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**Table 1.** Work Paper Abstract Snapshot

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Work Paper Abstract Snapshot | | |
| Item | **Details** | **Notes** |
| Measure name |  |  |
| Measure description |  |  |
| Sector (Res/Non-Res) |  |  |
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| Program(s) |  |  |
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# Measure Description

*Author must provide a brief description of the measure and technology. Description must include measure and base case equipment type, and the sector(s) where the savings are realized (residential, commercial, industrial, etc.).*

# Key Terms

*Author must provide key measure definitions and terms.*

# Program Implementation Method

*Include detailed description of market delivery. Author needs to indicate whether program delivery is upstream, midstream or downstream. Indicate any program exclusions or targeted sectors. Confirm whether delivery approach will be consistent statewide. If not, measure parameters may vary by delivery approach. Include details of implementation that may affect measure application type (i.e., NC, ROB, ER, etc.).*

# Mixed Baseline

*Indicate if there may be a mix of technologies in the baseline, and what the estimated distribution will be for the deemed measure.*

# Measure Summary

*Provide measure summary details. If measure delivery is not consistent statewide, include columns for each market delivery approach.*

**Table 2.** Measure Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **Measure** |
| Baseline Technology or Mix |  |
| Measure Technology |  |
| Measure Application Type | (i.e., ROB, NC, ER) |
| Delivery Mechanism | (i.e., Upstream, Midstream, Downstream, DI) |
| Impacted Markets | (i.e., residential, commercial, industrial, etc.) |
| Relevant Codes and Standards | (i.e., T20, T24, federal standard) |

# Estimated Size of Offer (Number of Participants)

*Indicate if total savings from measures will be high impact (1% or greater of portfolio savings) for an individual PA.*

# Estimated Impact of the Measure on Statewide Energy Efficiency Savings.

*Values should be developed with levels of precision and accuracy commensurate with their overall programmatic impact.*

# Applicable DEER

*Overview of relevant DEER measures and how they will be used (or why they won’t be used). Overview of DEER tools that will be used (lighting operating hours, wattage reduction ratio, etc.), or discussion of why DEER tools won’t be used. Sections 9 and 10 provide an opportunity to indicate data and methodology taken directly from DEER or modified from DEER.*

# Proposed Measure Parameter Data and Sources

*Include a list of all data and associated references that will be used for workpaper cost effectiveness parameters. Reference relevant codes and standards as appropriate. Indicate level of confidence that source(s) provide reasonably accurate values. Should include web links or linked/embedded files for the reviewer in Appendix A. Articulate in this section any data assumptions that the TF should be aware of.*

**Table 3.** Proposed Measure Parameter Data and Sources

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure Parameter** | **Data** | **Source Description[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Modification of DEER or reason for not using DEER** | **Confidence Level**  **(High, Medium, Low)** |
| Savings – kWh |  |  |  |  |
| Savings – kW |  |  |  |  |
| Savings – therm |  |  |  |  |
| EUL or RUL |  |  |  |  |
| MC or IMC |  |  |  |  |
| NTG |  |  |  |  |

# Commission Staff Review and Feedback

*Commission staff should provide feedback on proposed data and sources within 10 days of request.*

**Table 3.** Commission Staff Feedback on Proposed Data and Sources

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure Parameter** | **Date Sent to Staff** | **Date Staff Responded** | **Commission Staff Comment** |
| Savings – kWh |  |  |  |
| Savings – kW |  |  |  |
| Savings – therm |  |  |  |
| EUL or RUL |  |  |  |
| MC or IMC |  |  |  |
| NTG |  |  |  |

# Cal TF Comments on Proposed Measure Parameter Data and Sources

*Cal TF comments on proposed data and sources. Do data represent best available data? If not, what are alternate data/sources that should be considered?*

**Table 5.** Cal TF Comments on Measure Parameter Data and Sources

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure Parameter** | **Cal TF Comments on**  **Proposed Data/Source** | **Cal TF Recommendation(s) on Alternate Sources to Consider** |
| Savings – kWh |  |  |
| Savings – kW |  |  |
| Savings – therm |  |  |
| EUL or RUL |  |  |
| MC or IMC |  |  |
| NTG |  |  |

# Proposed Measure Parameter Methodology Sources

*Include a list of all methodology and associated references that will be used for workpaper cost effectiveness parameters. Indicate level of confidence that methodology will be sufficient to develop reasonably accurate values with reasonable resource availability. Should include web links or linked/embedded files for the reviewer in Appendix A. Articulate in this section any methodology assumptions that the TF should be aware of.*

**Table 6.** Proposed Measure Parameter Methodology and Sources

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure Parameter** | **Methodology** | **Source Description[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Modification of DEER or reason for not using DEER** | **Confidence Level**  **(High, Medium, Low)** |
| Savings – kWh |  |  |  |  |
| Savings – kW |  |  |  |  |
| Savings – therm |  |  |  |  |
| EUL or RUL |  |  |  |  |
| MC or IMC |  |  |  |  |
| NTG |  |  |  |  |

# Cal TF Comments on Proposed Measure Parameter Methodology and Sources

*Cal TF comments on proposed methodology and sources. Do values represent best available data? If not, what are alternate methods/sources that should be considered?*

**Table 7.** Cal TF Comments on Measure Parameter Methodology and Sources

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure Parameter** | **Cal TF Comments on**  **Proposed Data/Source** | **Cal TF Recommendation(s) on Alternate Sources to Consider** |
| Savings – kWh |  |  |
| Savings – kW |  |  |
| Savings – therm |  |  |
| EUL or RUL |  |  |
| MC or IMC |  |  |
| NTG |  |  |

# Questions for CPUC Staff on Applicability of DEER Values, Methods, Tools, Data, Etc.

*List any questions for CPUC staff proposed data and methodology, including questions about applicable DEER values, methods, data. Question should be specific, and provide link to DEER where applicability is uncertain.*

# Additional Research Needed

*Author should list any other research needed to complete the abstract and/or workpaper.*

# Applicable EM&V

*Describe any recent EM&V studies (California or other jurisdiction) that should be considered in developing measure WP, with link to study in Appendix A.*

# Workpaper Development

Provide:

1. Proposed WP developer, and justification for why developer selected.

2. List key tasks for developer

3. Provide proposed budget for WP development.

# Appendix A – Sources

List all source links or embedded documents

1. Provide a link to source or embed source in Appendix A of this document. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Provide a link to source or embed source in Appendix A of this document. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)