

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

**DATA REQUEST SET A.17-01-013-CEE-SCE-001**

**To:** CEE  
**Prepared by:**  
**Title:**  
**Dated:** 03/24/2017

---

**Question 016:**

Do energy savings and cost-effectiveness calculations for *upstream* energy efficiency programs take into account the risk of lost energy savings due to poorly installed energy efficiency measures? If yes, please describe and provide documentation showing: (a) how and where this is taken into account, (b) in what programs this is taken into account, (c) what adjustment factors (if any) were applied, and (d) the basis for the adjustment factor.

**Response to Question 016:**

Yes, energy savings and cost-effectiveness calculation for upstream energy efficiency (EE) programs take into account the risk of lost energy savings due to poorly installed EE measures. These risk factors for degradation of the performance of energy efficiency (EE) measures are factored into the installation rates. EE performance is measured in ex post impact evaluation studies from field data collection of installed equipment that feed into all savings and cost parameter assumptions in the cost-effectiveness calculation.

As an example, see the recently published draft CPUC study: 2015 Upstream and Residential Downstream Lighting Program Impact Evaluation Research Plan. Performance of upstream delivered lighting is measured by a combination of measurement parameters, including installation rate of measure/technology. More specifically, the installation rates (i.e., Gross-Savings Adjustments (GSIA) Rate) are captured in the workpapers. In general, the GSIA rates come from prior measurement and evaluation (M&E) activities and are based on program and measure type and are stored in Readi database (<http://www.deeresources.com/index.php/deer-versions/readi>).