

Service Provider Evaluation System

Prescriptive and Custom Programs

CONTENTS

Application Evaluation Criteria	1
Retrofit Lighting	1
Prescriptive (Existing Buildings and New Construction)	5
Custom and Custom New Construction.....	8
New Construction Design Based Lighting	11
Evaluation Tiers and Action Levels.....	14
Inspection Evaluation Criteria.....	14
Retrofit and New Construction Design Based Lighting.....	15
Prescriptive (Existing Buildings and New Construction)	16
Custom and Custom New Construction.....	17
Evaluation Tiers and Action Levels.....	18
Cancellation Evaluation Criteria.....	19
Cancellation Reasons	20
Evaluation Tiers and Action Levels.....	21

Application Evaluation Criteria

In an effort to reduce processing times and ensure the submission of complete and accurate applications, all applications submitted by Service Providers to the Prescriptive and Custom Programs will be evaluated and scored based on the criteria below.

Each category represents a type of flaw found within applications. If an application is determined to have errors, it will result in an assessment of points based on the type of flaw. Once an application is finalized, it will receive a total score based on the aggregated total of flaw points assessed for the application.

Service Providers will maintain an average score from all Prescriptive and Custom Program applications submitted within a six-month time period. Based on a company's average score, program benefits or restrictions of participation can apply.

Retrofit Lighting

Program Rules (2 points)

One or more scenarios occurred that violated program rules including:

- Application submitted to incorrect program or incentive track
- Date of invoice was prior to the date of the program-issued pre-approval email
- Application was submitted where any amount of existing equipment was removed prior to date of the program-issued pre-approval email
- Application was submitted where any amount of proposed equipment was purchased and/or installed prior to date of the program-issued pre-approval email
- A party other than the customer signed their name to the Terms and Conditions document for an incentive application
- A party other than the customer signed their name to the pre-approval email
- A party other than the Delmarva Power customer submitted an incentive application prior to applying for and/or being approved as a Service Provider
- Application was not completed within allotted timeframe (includes completion of installation and upload of all final documentation):
 - Retrofit = six months within date of program-issued pre-approval email

Missing/Incorrect Terms and Conditions/Letter of Authorization (1 point)

- Terms and Conditions document was not uploaded to the Application Center when an application was submitted for review
- An incomplete Terms and Conditions document was uploaded to the Application Center when an application was submitted for review
 - Empty project fields
 - Customer Acknowledgment section not complete
 - Payment Information section not complete
- An application was submitted for processing with a missing or unsigned Letter of Authorization (aka Agency Agreement) (applies to rebate processors only)

Missing/Incorrect Invoice (1 point)

- Invoice not uploaded to the Application Center prior to submitting application for final approval
- Incorrect invoice uploaded to the Application Center when submitting application for final approval
- Incomplete invoice uploaded to the Application Center when submitting application for final approval
 - Does not contain quantities and/or model numbers
 - Premise address not listed
 - Invoice date not indicated

Missing/Incorrect Specification Sheets (1 point)

- Manufacturer's specification sheets were not included for all proposed fixtures and controls
- Incorrect specification sheets were uploaded to the Application Center

Missing/Incorrect ENERGY STAR®/DLC Screen Shots (1 point)

- ENERGY STAR/DLC screen shots of product listings were not included for all fixtures and/or networked lighting controls
- Incorrect ENERGY STAR/DLC screen shots were uploaded to the Application Center
- Out-of-date ENERGY STAR/DLC screen shots of product listings were provided for equipment that was removed from the certifying authority's Qualified Product List

Missing/Obsolete Electronic Lighting Worksheet (1 point)

- Electronic Lighting Worksheet was not uploaded to the Application Center when application was submitted for review

- An outdated version of the Electronic Lighting Worksheet was uploaded to the Application Center when application was submitted for review
- Electronic Lighting Worksheet was uploaded to the Application Center in a format other than Excel (PDF, etc.)

Missing/Unsigned Pre-Approval Email (1 point)

- Program-issued pre-approval email was not uploaded to the Application Center prior to submitting application for final approval
- Program-issued pre-approval email was uploaded to the Application Center without a signature prior to submitting application for final approval

Fixture Eligibility – One Error (1 point)

- DesignLights Consortium or ENERGY STAR fixture was applied for that does not meet efficacy or wattage reduction requirements
- Equipment applied for was not a listed fixture on DesignLights Consortium or ENERGY STAR
- Equipment applied for was not eligible for program incentives by another means

Fixture Eligibility – Two or More Errors (2 points)

- Two or more DesignLights Consortium and/or ENERGY STAR fixtures were applied for that did not meet efficacy or wattage reduction requirements
- Two or more equipment models were applied for that were not listed fixtures on DesignLights Consortium and/or ENERGY STAR
- Two or more equipment models were applied for that were not eligible for program incentives by another means

Missing Electronic Lighting Worksheet Field Entries (1 point)

- Mandatory fields were not completed on the Electronic Lighting Worksheet such as:
 - Building type, space description, control, lumens, efficacy, etc.

Incorrect Electronic Lighting Worksheet Field Entries (1 point)

- Manufacturer and/or model number for equipment is not entered on Electronic Lighting Worksheet
- Model number entered on Electronic Lighting Worksheet for equipment does not match model number as listed on DesignLights Consortium or ENERGY STAR listing
- Indicated efficacy, lumens, or wattage for equipment differs from the values indicated for the equipment as listed on DesignLights Consortium or ENERGY STAR
- Selected device codes on Electronic Lighting Worksheet were incorrect

Incorrect Measure Code Selection (1 point)

- A measure code was applied for with the incorrect DesignLights Consortium product category or primary use designation
- A measure code with a tiered incentive structure (high bays, exterior fixtures, etc.) was applied for incorrectly
- A measure code was applied for where the technical requirements indicate the equipment should be classified in a different measure code

Controls Requirements Not Met (1 point)

One or more control requirements were not met including:

- An occupancy, vacancy, or daylighting control was not indicated as being applied for when mandatory for a required line item
- A pre-existing control (including a time clock or photocell for exterior fixtures) was not properly indicated on a line when applicable
- An incorrect quantity of fixtures controlled was indicated
- An incentive was requested for a daylight control on an exterior fixture
- A Networked Lighting Control was applied for that was not listed on the DesignLights Consortium (DLC) Networked Lighting Control (NLC) Qualified Product List (QPL)

Incorrect Control Measure Code Selection (1 point)

An incorrect measure code was selected for a control including:

- A measure code was selected for a fixture that controls 20W or greater when the fixture controlled is less than 20W or vice versa
- The measure code applied for does not match the actual control capability (ex: a dual daylight/occupancy control is installed, yet only the occupancy control was proposed)
- A networked lighting control that does not require a local/cloud-based server (as indicated by DesignLights Consortium Networked Lighting Control Qualified Products List) was applied for as the measure code that pays an incentive based on this requirement

Administrative Requirements (1 point)

- An inaccurate account number (ex: residential or gas only account) was provided for the premise
- A Service Provider or other third party is listed as the customer's primary contact
- An incorrect mailing/premise address was provided for the customer and/or Service Provider
- Incorrect contact information was provided for the customer and/or Service Provider

- Inaccurate payee mailing information was indicated resulting in a stop payment

Responsiveness (1 point)

- No response to emails or calls from program staff requesting missing documentation or additional clarification within a two-week period

Gross Violation (10 points)

- Service Provider or other party entered an incentive application representing themselves as the Delmarva Power customer
- Service Provider or other party signed a program form or other submitted documentation representing themselves as the Delmarva Power customer
- Service Provider or other party submitted a project for final approval (signed pre-approval email and/or invoice uploaded) when the project installation was determined not to have been completed
- Actual installation was performed by a party other than the identified party in the installation contractor field
- Actual installed equipment was misrepresented on the application; equipment installed was not listed on DesignLights Consortium and/or ENERGY STAR; did not meet wattage reduction, lumen, and/or efficacy requirements; did not meet technical requirements, etc.

Prescriptive (Existing Buildings and New Construction)

Program Rules (2 points)

One or more scenarios occurred that violated programmatic rules including:

- Application submitted to incorrect program or incentive track
- Application was submitted where any amount of existing equipment was removed prior to pre-approval
- Application was submitted where any amount of proposed equipment was purchased and/or installed prior to pre-approval
- A party other than the customer signed their name to the Terms and Conditions document for an incentive application
- A party other than the customer signed their name to the pre-approval email
- Application not completed within allotted timeframe
 - Retrofit = six months within date of program-issued pre-approval email
 - New Construction = one year within date of program-issued pre-approval email

Missing/Incorrect Terms and Conditions/Letter of Authorization (1 point)

- A customer-signed Terms and Conditions document was not uploaded to the Application Center when an application was submitted for review
- A Terms and Conditions document was uploaded to the Application Center and was incomplete when submitted for review
 - Empty project fields
 - Customer Acknowledgment section not complete
 - Payment Information section not complete
- An application was submitted for processing with a missing or unsigned Letter of Authorization (aka Agency Agreement) (applies to rebate processors only)

Missing/Incorrect Invoice (1 point)

- Invoice not uploaded to the Application Center prior to submitting application for final approval
- Incorrect invoice uploaded to the Application Center when submitting application for final approval
- Incomplete invoice uploaded to the Application Center when submitting application for final approval
 - Does not contain quantities and/or model numbers
 - Premise address not listed
 - Invoice date not indicated

Missing/Incorrect Specification Sheets (1 point)

- Manufacturer specification/cut sheets
- AHRI certificate (substitute for HVAC specification sheets)

Missing/Unsigned Pre-Approval Email (1 point)

- Program-issued pre-approval email was not uploaded to the Application Center prior to submitting application for final approval
- Program-issued pre-approval email was uploaded to the Application Center without a signature prior to submitting application for final approval

Equipment Eligibility – One Error (1 point)

- Efficiency standards for HVAC equipment not met
- ENERGY STAR/CEE fixture does not meet minimum requirements
- ENERGY STAR/CEE fixture not listed
- Performance designations not met with selected equipment
- VFD applied for which was replacing a failed VFD

Equipment Eligibility – Two or More Errors (2 points)

- Efficiency standards for HVAC equipment not met
- ENERGY STAR/CEE fixture does not meet minimum requirements
- ENERGY STAR/CEE fixture not listed
- Performance designations not met with selected equipment
- VFD applied for which was replacing a failed VFD

Equipment Entry (1 point)

Indicated equipment is submitted improperly and/or incomplete with one or more of the following errors:

- Incorrect product type/category selected
- Incorrect/incomplete model numbers listed
- Incomplete mandatory fields
- Information needs to match specification sheet or AHRI certification

Administrative Requirements (1 point)

- An inaccurate account number (ex: residential or gas only account) was provided for the premise
- A Service Provider or other third party is listed as the customer's primary contact
- An incorrect mailing/premise address was provided for the customer and/or Service Provider
- Incorrect contact information was provided for the customer and/or Service Provider
- Inaccurate payee mailing information was indicated resulting in a stop payment

Responsiveness (1 point)

- No response to emails or calls from program staff requesting missing documentation or additional clarification within a two-week period

Gross Violation (10 points)

A Gross Violation occurred, which could include, but is not limited to:

- Service Provider or other party fraudulently signed a program form or other submitted documentation posing as the Delmarva Power customer
- Service Provider or other party fraudulently posed as a customer when submitting an application under a customer login
- Service Provider or other party submitted a signed pre-approval email and/or invoice when the project installation was not complete
- The installation was performed by a party other than the identified party in the installation contractor field
- Actual installed equipment was misrepresented on the application; equipment installed was not CEE/ENERGY STAR listed or did not meet technical requirements, etc.

Custom and Custom New Construction

Program Rules (2 points)

One or more scenarios occurred that violated general programmatic rules including:

- Application submitted to incorrect program or incentive track
- Application was submitted where any amount of existing equipment was removed prior to pre-approval
- Application was submitted where any amount of proposed equipment was purchased and/or installed prior to pre-approval
- A party other than the customer signed their name to the Terms and Conditions document for an incentive application
- A party other than the customer signed their name to the pre-approval email
- Application not completed within allotted timeframe
 - Retrofit = six months within date of program-issued pre-approval email
 - New Construction = one year within date of program-issued pre-approval email

Quality of Analysis Insufficient (1 point)

The quality of the Energy Impact Summary and/or Cost Analysis was insufficient including, but not limited to:

- Missing Technical Analysis Study Report or equivalent scope report
- Incorrect baseline or project type (retrofit vs end-of-life) was indicated

- Assumptions made through supporting calculations not justifiable
- Supporting calculations were flawed/incomplete
- Obvious and repeated attempts to inflate the indicated proposed costs
- Quality of Analysis insufficient

Missing/Incorrect Terms and Conditions/Letter of Authorization (1 point)

- A customer-signed Terms and Conditions document was not uploaded to the Application Center when an application was submitted for review
- A Terms and Conditions document was uploaded to the Application Center and was incomplete when submitted for review
 - Empty project fields
 - Customer Acknowledgment section not complete
 - Payment Information section not complete
- An application was submitted for processing with a missing or unsigned Letter of Authorization (aka Agency Agreement) (applies to rebate processors only)

Missing/Incorrect Specification Sheets (1 point)

- Manufacturer specification/cut sheets
- AHRI certificate (substitute for HVAC specification sheets)

Missing/Unsigned Pre-Approval Email (1 point)

- Program-issued pre-approval email was not uploaded to the Application Center prior to submitting application for final approval
- Program-issued pre-approval email was uploaded to the Application Center without a signature prior to submitting application for final approval

Missing/Incorrect Invoice (1 point)

- Invoice not uploaded to the Application Center prior to submitting application for final approval
- Incorrect invoice uploaded to the Application Center when submitting application for final approval
- Incomplete invoice uploaded to the Application Center when submitting application for final approval
 - Does not contain quantities and/or model numbers
 - Premise address not listed
 - Invoice date not indicated

Missing/Unsigned Minimum Requirements Document (1 point)

- Minimum Requirements Document (MRD) was not uploaded into the application center or emailed to Project Engineer
- Minimum Requirements Document (MRD) was unsigned or signed by a party other than the customer or authorized representative

Administrative Requirements (1 point)

- An inaccurate account number (ex: residential or gas only account) was provided for the premise
- A Service Provider or other third party is listed as the customer's primary contact
- An incorrect mailing/premise address was provided for the customer and/or Service Provider
- Incorrect contact information was provided for the customer and/or Service Provider
- Inaccurate payee mailing information was indicated resulting in a stop payment

Responsiveness (1 point)

- No response to emails or calls from program staff requesting missing documentation or additional clarification within a two-week period

Gross Violation (10 points)

A Gross Violation occurred, which could include, but is not limited to:

- Service Provider or other party fraudulently signed a program form or other submitted documentation posing as the Delmarva Power customer
- Service Provider or other party fraudulently posed as a customer when submitting an application under a customer login
- Service Provider or other party submitted a signed pre-approval email and/or invoice when the project installation was not complete
- The installation was performed by a party other than the identified party in the installation contractor field
- Actual installed equipment was misrepresented on the application; equipment installed was not CEE/ENERGY STAR listed or did not meet technical requirements, etc.

New Construction Design Based Lighting

Program Rules (2 points)

One or more scenarios occurred that violated program rules including:

- Application submitted to incorrect program or incentive track
- Date of invoice was prior to the date of the program-issued pre-approval email
- Application was submitted where any amount of existing equipment (for major renovations) was removed prior to date of the program-issued pre-approval email
- Application was submitted where any amount of proposed equipment was purchased and/or installed prior to date of the program-issued pre-approval email
- A party other than the customer signed their name to the Terms and Conditions document for an incentive application
- A party other than the customer signed their name to the pre-approval email
- Application was not completed within allotted timeframe (includes completion of installation and upload of all final documentation):
 - Retrofit = six months within date of program-issued pre-approval email
 - New Construction = one year within date of program-issued pre-approval email

Missing/Incorrect Terms and Conditions/Letter of Authorization (1 point)

- A customer-signed Terms and Conditions document was not uploaded to the Application Center when an application was submitted for review
- A Terms and Conditions document was uploaded to the Application Center and was incomplete when submitted for review
 - Empty project fields
 - Customer Acknowledgment section not complete
 - Payment Information section not complete
- An application was submitted for processing with a missing or unsigned Letter of Authorization (aka Agency Agreement) (applies to rebate processors only)

Missing/Incorrect Invoice (1 point)

- Invoice not uploaded to the Application Center prior to submitting application for final approval
- Incorrect invoice uploaded to the Application Center when submitting application for final approval
- Incomplete invoice uploaded to the Application Center when submitting application for final approval

- Does not contain quantities and/or model numbers
- Premise address not listed
- Invoice date not indicated

Missing/Incorrect Specification Sheets (1 point)

- Manufacturer's specification sheets were not included for all luminaires, lamps, and controls
- Incorrect specification sheets were uploaded to the Application Center

Missing/Obsolete New Construction Lighting Electronic Worksheet (1 point)

- New Construction Lighting Worksheet was not uploaded to the Application Center when application was submitted for review
- An outdated version of the New Construction Lighting Electronic Worksheet was uploaded to the Application Center when application was submitted for review
- New Construction Lighting Electronic Worksheet was uploaded to the Application Center in a format other than Excel (PDF, etc.)

Lighting Layout Plans (1 point)

- Lighting layout plans were not uploaded to the Application Center when an application was submitted for review

Missing New Construction Lighting Electronic Worksheet Field Entries (1 point)

- Mandatory fields were not completed on the New Construction Lighting Electronic Worksheet such as:
 - Building type, space description, lumens, gross area, etc.

Incorrect New Construction Lighting Electronic Worksheet Field Entries (1 point)

- Manufacturer and/or Model number for equipment is not entered on New Construction Lighting Electronic Worksheet
- Model number entered on New Construction Lighting Electronic Worksheet for equipment does not match model number as listed on DesignLights Consortium or ENERGY STAR listing
- Indicated efficacy, lumens, or wattage for equipment differs from the values indicated for the equipment as listed on DesignLights Consortium or ENERGY STAR
- Entered inaccurate gross area for space or for building method lighting power density calculations

Wattage Reduction Not Met (1 point)

- Wattage reduction for either space-by-space or building-area method was not at least 10% more efficient than code requirements

Missing/Unsigned Pre-Approval Email (1 point)

- Program-issued pre-approval email was not uploaded to the Application Center prior to submitting application for final approval
- Program-issued pre-approval email was uploaded to the Application Center without a signature prior to submitting application for final approval

Administrative Requirements (1 point)

- An inaccurate account number (ex: residential or gas only account) was provided for the premise
- A Service Provider or other third party is listed as the customer's primary contact
- An incorrect mailing/premise address was provided for the customer and/or Service Provider
- Incorrect contact information was provided for the customer and/or Service Provider
- Inaccurate payee mailing information was indicated resulting in a stop payment

Responsiveness (1 point)

- No response to emails or calls from program staff requesting missing documentation or additional clarification within a two-week period

Gross Violation (10 points)

- Service Provider or other party entered an incentive application representing themselves as the Delmarva Power customer
- Service Provider or other party signed a program form or other submitted documentation representing themselves as the Delmarva Power customer
- Service Provider or other party submitted a project for final approval (signed pre-approval email and/or invoice uploaded) when the project installation was determined not to have been completed
- Actual installation was performed by a party other than the identified party in the installation contractor field
- Actual installed equipment was misrepresented on the application; equipment installed was not listed on DesignLights Consortium and/or ENERGY STAR; did not meet wattage reduction, lumen, and/or efficacy requirements; did not meet technical requirements, etc.

Evaluation Tiers and Action Levels

Rating	Average Flaw Points	Rewards/Consequences
Good	1.9 or Less	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing on Prescriptive and Custom Programs Service Provider Directory • Ability to attend industry Service Provider only events
Needs Improvement	2.0–3.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phone meeting with Service Provider Outreach Manager
Probationary	4.0–7.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All applications on hold until further notice • In person meeting with the Service Provider Participation & Support Services Manager and Service Provider Outreach Manager
Suspension	8.0 or More	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st offense = 2-month suspension • 2nd offense = 4-month suspension • 3rd offense = Program expulsion

Inspection Evaluation Criteria

In an effort to ensure accuracy and reduce processing times, all applications submitted by Service Providers to the Prescriptive and Custom Program that are selected for inspection will be evaluated and scored based on the criteria below.

The inspection score is based primarily on the quality and accuracy of the information provided pertaining to the type and quantity of the identified existing and proposed equipment.

Additionally, the score will be negatively impacted by other factors such as a site contact being unprepared to facilitate the inspection.

Each category below represents a type of flaw found during an inspection. The value in parenthesis represents the number of points assessed based on each type of flaw. Once a project is inspected, the application will receive an aggregated inspection score that consists of the total of any applicable points assessed.

Service Providers will receive an inspection score once they have participated in the program for at least six months and/or have submitted at least five projects to the program. The overall inspection score will represent the cumulative score of all projects submitted by that Service Provider that have been inspected in the past six

months. Based on a company's cumulative inspection score, program benefits or restrictions of participation can apply.

Retrofit and New Construction Design Based Lighting

Pre-Inspection – Pass With Corrections (1 point)

A Pre-Inspection is rated as "Pass With Corrections" due to minor inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Fixture counts
- Reported existing technologies, wattages, etc.
- Space descriptions
- Very minor amount of equipment found installed prior to pre-approval
 - Points will also be deducted for Program Rule Violations on the Application Evaluation

Pre-Inspection – Failed (2 points)

A Pre-Inspection is rated as "Failed" due to egregious inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Fixture counts
- Reported existing technologies, wattages, etc.
- Space descriptions
- A significant portion or all of the proposed equipment found already installed
 - Points will also be deducted for Program Rule Violations on the Application Evaluation
- Site contact not prepared with tools necessary to complete inspection such as ladders, tools, etc.
- Site contact was not knowledgeable about pertinent information necessary to complete the inspection

Post-Inspection – Pass With Corrections (1 point)

A Post-Inspection is rated as "Pass With Corrections" due to minor inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Fixture counts
- Reported installed technologies
- Space descriptions

Post-Inspection – Failed (2 points)

A Post-Inspection is rated as “Failed” due to egregious inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Fixture counts
- Reported installed technologies
- Space descriptions
- Square footage (New Construction)
- Site contact not prepared with tools necessary to complete inspection such as ladders, tools, etc.
- Site contact was not knowledgeable about pertinent information necessary to complete the inspection

Delayed Inspection (1 point)

An inspection was delayed (yet able to be completed) as a result of one or more of the following:

- Site contact is late to an inspection by more than 20 minutes
- Site contact did not come with the necessary equipment
- Site contact was not knowledgeable about pertinent project information needed to complete the inspection
- Vague space description data discovered on-site
- Excessive attempts to schedule or reschedule an inspection

Prescriptive (Existing Buildings and New Construction)

Pre-Inspection – Pass With Corrections (1 point)

A Pre-Inspection is rated as “Pass With Corrections” due to inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Very minor amount of equipment found installed prior to pre-approval

Pre-Inspection – Failed (2 points)

A Pre-Inspection is rated as “Failed” due to egregious inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- A significant portion or all of the proposed equipment found already installed
- Site contact not prepared with tools necessary to complete inspection
 - Ladders, tools, etc.

Post-Inspection – Pass With Corrections (1 point)

A Post-Inspection is rated as “Pass With Corrections” due to minor inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Equipment counts
- Reported installed technologies (model numbers, etc.)

Post-Inspection – Failed (2 points)

A Post-Inspection is rated as “Failed” due to egregious inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Fixture counts
- Reported installed technologies (model numbers, etc.)
- Site contact not prepared with tools necessary to complete inspection
 - Ladders, tools, etc.

Delayed Inspection (1 point)

An inspection was delayed as a result of one or more of the following:

- Site contact is late to an inspection by more than 20 minutes
- Site contact did not come with the necessary equipment
 - Was able to complete inspection due to being able to find equipment or use customer equipment on site
- Excessive attempts to schedule or reschedule an inspection

Custom and Custom New Construction

Pre-Inspection – Pass With Corrections (1 point)

A Pre-Inspection is rated as “Pass With Corrections” due to minor inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Baseline equipment indicated in the application
- Baseline usage as described in the application

Pre-Inspection – Failed (2 points)

A Pre-Inspection is rated as “Failed” due to egregious inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- A significant portion or all of the proposed equipment found already installed

- Project Engineer would also deduct for Program Rule Violations
- Site contact not prepared with tools necessary to complete inspection
 - Ladders, tools, etc.

Post-Inspection – Pass With Corrections (1 point)

A Post-Inspection is rated as “Pass With Corrections” due to minor inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Equipment counts
- Reported installed technologies (model numbers, etc.)

Post-Inspection – Failed (2 points)

A Post-Inspection is rated as “Failed” due to egregious inaccuracies within one or more of the following error types:

- Equipment counts
- Reported installed technologies (model numbers, etc.)
- Site contact not prepared with tools necessary to complete inspection
 - Ladders, tools, etc.

Delayed Inspection (1 point)

An inspection was delayed as a result of one or more of the following:

- Site contact is late to an inspection by more than 20 minutes
- Site contact did not come with the necessary equipment
 - Was able to complete inspection due to being able to find equipment or use customer equipment on site
- Excessive attempts to schedule or reschedule an inspection

Evaluation Tiers and Action Levels

Rating	Flaw Points	Rewards/Consequences
Good	1.9 or Less	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Eligible to be listed on Service Provider Directory
Needs Improvement	2.0–3.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Phone meeting with Inspector and Service Provider Outreach Manager ● Written summary of inspection flaws provided

Rating	Flaw Points	Rewards/Consequences
Probation	4.0–5.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All existing projects placed on hold until meeting Formal meeting with Inspector and Service Provider Outreach Manager Action plan for improvement prepared and signed by Service Provider Includes list of existing projects to be revised/addressed
Suspension	6.0 or More	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal meeting with Inspector, Manager of Service Provider Participation and Support Services, and Service Provider Outreach Manager 100% inspection rate of new and existing projects until the Inspectors' release Additional consequences may be imposed if inspections during the probationary period result in a failed inspection. The consequences for each occurrence are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 failure = 2-month suspension 2 failures = 4-month suspension 3+ failures = Possible expulsion

Cancellation Evaluation Criteria

In an effort to ensure accuracy and reduce processing times, all applications submitted by Service Providers to the Prescriptive and Custom Programs will be monitored for the rates of cancellation based on the criteria below.

The cancellation score simply tracks the percentage of cancelled applications as a share of the total applications submitted by a given Service Provider. The score is meant to identify Service Providers that have difficulty in completing applications and projects, whether due to missing documentation, changing project scopes, or other issues that may arise. These flaws will not factor into the Application Evaluation or Inspection scoring systems, but will require intervention if high shares of applications are cancelled in a given period of time.

The cancellation reasons that result in intervention versus those that are eligible for exemption can be found in descriptions below.

Service Providers will receive a percentage cancellation score once they have participated in the program for at least six months and/or have submitted at least five projects to the program. The score will represent the

percentage of all projects cancelled as a share of total projects submitted by that Service Provider in the past six months. Based on a company's cancellation score, program benefits or restrictions of participation can apply. Any flaw points assessed against a cancelled application through the Application Evaluation System will not count towards the Service Provider's application evaluation score. Flaw points assessed for failed or pass with correction inspections will still be counted towards the Service Provider's inspection score, especially if they result in the cancellation of an application.

Cancellation Reasons

A cancelled application is counted towards the application percentage score if it is cancelled for any of the following reasons:

- Customer invalid
- Duplicate application
- Fatal technical flaw
- No pre-approval
- Expired pre-approval period
- Flawed expiration
- Equipment not eligible
- Other, except for cancellations due to:
 - Authorized change in scope
 - Change in Service Provider
 - Transferred/re-entered application

A cancelled application will not be counted towards the application percentage score if it is cancelled due to a customer withdrawal. Custom applications are also exempt for any reasons associated with non-custom scope, cost-effectiveness, or other unique attributes as they may not be foreseeable amongst Service Providers before the application is submitted.

Evaluation Tiers and Action Levels

Rating	Percentage	Rewards/Consequences
Good	Less than 25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligible to be listed on Service Provider Directory
Needs Improvement	25%–50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phone meeting with Service Provider Team • Written summary of cancelled projects provided
Probation	More than 50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal meeting with Service Provider Team • Action plan for improvement prepared and signed by Service Provider

Delmarva Power Energy Savings for Business Program

Contact: 866-353-5799 | delmarvabusiness@icf.com