOUs	Accepted	The IOUs agree that we should collect a common and consistent set of core data points from course evaluations, and reserve the flexibility to add custom questions dependent upon what the IOUs are trying to learn from the surveys. The IOUs will work to implement these recommendations in 2016.

Item #	Page	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations	Recommendation Recipient	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)
6	2		Revise and enhance tool lending library data tracking: The tool lending libraries at each Center collect inconsistent information and the study team recommends that they collectively improve the data tracking to support the Program Theory and Logic and future energy savings claims. Specific recommendations can be found in Section 3.10.	All IOUs	Accepted	The IOUs agree that the information collected from tool lending libraries should be common and consistent throughout the IOU programs. Questions would need to be designed around what the IOUs are trying to learn while supporting the purpose and goal of the tool lending library. The IOUs feel the best design is to have a core set of common questions, plus additional regional questions to account for program implementation nuances, and the IOUs reserve the flexibility to add custom questions to meet service territory specific needs. The IOUs will work to implement these recommendations in 2016.
7	2-3		Determine plan of action for making course tracking, registration and feedback survey changes: Notably, multiple past evaluations of the Centers have recommended similar data tracking and survey changes. We strongly recommend that the Centergies program take action to improve their data tracking systems. This action is necessary for statewide consistency and to allow for program performance monitoring and evaluation. All of the detailed improvements necessary can be found in Section 3.10.	All IOUs	Accepted	IOUs agree that consistency in tracking, registration and feedback surveys can help in program design and evaluation. IOUs are assessing best ways to apply these recommendations for more consistency, considering the uniqueness within each IOU service territory. The IOUs will work to implement these recommendations in 2016.

Item #	Page	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations	Recommendation Recipient	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)
8	3	<p>The 2013-2014 WE&T research roadmap references two decisions (Decisions 12-05-015 and 12-08-044) that are relevant to Workforce Education and Training initiatives. The WE&T roadmap called for the IOUs to initiate a study to explore these decisions, how the IOUs have responded to the decisions thus far and what options they might have for responding to them in the future. Since these decisions were included in the WE&T roadmap it was initially assumed they were directly relevant to the Centergies activities. However, based on a deeper analysis of the Decisions, it is clear that these decisions are actually relevant to specific IOU resource programs and not Centergies as much of the data collection activities should be initiated by the specific programs rather than the WE&T team. Since the IOU WE&T Centergies M&E team initiated this research, the team was uncertain how far they should go with these Decisions.</p> <p>The study team investigated the 12-05-015 Decision in the context of three certifications for three specific sectors: CALCTP for the non-residential lighting sector, BPI for the residential whole house retrofit sector, QI/QM for the residential HVAC sector. This Decision will continue to be explored through IOU and CPUC ED led research throughout 2014 and 2015. It is uncertain at this time whether there are any other certifications or sectors that should follow-up on this Decision.</p>	<p>Better define what programs are WE&T and what specific programs should respond to WE&T related policy decisions: The CPUC needs to better define what WE&T is and the IOUs need to determine whether a different taskforce or group needs to be created in order to best respond to how WE&T is defined. The current program management and EM&V structure is too fragmented across the Centers, Connections and IOU resource programs to efficiently respond to WE&T related directives from the CPUC. Further, WE&T policy decisions need to clearly state who should respond to directives, i.e. the Centers, Connections or specific IOU Resource Programs. The IOUs recommend a forum whereby the program teams and the WE&T team can sit down and discuss issues. It would allow the WE&T team an opportunity to understand the rebate program team training needs. Each month they could rotate through key contractor areas (i.e., HVAC, Lighting) and discuss what is working and what is not. The IOUs agree that this is vital to improving WE&T efforts however additional resources and time are needed.</p>	IOUs and CPUC	Accepted	Today, the policy directives are not sufficiently clear for the statewide WE&T team, leaving the WE&T program in a position to coordinate activities outside of its control. The IOUs welcome discussing this with the CPUC.

Item #	Page	Findings	Best Practice / Recommendations	Recommendation Recipient	Disposition (Accepted, Rejected, or Other)	Disposition Notes (e.g. Description of specific program change or Reason for rejection or Under further review)
9	3-4	<p>After exploring these decisions, it became clear that WE&T is no longer clearly defined as a distinct program. The Statewide IOU WE&T Program currently includes three pivotal Sub-Programs; Centergies, Connections and Strategy. However, general discussions between the CPUC, IOUs and stakeholders and recent Decision language, refer to WE&T as something beyond these three sub-programs. Sometimes it is referred to as something that is part of the IOU Resource Programs' specific program training, mentoring and requirements. At other times, it is referred to as the training and education happening in the market generally and outside of the IOUs funding and purview such as external certification training that people may receive at the Centers or elsewhere such as BPI Certification. WE&T is now something that cuts across multiple programs and entities. The cross-cutting nature of WE&T has produced uncertainty amongst the IOUs and Centers as to who is supposed to act on policy decisions related to WE&T.</p>	<p>Conduct further research for policy decisions under the ED-led studies for '13-'14: Based on the research to date, the WE&T team is recommending that the Decisions 12-05-015 and 12-08-044 are researched by a broader project team than just the WE&T Centergies program and EM&V staff since these decisions are largely directed toward the IOU resource program teams. These Decisions will be further explored under the 2013-2014 Energy Division evaluation contracts and will need support from the IOU resource program teams throughout the evaluation process. Relevant IOU resource program staff are ready and willing to be engaged in this and have already joined a WE&T Project Coordination Group to facilitate some of this research.</p>	IOUs and CPUC	Accepted	WE&T teams support this effort and will be an integral contributor to the process.