

Commenter Name:

Commenter Affiliation:

Date:

Considerations for reviewing and providing comments on Full PA Business Plans

Please consider the following questions as you review the Business Plan chapters. The second page provides a template into which your feedback may be captured.

Prior to reviewing and commenting on the Business Plan drafts, a reviewer may wish to review the updated Business Plan Checklist found on the CAEECC [Guidance webpage](#). In addition to comparing the Business Plan contents against the Updated Business Plan Checklist, the following questions are intended to highlight those items that would be helpful in updating the business plans. These questions are food for thought; we do not expect stakeholders to specifically address these questions in their form. Please choose those that are relevant to your interests.

1. Structural Review

- a. Do the chapter layout and order of topics comply with NRDC compiled guidance document “outline”?
- b. Does the stylistic/visual presentation allow for easy navigation through the chapter (i.e., allowing easy comparison of the chapter against the NRDC compilation)?
- c. What examples from other PA chapters (whether same PA different sector or different PA all together) would you suggest be considered for this document

2. Content-Related Review

- a. Are all key pieces of information, tables, graphics, and supporting documents called for in the Updated Business Plan checklist present in the Chapter?
- b. Are your previous comments and input addressed in the document?
- c. Is the overall sector plan coherent and clear?
- d. Are proposed activities (intervention strategies) sufficiently justified by the market assessment and other data analyses presented?
- e. Are substantive assertions and conclusions supported with clear reasoning and adequate citations?
- f. Are metrics relevant, representative, and associable with future IPs and PIPs?
- g. Is material presented at the right level of detail for a Business Plan?

On the next page, please find the comment template in which substantive comments can be recorded and then submitted to facilitator@caeec.org. If you have any questions about using this form or the review process, please contact the facilitator by phone or email.

Commenter Name:

Commenter Affiliation:

Date:

Instructions: **Please make comments specific, reference pages where appropriate, and be focused on Business Plan level strategies.**

Commenter: Please Fill In This Part Of The Form

Comment #	PA(s)	Sector	Page #	Comment
CPUC-1	MCE	ES, strategic advantages	4, 19	Observations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MCE highlights nearly 4 years of program experience and a 45% increase in savings, and yet cost-effectiveness information is lacking and/or unclear (2017 Budget AL filing).• MCE highlights hard-to-reach customers, and yet doesn't present any supporting information that these customers are indeed the primary program participants• Are SF customers hard to reach? If not, how is MCE's program reaching customers that aren't or couldn't be reached by IOU programs? Recommended Action <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present substantiating evidence that increased TRC values, as presented in appendix placemats, can be achieved notwithstanding prior program performance.• Present substantiating evidence that MCE programs are indeed reaching hard to reach customers including low- to moderate-income, renters, and non-English speaking customers.
CPUC – 2	MCE	Residential	37	Observations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The MF logic model lacks baselines for all short-term outcomes Recommended Action <p>MCE needs to develop baselines for each of these projected short-term outcomes. The absence of baselines renders projections meaningless in terms of measuring program performance.</p>
CPUC – 3	MCE	Residential	40	Observations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The SF logic model lacks baselines for all short-term outcomes. Recommended Action <p>MCE needs to develop baselines for each of these projected short-term outcomes. The absence of baselines renders projections meaningless in terms of measuring program performance.</p>

Commenter Name:

Commenter Affiliation:

Date:

Commenter: Please Fill In This Part Of The Form

Comment #	PA(s)	Sector	Page #	Comment
<i>CPUC-4</i>	MCE	Market Analysis	25	Observations <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>MCE has single family and multi-family programs. Figure 7 would be more helpful if it split units by vintage to reflect these two distinct markets.</i>
<i>CPUC – 5</i>	MCE	ES	3	Observations <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>GHG mitigation is helpful, but cost-effective energy savings are the primary metric by which portfolio performance is measured.</i>
<i>CPUC – 6</i>	MCE	GENERAL COMMENT		MCE would benefit by providing a bit more detailed information regarding what it has accomplished to date and what remains to be done. While evaluation information may be lacking, MCE should have program tracking data in terms of participation, types of participants, etc., that can help substantiate claims regarding MCE program performance and provide insights into what remains to be done and justification for projected achievements.
Commenter: Please Fill In This Part Of The Form				

Commenter—please replace **red text** with the information you wish to provide. Please submit completed comments to facilitator@caeec.org