



Recommended for Statewide Use

Common (Statewide) Problem	Common (Statewide) Metric
Capturing Energy Savings	Annual Public Sector Gas, Electric, and Demand Savings
Depth of Interventions	Energy Savings (kWh, kW, Therms) per Project Energy Savings (kWh, kW, Therms) per Square Foot
Penetration of EE Programs and Benchmarking in the Eligible Market	Percent of Participation Relative to Eligible Population Percent of Square Feet of Eligible Population Participating in EE Programs
Higher Cost per Unit Saved than Statewide Average	Levelized Cost of Energy Efficiency per kWh, kW, and Therm
Low Financial Investment in Energy Efficiency	Dollars of Investments (all sources) for Energy Efficiency in Public Sector
Tracking Building Energy Intensity	Average Energy Use Intensity of Public Buildings Percent of Square Feet of Eligible Population Benchmarked





Proposed WE&T Statewide Metrics

Common Problem	Common Metric
Leverage effective partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of partnerships by workforce segment
Penetration of training and diversity of participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of participants by workforce segment % of participation relative to eligible target population for curriculum
Impact of training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of participants who report they applied the training annually # of projects implemented in applying the training annually

Definitions:

- **Partnerships** - jointly developed curriculum + agreement to implement
- **Workforce segment** – market actor segment within EE workforce (e.g. architects/designers, building officials, HVAC contractors, etc.)





Proposed Emerging Technology Metrics

Common Problem	Common Metric
Savings are not being tracked	Continued tracking of technologies that have moved from ET into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -portfolio -code -portfolio then code with associated dates and net and gross energy savings in the quarterly resource program savings reports.
Input from other groups is not being tracked	-Track recommendations received and responses to recommendations from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -C&S/code readiness -industry groups -architect/implementer/builders groups -other TDAs, such as EPIC, CalSEED, CalCEF, Rocket Fund, FLoW -ZNE implementation teams
Output from ET is not explicitly aligned with long-term goals	Mapping of ET projects and technologies aligned with specific statewide goals, with specificity as to what aspect of each goal it is fulfilling. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -“4 ET projects are aligned with statewide ZNE-readiness” -List of ET projects that are aligned with ZNE-readiness
ET project results are not always aligned with work paper requirements	What percentage of ET-originated work papers require additional information before submission?
ET event success is not tracked	Report results of event surveys indicating whether an event had its intended effect
ET hasn't increased the focus on market studies as recommended by ET EM&V	Percent of ET projects that include a market and/or barrier identification study
ET is not utilizing other programs to confront barriers to market penetration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -# of WE&T programs created around ET projects -# of ME&O programs created around ET projects -# of X programs (add other resources) created around ET projects





Codes & Standards

Common Problem	Common Metric
Capturing energy savings	Energy Savings: GWH, MMTherms and MW (demand)
Activity in advocating for codes and standards tied to adoption in CA	Number of CASE studies and a subset of the number that actually were used to implement codes and standards
Local government participation and success in adoption of reach codes	The number of local government Reach Codes implemented (this is a joint IOU and REN effort)
Activity in advocating for codes and standards tied to adoption at the federal level	Number of federal standards adopted for which a utility advocated

