

*Southern California Edison*  
**SCE EE Business Plan A.17-01-013**

**DATA REQUEST SET A.17-01-013-CEE-SCE-002**

**To:** CEE

**Prepared by:** Joni Key

**Title:** Project Manager

**Dated:** 05/18/2017

---

**Question 44a:**

The responses to Data Request Questions 16, 17 and 18 state that the “risk factors for degradation of the performance of energy efficiency (EE) measures are factored into the installation rates found in workpapers ... and subsequently updated in DEER as Gross Savings Installation Adjustments (GSIA). Energy savings (with deductions for installation rates) are one input into cost-effectiveness calculations, so these installation rate reductions are reflected in cost effectiveness calculations as well.”

a. The responses to Data Request Questions 16, 17 and 18 refer to “installation rate reductions.” An “installation rate reduction” appears to be an adjustment to account for equipment that was not actually installed, not an adjustment for energy losses due to poor installation. Is that correct?

**Response to Question 44a:**

In the process of responding to Question 44, SCE determined that its responses to Questions 16, 17, and 18 are incorrect. Energy savings and cost-effectiveness calculations for its EE programs do not take into account the risk of lost energy savings due to poorly installed EE measures. Also, cost-effectiveness calculations (e.g., Total Resource Cost – TRC) do not include inputs intended to adjust energy savings due to risk of lost energy savings due to poor installation. SCE will submit amended responses to those questions.

(a) Yes, installation rate reduction are adjustments for measures or measure treatment(s) that were not actually installed [1]

[1] *See* EE Policy Manual, Version 5, pg. 55.