




Emerging Technologies Program Technology to Portfolio Evaluation

Prepared for the California Public Utilities Commission
by Opinion Dynamics



February 26, 2024
CALMAC Study ID: CPU0231.03



This study is covered under CPUC Contract 17PS5017 between Opinion Dynamics and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Ridge and Associates and Itron are subcontractors to Opinion Dynamics for this work.

Acknowledgements

This project was a collaborative effort under contract to the CPUC. We would like to thank the California Commission Staff and Investor-Owned Utilities for guidance and input throughout the project planning and execution. In particular, we would like to thank ETP program management staff who took the time to support this study by responding to data requests and helping inform the analysis.

Legal Notice

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the California Public Utilities Commission. It does not necessarily represent the views of the Commission or any of its employees except to the extent, if any, that it has formally been approved by the Commission at a public meeting. For information regarding any such action, communicate directly with the Commission at 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102. Neither the Commission nor the State of California, nor any officer, employee, or any of its contractors or subcontractors makes any warrant, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability whatsoever for the contents of this document.

Abstract

This research is an addendum to the “Emerging Technologies Program Technology to Portfolio Evaluation” report published on May 11, 2021. The study initially examined the effects of the Emerging Technologies Program (ETP) from program years 2009–2017. The evaluation team then updated the results to include program years 2018 – 2022 through this addendum.

Each of the four California Investor-Owned Utilities (IOUs) administers an ETP, with the overall goal of serving as a pipeline to deliver emerging technologies (ETs) to ratepayer-funded energy efficiency (EE) programs. ETP helps to meet the state’s energy reduction needs by identifying and vetting technologies that deliver reliable energy savings. In the 2009–2022 timeframe, ETP studied numerous technologies or novel applications of technologies, resulting in some being recommended for consideration in the California EE Portfolio (hereafter referred to as Portfolio) and some being ruled out.

This study met the following objectives set forth by the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC): (1) Evaluated the market uptake (defined as the number of measures incentivized) and achieved savings of all technologies and approaches that moved from ETP into the Portfolio or directly into codes or standards (C&S) from 2009 to 2022, (2) Estimated Portfolio evaluated lifetime savings resulting from these measures, (3) Developed recommendations for Portfolio database specification changes or other pertinent tracking mechanisms that may improve and streamline quantifying ETP-associated savings in the future, and (4) Developed preliminary baselines for the recently-adopted ETP metrics codified in the IOU business plans.

The study revealed that ETP-associated measure codes generated over one million matches to the Portfolio, representing over ten billion evaluated net lifetime kWh and 108 million evaluated net lifetime therms. In the 2009–2022 timeframe this equated to, on average, 4% of Portfolio kWh savings, 6% of kW savings (2016–2022 only), and 1% of positive therm savings (excluding interactive effects). The majority of these savings were in the non-residential sector, and indoor lighting measures were the most prevalent technologies and/or applications. Though the non-residential sector dominated savings, the residential sector also largely contributed to ETP-associated savings in terms of the number of residential savings claims between 2009 – 2022.

The study also identified a myriad of data-tracking inconsistencies and challenges that prevent ETP-associated measures from being reliably measured or tracked in a streamlined or automated fashion.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Research Approach.....	1
1.3 Summary of Findings and Recommendations from 2009-2022.....	3
2. Study Overview	7
2.1 Evaluation Objectives	7
2.2 Evaluation Methodology	8
3. Study Findings	17
3.1 ETP Projects Eligible for Adoption in Portfolio	17
3.2 ETP Projects Represented in the Portfolio.....	18
3.3 ETP to Portfolio Match Characteristics and Savings.....	20
3.4 EE Business Plan Metrics.....	25
4. Framework for Tracking ETP-Associated Measures	30
4.1 ETP to Portfolio Matching Challenges and Considerations	30
4.2 Framework for Tracking Measures	32
5. Key Findings and Recommendations.....	34
Appendix A. CA IOU Measure Development Process.....	37
Appendix B. Supplemental Detailed Findings	38
Detailed Metrics Analysis Tables	38
ETP-Associated Savings Cohort Comparison.....	43
Appendix C. Portfolio Exclusions.....	50
Appendix D. Workpaper Review Results.....	52
Appendix E. Selection of Tracking Issues and Recommendations from Prior ETP Evaluations ..	58
Appendix F. Historical Analysis Addendum	62
Updated Appendix B. Supplemental Detailed Findings for Addendum	88
Updated Appendix C. Portfolio Exclusions for Addendum	100
Appendix G. Stakeholder Comments and Response	103

Table of Tables

Table 1. ETP Metrics (ETP-T1 through ETP-T5).....	8
Table 2. Percent of ETP to Portfolio Matches Based on Workpaper Review	15
Table 3. ETP Project Adoption from 2009-2017 by IOU.....	18
Table 4. Summary of Measure Code Dispositions by Matching Level (n=748).....	19
Table 5. Summary of ETP-Associated Measures, Claims, and Ex Post Savings	20
Table 6. Total ETP-Associated Measures, Claims, and Ex Post Savings by IOU ETP Program	21
Table 7. Number of Unique ETP-Associated Measure Codes by Sector and Claim Year ^a	21
Table 8. Emerging Technologies Program Metrics and Findings.....	25
Table 9. Number and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio	27
Table 10. Ex Post Net Savings and Percent Savings of ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5a – ETP-T5c).....	29
Table 11. Ex Ante and Ex Post kWh Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5a)	38
Table 12. Ex Ante and Ex Post kW Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5b)	39
Table 13. Ex Ante and Ex Post Therm Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5c) – Excluding Negative Therms.....	40
Table 14. Ex Ante and Ex Post Therm Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5c) – Including Negative Therms.....	42
Table 15. Number of Unique ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year.....	44
Table 16. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Net kWh Savings by Cohort and Claim Year.....	44
Table 17. Ex Post Net kWh Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year.....	46
Table 18. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Net kW Savings	47
Table 19. Ex Post Net kW Savings of ETP-Associated Measures.....	47
Table 20. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Net Therm Savings by Cohort and Claim Year.....	49
Table 21. Ex Post Net Therm Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year.....	49
Table 22. Codes & Standards Ex Post Net Savings by Claim Year	50
Table 23. Unidentifiable Ex Post Net Savings by Claim Year	51
Table 24. Workpaper IDs, ETP Projects, and Measure Codes Identified by Evaluation Team.....	52
Table 25. ETP Project Adoption from 2009-2022 by IOU.....	68
Table 26. Summary of Measure Code Dispositions for Claim Years 2018-2022 by Matching Level (n=1,609)	70
Table 27. Summary of ETP-Associated Measures, Claims, and Ex Ante Savings.....	71

Table 28. Total ETP-Associated Measures, Claims, and Ex Ante Savings by IOU ETP Program.....	72
Table 29. Number of Unique ETP-Associated Measure Codes by Sector and Claim Year ^a	72
Table 30. Summary of ETP-Associated C&S Measures, Claims, and Ex Ante Savings 2018-2022	78
Table 31. Total ETP-Associated C&S Measures, Claims, and Ex Ante Savings by IOU ETP Program	78
Table 32. Number of Unique ETP-Associated C&S Measure Codes by Sector and Claim Year	78
Table 33. TRC Costs and Benefits Ratio by Claim Year and IOU 2018 - 2022.....	84
Table 34. TRC Costs and Benefits Ratio by Claim Year and Technology Type 2018 - 2022.....	84
Table 35. TRC Costs and Benefits Ratio by Claim Year and Sector 2018 - 2022.....	85
Table 36. Emerging Technologies Program Metrics and Findings.....	86
Table 37. Number and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio.....	87
Table 38. Ex Ante and Ex Post kWh Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5a)	88
Table 39. Ex Ante and Ex Post kW Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5b)	90
Table 40. Ex Ante and Ex Post Therm Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5c) – Excluding Negative Therms.....	90
Table 41. Ex Ante and Ex Post Therm Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5c) – Including Negative Therms.....	92
Table 42. Number of Unique ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year.....	94
Table 43. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Net kWh Savings by Cohort and Claim Year.....	95
Table 44. Ex Ante Net kWh Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year.....	95
Table 45. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Net kW Savings by Cohort and Claim Year.....	97
Table 46. Ex Ante Net kW Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year.....	97
Table 47. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Net Therm Savings by Cohort and Claim Year	98
Table 48. Ex Ante Net Therm Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year.....	98
Table 49. Codes & Standards Ex Ante Net Savings by Claim Year.....	100
Table 50. Unidentifiable Ex Ante Net Savings by Claim Year.....	101
Table 51. ESA Ex Ante Net Savings by Claim Year ^a	102
Table 52. Stakeholder Comments and Evaluator’s Responses	103

Table of Figures

Figure 1. Emerging Technologies Program Savings Tracking Data Sources Workflow	2
Figure 2. Key Findings of ETP Efforts from 2009–2022	3
Figure 3. Summary of the CA IOU Technology Intake and Measure Development Process	9
Figure 4. Emerging Technologies Program Savings Tracking Data Sources Workflow	10
Figure 5. ETP Project Adoption Status from 2009 to 2017	17
Figure 6. Summary of Matches by Criteria (n=158)	19
Figure 7. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle Net kWh by Sector and Claim Year	22
Figure 8. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle Net kW by Sector and Claim Year	22
Figure 9. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle Net Therms by Sector and Claim Year ^a ...	22
Figure 10. Percent of ETP-Associated Claims by Sector and Year	23
Figure 11. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle kWh Savings by Technology	24
Figure 12. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle kW Savings by Technology	24
Figure 13. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle Therm Savings by Technology ^a	25
Figure 14. IOU Measure Development Process Decision Points	37
Figure 15. Portfolio and ETP-Associated Ex Post kWh Savings Comparison by Claim Year	39
Figure 16. Portfolio and ETP-Associated Ex Post Therm Savings Comparison by Claim Year	41
Figure 17. ETP Project Adoption Status from 2009 to 2022	68
Figure 18. Summary of Matches by Criteria (n=171)	69
Figure 19. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh by Sector and Claim Year ^{a, b} ...	73
Figure 20. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW by Sector and Claim Year ^{a, b}	73
Figure 21. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therms by Sector and Claim Year ^{a, b, c}	74
Figure 22. Percent of ETP-Associated Claims by Sector and Year ^{a, b}	75
Figure 23. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle kWh Savings by Technology ^{a, b}	76
Figure 24. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle kW Savings by Technology ^{a, b}	76
Figure 25. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle Therm Savings by Technology ^{a, b, c}	77
Figure 26. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh by Sector and Claim Year ^a	79
Figure 27. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW by Sector and Claim Year ^a	80
Figure 28. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therms by Sector and Claim Year ^{a, b}	80
Figure 29. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Claims by Sector and Claim Year ^a	81
Figure 30. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle kWh Savings by Technology ^a	81
Figure 31. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle kW Savings by Technology ^a	82

Figure 32. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle Therm Savings by Technology ^{a,b}.... 82
Figure 33. Portfolio and ETP-Associated Ex Ante kWh Savings Comparison by Claim Year 89
Figure 34. Portfolio and ETP-Associated Ex Ante Therm Savings Comparison by Claim Year 91

Table of Abbreviations

ABAL	Annual Budget Advice Letters
C&S	Codes and Standards
CA	California
CaITF	California Technical Forum
CCA	Community Choice Aggregators
CEDARS	California Energy Data and Reporting System
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
DEER	Database for Energy Efficiency Resources
EE	Energy Efficiency
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ET	Emerging Technologies
ETCC	Emerging Technologies Coordinating Council
ETP	Emerging Technologies Program
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
IOU	Investor-Owned Utility
LED	Light-emitting diode
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
REN	Regional Energy Network
SCE	Southern California Edison
SDG&E	San Diego Gas & Electric
SoCalGas/SCG	Southern California Gas Company
PA	Program Administrator

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Introduction

This research examines the effects of the Emerging Technologies Program (ETP) from 2009–2022.¹ Each of the four California (CA) Investor-Owned Utilities (IOUs) administers an ETP, with the overall goal of serving as a pipeline to deliver emerging technologies (ETs) to ratepayer-funded energy efficiency (EE) programs. ETP helps to meet the state’s energy reduction needs by conducting an array of projects to identify and vet technologies that deliver reliable energy savings. In the 2009–2022 timeframe, ETP conducted a range of projects studying numerous technologies, or novel applications of technologies, resulting in some being recommended for consideration in the CA EE Portfolio (hereafter referred to as the Portfolio) and some being ruled out.²

Typically, the effects of ETP are not quantified in terms of kWh, kW, and therm savings because this program does not offer rebates or account for energy savings. Its objective is to fill the pipeline of high-efficiency technologies (referred to as measures) offered to customers through other utility incentive programs. A central element of the IOU portfolio is incentive programs that offer rebates and incentives to customers who adopt these measures.³ However, there is great value in understanding the energy savings associated with technologies adopted from this long-standing program. To this end, we:

- Evaluated the market uptake of high-efficiency technologies (defined as the number of measures incentivized) and achieved savings of all technologies and approaches that moved from ETP into the Portfolio or directly into Codes and Standards (C&S) from 2018 to 2022;
- Estimated Portfolio Program Administrator (PA) reported lifetime savings claims resulting from measures;⁴
- Developed recommendations for Portfolio database specification changes or other pertinent data tracking mechanisms that may improve and streamline quantifying ETP-associated savings in the future; and
- Updated baselines⁵ for recently adopted ETP savings metrics codified in the IOU business plans⁶.

1.2 Research Approach

The analysis required a multi-faceted approach to gathering data due to the inconsistencies regarding data quality and completeness in historical ETP and Portfolio databases. The analysis primarily utilized two sources

¹ The work plan originally included energy savings for program years 2018 through 2021. However, the evaluation team included energy savings for 2022 per CPUC’s request. Updates for 2022 are included in Appendix F.

² The EE Portfolio used in this study consisted of energy, demand, and therm savings reported by PAs. Notably, Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) savings claims were excluded from the study because ESA is funded by non-EE dollars. Other exclusions include 2009 to 2022 energy savings claims that did not have measure codes because those cannot be matched with ETP-supported measures and 2009-2017 codes and standards claims because there were no Portfolio savings claims that could be matched with ETP-supported measures at the time the study was conducted.

³“Measures” are technologies selected for inclusion into the IOU incentive portfolio.

⁴ PA reported lifetime savings claims refer to pre-evaluated savings, which can be directly compared with ETP project estimated savings.

⁵ Notably, these baselines and related metrics may currently be better suited to program tracking as opposed to the establishment of targets. However, the possibility of establishing program targets should be revisited by PAs, third-party implementers, and the CPUC in the future once baselining practices are firmly established and baselines understood in context.

⁶ Southern California Edison Company’s (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics, SCE, Rosemead, CA, 2018.


of data: (1) the ETP databases from each IOU, and (2) the Portfolio database (Figure 1).⁷ In addition to the primary source files, we also cross-referenced Annual Budget Advice Letter (ABAL) files, the IOU measure catalogues,⁸ over 25 workpapers, and several Emerging Technology Coordinating Council (ETCC) reports to gather sufficient information to track ETP-associated technologies in their journey from ETP to the Portfolio.

Given the complexity of the analysis, we present only the core steps of the analytical approach here, which were as follows:

1. Determine the outcome of each ETP project in the 2009–2022 timeframe, including determining which ETP-associated technologies were recommended for adoption to the Portfolio;
2. For technologies that were recommended for adoption to the Portfolio, determine the unique identifier (i.e., measure code) for that technology; and
3. Match the unique measure code to the evaluated lifecycle kWh, kW, and therms savings from the Portfolio database for that ETP-associated technology.

Figure 1 provides an overview of the analysis workflow, including data inputs and outputs (gray boxes), and computational steps (blue ovals).

Figure 1. Emerging Technologies Program Savings Tracking Data Sources Workflow



⁷ Although we refer to the Portfolio database as a single entity, this database consists of five independent databases that represent groups of years according to program cycles. These databases are listed separately in Figure 1 but are referred to collectively as the Portfolio database throughout this report. This database is also known as CPUC Claims data, CPUC program tracking data, or claims data available on California Energy Data and Reporting System or CEDARS.


⁸ The IOU measure catalogues (referred to as Master Measure Database by SCE and Workpaper Database by PG&E) list energy saving technologies offered by each IOU (i.e., PG&E, SCE, SCG, and SDG&E) to their customers between 2008–2017 and 2018–2022. While there are variations between each measure catalogue, each one includes information regarding the program year each measure was offered to customers via EE programs, measure names and descriptions, measure categories or end uses, and unique identifiers that enabled the evaluation team to track each measure supported by ETP. Measures listed in the catalogues include measures with and without energy savings claims.

Note: The evaluation team leveraged the cleaned and processed EE Portfolio datasets used in Year 1 and appended 2018 to 2022 EE Portfolio data for this addendum. The evaluation team also combined the final ETP database used in the Year 1 study to the latest version of the ETP database for this analysis.

1.3 Summary of Findings and Recommendations from 2009-2022

Based on the analyses conducted in this study, we present a summary of key findings in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Key Findings of ETP Efforts from 2009–2022



MEASURES MATCHED BETWEEN THE ETP DATABASE AND THE PORTFOLIO:



This study is covered under CPUC Contract 17P85017 between Opinion Dynamics and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Ridge and Associates and Iron are subcontractors to Opinion Dynamics for this work.

Notes: * There are ETP projects that do not have measure codes as they can be either custom measures or projects that entail a process or behavior change. We have kept these under recommended for adoption per ETP project status. However, the adoption status is “Unknown” since we are only able to confirm adoption status via matching to EE Portfolio data when measure codes exist.

** Greenhouse Gas (GHG) equivalencies were calculated using the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) GHG Equivalencies Calculator at <https://www.epa.gov/energy/greenhouse-gas-equivalencies-calculator>

To further illuminate the historical effects of ETP, we provide detailed insights and recommendations⁹ based on the findings of this study:

- **Key Finding #1: ETP has been successful in driving technology adoption into the portfolio.** Eighteen percent of the projects ETP pursued from 2009 to 2022 resulted in measures being adopted to the Portfolio. Though this figure may appear low, we highlight that the purpose of ETP is not only to provide a pipeline of promising technologies but also to scrutinize and eliminate unsuitable technologies. In the timeframe of this study, 1,609 measure codes corresponding with 927 ETP projects were assessed by PAs to support potential measure development for adoption into the portfolio. Of the 232 ETP projects recommended for adoption to the portfolio, 171 (74%) were confirmed to be adopted as one or more measures in the portfolio (Appendix F). As discussed in Key Finding #4, this may be underestimated because custom measures have no measure codes.
- **Key Finding #2: ETP-associated measures are associated with significant savings in the portfolio,** representing over 10 million PA-reported lifecycle net¹⁰ MWh, over 2,000 PA-reported lifecycle net MW, and over 100 million PA-reported lifecycle net positive¹¹ therms. In the 2009-2022 timeframe this equated to, on average, 4% of Portfolio kWh savings, 6% of kW savings (2016–2022 only), and 1% of positive therm savings.¹² The majority of these savings were in the non-residential sector, and indoor lighting measures were the most prevalent technologies and/or applications. Though the commercial sector dominated savings, a considerable portion of ETP-associated savings was derived from residential projects (28%–60% across kWh, kW, and therms).
- **Key Finding #3: ETP has been successful at supporting measure development for portfolio inclusion.** This study provided findings to support the Business Plan metrics, which indicated that ETP has impacted the Portfolio over the last decade. We developed baselines using all available historical data, which indicated that ETP-associated measures were associated with 59 measures (or 4% of new Portfolio measures) on average annually from 2009 to 2022 (Appendix F).
 - **Recommendation (Year 1):** Results from this study should be used to inform baselines for further metrics tracking. However, given the transition of ETP to third-party implementation, future technology targets, and other factors, ongoing review of metrics will be required to ensure they are appropriate for the program as it evolves. Ongoing tracking of these metrics against this baseline will provide ETP PAs and implementers insight into the effectiveness of technology adoption to the portfolio as the program is deployed over time.
- **Key Finding #4: It is critical that ETP track its contributions to the portfolio.** The current data tracking and communication protocols for ETP-associated technologies do not allow for accurate and timely quantification of ETP contributions to the Portfolio, nor do they provide an adequate foundation for creating a streamlined, repeatable approach that the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

⁹ Note, because this report contains results from both the year one report and the addendum, we have retained the findings and recommendations from year one and added findings and recommendation based on findings from the addendum. Recommendations from year one are marked with “(Year 1)” and recommendations from the addendum are marked with “(Addendum)”

¹⁰ The CPUC defines net savings as energy savings estimates that are attributable to an EE program and therefore do not include naturally occurring adoption of high-efficiency equipment.

¹¹ We present therms savings without interactive effects. Therms impacts inclusive of interactive effects are presented in Appendix F.

¹² Codes & Standards claims are excluded from the Portfolio for 2009-2017 when calculating percentages, which we describe in more detail in the methodology (Section 2.2) When C&S is included in the denominator of the percentage, ETP represents 5% of kWh, 8% of kW, and 1% of therms impacts over the timeframe of the study.

and IOUs can implement to readily track progress against metrics in the future. In particular, this analysis relied heavily on the ability to use measure codes to cross-reference the ETP and Portfolio databases, but this method is unlikely to fully characterize the contributions of ETP on the Portfolio for two reasons. First, ETP does not consistently record the eventual measure code that a technology is assigned once leaving the ETP program (Sections 2.2.3 and 4.1.1). Second, some Portfolio measures, including many implemented through custom, process, or behavioral programs, are not assigned measure codes. We acknowledge that the measure-tracking processes may inherently differ as we transition to third-party implementers. This changing landscape, in addition to the challenges identified above, should be considered when developing third-party tracking processes. With that in mind, we offer the following recommendations:

- **Recommendation (Addendum):** Establish unique identifiers that connect ETP database measures to their EE program counterpart. In practice, the coordination and communication required to ensure this connection is robust could take many forms, and the most important element to ensure success is buy-in from key parties, such as the IOUs, program implementers, CPUC, and the California Technical Forum (CalTF). Given the movement to a third-party program design, we suggest convening a stakeholder workshop to establish protocols to achieve this ultimate goal. Such protocols should emphasize early and consistent communication and include touchpoints at interim stages, such as workpaper development and CalTF documentation. We acknowledge that the measure development process can continue long after an ETP project is recommended for adoption, which makes it challenging to track down the outcome of the process, but by having third-party implementers establish communication and reporting protocols, we are confident that ETP can increase the number of measure codes it records for its projects (Section 4.1.2).
- **Recommendation (Year 1):** Track the outcome of each ETP project in the ETP database. The ETP third-party administrator should collect the outcomes of each ETP project: (1) whether it was recommended for adoption; (2) whether a workpaper was developed, and if so, what the workpaper ID is; (3) the eventual measure codes associated with the technology; and (4) savings associated with those measure codes.
- **Recommendation (Addendum):** Assign unique identifiers to custom measures and track EE programs that promote or implement process or behavioral changes that have been supported by ETP and adopted and assess any energy or non-energy related savings achieved by these measures or activities.
- **Finding #5: Portfolio data inconsistencies make comparisons over time difficult.** This historical analysis aimed to understand how effective ETP has been over the last decade, which ideally would allow for examining trends in ETP-associated measure performance over time (e.g., understanding how well measures persist). When examining trends in claims and savings over time, we found that ETP's proportion of the Portfolio database highlights data inconsistencies due to lack of standardized tracking systems or possibly trends seen in the portfolio at large, which makes it difficult to isolate ETP-associated savings of the program over time. For example, it is not possible to assert that an increase in ETP-associated measure savings relative to the Portfolio year over year is due to the demand for ETP-associated measures, because it could also be due to a decrease in overall Portfolio savings, as demonstrated in Section 3.3. Trends in overall Portfolio savings could be attributed to a range of causes, including how and when claims were entered into the Portfolio database (i.e., if they are not entered in the year in which the project took place), variability in the accuracy of record keeping and measure code assignments over the years, the market influence on the Portfolio, and effects of our analysis (Section 3.3 and Appendix F). Section 2.2.3 and Appendix F detail the limitations to this study.

It is evident that the technologies and applications that ETP has studied over the years have laid the groundwork for future energy savings in the Portfolio. As ETP evolves in the coming years, the findings from

this retrospective study may serve as a guidepost for developing future metrics and contextualizing future savings potential

2. Study Overview

This study examines the historical effects and accomplishments of the ETP from 2009–2017. Each of the four CA IOUs administers an ETP, with the overall goal of serving as a pipeline to deliver ETs to ratepayer-funded EE programs. ETP helps to meet the state’s energy reduction needs by identifying and vetting EE measures that deliver reliable energy savings.¹³ ETP is a non-resource acquisition program,¹⁴ and therefore, the energy impacts of the program are not typically quantified. Rather, the value and accomplishments of the program are assessed in non-energy terms, and the program helps to support both legislative and regulatory needs, as well as program administrator (PA) and customer needs.¹⁵ However, there is great value in understanding the associated energy impacts and efficacy of this long-standing program. This report presents findings from a close examination of the technologies ETP has recommended for adoption to the CA Public Utility Commission (CPUC) EE Portfolio (hereafter referred to as the Portfolio).¹⁶

2.1 Evaluation Objectives

The objective of this study is to assess the historical impact of ETP on the Portfolio’s energy savings and establish a framework for tracking ETP-associated measures moving forward. To achieve this objective, we:

- Evaluated the market uptake (defined as the number of measures incentivized) and achieved savings of all technologies and approaches that moved from ETP into the Portfolio or directly into C&S from 2009 to 2017;
- Estimated Portfolio evaluated net lifetime savings resulting from these measures; and
- Developed recommendations for Portfolio database specification changes or other pertinent tracking mechanisms that may improve and streamline quantifying ETP-associated savings in the future.

In addition to the study objectives listed above, this research developed preliminary baselines for the recently-adopted ETP metrics codified in the IOU business plans for metrics ETP-T1, ETP-T2 as well as ETP-4 and ETP-5 (Table 1). Although this evaluation assessed ETP-T3 and ETP-T4, we did not identify any direct linkages between ETP to Codes & Standards. Additional linkages of ETP-associated measures that supported eventual code will be explored in subsequent studies.

Going forward, the IOUs will measure their progress against these metrics, and the CPUC and its evaluators were charged with helping the IOUs establish baselines against which to measure their progress. This study attempts to offer both quantitative findings that can inform metric baselines and suggestions for successful metric tracking in the future, as the ability to track the market uptake of ETP-associated measures and quantify EE savings is a requisite step in assessing ETP metrics. Notably, the establishment of targets for each metric

¹³ Barsley, G., Mack, J., Rodriguez, K., Thomas, M., Wallenrod, M., Weber, T., & Wood, K. (2017). Southern California Edison Company’s Energy Efficiency Rolling Portfolio Business Plan for 2018-2025 (p. 311).

¹⁴ Non-resource acquisition programs are EE programs or activities that aim to fill the pipeline of high-efficiency technologies (referred to as measures) offered to customers through other utility incentive programs. A central element of the IOU portfolio is incentive programs that offer rebates and incentives to customers that adopt these high-efficiency technologies “measures”.

¹⁵ PAs operate the EE programs ordered by the CPUC. PAs include the Investor-Owned Utilities (IOUs), Regional Energy Networks (RENs), and community choice aggregators (CCA). Source: Summit Blue Consulting, LLC, ADM Associates, Inc., California Technology International, Inc., E Source, Energy Market Innovations, & Opinion Dynamics Corporation. (2010). *Final Report: Evaluation of the California Statewide Emerging Technologies Program* (p. 205).

¹⁶ The California Energy Efficiency Portfolio is comprised of a range of EE programs that help California reduce electricity and natural gas consumption, and consequently, greenhouse gas emissions. Source: Ibid.

should be revisited by the PAs, third-party implementers, and the CPUC once baselining practices are firmly established.

Table 1. ETP Metrics (ETP-T1 through ETP-T5)

Metric Name	Metric Description	Unit of Measurement
ETP-T1	Prior year: % of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies	%
ETP-T2	Prior Year: # of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies	#
ETP-T3	Prior year: % of new codes or standards that were previously ETP technologies	%
ETP-T4	Prior Year: # of new C&S that were previously ETP technologies	#
ETP-T5a	Energy savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex post where available	Lifecycle Net kWh
ETP-T5b	Demand savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex post where available	Lifecycle Net kW ^a
ETP-T5c	Therms savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex post where available	Lifecycle Net Therms

^a Though technically kW impacts are only first-year, here we report Lifecycle kW impacts to stay consistent with the units reported in the Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics and the Portfolio.

Source: Valdberg, A., & Cole, J. L. (2018). *Southern California Edison Company's (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics* (p. 146).

2.2 Evaluation Methodology


ETP is one of many contributors introducing new technologies to the Portfolio. To appropriately contextualize ETP's role, it is necessary to examine the Portfolio measure development process and how ETP fits into that process. In ETP's case, measure development is the process by which a technology's energy savings and costs, inform and support the development of workpapers,¹⁷ and ultimately EE measures that are offered through PA incentive programs.^{18,19} Figure 3 provides an overview of the IOU measure development process in CA, and Appendix A describes each IOU's decision-making process prior to including measures in an EE program. In order to track the journey and eventual savings of each ETP-associated technology from 2009–2017, we reviewed data representing the key stages in the measure development process below, including the ETP database (Technology Investigation Stage), custom data inputs resulting from data requests to the IOUs (Workpaper Development & Approval), and California Energy Data and Reporting System (CEDARS) and ABAL records (Program Integration).

¹⁷ Workpapers are technical documents submitted for approval to the CPUC that determine the cost effectiveness and market suitability of a given technology in preparation for measure deployment.

¹⁸ Opinion Dynamics Corporation, Energy and Resource Solutions (2015) *PY2013–2014 Emerging Technologies Program Targeted Effectiveness Study Report*.

¹⁹ Evergreen Economics, & Willems, P. (2015). *Final Report: Study of the California Utility Internal Measure Development Process* (p. 122).

Figure 3. Summary of the CA IOU Technology Intake and Measure Development Process



Source: Opinion Dynamics & Guidehouse. (2020). *Emerging Technologies Program Handoff Process Evaluation* (p. 5).

The following sections provide a high-level description of the methods employed to complete this analysis, followed by the detailed analytical steps and limitations of the study.

2.2.1 Historical Analysis Overview

This section provides an overview of the approach used to track ETP-associated savings for technologies recommended for adoption into the statewide Portfolio. The analysis primarily utilized two sources of data: (1) the ETP databases from each IOU, and (2) the Portfolio database (Figure 4).²⁰ However, the analysis required a multi-faceted approach to data gathering due to a wide range of data quality and completeness issues present in the ETP database and the Portfolio database. In addition, variations in measure code²¹ development processes across PAs and the fact that this evaluation analyzes data dating back to 2009, when

²⁰ Note that, although we refer to the Portfolio database as a single entity, this database consists of five independent databases that represent groups of years according to program cycles. These databases are listed separately in Figure 4 but are referred to collectively as the Portfolio database throughout this report. This database is also known as CPUC Claims data, CPUC program tracking data, or claims data available on CEDARS.


²¹ A measure code is an alphanumeric identifier of a specific energy efficient technology or approach in the Portfolio.

data tracking was not as comprehensive, presented unique challenges in tracking ETP-associated technologies' journeys into the Portfolio.

In addition to the primary source files listed above, we also cross-referenced ABAL files, the IOU measure catalogues,²² over 25 workpapers, and several Emerging Technology Coordinating Council (ETCC) reports,²³ and we submitted four data requests to the IOUs for additional or clarifying information. In total, this effort required consolidating nine data sources or versions of each data source and consultation of nearly 30 supplemental documents to arrive at complete input data files.

We performed quality checks and took steps to clean and compile data sources from each of the data types (i.e., data sources from each IOU and for each year of the analysis), and then cross-referenced the ETP database with the Portfolio. Figure 4 provides an overview of the analysis workflow; the subsequent sections provide further detail for each step of the analysis.

Figure 4. Emerging Technologies Program Savings Tracking Data Sources Workflow



2.2.2 Detailed Analytical Steps

To complete this analysis, we conducted five core analytical steps as described below. Throughout this process, we gathered information to support recommendations for future tracking, which we present in Section 4.2 of the report.

Step 1: Identify ETP Projects Recommended for Adoption and Adopted to the Portfolio

Within the ETP database, each ETP project includes a field to indicate whether it has been “adopted,”²⁴ which means that ETP staff have formally recommended at least one of the ETP technologies in the project for

²² The IOU measure catalogues (referred to as Master Measure Database by SCE and Workpaper Database by PG&E) list energy saving technologies offered by each IOU (i.e., PG&E, SCE, SCG, and SDG&E) to their customers between 2008–2020. While there are variations between each measure catalogue, each one includes information regarding the program year each measure was offered to customers via EE programs, measure names and descriptions, measure categories or end uses, and unique identifiers that enabled the evaluation team to track each measure supported by ETP. Measures listed in the catalogues include measures with and without energy savings claims.

²³ Emerging Technology reports are published on the ETCC website: <https://www.etcc-ca.com/>

²⁴ ETP projects refer to ETP-supported studies of numerous technologies, or novel applications of technologies, resulting in some being recommended for consideration in the CA EE Portfolio and some being ruled out.

adoption and that the technology(s) have gone through the required processes (detailed in Appendix A) to be included in the Portfolio.²⁵ For adopted projects, an ETP project may have one or more technologies, and thus eventual measure codes or workpaper IDs associated with it.²⁶ Each IOU has its own measure development process, which results in unique ETP database and Portfolio measure codes using different combinations of alphanumeric values. The evaluation team identified, and then verified with each IOU, the total number of adopted ETP projects between 2009–2017, and requested Portfolio measure codes or workpaper IDs for each project.

Step 2: Establish Measure Code(s) Associated with Each ETP Project

In some cases, the measure codes or workpaper IDs stemming from an ETP project are listed in the ETP database, and in other cases, there is no information listed even though the database indicates the project was adopted. We submitted four data requests and conducted several meetings with the CPUC and IOUs to clarify data and gather additional information to identify a measure code or workpaper ID for each adopted project. We then manually reviewed and updated the ETP database with additional information regarding each ETP project as it was received.

For 71 ETP projects, the IOUs could only provide workpaper IDs associated with the ETP project, not measure codes. Workpapers often provide research findings for many similar technologies, so some workpapers can have tens or hundreds of measure codes associated with them. Therefore, when only a workpaper ID was listed for an ETP project, we examined that workpaper to determine which measure codes in the workpaper were likely associated with the ETP project, if any. Before conducting the workpaper review, we tried to match the workpaper to the Portfolio. In cases where a workpaper ID listed in the ETP database did not have any claims in the Portfolio,²⁷ we did not conduct further research on those workpaper IDs. In total, we researched 34 workpapers representing 51 ETP projects.

Step 3: Clean and Aggregate Portfolio Measure and Savings Data

The scope of this study focused on EE program years 2009 through 2017.²⁸ In each EE program year, the PAs submit program savings claims to the CPUC. This data is reviewed and updated for errors by CPUC consultants to ensure data quality. For each year included in this study, we used the evaluator reviewed data, though the sources of the data vary over the history of the Portfolio. For example, 2016–2017 data was available on the CEDARS,²⁹ whereas older data was sourced from the Efficiency Savings and Performance Incentive (ESPI) mechanism. In each case, we pulled all variables relevant to this study, including PA reported savings claims (also referred to as ex ante savings) and evaluated gross and net savings (also referred to as ex post savings) and numerous descriptive fields such as project sector, PA, year of savings claim, measure code number, and workpaper ID. Because the final platform on which evaluated data was hosted varied over the past decade, we then cleaned, standardized, and compiled the program years. Through this effort, we developed a database of Portfolio PA reported and evaluated savings claims from 2009 through 2017, which we used to identify ETP-associated measure codes. Notably, demand data prior to 2016 is not consistently available on any platform, so this study only includes kW results from 2016 and 2017.

²⁵ One ETP project can study multiple technologies, and one technology may be included in multiple ETP projects.

²⁶ A workpaper ID is an alphanumeric identifier of a workpaper, which is a broader categorization than a measure code. One workpaper may have many measure codes associated with it.

²⁷ A claim, or savings claim, is the record of an EE technology or process being installed or implemented through a Portfolio program. Claims are documented in the Portfolio database.

²⁸ We began with 2009 because ETP had no formal ETP tracking database prior to this time.

²⁹ The California Energy Data and Reporting System or CEDARS is accessible via: <https://cedars.sound-data.com>

Upon consultation with the CPUC, we removed C&S claims from the matching analysis after determining that ETP projects have not resulted in any discernable C&S claims (please see Section 3.4 for results). This choice focuses findings and baseline metrics on the portion of the Portfolio that ETP has historically affected to appropriately scale ETP's contribution. In other words, all percent calculations remove C&S claims.

Step 4: Cross-Reference Adopted ETP-Associated Projects to the Portfolio

The measure code, claim year, and additional ETP project descriptions were used to match ETP projects to associated measures in the Portfolio. Ideally, attempts to match measure codes to the Portfolio would result in reliable one-to-one matches. However, in practice, we completed an iterative process in which the pool of matches was refined based on a series of matching criteria described below.

Excluding Ineligible Projects from Portfolio

Since measure codes and claim years are key to identifying ETP-associated claims, we excluded Portfolio claims that did not have any unique identifier (i.e., measure code, measure ID, or workpaper ID) from analyses that compare ETP-associated claims to Portfolio claims as claims missing measure codes could not be matched with ETP-associated measures. In addition, as mentioned above C&S claims are also excluded. Evaluated net savings excluded from the analyses are presented in Appendix C.

Matching Criteria for Measures

To match ETP projects to associated measures in the Portfolio, we utilized the following data variables: measure codes, ETP project completion date, and Portfolio claim year. We established different levels of matching with a match on measure code alone as the least stringent (Level 1) and a match on measure code and project completion date as more stringent (Level 2). We used the matching levels as follows:

1. **Matching Level 1 (Measure Code Only):** The first level for matching ETP projects to Portfolio projects was based on measure code, which exists in both the ETP database and the Portfolio database and provides a reliable way to identify a specific technology. If measure codes matched between the two databases, we considered the ETP project as having achieved a Level 1 Match. Notably, we gathered additional data from the IOUs through supplemental data requests to ensure we achieved the highest match rate possible between the ETP data and the Portfolio data. After several iterations with the IOUs, we were able to match 88% of adopted ETP projects (n=137) to the Portfolio via measure codes.

We also utilized workpaper IDs³⁰ listed in the ETP database as an intermediary analytical step when measure codes were not available for an ETP project. First, we searched the Portfolio database for the workpaper IDs provided in the ETP database. If the workpaper ID had positive matches in the portfolio, we flagged it for further research. In total, there were 71 ETP projects³¹ for which only a workpaper ID was provided.³² Of the 51 workpapers representing the 71 ETP projects, 17 did not have an associated claim in the portfolio and were excluded from further consideration. For the remaining 34 workpapers, the team located the workpaper in the Database of Energy Efficiency Resources (DEER) and studied it to discern which measure codes it covered and to what extent they were related to the technology

³⁰ This only applies to Year 1 results. PAs provided local and statewide measure codes for new ETP projects. As such, there was no need to use workpaper IDs to identify ETP-supported measures.

³¹ Some ETP projects share workpaper IDs.

³² Workpaper ID alone is not necessarily a reliable identifier of a single technology, because workpapers can include tens or sometimes hundreds of measure codes. Therefore, matching on workpaper ID alone has the potential to overestimate savings associated with a single ETP technology. Measure codes, conversely, typically represent one specific technology and therefore provide a more granular way to identify technologies and cross-reference projects between databases.

covered in the ETP project in question. We also consulted each IOU's measure catalogue and ETCC reports if we could not find the actual workpaper that the ETP database referenced,³³ or if additional information on the technology was needed. This process relied heavily on the project description given in the ETP database to confirm a connection between the studied technology and the eventual measure code. In total, we discovered 217 measure codes that matched the ETP database description of the ETP project. Six workpapers were excluded from the analysis due to the inability to confirm a connection to the ETP project under which it was listed. However, only one of the 71 ETP projects was excluded from the analysis via this methodology, since many ETP projects list multiple workpapers and had a positive match through at least one of them. We discuss the limitations of this analytical approach in the study limitations section (Section 2.2.3). For the remainder of this paper, we refer to measure codes sourced from the ETP database and measure codes identified through the workpaper review collectively as measure codes.

2. **Matching Level 2 (Measure Code and Project Completion Date):** The second level for matching used the measure code in addition to temporal information. We leveraged the ETP project completion date (based on the "Progress Point: Report/deliverable complete" field in the ETP database³⁴) and the claim year (based on the "ClaimYearQuarter" field in the Portfolio) to ensure that the timing of the match aligned with when the ETP project was completed. A level two match was achieved when the claim year corresponding with each matching measure code is at least one year after the ETP project completion date. This lag is necessary because once an ETP-associated measure is adopted to an EE program, it takes time for the measure to achieve savings claims, depending on market uptake. This criterion was important to operationalize because the study team found some ETP measure codes with matching claims *before* the ETP project took place. In those instances, one can deduce that ETP was not associated with savings from that measure code before the ETP project started. By including this criterion, we eliminated some, but not all, spurious matches. We discuss the limitations of this analytical approach in the study limitations section (Section 2.2.3).

Step 5: Analyze Data

After matching the ETP database to the Portfolio database, we analyzed the resulting matches, in addition to analyzing data from the Portfolio at large.

Calculate ETP Metrics

In addition to characterizing and measuring the adoption of ETP-associated technologies to the Portfolio, we calculated the historical averages for the ETP metrics (see Table 1) specified in SCE's (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics.³⁵ We were directed to provide baselines for the metrics based on historical data,³⁶ against which the IOUs may track their effectiveness in the future. We understand that ETP will be undergoing changes as it moves into third-party implementation meaning that the measures available, program administration approach, and resulting measure adoption will likely change; but the metrics based on historical results reflect the best information available to date to inform baseline development. As new data become available, the metrics and their respective baselines should be updated.

³³ There may be instances where a workpaper ID is replaced with another workpaper ID. In such instances, we may not be able to find the workpaper.

³⁴ In cases where there was no ETP project completion date provided in the ETP database, the team used the project initiation date (i.e., "Progress Point: Project Funded/Initiated" field in the ETP database).

³⁵ Valdberg, A., & Cole, J. L. (2018). *Southern California Edison Company's (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics* (p. 146).

³⁶ A baseline is the first assessed value of a metric.

The metrics baselines provided in this report are based on Matching Level 2 and reflect results from all historical data.

Due to data tracking limitations, we were unable to develop some of the baselines for some of the study years:

- **Demand (kW) Reported and Evaluated Net Savings prior to 2016:** We did not determine demand (kW) savings prior to 2016 because kW savings associated with EE projects were not reported in the Portfolio until 2016.
- **Evaluated Savings for 2009:** Ex post energy (kWh), demand (kW), and gas (therm) savings were not reported in 2009 in the Portfolio.

Analyze Data by Cohort

To capture the share of ETP-associated measures relative to all measures submitted to the portfolio in the same year, we analyzed the data by “cohort” (i.e., all measures that share the same first year in the Portfolio), in addition to analyzing it by claim year. This approach allows for the examination of how ETP-associated measures perform relative to other new measures, as opposed to how they perform against well-established measures. It also can provide insights into how ETP measure prevalence changes over the years relative to other measures of the same vintage. Appendix B presents these findings.

2.2.3 Study Limitations

A significant limitation of the analytical process of this study is uncertainty in the validity of matches, due to a lack of consistent record keeping with respect to measure codes across the Portfolio. This was primarily due to either insufficient data coverage or quality at the Portfolio level, Portfolio and ETP-database-entry errors, or the fact that only workpaper IDs were provided for some ETP projects, limiting the ability to effectively match ETP projects with associated Portfolio measures. While the eventual outcome of the iterative matching process was an estimation of ETP-associated savings, these results inherently include considerable uncertainty from various sources, as follows:

- **Incomplete and poor-quality data.** This study drew on nearly 50 data and information sources due to the fact that no single database provided complete information. Several of the data quality and availability issues have been ameliorated on the Portfolio side with the development of CEDARS since 2016 and will not affect analyses for 2016 and beyond. However, this analysis was impacted by a lack of demand impact data prior to 2016, inconsistent or missing measure codes in both the Portfolio and ETP databases, and the inability to identify first-year measures in the portfolio. Additionally, we excluded Portfolio claims that did not have any unique identifier (i.e., measure code or workpaper ID) from analyses that compared ETP-associated claims to Portfolio claims as measure codes are required to identify ETP-associated claims and Portfolio claims. Without these measure codes, claims could not be included in matching ETP-associated measures to Portfolio measures and we removed them from the analysis. These exclusions—in terms of records and kWh, kW, and therms—are presented in Appendix C.
- **Potential overestimation of ETP metrics due to lack of measure code tracking.** Seventy-one ETP projects listed only workpaper IDs, rather than measure codes. As such, the study risked either potentially underestimating ETP-associated savings if workpaper IDs were omitted from the analysis, or overestimating savings if the workpapers or their associated measure codes were included. As discussed above, we used all available sources to find measure codes listed within workpapers and then confirm their connection with ETP projects, but the ability to draw that connection relied heavily on the brief (1–2 sentence) description of the ETP project provided in the database. Table 2

summarizes the percent of matched ETP claims and savings derived from measure codes that we identified and connected to ETP via our workpaper review. The table illustrates that a considerable portion of the matched ETP claims and savings in each claim year—up to 98% in 2010—were derived from measure codes that we identified through the workpaper review process. While we are confident in the relationship between ETP and the measure codes we identified through the workpaper review, there still exists some potential for error, as we cannot definitively say that ETP projects were associated with every measure code based on existing documentation. We provide a list of workpaper IDs, ETP projects they are associated with, and measure codes that we uncovered in Appendix D. The results from this study should be viewed in light of this information.

Table 2. Percent of ETP to Portfolio Matches Based on Workpaper Review

Claim Year	Percent of Matched Claims Derived from Evaluation Team’s Workpaper Review	Percent of Matched Ex Post Net kWh ^a Derived from Evaluation Team’s Workpaper Review
2010	98%	93%
2011	74%	64%
2012	25%	17%
2013	10%	11%
2014	31%	19%
2015	34%	23%
2016	26%	30%
2017	30%	14%
Average	41%	34%

^a Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

- **Re-use of measure codes.** In addition to the potential overestimation due to the use of workpaper IDs, there is also a possibility that not all matching measure codes were ETP supported due to the re-use of existing measure codes to track similar measures. Technologies may be assigned an existing measure code even though they are new technologies in the Portfolio. In some cases, we found that ETP adopted a new technology into the Portfolio, but it was given a measure code that was in existence before the ETP project occurred. This makes it challenging to discern which technologies and EE claims associated with those technologies actually had ties to ETP, and which stemmed from further back in the Portfolio’s history. Initial review of Portfolio data revealed that twelve ETP-associated measure codes already existed *prior* to the completion of ETP projects with matching measure codes. To address this issue, we utilized the Matching Level 1 and Matching Level 2 approach described above, which ensures that matches meet both measure code and temporal conditions.
- **Relabeling of measure codes.** In some instances, we found that measure codes only exist in the Portfolio database for one year, though the technology that they represent persists in the Portfolio with a new measure code. This poses a challenge for matching to measure codes provided in the ETP database, because there is no record of changes in Portfolio measure codes over the years. Given the great volume of measure codes and claims in the Portfolio, and each utility’s unique measure development process, it was beyond the scope of this study to discern which of these

measure codes could have been associated with ETP technologies over the course of the last decade. It is also difficult to ascertain the scale of the uncertainty associated with re-using and relabeling measure codes.

- **Many-to-many relationship between ETP Projects and Measure Codes.** Upon review of the ETP database, we found that there are ETP projects initiated in different years that share measure codes with other ETP projects. While we were able to match ETP measure codes to measure claims in the Portfolio, this many-to-many relationship between measure codes and ETP projects limited our ability to accurately trace a measure code back to *one* ETP project in cases where a measure code is associated with multiple ETP projects. While this is not a potential source of overestimation, it prevents us from assessing the impacts of specific ETP projects.
- **Measurement of first-year savings.** Although Appendix B presents a cohort analysis to better characterize ETP-associated savings in the first year that the technology was claimed, we acknowledge limitations to this approach. First, due to the re-use and relabeling of measure codes, it is impossible to assign technologies to a certain cohort without error. Some technologies may have been in existence in the Portfolio for years but were just assigned a new measure code, making them appear as a “first-year” measure. Other technologies may be assigned an existing measure code even though they were new technologies and thus were not flagged for first-year savings even though they should have been.

Additionally, when examining trends in claims and savings over time, whether by cohort or by claim year, it is critical to keep in mind that ETP’s proportion of the Portfolio database is highly sensitive to the underlying fluctuations in claims and savings in the portfolio at large. Underlying fluctuations in historical Portfolio savings could be due to several reasons, including how and when claims are entered into the portfolio in a given program cycle (for example, we see clustering of savings in some years and less savings in others), variability in the accuracy of record keeping and measure code assignments over the years, the limitations associated with accurately assigning both ETP-associated and Portfolio measures to cohorts, and importantly, external market conditions.

- **Exclusion of ETP-associated activities prior to 2009.** Given data limitations prior to 2009, this study reviews claimed savings and measures as of 2009 and excludes prior years of ETP deployment. As a result, ETP-associated savings prior to 2009 are likely included in our denominator (e.g., the Portfolio savings) for this analysis. Measures existing in the Portfolio as of 2009 could have been derived from ETP-associated activities. In 2010, an evaluation study assessed ETP contributions to the Portfolio from 2006-2008, which include a host of measures prevalent in the Portfolio for many years, such as CFLs, LED exterior lights, etc.³⁷

³⁷ CPUC, Final Report: Evaluation of the California Statewide Emerging Technologies Program. Summit Blue Consulting, 2010. http://www.calmac.org/publications/Final_Comprehensive_ETP_Final_Report_02-04-10_R7_3.pdf


3. Study Findings

In this section, we present the status of all 2009–2017 ETP projects. We then provide detailed information on matches of ETP projects to the Portfolio in terms of project counts and energy and demand savings to provide the market uptake and achieved savings of all technologies and approaches that moved from ETP into the Portfolio.³⁸ Lastly, we address the ETP program metrics codified in the EE Business Plans.³⁹

3.1 ETP Projects Eligible for Adoption in Portfolio

We reviewed databases from the four IOUs to identify the total number of ETP projects that were conducted between 2009–2017. Overall, 788 projects were initiated from 2009 to 2017 (Figure 5). Of these, 504 (or 64%) were complete at the time of this analysis. The remaining projects were classified as active (135, or 17%) or cancelled (149, or 19%). Of the completed projects, less than half (205, or 41%) were recommended for adoption. Of those recommended projects, 158 (80%) were adopted.⁴⁰ These adopted projects comprise the population of projects that we sought to match to Portfolio claims.

Figure 5. ETP Project Adoption Status from 2009 to 2017



Overall, 20% of the 788 projects ETP pursued from 2009–2017 resulted in measures being adopted to the Portfolio. While this figure may appear low, we highlight that the purpose of ETP is not only to provide a pipeline of promising technologies but also to scrutinize and eliminate unsuitable technologies. Further, while ETP staff play a major role in identifying and screening new ETs, several other IOU groups are involved in the measure development process at various stages, as outlined in Figure 3 (see Section 2.2). The eventual adoption of an ETP-associated measure is therefore the culmination of a rigorous process subject to expertise from ETP staff, engineering staff, the CPUC, incentive program managers, C&S managers, and measure development

³⁸ Notably, the Portfolio excludes C&S claims (see Section 2.2).

³⁹ Valdberg, A., & Cole, J. L. (2018). *Southern California Edison Company's (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics* (p. 146).

⁴⁰ Technology adoption refers to a technology being approved for inclusion in the Portfolio via the completion of a workpaper or custom measure documentation. For more information on the measure development process see: Summit Blue Consulting, LLC, ADM Associates, Inc., California Technology International, Inc., E Source, Energy Market Innovations, & Opinion Dynamics Corporation. (2010). *Final Report: Evaluation of the California Statewide Emerging Technologies Program* (p. 205).

management. For more information on this process please see the Emerging Technologies Program Handoff Process Evaluation.⁴¹

Table 3 summarizes the status of the 788 ETP projects, by IOU. Consistent with the size of each program, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and Southern California Edison (SCE) accounted for 66% of projects. Importantly, only two projects in the ETP database indicated that they would be adopted directly to C&S, and those projects were still pending adoption at the time of the analysis.

Table 3. ETP Project Adoption from 2009-2017 by IOU

Project Status	PGE	SCE	SCG ^a	SDG&E ^b	Total	Percent of Total Projects
Total Completed Projects	157	196	67	84	504	64%
Completed, Recommended for Adoption	63	79	28	35	205	26%
Total Adopted	52	56	24	33	158	20%
Adopted	51	55	19	33	151	19%
Adopted but Measure Codes Unknown	1	1	5	0	7	1%
Not Adopted	12	20	6	2	40	5%
Pending/On hold	0	4	1	0	5	1%
Pending Adoption to Codes & Standards	0	0	2	0	2	0.3%
Completed, Not recommended for Adoption	94	117	39	49	299	38%
Complete, not recommended for adoption at this stage	45	93	24	49	211	27%
Under consideration for Custom Project	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%
Project Completed - Not intended for Program Inclusion	49	23	15	0	87	11%
Active ETP Projects	14	61	43	17	135	17%
Cancelled	37	56	38	18	149	19%
Total Projects	208	313	148	119	788	

^a Southern California Gas Company

^b San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E)

3.2 ETP Projects Represented in the Portfolio

This analysis focused on the 158 ETP projects that were adopted into the Portfolio. Of the 158 adopted projects, seven were excluded from the analysis because they were missing the measure codes or workpaper IDs that would have allowed us to track their associated savings in the Portfolio. We also excluded 14 additional projects as 13 workpapers did not result in any matching claims, while one workpaper could not reliably be linked back to ETP based on workpaper review. Of the 137 remaining projects, 120 (88%) had at least one matching savings claim in the Portfolio, based on measure code (Matching Level 1) and 115 or 84% had at least one matching claim based on measure code and year (Matching Level 2, Figure 6). In summary, we were unable to match some projects due to lack of claims, claims occurring outside of the analysis time frame, or measure codes that were not claimed to date. This match rate is the highest evaluators have achieved to date and includes both deemed and custom measures.⁴² Future research can provide greater

⁴¹ Opinion Dynamics & Guidehouse. (2020). *Emerging Technologies Program Handoff Process Evaluation*.

⁴² For example, the 2013–2014 evaluation of ETP matched 55% of the provided ETP measure codes to the Portfolio. Opinion Dynamics Corporation, Energy and Resource Solutions (2015) *PY2013–2014 Emerging Technologies Program Targeted Effectiveness Study Report*.

insights into the percentage of measures supported by ETP projects that are promoted in EE programs but unclaimed.

Figure 6. Summary of Matches by Criteria (n=158)




Table 4 summarizes the number of measure codes matched for the 158 ETP projects. We used two levels of matching, described in Section 2.2.2. Table 4 presents the dispositions of the ETP-associated measure codes. The table demonstrates that imposing Matching Level 2 only disqualified 13 measure codes from the analysis.⁴³ The remainder of the results section only presents findings from Matching Level 2.

Table 4. Summary of Measure Code Dispositions by Matching Level (n=748)

Disposition	Matching Level 1		Matching Level 2	
	Number of Matches	Percent	Number of Matches	Percent
Valid Measure Code^a	733	98%	720	96%
Valid Match with Claims	470	63%	457	61%
Valid Match with No Claims	236	32%	236	32%
Valid but Claim Outside Date Range	24	3%	24	3%
Inexact ^b Match with Matching Claims	3	0.4%	3	0.4%
Invalid Measure Code / Workpaper ID^c	15	2%	15	2%
Only Matched on Matching Level 1^d			13	2%
Total	748	100%	748	100%

^a Valid measures are unique measure identifiers that either matched between the ETP database and the Portfolio or ones that IOUs confirmed to be valid either through responses to data requests or through search within each IOU’s measure catalogue.

^b Inexact matches were matches where formatting may have been different between the ETP database and the Portfolio (e.g., due to spaces or dashes), but the match was reviewed and assumed to be valid.

^c Invalid measure codes or workpaper IDs are unique measure identifiers provided by IOUs, which IOUs noted as being placeholders rather than actual measure codes or workpaper IDs. Per IOU instruction, these invalid measure codes and/or workpaper IDs may be excluded from the analysis.

^d Measure codes that only matched on Matching Level 1 are measure codes that matched between the ETP database and the Portfolio but did not satisfy the year criterion for Matching Level 2, which stipulates that a measure can start achieving savings claims no sooner than one year after its corresponding ETP project has been completed.

⁴³ Note that, although Matching Level 2 only disqualified 13 measures, it did also render some claims ineligible for the Matching Level 2 results if the claim occurred before the ETP project with which it was associated was completed (i.e., measure codes with some eligible claims and some ineligible claims were kept in the Matching Level 2 findings). This phenomenon is likely due to measure code recycling.

3.3 ETP to Portfolio Match Characteristics and Savings

This section presents findings from the 457 ETP-associated measure codes that we matched to the Portfolio based on Matching Level 2.

We found inconsistent data coverage across electric and gas savings as well as demand impacts in the Portfolio databases. For energy savings, electric and gas savings claims were available consistently from 2009 across the Portfolio. However, for electric demand impacts, demand impact data was not available Portfolio-wide prior to 2016. Notably, we did not find any ETP-associated therms matches between the ETP database and the Portfolio in 2010–2012, despite the Portfolio reporting therms savings at the time. This suggests that ETP-associated measures only claimed therms savings in the Portfolio after 2013. Notably, ETP did not generate C&S claims throughout this period (discussed further in Section 3.4). Table 5 provides a summary of ETP-associated measures, claims, and savings by claim year in the Portfolio. Matched measures, claims, and kWh savings consistently increase year over year.

Table 5. Summary of ETP-Associated Measures, Claims, and Ex Post Savings

Claim Year	Number of Measures	Number of Claims	Ex Post Lifecycle Net kWh	Ex Post Lifecycle Net kW ^b	Ex Post Lifecycle Net Therms ^d
2009 ^a					
2010	5	180	15,753,231	N.A.	0
2011	11	1,099	52,897,843	N.A.	0
2012	53	11,224	182,347,412	N.A.	0
2013	95	25,721	371,510,835	N.A.	8,209,749
2014	184	127,003	923,441,704	N.A.	10,984,648
2015	244	239,815	1,796,551,357	N.A.	16,816,785
2016	304	209,167	1,614,900,797	375,644	8,531,642
2017	330	322,224	2,368,434,104	350,772	9,885,344
Total	457^c	936,433	7,325,837,282	726,415	54,428,169

^a 2009 was not eligible for matching under Matching Level 2, as the earliest ETP projects in this study were completed in 2009 and subsequently became eligible for matching in 2010.

^b Demand impact data is not available prior to 2016 at the Portfolio level.

^c Measure code total represents the cumulative unique matched measure codes and is not additive over claim years.

^d Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects. Appendix B provides detailed findings including interactive effects.

Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 6 presents the measures, claims, and total savings by the IOU who completed the associated ETP project.⁴⁴ PG&E and SCE represent the majority of ETP matches to the Portfolio, which is commensurate with the relative sizes of their programs. Other IOU claims per measure ranged from 464 to approximately 3,000 on average. In total, ETP spent \$116,029,034 and ETP-associated projects resulted in 7,325,837,282 kWh, 726,415 kW, and 54,428,169 therm savings from 2009–2017. Note that given limitations with the demand data, ex post lifecycle net kW reflects 2016–2017 values only.

⁴⁴ This table reflects the provenance of the IOU ETP measures claimed in the Portfolio, however, the associated claims could have been submitted by any PA.

Table 6. Total ETP-Associated Measures, Claims, and Ex Post Savings by IOU ETP Program

IOU	Number of Measure Codes 2009–2017		Number of Claims 2009–2017		Ex Post Lifecycle Net kWh		2016–2017 Ex Post Lifecycle Net kW		Ex Post Lifecycle Net Therm ^a	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
PG&E	193	42%	581,770	62%	4,111,399,254	56%	486,619	67%	39,378,268	72%
SCE	187	41%	269,659	29%	2,573,927,552	35%	154,060	21%	122,336	0.2%
SCG	14	3%	55,798	6%	15,966,634	0%	188	0%	14,766,330	27%
SDG&E	63	14%	29,206	3%	624,543,843	9%	85,548	12%	161,234	0.3%
Total	457	100%	936,433	100%	7,325,837,282	100%	726,415	100%	54,428,169	100%

^a Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects. Appendix B provides detailed findings including interactive effects.

Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

ETP to Portfolio Matches and Savings by Sector

Examining the number of ETP-associated measures by sector shows that most of the measures associated with ETP have been in the non-residential sector (Table 7), which aligns with record-keeping in the ETP database. Note that due to tracking inconsistencies in the Portfolio, sector cannot be analyzed on a more granular level than residential versus non-residential (e.g., by commercial, industrial, or agriculture).

Table 7. Number of Unique ETP-Associated Measure Codes by Sector and Claim Year^a

Sector	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Non-Residential		5	13	50	80	158	204	253	230	343
Residential		0	0	7	33	69	98	84	153	208
Other		0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Unknown		0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total by Claim Year		5	14	58	115	228	302	337	383	555^b


^a Measure code total represents the cumulative unique matched measure codes and is not additive over claim years.

^b Measure codes by sector do not equal total number of measure codes associated with ETP (n=457) because some measure codes are both residential and non-residential.

Consistent with the measure distribution by sector, ETP-associated savings were also driven by non-residential projects, representing 65% of total kWh savings from 2009–2017 (Figure 7), 58% of total kW savings over 2016–2017 (Figure 8), and 52% of therms (Figure 9).

Figure 7 through Figure 9 show the percent of ETP-associated claims and savings by claim year. It is important to note that these data reflect not only what measures were claimed in the Portfolio but how well these claims were tracked.

Figure 7. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle Net kWh by Sector and Claim Year




Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Figure 8. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle Net kW by Sector and Claim Year



Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.


Figure 9. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle Net Therms by Sector and Claim Year ^a



^a Only positive savings included in calculation of therm savings. Appendix B provides detailed findings including interactive effects. Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Residential projects did make increasingly notable contributions to the number of claims (Figure 10), along with kWh (Figure 7) and therms savings (Figure 9) as time went on. In fact, residential projects accounted for a greater proportion of claims consistently from 2014–2017 and represented the majority (68%) of claims overall.⁴⁵ This trend was due to residential lighting projects, which drove a high number of claims, but a lower amount of overall savings compared to non-residential projects. We discuss savings by technology in more detail throughout the remainder of this section. We do note that variations in the accuracy of record keeping over the years could drive some of these trends.

Figure 10. Percent of ETP-Associated Claims by Sector and Year




To further characterize ETP-associated measures present in the Portfolio, we grouped savings based on equipment groups.⁴⁶ Overall, lighting measures (including indoor and outdoor) dominated the measure matches between the ETP database and the Portfolio, with 57% of matched measures. This finding is also consistent with the project descriptions provided in the ETP database. Indoor lighting steadily accounted for roughly 70% of kWh (Figure 11) and kW savings (Figure 12). Outdoor lighting was the second highest energy saver in terms of kWh and kW, meaning that lighting in general comprised the vast majority of ETP-associated savings over the years of this study. Given that lighting has played such an important role in the ETP program and Portfolio savings at large, we expect to see a significant shift in the focus of ETP as lighting incentives are phased out of the Portfolio.

⁴⁵ Note that unlike other program years, the 2016 ESPI savings were based on proxy multipliers because there was no impact evaluation, and therefore no “evaluated” 2016 savings. However, the claimed savings for 2016 are technically ex post savings, but not evaluated like other years.


⁴⁶ To assign claims and associated savings to equipment groups, we cleaned and standardized the “Measure Group” variable in the Portfolio. Measure group includes the following categories: Indoor Lighting, Appliances, HVAC, Irrigation, Refrigeration, Building Envelope, Other, Lighting Other, C&S Title 20, C&S Title 24, Retrocommissioning/Process, Office Equipment, EMS, Water Heating, C&S Appliance, Outdoor Lighting, Plug Load Sensor, Pool Pump, Steam Trap, Unknown, Whole Building, and Food Service.

Figure 11. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle kWh Savings by Technology



Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.


Figure 12. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle kW Savings by Technology



Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Food service technologies comprised between 14% and 65% of ETP-associated therms savings, while water heating also accounted for a significant portion of ETP-associated therms savings (Figure 13). In 2017, whole building upgrades, or energy management systems, accounted for 45% of therms savings, which could signify a shift in the types of technologies ETP is studying. Analysis of years after 2017 could confirm whether this was a unique occurrence or a more permanent shift. Notably, ETP associated measures were not associated with a number of technology groups present in the Portfolio, such as building envelope upgrades, steam traps, and pool pumps, to name a few.

Figure 13. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Lifecycle Therm Savings by Technology ^a



^a Negative values were removed from therm savings data to omit interactive effects. Appendix B provides detailed findings including interactive effects.
 Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

3.4 EE Business Plan Metrics

Through this study, we developed preliminary baselines for the five ETP savings metrics, against which the ETP program can be evaluated in future years. These analytical outputs provide insights to inform baselines and approaches to estimate ETP program effectiveness. To develop baselines, we considered the average output of ETP over the 2009–2017 timeframe. This approach leverages all available data on the historical performance of the program.

We fully expect that the suggested baselines from this analysis will adjust over time as ETP is deployed as a third-party program. Further, a retrospective study such as this must take into account that the types of technologies have evolved considerably since 2009, and the nature of the technologies that ETP will study will continue to evolve going forward. Given upcoming program changes and the variations in funding, targeted technology type, and other factors, ongoing review of the baselines will be required to ensure they are appropriate to future program types. Table 8 provides an overview of the Business Plan Metrics and a summary of results, which we recommend using as baselines moving forward.

Table 8. Emerging Technologies Program Metrics and Findings⁴⁷

Metric Name	Metric Description	Unit of Measurement	2009-2017 Average Result / Recommended Baseline
ETP-T1	Prior year: % of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies	%	4%
ETP-T2	Prior Year: # of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies	#	51

⁴⁷ Valdborg, A., & Cole, J. L. (2018). *Southern California Edison Company's (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics* (p. 146).

Metric Name	Metric Description	Unit of Measurement	2009-2017 Average Result / Recommended Baseline
ETP-T3	Prior year: % of new codes or standards that were previously ETP technologies	%	0
ETP-T4	Prior Year: # of new C&S that were previously ETP technologies ^a	#	0
ETP-T5a	Energy savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex post where available	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh	915,729,660
ETP-T5b	Demand savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex post where available	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW ^b	363,208
ETP-T5c	Energy savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex post where available	Lifecycle Net Therms ^c	10,885,634

^a Notably, one ETP-associated measure resulted in five matching claims under C&S. However, the claims did not satisfy the second matching criteria as the claims were for years prior to when the associated ETP project was completed and recommended for adoption.

^b Though technically kW impacts are only first-year, here we report Lifecycle kW impacts to stay consistent with the units reported in the Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics and the Portfolio; kW impacts represent 2016 and 2017 average only, as those are the only years with available data.

^c Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects. (Note: Excludes C&S claims.)

Table 9 shows the number and percent of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies, by year. Notably, the denominator excludes C&S claims to provide an equivalent comparison. The average over the timeframe of this study was 51 measures per year, or 4% of new Portfolio measures, with higher numbers of ETP-associated measures entering the Portfolio in more recent years. Given that this number reflects an average of activities, we understand that the results in a given year may fluctuate for many reasons – including transitioning to a third-party program, changes in program funding, changes in Portfolio strategy. Given this, we recommend prioritizing ETP-T2 over ETP-T1 as a baseline through the first year of the third-party program transition. The rationale for prioritizing number of measures (e.g., 51 measures) over percent of measures in Portfolio (e.g., 4%) is the uncertainty associated with changes to the overarching Portfolio. In addition, while we recommend using 51 measures as the baseline, given the historical and future uncertainty of measures adopted into the Portfolio, we consider an acceptable range of measures to be 13 to 89 (or one standard deviation from the average). We anticipate that the CPUC and stakeholders will revisit this baseline as the program design and implementation of this program evolve.

Table 9. Number and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio

Claim Year	Total number of new measures added to the Portfolio ^a	Number of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies (ETP-T2)	Percent of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies (ETP-T1)
2009	3,430	0	-
2010	2,162	5	0%
2011	860	7	1%
2012	665	41	6%
2013	767	51	7%
2014	761	110	14%
2015	1,020	79	8%
2016	1,635	73	4%
2017	967	91	9%
Total	12,267	457	NA
Average 2009-2017	1,363	51	4%

^a Excludes C & S claims

Exclusion of Codes and Standards Claims when Comparing ETP to the Portfolio

The study found that zero ETP projects resulted in technologies being adopted into C&S, despite the hypothesis that the program supports C&S claims and there being a metric to measure the number of ETP projects claimed in C&S. As previously noted, two projects were pending adoption to C&S at the time of this analysis, but older projects did not indicate a direct relationship to C&S. Our measure code matching analysis confirmed this trend, as the ETP-associated measures that we tracked in the Portfolio returned matches solely from incentive programs. We note the possibility that an ETP-associated measure may become part of C&S after it is sunset from incentive programs (i.e., if market transformation is achieved). The available data did not allow for exploring this possibility as part of this study.

As a result of this finding, we removed C&S claims from the Portfolio claims that we incorporated in the matching analysis. This results in reporting ETP-associated measures effects on the portfolio as a percent of deemed and custom projects from 2009-2017, exclusive of Codes and Standards claims. This was a strategic choice that allows the study to focus on where ETP has historically affected the Portfolio and appropriately scales its contribution.

This outcome is consistent with the recent findings from the ETP Handoff Process Evaluation,⁴⁸ which found that there is currently no process to transition measures or data that originated in ETP to C&S advocacy work. While it is theoretically possible for ETP evaluations to feed directly into C&S, this handoff is rare for a number of reasons, including the fact that C&S managers typically seek data and information outside of the scope of what ETP produces, and the individual technologies and/or applications that ETP focuses on are on a different scale than what interests the C&S team. The ETP Handoff Process Evaluation provides additional insights into the gap between ETP and C&S and makes recommendations on how these two programs may coordinate better in the future.

Table 10 summarizes the evaluated net savings of ETP-associated measures overall and as a percent of the Portfolio. Over the timeframe of this evaluation, we estimate that ETP-associated measures saved over 7 billion net ex post lifecycle kWh, 726,415 net ex post lifecycle kW, and 54 million net ex post lifecycle therms

⁴⁸ Opinion Dynamics & Guidehouse. (2020). *Emerging Technologies Program Handoff Process Evaluation*.

(not accounting for interactive effects⁴⁹). Generally, the absolute amount and percent of kWh savings increased year over year. From 2009–2017, ETP-associated measures comprised, on average, 8% of Portfolio kWh savings, and 2% of positive ex post net therms savings. For kW, data is available for 2016–2017 only, during which ETP-associated measures comprised 17% of kW savings.⁵⁰ We recommend that the IOUs consider these percentages in developing the metrics baselines.

⁴⁹ Please see Appendix B to see therms savings interactive effects included.

⁵⁰ It is important to note the exclusions made from the Portfolio (i.e., the denominator) in the percentage calculations, which we describe in more detail in the methodology (Section 2.2). When C&S is included in the denominator of the percentage, ETP represents 5% of kWh, 8% of kW, and 1% of therms impacts over the timeframe of the study.

Table 10. Ex Post Net Savings and Percent Savings of ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5a – ETP-T5c)

Claim Year	Total Portfolio Savings from 2009–2017 ^b			Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2017			Percent of ETP kWh Savings Relative to Total EE Portfolio Savings from 2009–2017		
	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms ^a	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms ^a	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms
2009									
2010	14,898,713,818	N.A.	476,108,364	15,753,231	N.A.	0	0.1%	N.A.	0%
2011	13,818,658,780	N.A.	613,978,902	52,897,843	N.A.	0	0.4%	N.A.	0%
2012	13,577,502,421	N.A.	538,942,863	182,347,412	N.A.	0	1%	N.A.	0%
2013	9,341,212,202	N.A.	314,435,869	371,510,835	N.A.	8,209,749	4%	N.A.	3%
2014	10,723,729,814	N.A.	314,737,602	923,441,704	N.A.	10,984,648	9%	N.A.	3%
2015	9,354,006,851	N.A.	202,867,438	1,796,551,357	N.A.	16,816,785	19%	N.A.	8%
2016	7,910,339,437	1,687,671	188,271,723	1,614,900,797	375,644	8,531,642	20%	22%	5%
2017	9,043,587,748	2,570,157	209,145,402	2,368,434,104	350,772	9,885,344	26%	14%	5%
Total	88,667,751,071	4,257,827	2,858,488,163	7,325,837,282	726,415	54,428,169	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Average 2009–2017	11,083,468,884	2,128,914	357,311,020	915,729,660	363,208	10,885,634	8%	17%	2%

^a Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects.

^b Excludes C&S claims.

Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

4. Framework for Tracking ETP-Associated Measures

An objective of this research was to establish a framework by which current and future ETP-associated measures can be tracked and quantified in the Portfolio. To meet this objective, we tabulated the tracking challenges encountered in this study and developed actionable solutions that allow for streamlining future estimation of ETP's association with the portfolio. The present study required an arduous process that cannot feasibly be repeated with regularity. Given that data tracking mechanisms are evolving and improving, however, it is possible that the steps outlined in our methodology section could be automated and repeated if key aspects of data tracking are improved. As noted below, we recommend convening a stakeholder workshop with key entities to facilitate improvements to tracking ETP-associated measures. We recommend that the convened group of stakeholders use the following framework of data tracking challenges, organizational challenges, and proposed framework to serve as a guide for this workshop. As such, this section details data tracking improvements that will make a framework possible and suggestions for framework design.

4.1 ETP to Portfolio Matching Challenges and Considerations

The extent to which we can confidently match ETP-associated measures to the Portfolio directly affects our ability to create a framework, as the ideal framework would include streamlined processes for measuring ETP-associated savings, quantifying and establishing baselines for ETP metrics, and tracking these metrics over time.

Below we document challenges we encountered as we addressed the objectives of the study. Notably, we incorporate previous evaluation findings and recommendations, as there have been attempts as recently as 2015 to quantify the historical savings of ETP. Many of the challenges that existed in prior evaluations persist today.⁵¹

We find that the inability to track ETP-associated savings largely falls into two categories: (1) data tracking challenges, and (2) organizational challenges. We detail these challenges and potential considerations below.

4.1.1 Data Tracking Challenges

The key challenges and considerations for the improvement of data tracking are as follows:

- **Challenge 1:** Once an ETP project is recommended for adoption, the ETP database does not consistently include the relevant Portfolio measure code. It is critical for ETP managers to obtain measure codes when an ETP project is adopted in the Portfolio. The ability to track eventual savings of ETP technologies rests on having the eventual measure code of that technology.
 - *Consideration 1:* Develop a process for relevant parties associated with the ETP project to obtain information during the measure development process to ensure measure codes are tracked in the ETP database. Adoption of Consideration 1 should facilitate Consideration 2a and b below.
 - *Responsible Parties:* ETP, IOU Measure Development, CalTF, and EE Reporting teams.
- **Challenge 2:** The ETP database includes internally conflicting information with respect to project adoption. For example, an ETP project may be described as “canceled” but the same project is described as “recommended” in the recommendation field. These discrepancies make it difficult to

⁵¹ Appendix D presents a summary of selected recommendations made in past studies specific to ETP and the measure adoption process.

accurately ensure that all relevant ETP projects are included within the analysis. For example, future potential analyses will be limited to projects with a status in the ETP database as recommended for adoption and a valid measure code.

- *Consideration 2a:* Create and populate one streamlined field in the ETP database that tracks whether an ETP project was adopted into the Portfolio.
- *Consideration 2b:* Ensure proper quality control checks within the ETP database to ensure consistency between fields (e.g., to ensure that a project listed as adopted does not have conflicting information from other field sources).
 - *Responsible Party:* ETP managers and staff.
- **Challenge 3:** Once an ETP project is adopted in the Portfolio, we found that in some instances, the measure code alone was not enough to determine if a measure's savings could be traced back to ETP. This issue arises when: (1) a measure code applies to a broad group of technologies (e.g., LEDs), but ETP may have only been involved with one discrete application of that umbrella measure code; (2) the measure code provided was in existence before the ETP project took place; or (3) the measure code provided was only claimed in the portfolio for one year before being renamed. These circumstances introduce error into the analysis, as they inhibit tracking the trajectory of a technology in the Portfolio over time. Notably, the practice of re-using and retiring/replacing measure codes not only affects the ability to understand the performance of ETP-associated measures over time but limits the ability to examine the trajectory of any technology once it enters the Portfolio.
 - *Consideration 3a:* In cases where ETP was only associated with one aspect of a measure (for example, one use case of a measure that can be used much more broadly), develop a field in the ETP database that qualifies or describes how the measure code should be linked to the Portfolio. Alternatively, a new measure code could be generated for the specific use case of a technology, allowing for direct tracking of the associated savings.
 - *Consideration 3b:* Discontinue the practices of re-using (giving a new technology an old measure code) and renaming (giving the same technology or slightly improved technology a new measure code) measure codes. We do not recommend conducting a retrospective study to understand how measure codes have been re-used or renamed in the past, as this is likely infeasible given the scale of the Portfolio and lack of historical documentation. Going forward, however, we suggest that the practices of re-using or renaming be examined and discontinued.
 - *Responsible Party:* IOU Measure Development teams and CalTF

4.1.2 Organizational Challenges

As previously noted, many of the data tracking issues identified in our 2019 evaluation have persisted for over a decade. This suggests that the challenges ETP staff face with tracking its technologies may stem from both data tracking as well as organizational barriers. The UIMD and ETP Handoff Process Evaluation,⁵² as well as our team's prior evaluation research, serve as a useful guide to enumerating potential organizational barriers. Drawing on this research, we outline the following key challenges and considerations for overcoming organizational barriers:

⁵² Evergreen Economics & Willems, P. (2015). *Study of the California Utility Internal Measure Development Process: Final Report* (p. 122).

- **Challenge 1:** According to the UIMD and ETP Handoff Process Study, each IOU encounters barriers specific to their structure, programs, and information-sharing protocols and processes.
- **Challenge 2:** Within each IOU there is uncertainty about the process and its communication protocol. This confusion and complexity are in themselves barriers to effectively tracking ETP measures throughout their journey from the ETP program to the Portfolio.
- **Challenge 3:** When an IOU encounters a barrier to implementing needed changes, there is no incentive to overcome that barrier.
 - *Overarching Consideration:* We acknowledge that this study did not seek to understand barriers and incentives to tracking ETP measures. As such, we do not presume to understand the intricate workings of each IOU and thus cannot make seamless, one-size-fits-all recommendations. While the Portfolio database is managed by the CPUC, each utility may have unique needs in meeting requests for changes in data tracking and recording. As such, a more effective approach might be to ask the IOUs to design and adopt a system of tracking ETP-associated measures that works within their unique systems and is tied to the program metrics enumerated in Table 1. As programs transition to third parties, this reporting and coordination could be required.
 - *Sub-Consideration:* An IOU-designed approach could include developing communication feedback loops or teams to ensure appropriate communication flows, that correspond with specific data requirements associated with ETP metrics. In particular, the IOUs may want to work with the various stakeholders to understand the specific barriers faced (both from a database and organizational perspective) and to solicit feedback on relevant and actionable approaches to ensure appropriate program metrics tracking. As an outcome from the stakeholder workshop, we recommend that the stakeholder workshop group produce recommendations for methods for tracking projects transferring from ETP to the portfolio, including interim stages such as workpaper development and CalTF documentation, for each entity involved in the process.
 - *Responsible Parties:* ETP, Ex Ante Workpaper, CalTF and EE Reporting teams.

Notably, while we identify challenges with organizational change through the UIMD and our preliminary research,⁵³ we acknowledge that the measure-tracking processes may inherently be different as we transition to third-party implementers. This changing landscape, in addition to the challenges identified above, should be considered when designing new tracking processes.

4.2 Framework for Tracking Measures

More broadly, based on this analysis, we recommend using Matching Level 2 (measure code and ETP project completion date compared with savings claim date) to verify ETP-associated claims in the Portfolio. If data tracking challenges are addressed and provide the necessary foundation for a repeatable analysis, we recommend standardizing the key analytical steps tested through this study to track ETP savings going forward. This approach would be streamlined as follows:

1. Identify ETP Projects Recommended for Adoption and Adopted into the Portfolio
 - a. Create an ETP flag in the Portfolio to clearly signify an ETP-associated measure. We note that as a result of this evaluation, the Energy Division has developed an ETP flag in the portfolio, which will serve

⁵³ Ibid.

as a critical tool in developing a broader ETP-associated measure tracking methodology. Details of this tracking methodology should be fleshed out in the stakeholder tracking workshop recommended by this study.

- b. Streamline this flagging process across IOU ETPs.
2. Establish Measure Code(s) Associated with Each ETP Project
 - a. Create clear communication channels to learn the eventual measure code assignment of the ETP-associated technology after it leaves ETP and completes the measure development process.
 - b. Record eventual measure codes in the ETP database using a consistent approach across IOU ETPs.
 3. Clean Annual Portfolio Measure and Savings Data
 - a. Leverage CEDARS cost-effectiveness (evaluated) tables to obtain streamlined and accurate Portfolio claims data.
 - b. CPUC, ETP administrators, and new third party implementers work together to arrive at a set of data cleaning steps and decisions that all parties agree to be accurate and beneficial, which can be repeated year over year.
 4. Cross-Reference ETP-Associated Measures to Portfolio via Matching Level 2
 - a. Measure development teams from each IOU support ETP third parties by sharing information about how measure codes were developed in that year (i.e., did measure code re-use or renaming take place? Is a new class of technology unrelated to ETP becoming available in the Portfolio in this year, and can that help contextualize the relative impact of ETP?).
 5. Calculate ETP Metrics
 - a. Use results from the matching analysis to calculate the results of the metrics.

5. Key Findings and Recommendations

Based on the analyses conducted in this study, we present the following key findings and recommendations to illuminate the historical effects of ETP:

- **Key Finding #1: ETP has been successful in driving technology adoption into the portfolio.** Twenty percent of the projects ETP pursued from 2009 to 2017 resulted in measures being adopted to the Portfolio. Though this figure may appear low, we highlight that the purpose of ETP is not only to provide a pipeline of promising technologies but also to scrutinize and eliminate unsuitable technologies. In the timeframe of this study, 720 measure codes assessed in 205 ETP projects were recommended for adoption to the portfolio to support potential measure development. Of the 205 projects recommended for adoption to the portfolio, 158 (80%) were adopted as one or more measures in the portfolio (Section 3.1).
- **Key Finding #2: ETP-associated measures are associated with significant savings in the portfolio,** representing over 7 billion evaluated lifecycle kWh, nearly 1 million evaluated lifecycle kW, and 54 million evaluated lifecycle positive⁵⁴ therms. In the 2009-2017 timeframe this equated to, on average, 8% of Portfolio kWh savings, 17% of kW savings (2016–2017 only), and 2% of positive therms savings.⁵⁵ The majority of these savings were in the non-residential sector, and indoor lighting measures were the most prevalent technologies and/or applications. Though the non-residential sector dominated savings, a considerable portion of ETP-associated savings was derived from residential projects (35%–48% across kWh, kW, and therms).
- **Key Finding #3: ETP has been successful at supporting measure development for portfolio inclusion.** This study provided findings to support the Business Plan metrics, which indicated that ETP has impacted the Portfolio over the last decade. We developed baselines using all available historical data, which indicated that ETP-associated measures were associated with 51 measures (or 4% of new Portfolio measures) on average annually from 2009 to 2017 (Section 3.3).
 - *Recommendation: Results from this study should be used as to inform baselines for further metrics tracking.* However, given the transition of ETP to third-party implementation, future technology targets, and other factors, ongoing review of metrics will be required to ensure they are appropriate for the program as it evolves. Ongoing tracking of these metrics against this baseline will provide ETP PAs and implementers insight into the effectiveness of technology adoption to the portfolio as the program is deployed over time.
- **Key Finding #4: It is critical that ETP track its contributions to the portfolio.** The current data tracking and communication protocols for ETP-associated technologies do not allow for accurate and timely quantification of ETP contributions to the Portfolio, nor do they provide an adequate foundation for creating a streamlined, repeatable approach that the CPUC and IOUs can implement to readily track progress against metrics in the future. In particular, this analysis relied heavily on the ability to use measure codes to cross-reference the ETP and Portfolio databases, but ETP does not consistently record the eventual measure code that a technology is assigned once leaving the ETP program (Sections 2.2.3 and 4.1.1). We acknowledge that the measure-tracking processes may inherently differ as we transition to third-party implementers. This changing landscape, in addition to the

⁵⁴ We present therms savings without interactive effects. Therms impacts inclusive of interactive effects are presented in Appendix B.

⁵⁵ Codes & Standards claims are excluded from the Portfolio when calculating percentages, which we describe in more detail in the methodology (Section 2.2). When C&S is included in the denominator of the percentage, ETP represents 5% of kWh, 8% of kW, and 1% of therms impacts over the timeframe of the study.

challenges identified above, should be considered when developing third-party tracking processes. With that in mind, we offer the following recommendations:

- *Recommendation: Track linkages between ETP and EE programs.* The IOUs, program implementers, CPUC, CalTF, and other stakeholders should coordinate to put in place protocols to make ETP-associated measure reporting a standard practice. Given the movement to a third-party program design, we suggest convening a stakeholder workshop to identify the advantages of different models, including feedback from the stakeholders listed above. As an outcome from the stakeholder workshop, we recommend that the stakeholder workshop group produce recommendations for methods for tracking projects transferring from ETP to the portfolio, including interim stages such as workpaper development and CalTF documentation, for each entity involved in the process. For example, we acknowledge that ETP staff do not create tags on measure identifiers to track their relationship to ETP projects nor are responsible for ensuring measure codes are not re-used. Subsequent to the publishing of this report, the Energy Division incorporated a tag in the CEDARS database to track ETP-projects moving forward. We acknowledge that the measure development process can continue long after an ETP project is recommended for adoption, which makes it challenging to track down the outcome of the process, but by having third-party implementers establish communication and reporting protocols, we are confident that ETP can increase the number of measure codes it records for its projects (Section 4.1.2).
- *Recommendation: Track the outcome of each ETP project in the ETP database.* The ETP third-party administrator should collect the outcomes of each ETP project: (1) whether it was recommended for adoption; (2) whether a workpaper was developed, and if so, what the workpaper ID is; (3) the eventual measure codes associated with the technology; and (4) savings associated with those measure codes.
- **Finding #5: Portfolio data inconsistencies make comparisons over time difficult.** This historical analysis aimed to understand how effective ETP has been over the last decade, which ideally would allow for examining trends in ETP-associated measure performance over time (e.g., understanding how well measures persist). When examining trends in claims and savings over time, we found that ETP's proportion of the Portfolio database highlights data inconsistencies due to lack of standardized tracking systems or possibly trends seen in the portfolio at large, which makes it difficult to isolate ETP-associated savings of the program over time. For example, it is not possible to assert that an increase in ETP-associated measure savings relative to the Portfolio year over year is due to the demand for ETP-associated measures, because it could also be due to a decrease in overall Portfolio savings, as demonstrated in Section 3.3. Trends in overall Portfolio savings could be attributed to a range of causes, including how and when claims were entered into the Portfolio database (i.e., if they are not entered in the year in which the project took place), variability in the accuracy of record keeping and measure code assignments over the years, the market influence on the Portfolio, and effects of our analysis (Section 3.3). Section 2.2.3 details the limitations to this study.
- *Recommendation: To mitigate data tracking issues enumerated under Finding 4, and support historical tracking, ETP-associated savings should be evaluated on an annual basis going forward.* With consistent tracking in each year, as well as the establishment of data tracking protocols, many of the data challenges faced in this study would be alleviated or eliminated. This analysis used historical data across multiple tracking systems to determine historical trends. If a similar analysis is conducted regularly, supported by ongoing tracking, it will increase the ability of evaluators and program implementers to isolate first-year measures in the Portfolio and examine the performance of ETP-associated measures against non-ETP associated measures of the same vintage, which are subject to the same market conditions.

It is evident that the technologies and applications that ETP has studied over the years have laid the groundwork for future energy savings in the Portfolio. As ETP evolves in the coming years, the findings from this retrospective study may serve as a guidepost for developing future metrics and contextualizing future savings potential.

Appendix A. CA IOU Measure Development Process

Figure 14. IOU Measure Development Process Decision Points

Table 24: Process Decision Points and Gates

Utility	Notes
PG&E	PG&E’s process has up to three gates, but initial screening is done before a measure reaches Gate 1, during an internal RFP process that quantitatively scores measures on energy savings, market potential and cost-effectiveness and selects the most promising for ET funding. After the ETP assessment, a measure goes through Gate 1 review and, if successful, work paper development is initiated unless additional research is required, in which case a Gate 2 review is triggered. The final checkpoint, Gate 3, is qualitative and is more of a checklist to assure that all preconditions for measure launch have been met. Because of the preliminary screening through preparation for the RFP process, few measures fail the Gate 1 and subsequent reviews.
SCE	The SCE process has five gates. In Gate 0, the initial feasibility screening stage, approval is based on qualitative assessments of how the measure aligns with corporate, regulatory and customer strategy. Gate 1, project initiation approval, is based on scores developed on the Idea Scorecard that considers quantitative factors such as energy savings potential, market size and cost effectiveness, as well as qualitative factors including organizational capacity and business priority. Gate 2, approval to build project, is based on the results of limited lab and field-testing, customer blue-printing and identification of marketing channels among other activities. If approved, the product passes on to the product development phase during which a work-paper is developed. The Gate 3 decision point is based on approval of the work paper and the success of the product demonstration and is a qualitative assessment. If approved, the product passes into the launch stage. Gate 4, post-stabilization hand-off, is passed through if a qualitative assessment of the success of the product launch is passed. At this point, the measure is fully transferred from the measure development process to DSM Operations.
SoCalGas	SoCalGas has six stages. The first four are developmental and require scores in six categories: portfolio strategy, market attractiveness, opportunity magnitude, operations, financial and regulatory. The weight of each category varies across the first four stages. A different score is required at various stages in order to assure that resources are only dedicated to the most promising measures. A minimum score must be met at each stage to move on to the following stage. At Stage 1, the minimum score is 2.0 and at Stage 2 it is 2.5; the next two stages are 2.75.
SDG&E	SDG&E does not have a scoring process, but Project Teams do evaluate measures before ETP does Technical Assessments via project evaluation forms. It looks for measures to pass a Total Resource Cost (TRC) test score of 1.25.
LADWP	LADWP does not have a formal stage gate process.
SMUD	SMUD’s process consists of five steps, one of which is a 4-stage gating process. The entire process has as many as six primary decision points, depending on the type and level of maturity of the measure. While a mixture of qualitative and quantitative information informs each decision point, only Stage 1 of the stage gate process, the technological assessment, has a specific scoring system in place. At this stage, a weighted score is developed based on technical savings potential, market potential, market readiness and the strength of the manufacturer.

Source: Evergreen Economics and Willems, Phil. *Study of the California Utility Internal Measure Development Process*. Evergreen Economics: Portland, 2015.

Appendix B. Supplemental Detailed Findings

Below we provide a series of tables that support the EE Business Plan Metric and cohort analyses presented in this report.

Detailed Metrics Analysis Tables

Table 11 provides each year’s lifecycle kWh savings for the Portfolio as well as ETP-Associated measures added to the Portfolio for each year of the study.

Table 11. Ex Ante and Ex Post kWh Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5a)


Claim Year	Portfolio kWh Savings from 2009–2017				kWh Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2017				Percent of ETP kWh Savings Relative to Portfolio Savings from 2009–2017			
	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kWh	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kWh	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kWh	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kWh	% Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kWh	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh
2009	26,690,636,465	18,491,902,211	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable								
2010	29,816,619,019	20,608,150,146	24,124,624,146	14,898,713,818	19,422,674	15,881,883	19,221,655	15,753,231	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
2011	27,625,629,289	19,333,315,594	22,208,964,703	13,818,658,780	68,117,346	53,204,785	67,637,750	52,897,843	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
2012	27,131,780,636	19,163,563,806	21,742,434,250	13,577,502,421	395,537,389	267,777,304	296,077,953	182,347,412	1%	1%	1%	1%
2013	17,692,756,250	12,376,463,522	15,198,663,384	9,341,212,202	724,921,311	518,436,156	566,637,310	371,510,835	4%	4%	4%	4%
2014	19,719,540,968	13,926,418,908	17,965,064,097	10,723,729,814	1,535,700,032	1,112,093,167	1,648,132,366	923,441,704	8%	8%	9%	9%
2015	16,549,577,752	11,566,298,414	15,201,800,040	9,354,006,851	2,474,809,947	1,740,040,547	3,313,209,407	1,796,551,357	15%	15%	22%	19%
2016	14,261,172,149	9,541,010,254	12,665,174,958	7,910,339,437	2,874,665,825	1,870,713,606	2,646,177,228	1,614,900,797	20%	20%	21%	20%
2017	15,858,144,258	12,095,834,914	12,604,306,675	9,043,587,748	3,769,418,976	2,720,958,805	3,505,708,901	2,368,434,104	24%	22%	28%	26%
Total	195,345,856,785	137,102,957,769	141,711,032,253	88,667,751,071	11,862,593,501	8,299,106,252	12,062,802,572	7,325,837,282	6%	6%	9%	8%

Notes: Excludes Codes & Standards claims.

Ex ante savings refer to EE program savings claims reported by PAs, while ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Figure 15 plots claims overtime, sourced from the table above. Here, we can see that ETP’s savings have increased over time, likely owing to the cumulative effect of having added ETP measures to the Portfolio over the past decade and these measures persisting over time. Other findings in this report also support the conclusion that ETP-associated measures generally persist over the years. Please note the difference in scales between the Portfolio and ETP axes.

Figure 15. Portfolio and ETP-Associated Ex Post kWh Savings Comparison by Claim Year



Notes: Excludes Codes & Standards claims.
 Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 12 provides each year’s lifecycle kW savings for the Portfolio as well as ETP-Associated measures added to the Portfolio for each year of the study. Notably, demand data are available for 2016–2017 only.

Table 12. Ex Ante and Ex Post kW Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5b)

Claim Year ^a	Portfolio kW Savings from 2009–2017				kW Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2017				Percent of ETP kWh Savings Relative to Portfolio Savings from 2009–2017			
	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kW	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kW	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kW	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kW	% Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kW	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW
2009												
2010												
2011												
2012												
2013												
2014												
2015												
2016	2,857,099	1,935,624	2,593,400	1,687,671	616,630	410,801	588,552	375,644	22%	21%	23%	22%
2017	3,646,578	3,090,341	3,175,262	2,570,157	822,181	642,916	528,358	350,772	23%	21%	17%	14%
Total	6,503,676	5,025,965	5,768,661	4,257,827	1,438,811	1,053,717	1,116,910	726,415	22%	21%	19%	17%

^a Demand (kW) savings data unavailable for years prior to 2016.

Note: Excludes Codes & Standards claims. Ex ante savings refer to EE program savings claims reported by PAs, while ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 13 and Table 14 provide each year’s lifecycle therm savings for the Portfolio as well as ETP-Associated measures added to the Portfolio for each year of the study. The first table excludes negative therms, and the second includes them. Figure 16 plots claims overtime, sourced from the table below. Notably, there were no ETP-associated measure claims from 2010–2012. Please note the difference in scales between the Portfolio and ETP axes.

Table 13. Ex Ante and Ex Post Therm Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5c) – Excluding Negative Therms


Claim Year	Portfolio Therm Savings from 2009–2017				Therm Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2017				Percent of ETP Therm Savings Relative to Portfolio Savings from 2009–2017			
	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms
2009	0	0	0	0								
2010	829,970,716	556,193,779	827,912,527	827,912,527	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2011	1,083,882,467	721,348,842	1,091,347,226	1,091,347,226	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2012	932,392,555	617,472,780	977,646,315	977,646,315	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2013	640,220,209	408,374,823	493,076,823	493,076,823	14,675,150	9,286,359	14,675,150	8,209,749	2%	2%	3%	2%
2014	696,194,794	451,960,268	511,065,961	511,065,961	17,724,202	11,282,699	17,724,202	10,984,648	3%	2%	3%	2%
2015	452,742,858	297,008,237	331,336,450	331,336,450	26,452,688	16,860,882	26,414,392	16,816,785	6%	6%	8%	5%
2016	356,131,406	228,568,137	298,416,162	298,416,162	15,108,159	9,320,344	14,503,247	8,531,642	4%	4%	5%	3%
2017	389,096,844	259,249,967	321,105,582	321,105,582	22,071,998	13,154,456	18,213,235	9,885,344	6%	5%	6%	3%
Total	5,380,631,848	3,540,176,833	4,851,907,046	4,851,907,046	96,032,197	59,904,739	91,530,227	54,428,169	2%	2%	2%	1%

Notes: Savings excludes negative therms.

Excludes Codes & Standards claims.

Ex ante savings refer to EE program savings claims reported by PAs, while ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Figure 16. Portfolio and ETP-Associated Ex Post Therm Savings Comparison by Claim Year



Note: Savings excludes negative thermes.
 Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 14. Ex Ante and Ex Post Therm Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5c) – Including Negative Therms

Claim Year	Portfolio Therm Savings from 2009–2017				Therm Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2017				Percent of ETP Therm Savings Relative to Portfolio Savings from 2009–2017			
	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms
2009	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2010	587,531,196	395,245,839	720,006,189	406,425,906	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2011	874,705,013	580,723,240	997,819,309	554,017,469	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2012	732,767,778	480,231,790	875,985,203	473,387,912	-42,186	-35,155	-1,374	-886	-0.01%	-0.01%	0.00%	0.00%
2013	558,673,025	357,181,953	403,060,513	268,864,188	13,834,552	8,616,925	13,829,074	7,701,651	2%	2%	3%	3%
2014	605,355,168	391,610,824	400,146,115	252,251,018	10,024,053	5,275,726	6,381,660	6,052,936	2%	1%	2%	2%
2015	351,490,089	231,305,110	216,059,002	135,212,937	11,849,800	6,602,803	-2,436,570	3,565,159	3%	3%	-1%	3%
2016	277,589,254	179,448,710	222,156,218	140,593,243	-3,050,441	-1,598,787	-3,519,731	-2,296,268	-1%	-1%	-2%	-2%
2017	278,595,056	171,005,075	236,068,576	142,686,040	-	-	-	-	-4%	-7%	-7%	-12%
Total	4,266,706,579	2,786,752,541	4,071,301,125	2,373,438,714	22,522,386	7,302,058	-1,657,016	-2,602,365	1%	0.26%	-0.04%	-0.11%

Note: Actual therm savings totals, including negative therms. Excludes Codes & Standards claims

Ex ante savings refer to EE program savings claims reported by PAs, while ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

ETP-Associated Savings Cohort Comparison

To capture the influence of ETP-associated measures relative to all measures submitted to the portfolio in the same year, we analyzed the metrics by “cohort.” Throughout the following results tables, “Cohort” represents the first year that a measure and its savings entered the Portfolio. This approach allows for the examination of how ETP-associated measures perform in their first year relative to other new measures and their subsequent growth (as opposed to looking at them relative to the entire Portfolio). In addition, a cohort-based analysis can provide unique insights into both ETP measure persistence and how ETP measure prevalence (expressed as a percentage of all new Portfolio measures of the same vintage) changes over time.

We do note that these findings should be treated with caution, however, since any trends in the percent of ETP-associated measures and savings over time are sensitive to the fluctuations in the Portfolio as well as data tracking limitations (see Section 2.2.3).⁵⁶ For example, this historical analysis aimed to understand how effective ETP has been over the last decade, which ideally would allow for examining trends in ETP-associated measure performance over time (e.g., understanding how well measures persist). When examining trends in claims and savings over time, however, we found that ETP’s proportion of the Portfolio database reflect data inconsistencies or trends seen in the portfolio at large, which makes it difficult to isolate the effect of the program over time. For example, it is not possible to assert that an increase in ETP-associated measure savings relative to the Portfolio year over year is due to the demand for ETP-associated measures, because it could also be due to a decrease in overall Portfolio savings, as demonstrated in Section 3. Trends in overall Portfolio savings could be attributed to a range of causes, including how and when claims were entered into the Portfolio database (i.e., if they are not entered in the year in which the project took place), variability in the accuracy of record keeping and measure code assignments over the years, the market influence on the Portfolio, and effects of our analysis data cleaning and cohort assignments.

It is not possible, therefore, to assert that ETP-associated measures performed better than non-ETP measures, as their prevalence is influenced by a range of factors, including variations in the accuracy of Portfolio record keeping over time and our ability to correctly assign “new” technologies to cohorts. The following figures compare ETP-associated evaluated net savings with portfolio savings.

Table 15 presents the number of ETP-associated measures added to the portfolio by cohort (cells shaded in light gray). The largest cohort of ETP-associated measures was in 2014, with 110 measures entering the portfolio. Measure counts in subsequent claim years provide an indication of the persistence of new ETP measures over time. Not surprisingly, the absolute number of measures from each cohort decreases over time as some of the measures drop out of the Portfolio. When looking at the share of ETP-associated measures and kWh relative to Portfolio measures of the same cohort, however, ETP-associated measures and savings tend to hold constant, or even increase, over the years.

⁵⁶ Due to the re-use and relabeling of measure codes, it is impossible to assign technologies to a certain cohort without error. Some technologies may have been in existence in the Portfolio for years but were just assigned a new measure code, making them appear as a “first-year” measure. Other technologies may be assigned an existing measure code even though they were new technologies and thus were not flagged for first-year savings even though they should have been. ETP’s proportion of the Portfolio database is highly sensitive to the underlying fluctuations in claims and savings in the portfolio at large. Underlying fluctuations in historical Portfolio savings could be due to several reasons, including how and when claims are entered to the portfolio in a given program cycle (for example, we see clustering of savings in some years and less savings in others), variability in the accuracy of record keeping and measure code assignments over the years, the limitations associated with accurately assigning both ETP-associated and Portfolio measures to cohorts, and importantly, external market conditions.

Table 15. Number of Unique ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year									% of ETP - Associated Measures over Portfolio Measures
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
2009										
2010		5	4	5	4	4	5	5	3	1%
2011			7	7	7	7	6	4	3	3%
2012				41	33	29	26	25	12	15%
2013					51	34	32	29	22	12%
2014						110	96	95	92	35%
2015							79	73	51	19%
2016								73	56	13%
2017									91	9%
Total by Claim Year		5	11	53	95	184	244	304	330	12%

Note: Excludes Codes & Standards claims.

Note that, the 101% in 2017 is partially an artifact of the cohort analysis methodology and assignment of savings to certain years, which makes ETP and Portfolio savings misaligned in some cases. The claim-year based analysis is not subject to this challenge. Moreover, removing C&S from the denominator of the percentage can inflate the contribution of ETP.

Table 16 and Table 17 present the percent and absolute amount of ETP-associated evaluated net first year kWh savings by cohort and claim year. Overall, percentages steadily increase over time, with some substantial variation. As part of this analysis, we reviewed the type of ETP-associated measures claimed in each year and found that there was a larger contribution of measures from ETP to the portfolio in 2014 based on the ETP database and claims matches but were generally consistent with other years largely reflecting indoor and outdoor lighting. The variation may also be due to the fluctuations in the Portfolio as well as data tracking limitations. Note that, the 101% in 2017 is partially an artifact of the cohort analysis methodology and assignment of savings to certain years, which makes ETP and Portfolio savings misaligned in some cases. The claim-year based analysis is not subject to this challenge. Moreover, removing C&S from the denominator of the percentage can inflate the contribution of ETP.

Table 16. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Net kWh Savings by Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year								
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
2009									
2010		0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	1.3%	0.6%
2011			2%	4%	11%	2%	1%	4%	2%
2012				17%	18%	27%	42%	18%	79%
2013					13%	20%	24%	12%	15%
2014						39%	47%	44%	101%
2015							37%	49%	50%
2016								18%	19%
2017									10%

Cohort	Claim Year								
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Average 2009-2017									8%

Note: Excludes Codes & Standards claims.

Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 17. Ex Post Net kWh Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year								
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
2009									
2010		15,753,231	34,552,437	22,562,375	10,739,938	20,044,816	8,330,148	23,371,293	9,237,229
2011			18,345,406	50,790,781	52,301,927	14,075,286	5,878,779	11,887,827	2,005,624
2012				108,994,256	135,360,542	262,508,967	521,475,570	51,987,648	326,089,315
2013					173,108,428	296,785,844	394,360,303	128,420,940	135,380,138
2014						330,026,790	600,210,219	766,774,976	1,026,700,273
2015							266,296,338	298,397,076	366,071,508
2016								334,061,036	179,459,798
2017									323,490,220
Total by Claim Year		15,753,231	52,897,843	182,347,412	371,510,835	923,441,704	1,796,551,357	1,614,900,797	2,368,434,104

Note: Excludes Codes & Standards claims.

Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 18 and Table 19 present the absolute and percent of ETP-associated ex post net first year kW savings by cohort and claim year. Overall, percentages steadily increase over time, with some variation. As noted above, we reviewed the type of ETP-associated measures claimed in each year and found that there was a larger contribution of measures from ETP to the portfolio in 2014 based on the ETP database and claims matches but were generally consistent with other years largely reflecting indoor and outdoor lighting. Note that, although we do not have kW impact data previous to 2016, the measures contributing to 2016–2017 impacts could be from previous years’ cohorts if the measures were introduced previous to 2016.

**Table 18. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Net kW Savings
by Cohort and Claim Year**

Cohort	Claim Year	
	2016	2017
2009		
2010	0.7%	0.3%
2011	0.5%	0.0%
2012	14%	71%
2013	16%	22%
2014	51%	83%
2015	35%	24%
2016	19%	21%
2017		2%
Average 2009–2017		17%

Note: Excludes Codes & Standards claims.

Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

**Table 19. Ex Post Net kW Savings of ETP-Associated Measures
by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year**

Cohort	Claim Year	
	2016	2017
2009		
2010	2,460	766
2011	472	20
2012	9,561	50,130
2013	37,791	33,069
2014	189,685	146,538
2015	62,959	52,082
2016	72,715	32,301
2017		35,865
Total by Claim Year	375,644	350,772

Note: Excludes Codes & Standards claims.

Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 20 and Table 21 present the absolute and percent of ETP-associated ex post net first year therm savings by cohort and claim year. This analysis excludes negative therm savings. Overall, percentages steadily increase over time, with some variation.

Table 20. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Post Net Therm Savings by Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year								
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
2009									
2010		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2011			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2012				0%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%
2013					11%	14%	21%	25%	7%
2014						5%	10%	4%	3%
2015							18%	10%	13%
2016								3%	10%
2017									5%
Total 2009–2017									2%

Notes: Therm savings totals exclude negative therms; therms savings inclusive of interactive effects are presented Table 14.

Excludes Codes & Standards claims.

Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 21. Ex Post Net Therm Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year								
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
2009									
2010		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2011			-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2012				-	230,981	243,885	309,069	309,069	309,069
2013					7,978,768	17,074,746	24,070,899	28,387,679	29,778,018
2014						1,875,767	6,868,760	8,261,483	9,330,744
2015							4,762,455	6,289,225	8,803,627
2016								1,295,369	4,938,757
2017									1,267,954
Total by Claim Year		-	-	-	8,209,749	19,194,397	36,011,183	44,542,825	54,428,169

Notes: Therm savings totals exclude negative therms; therms savings inclusive of interactive effects are presented in Table 14.

Excludes Codes & Standards claims. Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Appendix C. Portfolio Exclusions

We made two exclusions to the overall Portfolio data: (1) C&S claims and (2) measures with no identifiers.

Upon consultation with the CPUC, we removed C&S claims from the matching analysis after determining that ETP projects have not resulted in any discernable C&S claims (please see Section 3.4 for results). This choice focuses findings and baseline metrics on the portion of the Portfolio that ETP has historically affected to appropriately scale ETP’s contribution. The rationale for this exclusion is that no ETP-associated measures were adopted into C&S throughout the 2009–2017 period of study; and given that C&S claims represent a major portion of Portfolio savings, limited the team’s ability to identify trends or impacts from ETP. We detail the ex post net savings claims associated with the excluded C&S claims below, including the percent of the total portfolio that they represented.

Table 22. Codes & Standards Ex Post Net Savings by Claim Year

Claim Year	Ex Post Lifecycle		
	Net kWh Savings	Net kW Savings ^a	Net Therm Savings ^b
2010	939,329,449	N.A.	11,185,343
2011	1,185,641,668	N.A.	18,327,226
2012	1,346,666,394	N.A.	17,025,623
2013	4,669,434,863	N.A.	23,804,460
2014	5,776,635,779	N.A.	19,414,733
2015	12,146,775,732	N.A.	109,634,888
2016	9,107,518,780	1,964,525	293,398,109
2017	12,479,560,045	2,509,644	398,042,815
Total	47,651,562,710	4,474,169	890,833,195
Percent of Portfolio	27%	36%	21%

^a Demand impact data is not available prior to 2016.

^b Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects.

Note: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

We also excluded portfolio claims that did not have unique identifiers, such as measure codes, from the analyses. We removed these records from the analysis because we could neither confirm nor refute that these records had connection to ETP. We detail the evaluated net savings claims associated with the excluded claims below, including the percent of the total portfolio that they represented.

Table 23. Unidentifiable Ex Post Net Savings by Claim Year

Claim Year	Ex Post Lifecycle		
	Net kWh Savings	Net kW Savings ^a	Net Therm Savings ^b
2010	1,682,482,808	N.A.	9,772,293
2011	2,492,748,467	N.A.	32,255,864
2012	2,368,404,191	N.A.	33,367,402
2013	3,742,686,718	N.A.	15,116,943
2014	4,705,907,531	N.A.	16,382,071
2015	9,676,178,864	N.A.	55,786,528
2016	7,395,760,149	1,601,830	152,278,305
2017	10,252,669,705	2,107,890	225,101,195
Total	42,316,838,434	3,709,720	540,060,603
Percent of Portfolio	24%	30%	13%

^a Demand impact data is not available prior to 2016.

^b Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects.

Notes: Ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Appendix D. Workpaper Review Results

For ETP projects that only provided a resulting workpaper ID, Table 24 lists the workpapers provided in the ETP database, the ETP projects the workpaper was associated with, and the measure code that the evaluation found through their workpaper and supporting literature review. Please note that one workpaper ID could be associated with many ETP projects.

Table 24. Workpaper IDs, ETP Projects, and Measure Codes Identified by Evaluation Team

Workpaper ID from ETP Database	ETP Project 1	ETP Project 2	ETP Project 3	ETP Project 4	ETP Project 5	Measure Code
WPSDGENRLG0081	ET09SDGE0006	ET09SDGE0015	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0011	ET09SDGE0002	L-011
WPSDGENRLG0081	ET09SDGE0006	ET09SDGE0015	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0011	ET09SDGE0002	L-021
WPSDGENRLG0081	ET09SDGE0006	ET09SDGE0015	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0011	ET09SDGE0002	L-031
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	402266
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463073
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463074
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463075
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463076
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463077
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463078
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463080
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463081
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463082
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463083
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463084
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463085
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463086
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463087
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463088
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463089
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463090
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463091
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463092
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463093
WPSDGENRLG0196	ET09SDGE0016	ET13SDG7011	ET11SDGE0003	ET11SDGE0004	ET09SDGE0005	463094
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	464046
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	464047
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	401195
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	401196
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	401197
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	401198

Workpaper ID from ETP Database	ETP Project 1	ETP Project 2	ETP Project 3	ETP Project 4	ETP Project 5	Measure Code
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	402258
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	402259
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	402260
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	402261
WPSDGENRLG0181	ET09SDGE0009	ET09SDGE0010	ET09SDGE0012	ET11SDGE0006	ET12SDGE0001	403192
SCE13PR006	ET11SCE1040	ET12SCE1040	ET10SCE1160			PR-78447
SCE13HC013	ET10SCE1110	ET11SCE1130	ET11SCE1190			AC-17382
SCE13HC013	ET10SCE1110	ET11SCE1130	ET11SCE1190			AC-19317
SCE13HC013	ET10SCE1110	ET11SCE1130	ET11SCE1190			AC-78424
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			402262
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			402263
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			428087
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			429087
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462698
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462699
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462702
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462703
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462704
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462707
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462708
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462709
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			463834
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462700
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462705
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			462706
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			401199
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			401200
WPSDGENRLG0080	ET09SDGE0004	ET10SDGE0002	ET12SDGE0002			403198
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT007
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT008
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT009
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT010
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT011
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT012
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT013
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT014
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT015
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT016

Workpaper ID from ETP Database	ETP Project 1	ETP Project 2	ETP Project 3	ETP Project 4	ETP Project 5	Measure Code
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT017
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT018
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT019
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT020
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT021
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT022
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT023
PGECOLTG151	ET09PGE7914	ET09PGE1906				LT024
WPSDGENRHC1050	ET09SDGE0003	ET09SDGE0011				416359
WPSDGENRHC1050	ET09SDGE0003	ET09SDGE0011				416360
WPSDGENRHC1050	ET09SDGE0003	ET09SDGE0011				416363
WPSDGENRHC1050	ET09SDGE0003	ET09SDGE0011				416364
SCE13HC036	ET11SCE1030	ET10SCE1110				AC-18793
SCE13HC036	ET11SCE1030	ET10SCE1110				AC-20693
SCE13HC036	ET11SCE1030	ET10SCE1110				AC-39286
SCE13HC036	ET11SCE1030	ET10SCE1110				AC-49676
SCE13HC036	ET11SCE1030	ET10SCE1110				AC-57395
SCE13HC036	ET11SCE1030	ET10SCE1110				AC-69593
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-72014
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-97565
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-63277
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-14815
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-30287
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-67253
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-18726
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-36894
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-32399
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-42889
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-88048
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-52735
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-32686
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-70123
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-62985
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-71385
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-28655
SCE13HC045	ET13SCE1050	ET13SCE1070				AC-12899
SCE17CC014	ET10SCE1450	ET13SCE1190				FS-77556
PGECOFST102	ET12PGE8201	ET13SCG0002				F205

Workpaper Review Results

Workpaper ID from ETP Database	ETP Project 1	ETP Project 2	ETP Project 3	ETP Project 4	ETP Project 5	Measure Code
PGECOFST102	ET12PGE8201	ET13SCG0002				F206
SCE17LG117	ET14SCE1040	ET15SCE8040				LT-10001
SCE17LG117	ET14SCE1040	ET15SCE8040				LT-10002
SCE17LG117	ET14SCE1040	ET15SCE8040				LT-10003
SCE17LG117	ET14SCE1040	ET15SCE8040				LT-11950
SCE17LG117	ET14SCE1040	ET15SCE8040				LT-11966
SCE17LG117	ET14SCE1040	ET15SCE8040				LT-19146
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-50375
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-81566
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-37735
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-31588
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-87532
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-77878
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-22408
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-75087
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-46105
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-83486
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-26490
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-50319
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-70613
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-97648
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-66543
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-96580
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-69747
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-86967
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-61866
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-87169
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-97980
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-92105
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-59729
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-65475
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-99784
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-60134
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-65806
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-62068
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-73283
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-89637
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-53855

Workpaper ID from ETP Database	ETP Project 1	ETP Project 2	ETP Project 3	ETP Project 4	ETP Project 5	Measure Code
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-61202
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-62602
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-71681
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-94444
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-89435
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-67740
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-69545
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-50853
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-56930
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-75420
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-83228
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-73081
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-53523
SCE13HC012	ET10SCE1110					AC-98919
SCE13HC026	ET10SCE1110					AC-29859
SCE13LG103	ET11SCE3020					LT-61219
SCE13LG103	ET11SCE3020					LT-68701
SCE13LG103	ET11SCE3020					LT-16307
SCE13LG103	ET11SCE3020					LT-89884
SCE13RN025	ET10SCE1050					RF-37766
SCE13RN025	ET10SCE1050					RF-90868
SCGWP100303B	ET12SCG0020					504008
SCGWP100303B	ET12SCG0020					506046
SCGWP100303B	ET12SCG0020					525005
SCGWP100303B	ET12SCG0020					530389
SCGWP100303B	ET12SCG0020					530390
SCGWP100303B	ET12SCG0020					540160
SCGWP100303B	ET12SCG0020					540362
SCGWP100303B	ET12SCG0020					540363
SCGWP100315A	ET12SCG0004					505020
SCGWP100315A	ET12SCG0004					505021
WPSCGNRWH121113A	ET12SCG0019					530637
WPSCGNRWH121113A	ET12SCG0019					530638
WPSCGNRWH121113A	ET12SCG0019					530689
WPSCGNRWH121113A	ET12SCG0019					540385
WPSCGNRWH121113A	ET12SCG0019					540418
WPSCGNRWH121113A	ET12SCG0019					540779
WPSCGREHC110603A	ET12SCG0018					530068

Workpaper ID from ETP Database	ETP Project 1	ETP Project 2	ETP Project 3	ETP Project 4	ETP Project 5	Measure Code
WPCSGREHC110603A	ET12SCG0018					530069
WPCSGREHC110603A	ET12SCG0018					530285
WPCSGREHC110603A	ET12SCG0018					530351
WPCSGREHC110603A	ET12SCG0018					540917
WPCSGREHC160624A	ET13SCG0017					540401
WPCSGREHC160624A	ET13SCG0017					540402
WPCSGREWH161128A	ET12SCG0003					540014
WPCSGREWH161128A	ET12SCG0003					540015
WPCSGREWH161128A	ET12SCG0003					540372
WPCSGREWH161128A	ET12SCG0003					540373
WPCSGREWH161128A	ET12SCG0003					540441
WPCSGREWH161128A	ET12SCG0003					540442
WPSDGENRCC0019	ET11SDGE0016					FS-17337
WPSDGENRLG0082	ET09SDGE0007					402270
WPSDGENRLG0082	ET09SDGE0007					402273
WPSDGENRLG0082	ET09SDGE0007					402271
WPSDGENRLG0082	ET09SDGE0007					402274
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463911
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463855
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463913
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463858
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463919
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463867
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463921
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463870
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463927
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463879
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463929
WPSDGENRLG0106	ET11SDGE0004					463882
WPSDGENRLG0198	ET15SDG8021					463341
WPSDGENRRN0016	ET15SDG1092					464028
WPSDGENRRN0016	ET15SDG1092					464029
WPSDGENRRN0016	ET15SDG1092					464030
WPSDGENRRN0016	ET15SDG1092					464031

Appendix E. Selection of Tracking Issues and Recommendations from Prior ETP Evaluations

This appendix presents a summary of issues and recommendations given in prior CPUC-funded studies, which we selected based on relevance to the current evaluation and program metrics. This appendix is not intended to comment on the extent to which recommendations have or have not been adopted but to provide a summary of historical issues and potential solutions. Please note that the issues and recommendations may be paraphrased or presented as direct quotes from their source reports.

Issue	Resulting Recommendation	Source Study
Inconsistent ETP database project status to indicate whether or not a project and (its associated measures) has been adopted	CPUC and IOU staff agree on an update to the status variables in the ETP database to help relieve this issue. We described such a change in the ETP Targeted Effectiveness Evaluation Report.	1
Missing ETP project measure ID for adopted projects	ETP program staff ensure that all adopted projects have associated measure ID in ETP database.	1
Lack of corresponding ETP Measure ID in Portfolio	<p>The CPUC and IOUs should consider the best approach to flag ETP measures in the EE database to review and summarize savings. These approaches have varying burden to existing systems and stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop IDs that are one-to-one matches across ETP measure IDs and EE database IDs. This approach should ensure that future evaluation teams could trace any measure to its associated ETP project, but may be more burdensome to institute across the various stakeholders involved, or ▪ Develop a flag to capture measure origin to track ETP relationship to on each measure. Despite being less burdensome to institute, this approach has drawbacks because it does not link to the specific ETP project or IOU associated with the project but does indicate whether ETP was associated with the measure. Additionally, this approach eliminates the ability to perform quality assurance on IOU reported influence. 	1
Inability to match custom measures to Portfolio	Discuss benefits and costs to enhancing custom measure tracking with stakeholders to enable comprehensively capturing benefits from measures associated with ETP projects. The inability to identify ETP measures in custom projects likely reflects an incomplete assessment of ETP contributions to the Portfolio, and as such, key stakeholders should consider enhancing how custom projects are defined within the tracking data.	1
Internal communication issues throughout the PG&E measure development process	We recommend that PG&E Product Management consistently and formally share ETP results with the engineering team and others to ensure that all	2

Issue	Resulting Recommendation	Source Study
	available data are used in workpaper development. We recommend that there be a formal procedure to ensure this interaction.	
Internal communication issues throughout the SCE measure development process	SCE Engineering and ETP staff should work with the CPUC and other IOUs to see if there are ways to enhance or develop new guidance for workpaper development, which could help reduce uncertainty about required study sites and data collection.	2
Internal communication issues around tracking procedures at SDG&E. While one staff member reported tracking ETP information sources on a quarterly basis for the CPUC, at least two other measure development staff members were not aware of this tracking process.	SDG&E should share tracking processes internally and could consider merging information sources inside of ETP with those outside of ETP if they see this as valuable.	2
Internal communication issues throughout the SDG&E measure development process	Consider publishing a quarterly status report, which can allow ETP to communicate its role in measure development to stakeholders who may be unfamiliar with it. This report can also be used to educate new program staff about ETP's capabilities, as well as provide documentation of the path ETs take through the utilities measure development process.	2
	SCE Engineering and ETP staff should work with the CPUC and other IOUs to see if there are ways to enhance or develop new guidance for work paper development, which could help reduce uncertainty about required study sites and data collection.	
	SDG&E measure development stakeholders should formally disseminate customer utilization data with ETP and Engineering staff and solicit their feedback to document customer barriers.	
Internal ETP data tracking issues	<p>Going forward, basic data tracking activities should be implemented to facilitate informative review of and provide insights into ETP. Such activities would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assigning unchanging master ID numbers to ETP projects, ▪ Archiving data in a standard format as it is collected, and ▪ Refining implementation processes to facilitate tracking of technologies adopted from ETP to EE programs. <p>ETP staff should collaborate with EE program staff to create consistent project naming and numbering conventions, decision documentation, and feedback loops between ETP and the EE programs to which technologies were recommended for adoption. Doing so will increase project stakeholder involvement in the post-assessment process, thereby helping to drive the incorporation of ETP technologies into EE</p>	3

Issue	Resulting Recommendation	Source Study
	<p>programs. It will also facilitate improved tracking of adoptions of ETP technologies in EE programs to support program management and subsequent program evaluations.</p>	
<p>Lack of quality and consistency of documentation procedures for program- and project-level budget expenditures and program elements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ETP should strive to create consistent project naming and numbering conventions, decision documentation, and feedback loops between ETP and the EE programs to which technologies were recommended for adoption. ▪ The utilities should continue efforts to refine program implementation processes to develop more formal and better documented procedures, especially for the adoption phase. A major focus should be placed on improving the quality and consistency of documentation regarding program decision-making (e.g., rationale for recommending a technology for adoption) and data tracking processes (e.g., assigning unchanging master ID numbers to all ETP projects). 	<p>3</p>
<p>Need for improved documentation of program processes and procedures and associated decision making.</p>	<p>The 2010–2012 ETP PIPs reflect continued progress made by ETP managers and staff to address recommendations generated during program evaluation efforts; however, attention is still needed on the following priority areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Generating feedback loops between ETP and EE programs to assess the success of adopted technologies, and identify and mitigate barriers to anticipated levels of market adoption; ▪ Improving program data tracking systems and operations including consistent updates of the ETCC database; and ▪ Collaborating with the utilities’ respective regulatory affairs staffs to streamline internal review processes for final technology assessment reports. 	<p>3</p>
<p>The current data-tracking and communication protocols for ETP-associated technologies do not allow for accurate and timely quantification of ETP contributions to the Portfolio. Particularly, the resulting measure codes from ETP-associated technologies are often not recorded in the ETP database.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As ETP transitions to third-party management, requisite data tracking should include the outcomes of each ETP project: (1) whether it was recommended for adoption; (2) whether a workpaper was developed, and if so, what the workpaper ID is; and, (3) what the eventual measure codes associated with the technology are. ▪ Protocols should be put in place to make ETP-associated measure reporting a standard practice. We acknowledge that the measure development process can continue long after an ETP project is recommended for adoption, which makes it challenging to track down the outcome of the process, but by establishing communication and 	<p>Present Study</p>

Issue	Resulting Recommendation	Source Study
	<p>reporting protocols, we are confident that ETP can increase the number of measure codes it records for its projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While we identify potential change management challenges, we acknowledge that the measure-tracking processes may inherently differ as we transition to third-party implementers. This changing landscape, in addition to the challenges identified above, should be considered when designing new tracking processes. 	
<p>When examining trends in claims and savings over time, we found that ETP’s proportion of the Portfolio database reflect data inconsistencies or trends seen in the portfolio at large, which makes it difficult to isolate the effect of the program over time.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ETP-associated savings should be evaluated on an annual basis going forward to eliminate the error introduced when reaching back several years to calculate savings. If the analysis is conducted regularly, it will be possible to confidently isolate all first-year measures in the Portfolio and examine the performance of ETP-associated measures against measures of the same vintage, which are subject to the same market conditions. 	<p>Present Study</p>

Cited Studies:

1. Opinion Dynamics, & Guidehouse. (2020). Emerging Technologies Program Handoff Process Evaluation (p. 69).
2. Evergreen Economics, & Willems, P. (2015). *Study of the California Utility Internal Measure Development Process: Final Report* (p. 122).
3. Summit Blue Consulting, ADM Associates, Inc., California Technology International, Inc., E Source, Energy Market Innovations, & Opinion Dynamics Corporation. (2010). Final Report: Evaluation of the California Statewide Emerging Technologies Program (p. 205).

Appendix F. Historical Analysis Addendum

The objective of this Historical Analysis Addendum is to continue to assess the ongoing impact of the ETP on the PA EE Portfolio's energy savings for program years 2018 through 2022⁵⁷ as an addendum to the 2009 – 2017 study. Notably, each PA can incentivize and claim savings associated with measures supported through ETP activities. To achieve this objective, the evaluation team:

- Evaluated the market uptake (defined as number of measures rebated) and achieved savings of all technologies and approaches that have moved from ETP into the PA EE Portfolio or directly and indirectly into C&S from 2018 through 2022;
- Estimated resulting portfolio and/or direct to C&S savings resulting from these measures from 2018 through 2022⁵⁸;
- Estimated (or quantified) the value of ETP by comparing program costs and benefits, where data is available; and
- Refined EE baseline metrics and success criteria, as relevant.

This addendum serves as a follow-up to the Emerging Technologies Program Technology to Portfolio Evaluation report and solely documents the PA claimed savings for ETP measures that have been deployed to PA EE and C&S programs. Both studies do not address attribution of savings from the ETP efforts within the PA EE portfolio.

Addendum Detailed Analytical Steps

As part of this study, we tracked the number of ETP-associated projects that led to measures claimed and their associated energy savings within the PA EE portfolio from program years 2018 to 2022. We detail the analytical steps conducted for this addendum below.

Step 1: Identify ETP Projects Recommended for Adoption and Adopted to the Portfolio

Within the ETP database, each ETP project includes a field to indicate whether it has been “adopted,”⁵⁹ which means that ETP staff have formally recommended at least one of the ETP technologies in the project for adoption and that the technology(s) have gone through the required processes (detailed in Appendix A) to be included in the Portfolio.⁶⁰ For adopted projects, an ETP project may have one or more technologies, and thus eventual measure codes or workpaper IDs associated with it.⁶¹ Each IOU has its own measure development process, which results in unique ETP database and Portfolio measure codes using different combinations of alphanumeric values. Building on the work performed previously, the evaluation team identified, and then verified with each IOU, the status of measure codes included in ETP projects between 2018–2022. Notably,

⁵⁷ The work plan originally included energy savings for program years 2018 through 2021. However, the evaluation team included energy savings for 2022 per CPUC's request.

⁵⁸ The evaluation team also attempted to quantify ETP-associated measures from 2009 to 2017 that resulted in a C&S impact and associated savings per the work plan. However, no ETP-associated measures were matched to the EE Portfolio between 2009 – 2017 as discussed in Section 3.4 of the *Year 1 Emerging Technologies Program Technology to Portfolio Evaluation* report completed in May 2021.

⁵⁹ ETP projects refer to ETP-supported studies of numerous technologies, or novel applications of technologies, resulting in some being recommended for consideration in the CA EE Portfolio and some being ruled out.

⁶⁰ One ETP project can study multiple technologies, and one technology may be included in multiple ETP projects.

⁶¹ A workpaper ID is an alphanumeric identifier of a workpaper, which is a broader categorization than a measure code. One workpaper may have many measure codes associated with it.

any new measure codes associated with ETP projects between 2009 through 2017, were included in this step as well.

Step 2: Establish Measure Code(s) Associated with Each ETP Project

In some cases, the measure codes (local or statewide) or workpaper IDs stemming from an ETP project are listed in the ETP database, and in other cases, there is no information listed even though the database indicates the project was adopted. We submitted one data request and conducted one meeting with the CPUC and IOUs to clarify data and gather additional information to identify a local and/or statewide measure code or workpaper ID for each adopted project. We then manually reviewed and updated the ETP database with additional information regarding each ETP project as it was received.

Step 3: Clean and Aggregate Portfolio Measure and Savings Data

The scope of this study focused on EE program years 2018 through 2022. In each EE program year, the PAs submit program savings claims to the CPUC. This data is reviewed and updated for errors by CPUC consultants to ensure data quality. For each year included in this study, we used the pre-evaluated or ex ante data from CEDARS⁶² per CPUC's instruction. In each case, we pulled all variables relevant to this study, including PA reported savings claims (also referred to as ex ante savings) and numerous descriptive fields such as project sector, PA, year of savings claim, measure code number, and workpaper ID. We then cleaned, standardized, and compiled data from 2018 through 2022. Through this effort, we developed a database of Portfolio PA reported savings claims from 2018 through 2022 and appended the final dataset from the previous study that contained data for claim years 2009 through 2017.

Step 4: Cross-Reference Adopted ETP-Associated Projects to the Portfolio

The measure code, claim year, and additional ETP project descriptions were used to match ETP projects to associated measures in the Portfolio. Ideally, attempts to match measure codes to the Portfolio would result in reliable one-to-one matches. However, in practice, we completed an iterative process in which the pool of matches was refined based on a series of matching criteria described below.

Excluding Ineligible Projects from Portfolio

Since measure codes and claim years are key to identifying ETP-associated claims, we excluded Portfolio claims that did not have any unique identifier (i.e., measure code, measure ID, or workpaper ID) from analyses that compare ETP-associated claims to Portfolio claims as claims missing measure codes could not be matched with ETP-associated measures. Evaluated net savings excluded from the analyses are presented in Updated Appendix C. Portfolio Exclusions for Addendum below.

Matching Criteria for Measures

To match ETP projects to associated measures in the Portfolio, we utilized the following data variables: measure codes, ETP project completion date, and Portfolio claim year. We established different levels of matching with a match on measure code alone as the least stringent (Level 1) and a match on measure code and project completion date as more stringent (Level 2). We used the matching levels as follows:

3. **Matching Level 1 (Measure Code Only):** The first level for matching ETP projects to Portfolio projects was based on measure code, which exists in both the ETP database and the Portfolio database and

⁶² EE Portfolio claims is publicly accessible via: <https://cedars.sound-data.com/reports/record-level/>

provides a reliable way to identify a specific technology. If measure codes matched between the two databases, we considered the ETP project as having achieved a Level 1 Match.

As indicated in the work plan for this addendum, we did not conduct any workpaper reviews. However, we did secure a lookup tool from CalTF staff that helped us identify statewide measure codes associated with ETP-associated measures to allow for matching via statewide measure codes⁶³ as well as local or IOU specific measure codes.

4. **Matching Level 2 (Measure Code and Project Completion Date):** The second level for matching used the measure code in addition to temporal information. We leveraged the ETP project completion date (based on the “Progress Point: Report/deliverable complete” field in the ETP database⁶⁴) and the claim year (based on the “ClaimYearQuarter” field in the Portfolio) to ensure that the timing of the match aligned with when the ETP project was completed. A level two match was achieved when the claim year corresponding with each matching measure code is at least one year after the ETP project completion date. This lag is necessary because once an ETP-associated measure is adopted to an EE program, it takes time for the measure to achieve savings claims, depending on market uptake. This criterion was important to operationalize because the study team found some ETP measure codes with matching claims *before* the ETP project took place. In those instances, one can deduce that ETP was not associated with savings from that measure code before the ETP project started. By including this criterion, we eliminated some, but not all, spurious matches. We discuss the limitations of this analytical approach in the study limitations section below.

Step 5: Analyze Data

After matching the ETP database to the Portfolio database, we analyzed the resulting matches, in addition to analyzing data from the Portfolio at large.

Calculate ETP Metrics

In addition to characterizing and measuring the adoption of ETP-associated technologies to the Portfolio, we calculated the historical averages for the ETP metrics (see Table 36) specified in SCE’s (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics.⁶⁵ We were directed to provide baselines for the metrics based on historical data,⁶⁶ against which the IOUs may track their effectiveness in the future. We understand that ETP will be undergoing changes as it moves into third-party implementation meaning that the measures available, program administration approach, and resulting measure adoption will likely change; but the metrics based on historical results reflect the best information available to date to inform baseline development. As new data become available, the metrics and their respective baselines should be updated.

The metrics baselines provided in this report are based on Matching Level 2 and reflect results from all historical data.

As earlier indicated, due to data tracking limitations, we were unable to develop some of the baselines for some of the study years:

⁶³ In 2021, statewide measure codes that can be linked to local or IOU specific measure codes were included in both the ETP and EE Portfolio databases.

⁶⁴ In cases where there was no ETP project completion date provided in the ETP database, the team used the project initiation date (i.e., “Progress Point: Project Funded/Initiated” field in the ETP database).

⁶⁵ Valdberg, A., & Cole, J. L. (2018). *Southern California Edison Company’s (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics* (p. 146).

⁶⁶ A baseline is the first assessed value of a metric.

- **Demand (kW) Reported and Evaluated Net Savings prior to 2016:** We did not determine demand (kW) savings prior to 2016 because kW savings associated with EE projects were not reported in the Portfolio until 2016.
- **Evaluated Savings for 2009:** Ex post energy (kWh), demand (kW), and gas (therm) savings data were not reported or not populated in 2009 in the EE Portfolio.

Analyze Data by Cohort

To capture the share of ETP-associated measures relative to all measures submitted to the portfolio in the same year, we analyzed the data by “cohort” (i.e., all measures that share the same first year in the Portfolio), in addition to analyzing it by claim year. This approach allows for the examination of how ETP-associated measures perform relative to other new measures, as opposed to how they perform against well-established measures. It also can provide insights into how ETP measure prevalence changes over the years relative to other measures of the same vintage. [Updated Appendix B](#) section below presents these findings.

Addendum Study Limitations

A significant limitation of the analytical process of this study is uncertainty in the validity of matches, due to a lack of consistent record keeping with respect to measure codes across the Portfolio. This was primarily due to either insufficient data coverage or quality at the Portfolio level, Portfolio and ETP-database-entry errors, or the fact that only workpaper IDs were provided for some ETP projects, limiting the ability to effectively match ETP projects with associated Portfolio measures. While the eventual outcome of the iterative matching process was an estimation of ETP-associated savings, these results inherently include considerable uncertainty from various sources, as follows:

- **Incomplete and poor-quality data.** This study drew on numerous data and information sources due to the fact that no single database provided complete information. Several of the data quality and availability issues have been ameliorated on the Portfolio side with the development of CEDARS since 2016 and will not affect analyses for 2016 and beyond. However, this analysis was impacted by a lack of demand impact data prior to 2016, inconsistent or missing measure codes in both the Portfolio and ETP databases, and the inability to identify first-year measures in the portfolio. Additionally, in Year 1 we excluded Portfolio claims that did not have any unique identifier (i.e., measure code or workpaper ID) from analyses that compared ETP-associated claims to Portfolio claims as measure codes are required to identify ETP-associated claims and Portfolio claims. Without these measure codes, claims could not be included in matching ETP-associated measures to Portfolio measures and we removed them from the analysis. These exclusions—in terms of records and kWh, kW, and therms—are presented in the updated Appendix C section of this report.
- **Potential overestimation of ETP metrics due to lack of measure code tracking.** Seventy-one ETP projects listed only workpaper IDs, rather than measure codes in the Year 1 study and 46 ETP projects neither had workpaper IDs nor measure codes for this Addendum. As such, the study risked either potentially underestimating ETP-associated savings if workpaper IDs or measure codes were omitted from the analysis, or overestimating savings if the workpapers or their associated measure codes were included. As discussed above, we used all available sources to find measure codes listed within workpapers and then confirm their connection with ETP projects, but the ability to draw that connection relied heavily on the brief (1–2 sentence) description of the ETP project provided in the database. Table 2 (Year 1) and Table 26 (Addendum) summarize the percent of matched ETP claims and savings derived from measure codes that we identified and connected to ETP via our workpaper review.

- **Re-use of measure codes.** In addition to the potential overestimation due to the use of workpaper IDs, there is also a possibility that not all matching measure codes were ETP supported due to the re-use of existing measure codes to track similar measures. Technologies may be assigned an existing measure code even though they are new technologies in the Portfolio. In some cases, we found that ETP adopted a new technology into the Portfolio, but it was given a measure code that was in existence before the ETP project occurred. This makes it challenging to discern which technologies and EE claims associated with those technologies actually had ties to ETP, and which stemmed from further back in the Portfolio's history. Initial review of Portfolio data revealed that twelve ETP-associated measure codes already existed *prior* to the completion of ETP projects with matching measure codes. To address this issue, we utilized the Matching Level 1 and Matching Level 2 approach described in this report, which ensures that matches meet both measure code and temporal conditions.
- **Relabeling of measure codes.** In some instances, we found that measure codes only exist in the Portfolio database for one year, though the technology that they represent persists in the Portfolio with a new measure code. This poses a challenge for matching to measure codes provided in the ETP database, because there is no record of changes in Portfolio measure codes over the years. Given the great volume of measure codes and claims in the Portfolio, and each utility's unique measure development process, it was beyond the scope of this study to discern which of these measure codes could have been associated with ETP technologies over the course of the last decade. It is also difficult to ascertain the scale of the uncertainty associated with re-using and relabeling measure codes.
- **Many-to-many relationship between ETP Projects and Measure Codes.** Upon review of the ETP database, we found that there are ETP projects initiated in different years that share measure codes with other ETP projects. While we were able to match ETP measure codes to measure claims in the Portfolio, this many-to-many relationship between measure codes and ETP projects limited our ability to accurately trace a measure code back to *one* ETP project in cases where a measure code is associated with multiple ETP projects. While this is not a potential source of overestimation, it prevents us from assessing the impacts of specific ETP projects.
- **Measurement of first-year savings.** Although this addendum presents a cohort analysis to better characterize ETP-associated savings in the first year that the technology was claimed, we acknowledge limitations to this approach. First, due to the re-use and relabeling of measure codes, it is impossible to assign technologies to a certain cohort without error. Some technologies may have been in existence in the Portfolio for years but were just assigned a new measure code, making them appear as a "first-year" measure. Other technologies may be assigned an existing measure code even though they were new technologies and thus were not flagged for first-year savings even though they should have been. Additionally, when examining trends in claims and savings over time, whether by cohort or by claim year, it is critical to keep in mind that ETP's proportion of the Portfolio database is highly sensitive to the underlying fluctuations in claims and savings in the portfolio at large. Underlying fluctuations in historical Portfolio savings could be due to several reasons, including how and when claims are entered into the portfolio in a given program cycle (for example, we see clustering of savings in some years and less savings in others), variability in the accuracy of record keeping and measure code assignments over the years, the limitations associated with accurately assigning both ETP-associated and Portfolio measures to cohorts, and importantly, external market conditions.
- **Exclusion of ETP-associated activities prior to 2009.** Given data limitations prior to 2009, this study reviews claimed savings and measures as of 2009 and excludes prior years of ETP deployment. As a result, ETP-associated savings prior to 2009 are likely included in our denominator (e.g., the Portfolio savings) for this analysis. Measures existing in the Portfolio as of 2009 could have been derived from

ETP-associated activities. In 2010, an evaluation study assessed ETP contributions to the Portfolio from 2006-2008, which include a host of measures prevalent in the Portfolio for many years, such as CFLs, LED exterior lights, etc.⁶⁷

- **Limited Ability to Identify ETP-associated C&S and Custom Measures.** While we include C&S measures in this addendum, the ETP-associated C&S measures were limited to ones identified by IOUs as going into C&S or pending adoption into C&S during the prior study. Currently, there is no reliable and definitive way to identify ETP-associated measures that have been adopted into C&S. The same is true for custom measures as not all custom measures have measure codes. As such, findings in general and those presented in the “Codes & Standards” section below are not comprehensive and may be an underestimate of ETP’s contribution to C&S.

Addendum: Study Findings

In this section, we present the status of all 2009–2022 ETP projects. We then provide detailed information on matches of ETP projects to the Portfolio in terms of project counts and energy and demand savings to provide the market uptake and achieved savings of all technologies and approaches that moved from ETP into the Portfolio.⁶⁸ Lastly, we address the ETP program metrics codified in the EE Business Plans.⁶⁹

ETP Projects Eligible for Adoption in Portfolio

We reviewed databases from the four IOUs to identify the total number of ETP projects that were conducted between 2009–2022. Overall, 927 projects were initiated from 2009 to 2022 (Figure 17). Of these, 561 (or 61%) were complete at the time of this analysis. The remaining projects were classified as active (155 or 17%) or cancelled (211 or 23%). Of the completed projects, 232 (41%) were recommended for adoption. Of those recommended projects, 171 (74%) were adopted.⁷⁰ These adopted projects comprise the population of projects that we sought to match to Portfolio claims.


⁶⁷ CPUC, Final Report: Evaluation of the California Statewide Emerging Technologies Program. Summit Blue Consulting, 2010. http://www.calmac.org/publications/Final_Comprehensive_ETP_Final_Report_02-04-10_R7_3.pdf

⁶⁸ Notably, the Portfolio excludes C&S claims (see Section 2.2).

⁶⁹ Valdberg, A., & Cole, J. L. (2018). *Southern California Edison Company’s (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics* (p. 146).

⁷⁰ Technology adoption refers to a technology being approved for inclusion in the Portfolio via the completion of a workpaper or custom measure documentation. For more information on the measure development process see: Summit Blue Consulting, LLC, ADM Associates, Inc., California Technology International, Inc., E Source, Energy Market Innovations, & Opinion Dynamics Corporation. (2010). *Final Report: Evaluation of the California Statewide Emerging Technologies Program* (p. 205).

Figure 17. ETP Project Adoption Status from 2009 to 2022



Note: ^a There are ETP projects that do not have measure codes as they can be either custom measures or projects that entail a process or behavior change. We have kept these under recommended for adoption per ETP project status. However, the adoption status is “Unknown” since we are only able to confirm adoption status via matching to EE Portfolio data when measure codes exist.

Overall, 18% of the 927 projects ETP pursued from 2009–2022 resulted in measures being adopted to the Portfolio. While this figure may appear low, we highlight that the purpose of ETP is not only to provide a pipeline of promising technologies but also to scrutinize and eliminate unsuitable technologies. Further, while ETP staff play a major role in identifying and screening new ETs, several other IOU groups are involved in the measure development process at various stages, as outlined in Figure 3 (see Section 2.2). The eventual adoption of an ETP-associated measure is therefore the culmination of a rigorous process subject to expertise from ETP staff, engineering staff, the CPUC, incentive program managers, C&S managers, and measure development management. For more information on this process please see the Emerging Technologies Program Handoff Process Evaluation.⁷¹

Table 25 summarizes the status of the 927 ETP projects, by IOU. Consistent with the size of each program, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and Southern California Edison (SCE) accounted for 68% of projects.

Table 25. ETP Project Adoption from 2009-2022 by IOU

Project Status	PGE	SCE	SCG ^a	SDG&E ^b	Total	Percent of Total Projects
Total Completed Projects	156	218	96	91	561	61%
Completed, Recommended for Adoption	52	88	50	42	232	25%
Adopted	51	63	21	36	171	18%
Unknown Adoption Status ^c	1	25	17	6	49	5%
Not Adopted	0	0	12	0	12	1%
Completed, Not Recommended for Adoption	104	130	46	49	329	35%
Active ETP Projects	14	104	17	20	155	17%
Cancelled	52	87	51	21	211	23%
Total Projects	222	409	164	132	927	

⁷¹ Opinion Dynamics & Guidehouse. (2020). *Emerging Technologies Program Handoff Process Evaluation*.

Project Status	PGE	SCE	SCG ^a	SDG&E ^b	Total	Percent of Total Projects
----------------	-----	-----	------------------	--------------------	-------	---------------------------

^a Southern California Gas Company

^b San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E)

^c There are ETP projects that do not have measure codes as they can be either custom measures or projects that entail a process or behavior change. We have kept these under recommended for adoption per ETP project status. However, the adoption status is “Unknown” since we are only able to confirm adoption status via matching to EE Portfolio data when measure codes exist.

Addendum: ETP Projects Represented in the Portfolio

This analysis focused on the 171 ETP projects that were adopted into the Portfolio between 2009 - 2022. Of the 171 adopted projects, 49 (14 excluded in Year 1 and an additional 35 for this addendum) were excluded from the analysis because they were missing both measure codes and workpaper IDs that would have allowed us to track their associated savings in the Portfolio⁷². Of the 171 projects, 160 (93%) had at least one matching savings claim in the Portfolio, based on measure code (Matching Level 1) and 132 or 77% had at least one matching claim based on measure code and year (Matching Level 2, Figure 18). In summary, we were unable to match some projects due to lack of claims, claims occurring outside of the analysis time frame, or measure codes that were not claimed to date. This match rate is the highest evaluators have achieved to date and includes both deemed and custom measures.^{73, 74}

Figure 18. Summary of Matches by Criteria (n=171)




Table 26 summarizes the number of measure codes matched for the 171 ETP projects included in this Addendum. Notably, we matched all 171 ETP projects completed between 2009 and 2021 to EE Portfolio claims for 2018 to 2022. A summary of measure code dispositions from the Year 1 study is reported in Table 4, while results of the matching of ETP-associated measure codes with 2018 to 2022 EE Portfolio claims are presented in Table 26.

⁷² As agreed, 14 of the 19 were excluded in Year 1. An additional five projects were excluded in the analysis for this addendum, as stated on page 3 of the work plan, the evaluation team would only conduct a workpaper review to identify ETP-supported measures for ETP projects with workpaper IDs. Notably, the lack of workpapers and/or measure codes usually occur when the ETP-associated measures are custom measures or do not require workpapers. However, without any unique identifier to match to the EE Portfolio, ETP projects that do not have measure codes and workpaper IDs cannot be included in the analysis.

⁷³ For example, the 2013–2014 evaluation of ETP matched 55% of the provided ETP measure codes to the Portfolio. Opinion Dynamics Corporation, Energy and Resource Solutions (2015) *PY2013–2014 Emerging Technologies Program Targeted Effectiveness Study Report*.

⁷⁴ While custom measures are not assigned measure codes, there are some measures that are both deemed and custom and have measure codes, which can be used to match with EE Portfolio data.

Similar to the Year 1 study, we used two levels of matching for this Addendum, as described in the Detailed Analytical Steps section.⁷⁵ The remainder of the results section only presents findings from Matching Level 2.

Table 26. Summary of Measure Code Dispositions for Claim Years 2018-2022 by Matching Level (n=1,609)

Disposition	Matching Level 1		Matching Level 2	
	Number of Matches	Percent	Number of Matches	Percent
Valid Measure Code ^a	1,609	100%	442	27%
Valid Match with Claims	442	27%	442 ^b	27%
Valid Measure Code with No Claims between 2018 - 2022	1,167	73%	1,167	73%
Total Addendum	1,609	100%	1,609^b	100%

^a Valid measures are unique measure identifiers that either matched between the ETP database and the Portfolio or ones that IOUs confirmed to be valid either through responses to data requests or through search within each IOU’s measure catalogue.

^b All measure codes that matched also satisfied the year criteria. When appended to the 2009 to 2017 matched dataset from the Year 1 study, the total number of unique measure codes included in the 2009 – 2022 analysis is 824, including statewide measure codes.

^c For this addendum, we matched all ETP-associated measure codes from 2009 to 2021. The total number of unique valid measure codes is 1,609.

Addendum: ETP to Portfolio Match Characteristics and Savings

This section presents findings from the 824⁷⁶ ETP-associated measure codes that were matched to the Portfolio based on Matching Level 2 for 2009 to 2022.

We found inconsistent data coverage across electric and gas savings as well as demand impacts in the Portfolio databases. For energy savings, electric and gas savings claims were available consistently from 2009 across the Portfolio. However, for electric demand impacts, demand impact data was not available Portfolio-wide prior to 2016. Notably, we did not find any ETP-associated therms matches between the ETP database and the Portfolio in 2010–2012, despite the Portfolio reporting therms savings at the time. This suggests that ETP-associated measures only claimed therms savings in the Portfolio after 2013. Notably, ETP did not generate C&S claims from 2009 through 2017. However, estimates of identifiable C&S claims were included in the analysis from 2018 through 2022. Notably, estimates of ETP-associated C&S savings were limited to measures identified in the ETP database as C&S⁷⁷ and matched ETP-associated measure codes corresponding with C&S claimed savings in the EE Portfolio. This addendum limits ETP-associated C&S savings estimates to program years 2018 to 2022 as agreed upon in the Historical Analysis Addendum work plan (discussed further in the Codes & Standards Section below).

Table 27 provides a summary of ETP-associated measures, claims, and PA reported lifetime savings (also referred to in this section as ex ante lifecycle net kWh, kW, and therms) by claim year in the Portfolio. Matched measures, claims, and kWh savings consistently increased year over year from 2009 through 2017. However, savings decreased between 2020 through 2022. Decreased lighting savings claims as well as the decrease in savings claims overall between 2020 through 2022 contributed to decreased savings. Two events most

⁷⁶ Combined 2009 – 2022 unique number of measure codes that satisfied both matching criteria.

⁷⁷ IOUs indicated some ETP-associated measures as contributing to C&S via responses to data requests in the Year 1 study. However, no matches were found between the ETP-associated measures and the EE Portfolio between 2009 to 2017.

likely contributed to the decrease in lighting related savings in 2020 and 2021, the suspension of EE Programs during the COVID-19 pandemic and the discontinuation of lighting program(s) or lighting installations.

Table 27. Summary of ETP-Associated Measures, Claims, and Ex Ante Savings

Claim Year	Number of Measures	Number of Unique Measures Added by Claim Year	Number of Claims	Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh	Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW ^b	Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therms ^d
2009 ^a						
2010	5	5	180	15,881,883	N.A.	N.A.
2011	11	7	1,099	53,204,785	N.A.	N.A.
2012	53	41	11,224	267,777,304	N.A.	N.A.
2013	95	51	25,721	518,436,156	N.A.	9,292,222
2014	184	110	126,991	1,110,822,109	N.A.	11,289,505
2015	244	79	239,776	1,738,457,024	N.A.	16,860,882
2016	304	73	209,050	1,869,942,553	410,619	9,320,430
2017	330	91	322,075	2,717,467,618	642,193	13,156,231
2018	256	160	262,677	756,560,312	138,890	21,203,630
2019	265	89	212,757	1,062,175,255	206,878	15,618,952
2020	154	56	83,214	398,395,256	68,853	6,857,434
2021	98	16	33,710	161,695,658	638,956 ^f	3,204,040
2022	87	46	39,018	156,937,927	18,905	1,943,083
Total	824^e	824	1,567,492	10,827,753,839	2,125,294	108,746,409

^a 2009 was not eligible for matching under Matching Level 2, as the earliest ETP projects in this study were completed in 2009 and subsequently became eligible for matching in 2010.

^b Demand impact data is not available prior to 2016 at the Portfolio level.

^c Measure code total represents the cumulative unique matched measure codes and is not additive over claim years.

^d Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects. [Updated Appendix B](#) provides detailed findings including interactive effects.

^e The Number of Measures may not sum to the total as the Total Number of Measures (824) represents the total number of unique ETP-associated measures included in the analysis from 2009 – 2022. ^f While programs were suspended in 2020 and 2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a program in the Public sector that completed large lighting upgrades in a public university. The majority (631,383 kW) was due to this project with claim ID PGE-2021-CLA42-EW-9513-1-0013600000SZMAIAAO.

Table 28 presents the measures, claims, and total savings by the IOU who completed the associated ETP project.⁷⁸ PG&E and SCE represent the majority of ETP matches to the Portfolio, which is commensurate with the relative sizes of their programs. ETP-associated projects resulted in 10,827,753,839 kWh, 2,126,199 kW, and 108,731,878 therm savings from 2009–2022. Note that given limitations with the demand data, ex ante lifecycle net kW reflects 2016–2022 values only.

⁷⁸ This table reflects the provenance of the IOU ETP measures claimed in the Portfolio, however, the associated claims could have been submitted by any PA.

Table 28. Total ETP-Associated Measures, Claims, and Ex Ante Savings by IOU ETP Program

IOU	Number of Measure Codes 2009–2022		Number of Claims 2009–2022		Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh		2016–2022 Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW		Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therm ^a	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
PG&E	273	33%	843,313	54%	6,141,535,685	57%	1,644,759	77%	75,623,750	70%
SCE	321	39%	504,945	32%	3,445,641,240	32%	315,896	15%	9,879,230	9%
SCG	28	3%	177,097	11%	111,455,361	1%	188	0.01%	22,878,628	21%
SDG&E	219	27%	42,137	3%	1,129,121,554	10%	164,451	8%	364,800	0.34%
Total	824	N.A.	1,567,492	N.A.	10,827,753,839	N.A.	2,125,294	N.A.	108,746,409	N.A.

^a Negative values were removed from therm savings data to omit interactive effects. [Updated Appendix B](#) provides detailed findings including interactive effects.

Examining the number of ETP-associated measures by sector shows that most of the measures associated with ETP have been in the commercial sector (Table 29), which aligns with record-keeping in the ETP database.

Table 29. Number of Unique ETP-Associated Measure Codes by Sector and Claim Year^a


Sector	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Total
Agricultural		1							4	4	9	5	3	17
Commercial	5	11	48	80	158	203	253	230	172	187	118	68	31	605
Cross-Cutting									24	16	1			25
Industrial		1	1						11	13	11	17	8	46
Public									36	22	17	11		4
Residential			7	33	69	98	84	153	47	57	23	16	12	49
Other		1	1	2	1								46	286
Total by Claim Year	5	11	53	95	184	244	304	330	256	265	154	96	87	824

^a Measure code total represents the cumulative unique matched measure codes and is not additive over claim years.

^b Measure codes by sector do not equal total number of measure codes associated with ETP (n=824) because some measure codes span across sectors.

ETP-associated energy and demand savings were driven by commercial projects, representing 66% of total kWh savings from 2009 through 2022 (Figure 19) and 49% of total kW savings from 2016 to 2022 (Figure 20), while 60% of ETP-associated gas savings from 2013 to 2022 overall were driven by residential projects (Figure 21).

Figure 19. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh by Sector and Claim Year ^{a, b}




Notes:

^a Total Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh by claim year are as follows: Claim year 2010: 15,881,883 kWh Claim year 2011: 53,204,785 kWh; Claim year 2012: 267,777,304 kWh; Claim year 2013: 518,436,156 kWh; Claim year 2014: 1,110,822,109 kWh; Claim year 2015: 1,738,457,024 kWh; Claim year 2016: 1,869,942,553 kWh; Claim year 2017: 2,717,467,618 kWh; Claim year 2018: 756,560,312 kWh; Claim year 2019: 1,062,175,255 kWh; Claim year 2020: 398,395,256 kWh; Claim year 2021: 161,695,658 kWh; Claim year 2022: 156,937,927 kWh; Total: 10,827,753,839 kWh

^b Percentages less than 1% are not shown in the chart.

^c Savings claims that correspond with "Other" sector(s) are either due to missing sector information or unknown sectors.

Figure 20. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW by Sector and Claim Year ^{a, b}




Notes:

^a Total Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW by claim year are as follows: Claim year 2016: 410,619 kW; Claim year 2017: 642,193 kW; Claim year 2018: 138,890 kW; Claim year 2019: 206,878 kW; Claim year 2020: 68,853 kW; Claim year 2021: 638,956 kW; Claim year 2022: 18,905; Total: 2,125,294 kW

^b Percentages less than 1% are not shown in the chart.

^c In 2021, there was one large lighting project (claim ID PGE-2021-CLA42-EW-9513-1-0013600000SZMAIAAO) in the Public Sector that contributed 631,383 kW savings. This drives the 96% kW savings in the Public Sector in 2021.

Figure 21. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therms by Sector and Claim Year ^{a, b, c}



Notes:


^a Only positive savings included in calculation of therm savings. [Updated Appendix B](#) provides detailed findings including interactive effects.

^b Total Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therm savings by claim year are as follows: Claim year 2013: 9,292,222; Claim year 2014: 11,289,505; Claim year 2015: 16,860,882; Claim year 2016: 9,320,430; Claim year 2017: 13,156,231; Claim year 2018: 21,203,630; Claim year 2019: 15,618,952; Claim year 2020: 6,857,434; Claim year 2021: 3,204,040; Claim year 2022: 1,943,083; Total: 108,746,409

^c Percentages less than 1% are not shown in the chart.

Residential projects did make increasingly notable contributions to the number of claims (Figure 22), along with kWh (Figure 19) and therms savings (Figure 21) over time. In fact, residential projects accounted for a greater proportion of claims consistently from 2014–2022 and represented the majority (78%) of claims overall. This trend was due to residential lighting projects, which drove a high number of claims, but a lower amount of overall savings compared to non-residential projects. We discuss savings by technology in more detail throughout the remainder of this section. We do note that variations in the accuracy of record keeping over the years could drive some of these trends.

Figure 22. Percent of ETP-Associated Claims by Sector and Year ^{a, b}



^a Total number of savings claims by claim year are as follows: Claim year 2010: 180; Claim year 2011: 1,099; Claim year 2012: 11,224; Claim year 2013: 25,721; Claim year 2014: 126,991; Claim year 2015: 239,776; Claim year 2016: 209,050; Claim year 2017: 322,075; Claim year 2018: 262,677; Claim year 2019: 212,757; Claim year 2020: 83,214; Claim year 2021: 33,710; Claim year 2022: 39,018; Total: 1,567,492

^b Percentages less than 1% are not shown in the chart.

To further characterize ETP-associated measures present in the Portfolio, we grouped savings based on technology types.⁷⁹ Overall, lighting measures (including indoor and outdoor) dominated the technology types between the ETP database and the Portfolio, with 65% and 11% of matched indoor and outdoor lighting measures, respectively. This finding is also consistent with the project descriptions provided in the ETP database. Indoor lighting steadily accounted for majority of kWh (Figure 23) and kW savings (Figure 24). Outdoor lighting was the second highest energy saver in terms of kWh and kW, meaning that lighting in general comprised the vast majority of ETP-associated savings over the years of this study. Given lighting has played such an important role in the ETP program and Portfolio savings at large, we expect to see a significant shift in the focus of ETP as lighting incentives are phased out of the Portfolio.

⁷⁹ To assign claims and associated savings to equipment groups, we cleaned and standardized the “Measure Group” variable in the Portfolio. We also used the “tectype” (i.e., Technology Type) variable where “Measure Group” was unavailable. Both variables include the following categories: Indoor Lighting, Appliances, HVAC, Irrigation, Food Service, Refrigeration, Building Envelope, Other, Lighting Other, C&S Title 20, C&S Title 24, Retrocommissioning/Process, Office Equipment, EMS, Water Heating, C&S Appliance, Outdoor Lighting, Plug Load Sensor, Pool Pump, Steam Trap, Unknown, and Whole Building.

Figure 23. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle kWh Savings by Technology a, b




Notes:

a Total Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh by claim year are as follows: Claim year 2010: 15,881,883 kWh Claim year 2011: 53,204,785 kWh; Claim year 2012: 267,777,304 kWh; Claim year 2013: 518,436,156 kWh; Claim year 2014: 1,110,822,109 kWh; Claim year 2015: 1,738,457,024 kWh; Claim year 2016: 1,869,942,553 kWh; Claim year 2017: 2,717,467,618 kWh; Claim year 2018: 756,560,312 kWh; Claim year 2019: 1,062,175,255 kWh; Claim year 2020: 398,395,256 kWh; Claim year 2021: 161,695,658 kWh; Claim year 2022: 156,937,927 kWh; Total: 10,827,753,839 kWh

b Percentages less than 1% are not shown in the chart.

Figure 24. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle kW Savings by Technology a, b



Notes:


a Total Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW by claim year are as follows: Claim year 2016: 410,619 kW; Claim year 2017: 642,193 kW; Claim year 2018: 138,890 kW; Claim year 2019: 206,878 kW; Claim year 2020: 68,853 kW; Claim year 2021: 638,956 kW; Claim year 2022: 18,905; Total: 2,125,294 kW

b Percentages less than 1% are not shown in the chart.

Food service technologies comprised 36% of ETP-associated therms savings overall, while HVAC also accounted for a significant portion of ETP-associated therms savings (Figure 25). Notably, ETP associated

measures were not associated with a number of technologies present in the Portfolio, such as building envelope upgrades, steam traps, and pool pumps, to name a few.

Figure 25. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Lifecycle Therm Savings by Technology ^{a, b, c}



Notes:

^a Negative values were removed from therm savings data to omit interactive effects. [Updated Appendix B](#) provides detailed findings including interactive effects.

^b Total Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therm savings by claim year are as follows: Claim year 2013: 9,292,222; Claim year 2014: 11,289,505; Claim year 2015: 16,860,882; Claim year 2016: 9,320,430; Claim year 2017: 13,156,231; Claim year 2018: 21,203,630; Claim year 2019: 15,618,952; Claim year 2020: 6,857,434; Claim year 2021: 3,204,040; Claim year 2022: 1,943,083; Total: 108,746,409

^c Percentages less than 1% are not shown in the chart.

Codes & Standards

One sign that ETP technologies have gained widespread acceptance is their adoption into C&S, which clearly demonstrates they are deemed as best practice among market actors. As part of this addendum, by means of reviewing the ETP database, IOU responses to data requests, and review of CEDARS, we identified ETP-associated measures that were adopted into C&S (Title 24) or C&S programs directly or indirectly from ETP. In addition, to identify C&S measures in the EE Portfolio that have previously been supported by ETP, the evaluation team issued a data request to C&S program staff for a list of EE Portfolio measures that have been adopted into C&S. However, C&S program staff noted that there is currently no tracking mechanism in place that tracks ETP-associated measures into C&S, which is consistent with findings from the ETP Handoff Process Evaluation that found there is currently no process to transition measures or data that originated in ETP to C&S advocacy work (Section 3.4).

As stated in Section 3.4, the prior study found that zero ETP projects resulted in technologies being adopted into C&S between 2009 to 2017, despite the hypothesis that the program supports C&S claims and there being a metric to measure the number of ETP projects claimed in C&S. However, while conducting the prior study, through responses to data requests, IOUs noted that while older projects did not indicate a direct relationship to C&S, two projects were pending adoption to C&S. These projects, and a few other ETP-associated measures identified in the ETP database as going into C&S, were included in the matching between

ETP and EE Portfolio databases for this addendum. We present the results of the matching of ETP-associated C&S measures below for claim years 2018 through 2022.

Table 30 to Table 32 summarize ETP-associated C&S measures, claims, and ex ante savings by claim year, IOU, and sector between program years 2018 through 2022. As shown in the following tables a total of 122 unique ETP-associated C&S measures achieved 1,452,090,592 kWh, 897,549 kW, and 32,403,158 therms between 2018 and 2022.

Table 30. Summary of ETP-Associated C&S Measures, Claims, and Ex Ante Savings 2018-2022

Claim Year	Number of Measures	Number of Unique Measures Added by Claim Year	Number of Claims	Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh	Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW	Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therms ^a
2018	52	12	103,309	264,717,238	58,454	13,590,623
2019	64	20	87,394	664,460,237	143,079	10,321,664
2020	50	8	38,529	275,998,872	46,555	4,733,458
2021	43	5	20,764	124,272,293	631,383	2,522,397
2022	60	36	21,095	122,641,953	18,078	1,235,016
Total	122	81	271,091	1,452,090,592	897,549	32,403,158

Note:

^a Negative values were removed from therm savings data to omit interactive effects. [Updated Appendix B](#) provides detailed findings including interactive effects.

Table 31. Total ETP-Associated C&S Measures, Claims, and Ex Ante Savings by IOU ETP Program

IOU	Number of Measure Codes 2018–2022		Number of Claims 2018–2022		Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh		Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW		Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therm ^a	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
PG&E	273	33%	261,595	96%	1,424,873,856	98%	890,313	99%	32,144,822	99%
SCE	321	39%	9,469	29%	24,189,272	2%	6,803	1%	258,335	1%
SCG	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
SDG&E	219	27%	27	3%	3,027,464	0.2%	433	0.05%	N.A.	N.A.
Total	824		271,091		1,452,090,592		897,549		32,403,158	100%

Note:

^a Negative values were removed from therm savings data to omit interactive effects. [Updated Appendix B](#) provides detailed findings including interactive effects.


Table 32. Number of Unique ETP-Associated C&S Measure Codes by Sector and Claim Year

Sector	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Total
Agricultural	4	4	9	5	3	16

Sector	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Total
Commercial	18	31	34	31	23	53
Cross-Cutting			1			1
Industrial	3	11	10	16	8	34
Public	10	9	9	5	9	16
Residential	29	30	11	6	30	58
Total	52	64	50	43	60	122

As seen in Figure 26, commercial measures contributed nearly half (47%) of kWh savings between 2018 and 2022. However, there are more unique C&S measures (58 in Table 32) and energy savings claims (95% in Figure 29) in the residential sector overall between 2018 and 2022. Despite these, majority (77%) of kW savings overall came from the Public sector⁸⁰ (Figure 27), while 66% of therm savings overall came from the residential sector (Figure 28).

Figure 26. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kWh by Sector and Claim Year ^a




Note: ^a Total ex ante lifecycle kWh savings by claim year is as follows: Claim year 2018: 264,717,238; Claim year 2019: 664,460,237; Claim year 2020: 275,998,872; Claim year 2021: 124,272,293; Claim year 2022: 122,641,953; Claim years 2018-2022: 1,452,090,592

^b Savings claims that correspond with "Other" sector(s) are either due to missing sector information or unknown sectors.


⁸⁰ In 2021, there was a large project that installed lighting in a public university, which achieved 631,383 kW savings. The associated claim ID is PGE-2021-CLA42-EW-9513-1-0013600000SZMAIAAO.

Figure 27. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle Net kW by Sector and Claim Year^a



Note: ^a Total ex ante lifecycle kW savings by claim year is as follows: Claim year 2018: 58,454; Claim year 2019: 143,079; Claim year 2020: 46,555; Claim year 2021: 631,383; Claim year 2022: 18,070; Claim years 2018-2022: 897,549


Figure 28. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle Net Therms by Sector and Claim Year^{a,b}



Note: ^a Total ex ante lifecycle therm savings by claim year is as follows: Claim year 2018: 13,590,623; Claim year 2019: 10,321,664; Claim year 2020: 4,733,458; Claim year 2021: 2,522,397 Claim year 2022: 1,235,016; Claim years 2018-2022: 32,403,158

^b Negative values were removed from therm savings data to omit interactive effects. [Updated Appendix B](#) provides detailed findings including interactive effects.


Figure 29. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Claims by Sector and Claim Year^a



Note: ^a Number of unique ETP-associated C&S claims by claim year is as follows: Claim year 2018: 103,309; Claim year 2019: 87,394; Claim year 2020: 38,529; Claim year 2021: 20,764, Claim year 2022: 21,095, Claim years 2018-2022: 271,091

Consistent with previous program years, ETP-associated C&S lighting measures are still the largest contributor to kWh and kW savings as shown in Figure 30 and Figure 31. Indoor lighting consistently achieved the most kWh savings between 2018 and 2022, despite the COVID-19 pandemic and phase out of lighting from the EE programs.


Figure 30. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle kWh Savings by Technology^a



Note: ^a Total ex ante lifecycle kWh savings by claim year is as follows: Claim year 2018: 264,717,238; Claim year 2019: 664,460,237; Claim year 2020: 275,998,872; Claim year 2021: 124,272,293; Claim year 2022: 122,641,953; Claim years 2018-2022: 1,452,090,592

^b Savings claims that correspond with “Other” technologies are either due to missing or unidentifiable technology type information (e.g., “AllEquip”, “Pilot”, or “Motor Non-HVAC”).

Figure 31. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle kW Savings by Technology^a




Note: ^a Total ex ante lifecycle kW savings by claim year is as follows: Claim year 2018: 58,454; Claim year 2019: 143,079; Claim year 2020: 46,555; Claim year 2021: 631,383; Claim year 2022: 18,070; Claim years 2018-2022: 897,549

^b Savings claims that correspond with “Other” technologies are either due to missing or unidentifiable technology type information (e.g., “AllEquip”, “Pilot”, or “Motor Non-HVAC”).

When it comes to gas measures, ETP-associated C&S HVAC measures have consistently achieved the most therm saving between 2018 and 2022 with 36% of therm savings overall. Food service (34%) and whole building retrofits (28%) also largely contributed to therm savings.

Figure 32. Percent of ETP-Associated C&S Ex Ante Lifecycle Therm Savings by Technology ^{a,b}



Note: ^a Total ex ante lifecycle therm savings by claim year is as follows: Claim year 2018: 13,590,623; Claim year 2019: 10,321,664; Claim year 2020: 4,733,458; Claim year 2021: 2,522,397 Claim year 2022: 1,235,016; Claim years 2018-2022: 32,403,158

^b Negative values were removed from therm savings data to omit interactive effects. [Updated Appendix B](#) provides detailed findings including interactive effects.

^c Savings claims that correspond with “Other” technologies are either due to missing or unidentifiable technology type information (e.g., “AllEquip”, “Pilot”, or “Motor Non-HVAC”).

Cost and Benefits Ratio

This addendum also aimed to estimate the value of ETP by comparing costs and benefits. Per CPUC’s instruction, the evaluation team determined the ratio of ETP-associated measure benefits to cost using TRC costs and benefits associated with each ETP-associated savings claim. The following tables present the benefits to cost ratios by IOU and claim year, technology type and claim year, and sector and claim year from 2018 through 2022. Notably, the evaluation team attempted to conduct the same analysis for years 2016 and 2017. However, the dataset used in the prior historical analysis excluded claim IDs, and as such, we were unable to match the claims included in the 2009 to 2017 historical analysis with EE Portfolio data containing TRC costs and benefits fields.⁸¹

As shown in Table 33, SCG (115%) and SDG&E (120%) ETP-associated measure benefits were greater than TRC Costs overall, while PG&E (56%) and SCE (66%) ETP-associated measure benefits were at least half the cost overall from 2018 through 2022.

Table 33. TRC Costs and Benefits Ratio by Claim Year and IOU 2018 - 2022

Claim Year	PGE			SCE			SCG			SDGE		
	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio
2018	\$40,575,793	\$71,526,391	57%	\$38,300,057	\$52,822,044	73%	\$6,152,095	\$2,435,916	253%	\$4,333,948	\$2,558,200.98	169%
2019	\$59,116,301	\$104,153,745	57%	\$23,829,495	\$37,004,355	64%	\$7,845,211	\$7,665,329	102%	\$3,743,243	\$2,624,850.75	143%
2020	\$21,810,044	\$38,844,479	56%	\$9,245,792	\$10,716,961	86%	\$2,433,527	\$3,919,663	62%	\$1,070,997	\$1,861,779.49	58%
2021	\$12,271,514	\$24,892,498	49%	\$2,099,191	\$10,199,739	21%	\$1,983,793	\$1,357,278	146%	\$534,293	\$767,330.44	70%
2022	\$9,449,608	\$16,333,333	58%	\$3,287,423	\$4,741,828	69%	\$2,497,996	\$2,769,932	90%	\$351,404	\$563,172.22	62%
Total	\$143,223,260	\$255,750,446	56%	\$76,761,957	\$115,484,926	66%	\$20,912,622	18,148,118	115%	\$10,033,886	\$8,375,334	120%

When it comes to technology types, plug load sensors (125%) and food service (103%) ETP-associated measures had the most benefits compared to costs overall from 2018 through 2022, while building control (28%) had the least benefits compared to cost (Table 34).

Table 34. TRC Costs and Benefits Ratio by Claim Year and Technology Type 2018 - 2022

Technology Type	2018			2019			2020			2021			2022			Total		
	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio
Appliances	\$3,146,867	\$5,725,341	55%										\$1,795	\$15,675	11%	\$3,148,662	\$5,741,016	55%
Building Control	\$19,344	\$136,828	14%	\$77,414	\$212,587	36%										\$96,758	\$349,415	28%

⁸¹ The analysis is limited to 2018 to 2022 as the TRC costs and benefits data is unique to each savings claim. To conduct the same analysis for 2009 to 2017, the evaluation team would need claim IDs and TRC cost and benefits data corresponding with claims included in the analysis performed in Year 1. However, raw data provided to the evaluation team for the Year 1 study was aggregated by measure code at the very least. In the process of aggregation all claim IDs were dropped from the raw dataset. This limits us from identifying TRC cost and benefits data that correspond with savings claims included in the Year 1 study for years 2009 to 2017.

Historical Analysis Addendum

Technology Type	2018			2019			2020			2021			2022			Total		
	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio
Building Envelope							\$82,804	\$115,493	72%				\$911	\$3,110	29%	\$83,715	\$118,603	71%
Food Service	\$5,131,416	\$3,801,720	135%	\$3,662,055	\$3,351,845	109%	\$2,304,458	\$1,500,613	154%	\$974,769	\$3,037,519	32%	\$21,980	\$63,272	35%	\$12,094,678	\$11,754,969	103%
HVAC	\$46,222,478	\$45,221,910	102%	\$35,465,706	\$46,959,186	76%	\$14,567,373	\$20,542,332	71%	\$6,004,747	\$8,749,488	69%	\$6,334,443	\$8,411,667	75%	\$108,594,747	\$129,884,583	84%
Indoor Lighting	\$25,785,410	\$54,118,593	48%	\$48,413,129	\$87,807,971	55%	\$16,169,786	\$28,036,805	58%	\$8,523,157	\$21,786,354	39%	\$8,756,891	\$13,278,168	66%	\$107,648,374	\$205,027,892	53%
Outdoor Lighting	\$1,850,848	\$6,568,290	28%	\$3,416,595	\$5,395,561	63%	\$44,218	\$299,017	15%				\$22,922	\$33,421	69%	\$5,334,583	\$12,296,289	43%
Plug Load Sensor	\$247,962	\$199,093	125%													\$247,962	\$199,093	125%
Refrigeration	\$1,902,471	\$3,462,349	55%	\$422,804	\$586,888	72%	\$236,692	\$355,545	67%	\$371,073	\$906,368	41%	\$241,606	\$868,942	28%	\$3,174,646	\$6,180,093	51%
Water Conservation Measure	\$33,846	\$49,654	68%	\$118,713	\$151,077	79%	\$2,671	\$3,233	83%	\$2,128	\$1,759	121%	\$3,913	\$3,737	105%	\$161,271	\$209,460	77%
Water Heating	\$56,961	\$85,170	67%	\$25,213	\$87,088	29%	\$215,392	\$336,090	64%	\$224,897	\$337,516	67%	\$122,810	\$434,915	28%	\$645,273	\$1,280,780	50%
Whole Building	\$4,964,291	\$9,748,500	51%	\$2,932,622	\$6,844,273	43%	\$865,312	\$3,746,820	23%	\$747,851	\$2,325,445	32%	\$79,159	\$1,295,357	6%	\$9,589,235	\$23,960,395	40%
Other							\$71,653	\$204,818	35%	\$40,169	\$71,742	56%				\$111,822	\$276,560	40%
Total	\$89,361,893	\$129,117,450	69%	\$94,534,250	\$151,396,477	62%	\$34,560,359	\$55,140,766	63%	\$16,888,791	\$37,216,191	45%	\$15,586,431	\$24,408,265	64%	\$250,931,725	\$397,279,149	63%

Among the sectors, ETP-associated measures falling within the cross-cutting sector had the most benefit in relation to cost, while measures in the public sector had the least benefits compared to cost.

Table 35. TRC Costs and Benefits Ratio by Claim Year and Sector 2018 - 2022

	2018			2019			2020			2021			2022			Total		
	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio	Benefits	TRC Cost	Ratio
Agricultural	\$414,723	\$375,049	111%	\$2,646,158	\$4,147,776	64%	\$1,371,146	\$1,010,637	136%	\$4,137,962	\$3,863,725	107%	\$5,340,374	\$5,573,676	96%	\$13,910,364	\$14,970,861	93%
Commercial	\$26,753,701	\$48,406,442	55%	\$39,753,006	\$66,765,608	60%	\$17,790,602	\$25,530,056	70%	\$5,749,384	\$20,383,584	28%	\$3,389,990	\$6,958,370	49%	\$93,436,682	\$168,044,061	56%
Cross-Cutting	\$2,392,679	\$272,691	877%	\$1,644,966	\$152,535	1078%	\$167,925	\$141,843	118%							\$4,205,570	\$567,069	742%
Industrial	\$1,639,912	\$2,260,638	73%	\$1,308,379	\$1,296,971	101%	\$266,231	\$451,133	59%	\$601,537	\$2,390,526	25%	\$475,053	\$1,122,167	42%	\$4,291,112	\$7,521,435	57%
Public	\$7,056,894	\$22,800,160	31%	\$14,634,016	\$29,911,005	49%	\$2,909,744	\$8,145,625	36%	\$850,822	\$1,723,098	49%	\$347,984	\$1,515,751	23%	\$25,799,460	\$64,095,637	40%
Residential	\$51,103,984	\$55,227,571	93%	\$34,547,725	\$49,174,385	70%	\$12,054,712	\$20,063,589	60%	\$5,549,086	\$8,855,914	63%	\$6,033,030	\$9,238,302	65%	\$109,288,537	\$142,559,761	77%
Total	\$89,361,893	\$129,342,551	69%	\$94,534,250	\$151,448,280	62%	\$34,560,359	\$55,342,881	62%	\$16,888,791	\$37,216,845	45%	\$15,586,431	\$24,408,265	64%	\$250,931,725	\$397,758,823	63%

Updated EE Business Plan Metrics

In the prior study, we developed preliminary baselines for the five ETP savings metrics, against which the ETP program can be evaluated in future years. These analytical outputs provide insights to inform baselines and approaches to assess ETP program effectiveness. In the prior study, we considered the average output of 2009 to 2017 timeframe. To refine these baselines, we have updated the average output of ETP over the 2009 through 2022 timeframe. This approach leverages all available data on the historical performance of the program.

We anticipate that the suggested baselines from this analysis will change over time as ETP is deployed as a third-party program. Table 36 provides an overview of the updated Business Plan Metrics and a summary of results, which we recommend using as baselines moving forward.

Table 36. Emerging Technologies Program Metrics and Findings⁸²

Metric Name	Metric Description	Unit of Measurement	2009-2022 Average Result / Recommended Baseline
ETP-T1	Prior year: % of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies	%	4%
ETP-T2	Prior Year: # of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies	#	59
ETP-T3	Prior year: % of new codes or standards that were previously ETP technologies	%	1%
ETP-T4	Prior Year: # of new C&S that were previously ETP technologies ^a	#	16
ETP-T5a	Electric savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex post where available	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kWh	832,904,141
ETP-T5b	Demand savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex post where available	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kW ^b	303,613
ETP-T5c	Thermo savings of measures currently in the portfolio that were supported by ETP, added since 2009. Ex ante with gross and net for all measures, with ex post where available	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms ^c	8,365,108

^a This may be refined further should tracking from ETP to C&S become available in the future as this is based on only ETP-associated C&S measures that we learned about by means of data requests.

^b Though technically kW impacts are only first-year, here we report Lifecycle kW impacts to stay consistent with the units reported in the Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics and the Portfolio; kW impacts represent 2016 and 2022 average only, as those are the only years with available data.

^c Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects.

Table 37 shows the number and percent of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies, by year. The average over the timeframe of this study was 59 measures per year, or 4% of new Portfolio measures. Given that this number reflects an average of activities, we understand that the results in a given year may fluctuate for many reasons – including transitioning to a third-party program, changes in

⁸² Valdberg, A., & Cole, J. L. (2018). *Southern California Edison Company's (U 338-E) Energy Efficiency Business Plan Metrics* (p. 146).

program funding, changes in Portfolio strategy. Given this, we recommend prioritizing ETP-T2 over ETP-T1 as a baseline through the first year of the third-party program transition. The rationale for prioritizing number of measures (e.g., 59 measures) over percent of measures in Portfolio (e.g., 4%) is the uncertainty associated with changes to the overarching Portfolio. In addition, while we recommend using 59 measures as the baseline, given the historical and future uncertainty of measures adopted into the Portfolio, we consider an acceptable range of measures to be 15 to 103 (or one standard deviation from the average). We anticipate that the CPUC and stakeholders will revisit this baseline as the program design and implementation of this program evolve.

Table 37. Number and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio

Claim Year	Total number of new measures added to the Portfolio ^{a, b}	Number of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies (ETP-T2)	Percent of new measures added to the portfolio that were previously ETP technologies (ETP-T1)
2009	3,430	0	-
2010	2,162	5	0%
2011	860	7	1%
2012	665	41	6%
2013	767	51	7%
2014	761	110	14%
2015	1,020	79	8%
2016	1,624	73	4%
2017	955	91	10%
2018	8,669	160	2%
2019	501	89	18%
2020	393	56	14%
2021	413	16	4%
2022	274	46	17%
Total	22,494	824	NA
Average 2009-2022	1,607	59	4%

Note: ^a 2009 – 2017 Excludes C&S claims, 2018 – 2022 includes C&S claims

^b Totals exclude all ESA claims.

Updated Appendix B. Supplemental Detailed Findings for Addendum

Below we provide updated tables and figures presented in Appendix B as part of the addendum. The series of tables and figures include analysis results from claim years 2009 through 2022 and support the EE Business Plan Metrics and cohort analyses presented in this report.

Addendum: Detailed Metrics Analysis Tables

Table 38 provides each year’s lifecycle kWh savings for the Portfolio as well as ETP-Associated measures added to the Portfolio for each year of the study.

Table 38. Ex Ante and Ex Post kWh Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5a)


Claim Year	Portfolio kWh Savings from 2009–2022				kWh Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2022				Percent of ETP kWh Savings Relative to Portfolio Savings from 2009–2022			
	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kWh	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kWh	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kWh	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kWh	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kWh	% Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kWh	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net kWh
2009	26,690,636,465	18,491,902,211	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable								
2010	29,816,619,019	20,608,150,146	24,124,624,146	14,898,713,818	19,422,674	15,881,883	19,221,655	15,753,231	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
2011	27,625,629,289	19,333,315,594	22,208,964,703	13,818,658,780	68,117,346	53,204,785	67,637,750	52,897,843	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
2012	27,131,780,636	19,163,563,806	21,742,434,250	13,577,502,421	395,537,389	267,777,304	296,077,953	182,347,412	1%	1%	1%	1%
2013	17,692,756,250	12,376,463,522	15,198,663,384	9,341,212,202	724,921,311	518,436,156	566,637,310	371,510,835	4%	4%	4%	4%
2014	19,719,540,968	13,926,418,908	17,965,064,097	10,723,729,814	1,533,844,127	1,110,822,109	1,648,132,366	923,441,704	8%	8%	9%	9%
2015	16,549,577,752	11,566,298,414	15,201,800,040	9,354,006,851	2,472,373,758	1,738,457,024	3,313,209,407	1,796,551,357	15%	15%	22%	19%
2016	13,920,170,795	9,200,008,900	12,324,173,604	7,569,338,083	2,873,380,736	1,869,942,553	2,646,177,228	1,614,900,797	21%	20%	21%	21%
2017	14,525,097,516	10,696,135,835	11,271,259,933	7,643,888,669	3,764,190,478	2,717,467,618	3,505,708,901	2,368,434,104	26%	25%	31%	31%
2018	32,874,951,272	30,426,548,975	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	1,238,356,450	756,560,312	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	4%	2%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2019	27,327,539,694	25,619,177,958	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	1,469,091,966	1,062,175,255	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	5%	4%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2020	43,043,799,529	42,376,618,203	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	508,684,436	398,395,256	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	1%	1%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2021	44,412,370,234	43,937,620,191	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	212,936,727	161,695,658	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	0.5%	0.4%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2022	34,346,528,103	33,875,416,822	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	213,295,446	156,937,927	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	1%	0%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
Total	375,676,997,523	311,597,639,485	140,036,984,158	86,927,050,638	15,494,152,844	10,827,753,839	12,062,802,572	7,325,837,282	4%	3%	9%	8%

Notes: Savings exclude C&S claims for 2009 – 2017 and all ESA claims.

Ex ante savings refer to EE program savings claims reported by PAs, while ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Figure 33 plots claims overtime, sourced from the table above. Here, we can see that ETP’s savings have increased and decrease over time, likely owing to the cumulative effect of having added ETP measures to the Portfolio over the past decade and these measures persisting over time, while others sunset. Other findings in this report also support the conclusion that ETP-associated measures generally persist over the years. Please note the difference in scales between the Portfolio and ETP axes.

Figure 33. Portfolio and ETP-Associated Ex Ante kWh Savings Comparison by Claim Year



Notes: Savings exclude C&S claims for 2009 – 2017 and all ESA claims.
 Ex ante savings are EE Program savings that have been reported by EE program administrators and have yet to be verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies. CPUC has requested to report ex ante savings for this addendum as savings estimates for ETP projects are conducted at the ex ante level rather than ex post.

Table 39 provides each year’s lifecycle kW savings for the Portfolio as well as ETP-Associated measures added to the Portfolio for each year of the study. Notably, demand data are available for 2016–2022 only.

Table 39. Ex Ante and Ex Post kW Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5b)

Claim Year ^a	Portfolio kW Savings from 2009–2022				kW Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2022				Percent of ETP kW Savings Relative to Portfolio Savings from 2009–2022			
	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kW	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kW	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kW	Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross kW	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Net kW	% Lifecycle Ex Post Gross kW	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net kW
2009												
2010												
2011												
2012												
2013												
2014												
2015												
2016	2,786,089	1,864,614	2,522,390	1,616,661	616,327	410,619	588,552	375,644	22%	22%	23%	23%
2017	2,488,491	1,874,349	2,017,175	1,354,165	821,095	642,193	528,358	350,772	33%	34%	26%	26%
2018	7,051,746	6,613,499	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	220,561	138,890	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	3%	2%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2019	5,911,320	5,577,783	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	271,093	206,878	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	5%	4%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2020	7,271,708	7,119,885	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	87,330	68,853	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	1%	1%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2021	8,348,560	8,171,891	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	707,407	638,956	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	8%	8%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2022	6,583,574	6,477,939	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	24,081	18,905	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	0%	0%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
Total	40,441,489	37,699,961	4,539,565	2,970,827	2,747,894	2,125,294	1,116,910	726,416	7%	6%	19%	17%

^a Demand (kW) savings data unavailable for years prior to 2016.

Note: Savings exclude C&S claims for 2009 – 2017 and all ESA claims. Ex ante savings refer to EE program savings claims reported by PAs, while ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 40 and Table 41 provide each year’s lifecycle therm savings for the Portfolio as well as ETP-Associated measures added to the Portfolio for each year of the study. The first table excludes negative therms, and the second includes them. Figure 34 plots claims overtime, sourced from the table below. Notably, there were no ETP-associated measure claims from 2010–2012. Please note the difference in scales between the Portfolio and ETP axes.

Table 40. Ex Ante and Ex Post Therm Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5c) – Excluding Negative Therms


Claim Year	Portfolio Therm Savings from 2009–2022				Therm Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2022				Percent of ETP Therm Savings Relative to Portfolio Savings from 2009–2022			
	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms
2009	0	0	0	0								
2010	829,970,716	556,193,779	827,912,527	827,912,527	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2011	1,083,882,467	721,348,842	1,091,347,226	1,091,347,226	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2012	932,392,555	617,472,780	977,646,315	977,646,315	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2013	640,220,209	408,374,823	493,076,823	493,076,823	14,681,967	9,292,222	14,675,150	8,209,749	2%	2%	3%	2%
2014	696,194,794	451,960,268	511,065,961	511,065,961	17,732,293	11,289,505	17,724,202	10,984,648	3%	2%	3%	2%
2015	452,742,858	297,008,237	331,336,450	331,336,450	26,452,688	16,860,882	26,414,392	16,816,785	6%	6%	8%	5%
2016	339,308,682	211,745,413	281,593,438	281,593,438	15,108,303	9,320,430	14,503,247	8,531,642	4%	4%	5%	3%
2017	349,673,833	217,855,805	281,682,570	279,711,420	22,074,474	13,156,231	18,213,235	9,885,344	6%	6%	6%	3%
2018	846,092,018	730,228,302	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	37,965,952	21,203,630	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	4%	3%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable

Claim Year	Portfolio Therm Savings from 2009–2022				Therm Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2022				Percent of ETP Therm Savings Relative to Portfolio Savings from 2009–2022			
	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms
2019	842,624,598	742,611,058	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	27,659,080	15,618,952	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	3%	2%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2020	861,756,535	751,528,740	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	11,700,340	6,857,434	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	1%	1%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2021	1,233,602,966	821,075,952	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	5,233,456	3,204,040	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	0.4%	0.4%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2022	878,836,638	792,182,729	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	2,832,137	1,943,083	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	0.3%	0.2%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
Total	9,987,298,868	7,319,586,728	4,795,661,311	4,793,690,160	181,440,690	108,746,409	91,530,227	54,428,169	2%	1%	2%	1%

Notes: Savings exclude negative therms, 2009 – 2017 C&S claims, and all ESA claims.

sEx ante savings refer to EE program savings claims reported by PAs, while ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Figure 34. Portfolio and ETP-Associated Ex Ante Therm Savings Comparison by Claim Year



Note: Savings exclude negative therms, 2011 – 2017 C&S claims, and all ESA claims.

Ex ante savings refer to EE program savings claims reported by PAs, while ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Table 41. Ex Ante and Ex Post Therm Savings and Percent of New ETP Measures Added to the Portfolio (ETP-T5c) – Including Negative Therms

Claim Year	Portfolio Therm Savings from 2009–2022				Therm Savings of ETP-Associated Measures from 2009–2022				Percent of ETP Therm Savings Relative to Portfolio Savings from 2009–2022			
	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Ante Net Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Gross Therms	% Lifecycle Ex Post Net Therms
2009	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2010	587,531,196	395,245,839	720,006,189	406,425,906	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2011	874,705,013	580,723,240	997,819,309	554,017,469	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
2012	732,767,778	480,231,790	875,985,203	473,387,912	-42,186	-35,155	-1,374	-885.55	-0.01%	-0.01%	0%	0%
2013	558,673,025	357,181,953	403,060,513	268,864,188	13,834,552	8,616,925	13,829,074	7,701,651	2%	2%	3%	3%
2014	605,355,168	391,610,824	400,146,115	252,251,018	10,024,053	5,275,726	6,381,660	6,052,936	2%	1%	2%	2%
2015	351,490,089	231,305,110	216,059,002	135,212,937	11,849,800	6,602,803	-2,436,570	3,565,159	3%	3%	-1%	3%
2016	260,766,530	162,625,986	205,333,494	123,770,519	-3,050,441	-1,598,787	-3,519,731	-2,296,268	-1%	-1%	-2%	-2%
2017	239,172,045	129,610,913	196,645,565	101,291,878	-10,093,392	-11,559,454	-15,910,075	-17,624,956	-4%	-9%	-8%	-17%
2018	750,955,889	870,547,009	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	34,136,013	19,020,903	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	5%	2%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2019	745,875,877	848,418,953	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	21,215,992	10,336,088	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	3%	1%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2020	811,679,716	932,609,677	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	9,541,657	4,990,291	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	1%	1%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2021	880,537,211	1,008,988,963	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	4,556,916	2,627,676	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	1%	0.3%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
2022	870,663,302	994,267,721	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	2,248,960	1,475,887	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	0.3%	0.1%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
Total	8,270,172,838	7,383,367,978	4,015,055,390	2,315,221,827	94,289,697	45,797,206	-1,657,016	-2,602,365	1%	1%	<1%	<1%

Note: Actual therm savings totals, including negative therms. Excludes 2010 – 2017 C&S claims and all ESA claims

Ex ante savings refer to EE program savings claims reported by PAs, while ex post savings are EE Program savings that have been verified and adjusted through evaluation, measurement, and verification studies.

Addendum: ETP-Associated Savings Cohort Comparison

To capture the influence of ETP-associated measures relative to all measures submitted to the portfolio in the same year, we analyzed the metrics by “cohort.” Throughout the following results tables, “Cohort” represents the first year that a measure and its savings entered the Portfolio. This approach allows for the examination of how ETP-associated measures perform in their first year relative to other new measures and their subsequent growth (as opposed to looking at them relative to the entire Portfolio). In addition, a cohort-based analysis can provide unique insights into both ETP measure persistence and how ETP measure prevalence (expressed as a percentage of all new Portfolio measures of the same vintage) changes over time.

We do note that these findings should be treated with caution, however, since any trends in the percent of ETP-associated measures and savings over time are sensitive to the fluctuations in the Portfolio as well as data tracking limitations (see Section 2.2.3).⁸³ For example, this historical analysis aimed to understand how effective ETP has been over the last decade, which ideally would allow for examining trends in ETP-associated measure performance over time (e.g., understanding how well measures persist). When examining trends in claims and savings over time, however, we found that ETP’s proportion of the Portfolio database reflect data inconsistencies or trends seen in the portfolio at large, which makes it difficult to isolate the effect of the program over time. For example, it is not possible to assert that an increase in ETP-associated measure savings relative to the Portfolio year over year is due to the demand for ETP-associated measures, because it could also be due to a decrease in overall Portfolio savings, as demonstrated in Section 3. Trends in overall Portfolio savings could be attributed to a range of causes, including how and when claims were entered into the Portfolio database (i.e., if they are not entered in the year in which the project took place), variability in the accuracy of record keeping and measure code assignments over the years, the market influence on the Portfolio, and effects of our analysis data cleaning and cohort assignments.

It is not possible, therefore, to assert that ETP-associated measures performed better than non-ETP measures, as their prevalence is influenced by a range of factors, including variations in the accuracy of Portfolio record keeping over time and our ability to correctly assign “new” technologies to cohorts. The following figures compare ETP-associated evaluated net savings with portfolio savings.

Table 42 presents the number of ETP-associated measures added to the portfolio by cohort (cells shaded in light gray). The largest cohort of ETP-associated measures was in 2018, with 160 measures entering the portfolio. Measure counts in subsequent claim years provide an indication of the persistence of new ETP measures over time. Not surprisingly, the absolute number of measures from each cohort decreases over time as some of the measures drop out of the Portfolio. When looking at the share of ETP-associated measures and kWh relative to Portfolio measures of the same cohort, however, ETP-associated measures and savings tend to hold constant, or even increase, over the years.

⁸³ Due to the re-use and relabeling of measure codes, it is impossible to assign technologies to a certain cohort without error. Some technologies may have been in existence in the Portfolio for years but were just assigned a new measure code, making them appear as a “first-year” measure. Other technologies may be assigned an existing measure code even though they were new technologies and thus were not flagged for first-year savings even though they should have been. ETP’s proportion of the Portfolio database is highly sensitive to the underlying fluctuations in claims and savings in the portfolio at large. Underlying fluctuations in historical Portfolio savings could be due to several reasons, including how and when claims are entered to the portfolio in a given program cycle (for example, we see clustering of savings in some years and less savings in others), variability in the accuracy of record keeping and measure code assignments over the years, the limitations associated with accurately assigning both ETP-associated and Portfolio measures to cohorts, and importantly, external market conditions.

Table 42. Number of Unique ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year														% of ETP - Associated Measures over Portfolio Measures
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	
2009															
2010		5	4	5	4	4	5	5	3	1					1%
2011			7	7	7	7	6	4	3						3%
2012				41	33	29	26	25	12	8	4	4	3	1	15%
2013					51	34	32	29	22	14	8	8	8	5	12%
2014						110	96	95	92	6	3	2			35%
2015							79	73	51	20	21	18	8	5	19%
2016								73	56	21	16	8	4	2	3%
2017									91	26	14	5	3	2	8%
2018										160	111	23	9	7	2%
2019											90	30	17	9	18%
2020												56	30	6	14%
2021													16	4	4%
2022														46	17%
Total by Cohort Year^b		5	7	41	51	110	79	73	91	160	89	56	16	46	3%

Note: ^a Counts exclude C&S measures for program years 2009 to 2017 and all ESA measures.

^b Total by Cohort Year represents the number of unique new measures for each claim year.

Note that percentages over 100% are artifacts of the cohort analysis methodology and assignment of savings to certain years, which makes ETP and Portfolio savings misaligned in some cases. The claim-year based analysis is not subject to this challenge. Moreover, removing C&S from the denominator of the percentage can inflate the contribution of ETP. One other factor that causes these anomalies is the exclusion of savings claims that do not have measure codes (i.e., custom measures) as measure codes are used to create the cohort variable.

Table 43 and Table 44 present the percent and absolute amount of ETP-associated evaluated net first year kWh savings by cohort and claim year.

Table 43. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Net kWh Savings by Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year													
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
2009														
2010		0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	2%	1%	0.1%				
2011			1.0%	3%	9%	3%	1%	4%	1%					
2012				20%	21%	31%	31%	22%	76%	45%	31%	20%	2%	0.1%
2013					16%	23%	25%	15%	19%	12%	359%	957%	356%	75%
2014						37%	46%	44%	54%	1%	19%	16%		
2015							36%	57%	56%	30%	29%	19%	29%	95%
2016								21%	22%	1%	0.3%	0.04%	1%	5%
2017									19%	6%	119%	136%	83%	89%
2018										5%	23%	40%	42%	93%
2019											1%	41%	18%	19%
2020												1%	14%	20%
2021													1%	4%
2022														4%
Average 2009-2022														6%

Note: Savings exclude C&S claims for 2009 – 2017 and all ESA claims.

The way to interpret this is to think of cohorts as the first year a measure achieved savings and claim years for each cohort indicate persistence and uptake or sunsetting of measures over time.

Table 44. Ex Ante Net kWh Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
2009													
2010	15,881,883	34,714,927	22,877,349	21,238,199	29,605,396	11,098,593	70,323,538	28,197,375	984,367				
2011		18,489,857	51,346,801	53,381,619	23,588,761	7,140,514	14,158,020	1,859,564					
2012			193,553,154	183,368,855	296,029,618	331,649,512	77,667,932	367,901,780	17,738,274	10,838,632	4,044,866	85,860	3,156
2013				260,447,483	397,363,151	433,697,812	184,636,542	189,824,866	106,531,414	312,366,922	79,776,571	27,555,655	18,584,393
2014					364,235,182	614,819,491	800,478,708	824,551,147	5,680,502	5,879,311	1,739,102		

Historical Analysis Addendum

Cohort	Claim Year												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
2015						340,051,101	378,840,973	473,166,935	60,717,692	84,243,837	18,638,464	1,290,356	6,951,607
2016							343,836,840	241,527,167	56,302,043	25,619,411	6,614,412	1,575,735	12,742,216
2017								590,438,784	207,363,703	251,311,675	67,377,263	3,236,386	466,005
2018									301,242,316	314,748,197	100,392,269	72,107,783	65,230,621
2019										57,167,270	80,290,436	23,552,360	9,011,193
2020											39,521,872	13,054,019	5,703,262
2021												19,237,505	6,880,431
2022													31,365,043
Total by Claim Year	15,881,883	53,204,785	267,777,304	518,436,156	1,110,822,109	1,738,457,024	1,869,942,553	2,717,467,618	756,560,312	1,062,175,255	398,395,256	161,695,658	156,937,927

Note: Savings exclude C&S claims for 2009 - 2017 and all ESA claims.

Table 45 and Table 46 present the absolute and percent of ETP-associated ex post net first year kW savings by cohort and claim year.

Table 45. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Net kW Savings by Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year						
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
2009							
2010	2%	1%					
2011	1%	0.04%					
2012	16%	71%	59%	37%	17%	1%	0.1%
2013	18%	154%	17%	339%		28210%	124%
2014	49%	48%	2%	9%	30%		
2015	40%	30%	26%	27%	17%	13%	
2016	23%	26%	0.3%	0.04%	0.04%	0.2%	0.2%
2017			7%	84%	127%	82%	93%
2018			5%	26%	45%	40%	97%
2019				1%	44%	19%	4%
2020					1%	12%	2%
2021						0.9%	0.005%
2022							10%
Average 2009–2022							14%

Note: Savings exclude C&S claims for 2009 – 2017 and all ESA claims.
 The way to interpret this is to think of cohorts as the first year a measure achieved savings and claim years for each cohort indicate persistence and uptake or sunsetting of measures over time

Table 46. Ex Ante Net kW Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year						
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
2009							
2010	9,255	3,388					
2011	595	20					
2012	12,353	56,865	9,357	6,266	2,129	27	3
2013	48,233	277,021	23,867	71,063	12,317	618,682	2,874
2014	192,349	118,188	1,124	1,196	357		
2015	74,926	69,899	15,262	19,824	3,548	104	155
2016	72,907	44,754	6,180	810	1,046	132	96
2017		72,057	35,862	46,252	9,765	419	75
2018			47,238	51,730	14,751	10,170	7,470
2019				9,735	10,670	4,035	187
2020					14,270	4,145	166
2021						1,242	5
2022							7,874
Total by Claim Year	410,619	642,193	138,890	206,878	68,853	638,956	18,905

Note: Savings exclude C&S claims for 2009 – 2017.

Table 47 and Table 48 present the absolute and percent of ETP-associated ex post net first year therm savings by cohort and claim year. This analysis excludes negative therm savings. Overall, percentages increase and decrease over time.

Table 47. Percent of ETP-Associated Ex Ante Net Therm Savings by Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year													
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
2009														
2010														
2011														
2012					3%	1%	11%							
2013					13%	14%	31%	75%	28%	34%	42%	28%	25%	
2014						4%	10%	6%	5%	0.1%				
2015							13%	11%	11%	25%	25%	45%	10%	0.2%
2016								7%	58%	-18%	72%	-27%	3%	0.3%
2017									-4%	47%	34%	41%		
2018										1%	4%	1%	0%	1%
2019											0.5%	14%	4%	13%
2020												0.04%	0.1%	
2021													2%	1%
2022														0.6%
Total 2009–2022														3%

Notes: Therm savings totals exclude negative therms; Therms savings inclusive of interactive effects are presented Table 41. Savings exclude C&S claims for 2009 – 2017 and all ESA claims.

Table 48. Ex Ante Net Therm Savings of ETP-Associated Measures by First-Year Cohort and Claim Year

Cohort	Claim Year													
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
2009														
2010		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2011			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2012					230,981	12,904	65,183	0.0400	-	0.04018	0.18745	0.00017	-	-
2013					9,061,241	9,400,834	6,996,154	4,338,863.22	4,449,688	4,044,778	3,196,382	2,186,423	541,559	-
2014						1,875,767	4,992,993	1,392,723	1,069,261	31,323	-	-	-	-
2015							4,806,551	1,648,325	2,709,444	1,626,061	791,486	391,965	690,805	80,743
2016								1,940,519	3,655,682	2,909,855	2,388,701	503,534	105,210	43,387
2017									1,272,156	4,681,024	3,299,835	271,346	-	-
2018										7,910,590	3,736,688	1,023,240	98,077	72,386
2019											2,205,860	2,314,077	857,339	1,047,676

Historical Analysis Addendum

Cohort	Claim Year													
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
2020												166,849	48,729	-
2021													862,321	359,194
2022														339,697
Total by Claim Year		-	-	-	9,292,222	11,289,505	16,860,882	9,320,430	13,156,231	21,203,630	15,618,952	6,857,434	3,204,040	1,943,083

Notes: Therm savings totals exclude negative therms; Therms savings inclusive of interactive effects are presented Table 42.

Savings exclude C&S claims for 2009 - 2017. The way to interpret this is to think of cohorts as the first year a measure achieved savings and claim years for each cohort indicate persistence and uptake or sunseting of measures over time

Updated Appendix C. Portfolio Exclusions for Addendum

We made three exclusions to the overall Portfolio data: (1) C&S claims for 2009 through 2017, (2) measures with no identifiers for 2009 through 2017, and (3) All Energy Savings Assistance claims, which were first seen in the Portfolio in 2016.

Upon consultation with the CPUC, we removed C&S claims from the matching analysis for years 2009 to 2017 after determining that ETP projects have not resulted in any discernable C&S claims. This choice focuses findings and baseline metrics on the portion of the Portfolio that ETP has historically affected to appropriately scales ETP’s contribution. The rationale for this exclusion is that no ETP-associated measures were adopted into C&S throughout the 2009–2017 period of study; and given that C&S claims represent a major portion of Portfolio savings, limited the team’s ability to identify trends or impacts from ETP. Notably, for 2018 to 2022, we included C&S claims. We detail the ex ante net savings claims associated with the excluded C&S claims below, including the percent of the total portfolio that they represented.

Table 49. Codes & Standards Ex Ante Net Savings by Claim Year

Claim Year	Ex Ante Lifecycle		
	Net kWh Savings	Net kW Savings ^a	Net Therm Savings ^b
2010	939,329,448	N.A.	11,975,581
2011	1,185,641,668	N.A.	19,496,597
2012	1,346,666,394	N.A.	18,656,372
2013	3,101,815,967	N.A.	52,138,089
2014	3,177,419,056	N.A.	57,529,524
2015	10,582,500,655	N.A.	197,064,578
2016	9,107,518,780	1,964,526	296,532,608
2017	12,479,560,046	2,509,644	401,432,602
2018	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2019	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2020	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2021	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2022	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Total	41,920,452,014	4,474,169	1,054,825,950
Percent of Portfolio	10%	8%	10%

^a Demand impact data is not available prior to 2016.

^b Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects.

We also excluded portfolio claims that did not have unique identifiers in Year 1, such as measure codes, from the analyses. We removed these records from the analysis because we could neither confirm nor refute that these records were connected to ETP. We detail the evaluated net savings claims associated with the excluded claims below, including the percent of the total portfolio that they represented.

Table 50. Unidentifiable Ex Ante Net Savings by Claim Year

Claim Year	Ex Ante Lifecycle		
	Net kWh Savings	Net kW Savings ^a	Net Therm Savings
2010	1,682,482,808	0	18,377,889
2011	2,492,748,467	0	47,021,280
2012	2,368,404,191	0	46,817,541
2013	2,528,365,398	0	33,187,362
2014	2,669,920,708	0	41,421,755
2015	8,618,873,265	0	124,571,183
2016	7,370,334,102	1,593,411	179,332,098
2017	10,246,910,694	2,088,170	254,959,078
2018	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2019	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2020	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2021	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2022	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Total	37,978,039,633	3,681,581	745,688,185
Percent of Portfolio	9%	7%	7%

^a Demand impact data is not available prior to 2016.

^b Negative values were removed from therms savings data to omit interactive effects.

All ESA energy (kWh), demand (kW), and gas (therms) savings were excluded from EE Portfolio totals, which were used to assess ETP’s contribution to the Portfolio in figures and tables in [Updated Appendix B. ESA savings excluded due to having funded by non-EE dollars.](#) Table 51 summarizes [ESA ex ante lifecycle net savings excluded from the calculation of updated EE Business Plan Metrics shown in Table 36.](#)

Table 51. ESA Ex Ante Net Savings by Claim Year^a

Claim Year	Ex Ante Lifecycle		
	Net kWh Savings	Net kW Savings	Net Therm Savings
2010	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2011	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2013	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2014	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2015	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
2016	341,001,354	71,010	16,822,724
2017	1,399,699,079	1,215,992	41,394,162
2018	1,612,112,845	1,395,447	44,675,924
2019	1,885,305,484	239,425	1,234,795
2020	1,239,596,361	159,173	3,623,813
2021	983,783,889	122,822	5,204,570
2022	303,727,084	75,733	19,925,812
Total	7,765,226,096	3,279,602	132,881,800
Percent of Portfolio	3%	8%	2%

^a There were no ESA claims found in the EE Portfolio prior to 2016.

Appendix G. Stakeholder Comments and Response

Table 52 contains stakeholders’ feedback on the recommendations in this report and the evaluation team’s responses.

Table 52. Stakeholder Comments and Evaluator’s Responses

Comment #	"Committer	Page	Findings	"Best Practice/Recommendations	Comment/Feedback/Change Requested	Evaluator's Response
1	Joint IOU (SCE and SDG&E)	4	<p>“Key Finding #3: ETP has been successful at supporting measure development for portfolio inclusion. This study provided findings to support the Business Plan metrics, which indicated that ETP has impacted the Portfolio over the last decade. We developed baselines using all available historical data, which indicated that ETP-associated measures were associated with 59 measures (or 4% of new Portfolio measures) on average annually from 2009 to 2022 (Appendix F).”</p>	<p>Recommendation: Results from this study should be used to inform baselines for further metrics tracking. However, given the transition of ETP to third-party implementation, future technology targets, and other factors, an ongoing review of metrics will be required to ensure they are appropriate for the program as it evolves. Ongoing tracking of these metrics against this baseline will provide ETP PAs and implementers insight into the effectiveness of technology adoption to the portfolio as the program is deployed over time.</p>	<p>"Addendum to “Emerging Technologies Program (ETP) Technology to Portfolio Evaluation” evaluated measures and achieved savings of all technologies and approaches mapped to ETP in either the IOU EE Portfolio (“Portfolio”) or Codes and Standards (C&S) over the period, 2018 - 2022. Through the process described in the Addendum, the evaluation resulted in the quantification of metrics, ETP - T1 through T5. These metrics assessed the number and proportion of new measures added to the Portfolio or codes that were previously ETP technologies; they also quantified the amount of energy (i.e., kWh and therms) savings and demand reductions. Even though quantified, the IOUs would like to respectfully point out that the recommendation to use ETP metrics and findings, as shown on Table 36 of pp. 85 of the Addendum, to inform baselines for further metrics tracking would be erroneous and misleading for the following reasons.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. We emphasize that the metrics in Table 36 are preliminary and suggested baselines. These metrics are suggested in the absence of formal metrics that may be used to track ETP's contribution to the Portfolio and remain to be the only information that may indicate ETP's contributions. As stated in page 63: "We understand that ETP will be undergoing changes as it moves into third-party implementation meaning that the measures available, program administration approach, and resulting measure adoption will likely change; but the metrics based on historical results reflect the best information available to date to inform baseline development. As new data become available, the metrics and their</p>

Comment #	"Committer	Page	Findings	"Best Practice/Recommendations	Comment/Feedback/Change Requested	Evaluator's Response
					<p>Due to the inclusion of savings claimed by indoor lighting measures from 2009 – 2017 and consequent decline in savings from 2022 – 2022, partly due to discontinued lighting program(s) and installations, the metrics reported in Table 36 of Appendix F of the Addendum is likely an inflated metric or baseline. Even if reported as one standard deviation away from the average reported in Table 36, the metric or baseline is still biased upwards. Any calculation against an inflated baseline or metric would likely yield decreased impact, which could obscure the impact of ETP.</p> <p>Also, as pointed out in previous joint IOU comments, achieved or claimed savings in the Portfolio or Codes are outcomes that extend far beyond ETP, a non-resource program that does not report claimed or forecasted savings. As stated in the Statewide Electric Emerging Technologies Program (SWEETP) Implementation Plan, “while SWEETP efforts focus on maximizing information and knowledge transfer support the uptake into the IOU portfolios, uptake is reliant on resource program implementers to fully scale measures into the IOU portfolios” (pp. 5 of 39). Furthermore, “SWEETP does not actually transfer the technology as a measure into</p>	<p>respective baselines should be updated.”</p>

Comment #	"Commenter	Page	Findings	"Best Practice/Recommendations	Comment/Feedback/Change Requested	Evaluator's Response
					<p>the IOU portfolios but rather provides strategies and recommendations to support adoption, and continually monitors progress of the technology's inclusion (or lack thereof) into the IOU portfolios for both deemed, custom, and other programs" (pp. 9 of 39). Using the metrics or baselines in Table 36 of Appendix F to inform baselines that would further track legacy ETP or third-party SWEETP performance would be to subject them to criteria formed by the work of others, including resource programs, supply-chain players, supply and demand, available financing mechanisms, CPUC approval of workpapers, to list just a few.</p> <p>For these reasons, the joint IOU would like to request that metrics ETP-T1 through T5 be repealed, if there is no reporting of them through CEDARS. Any reporting made available through CEDARS should be treated as they are, without further allocation of time and resources for cleaning or interpretation to assess the performance of legacy ETP or third-party implemented SWEETP."</p>	
2a	Joint IOU (SCE and SDG&E)	5	"Key Finding #4: It is critical that ETP track its contributions to the portfolio. The current data tracking and communication protocols for	Recommendation: Establish unique identifiers that connect ETP database measures to their EE program counterpart. In practice, the coordination and	The Joint IOU rejects the recommendation and respectfully points out the jurisdiction of SWEETP, as laid out in the most up-to-date Implementation Plan in	Thank you for your feedback. We understand the concern. As stated in the recommendation, "Given the movement to a

Comment #	"Committer	Page	Findings	"Best Practice/Recommendations	Comment/Feedback/Change Requested	Evaluator's Response
			<p>ETP-associated technologies do not allow for accurate and timely quantification of ETP contributions to the Portfolio, nor do they provide an adequate foundation for creating a streamlined, repeatable approach that the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and IOUs can implement to readily track progress against metrics in the future. In particular, this analysis relied heavily on the ability to use measure codes to cross-reference the ETP and Portfolio this method is unlikely to fully characterize the contributions of ETP on the Portfolio for two reasons. First, ETP does not consistently record the eventual measure code that a technology is assigned once leaving the ETP program (Sections 2.2.3 and 4.1.1). Second, some Portfolio measures, including many implemented through custom, process, or behavioral programs, are not assigned measure codes. We acknowledge that the measure-tracking processes may inherently differ as we transition to third-party implementers. This changing landscape, in addition to the challenges identified above,</p>	<p>communication required to ensure this connection is robust could take many forms, and the most important element to ensure success is buy-in from key parties, such as the IOUs, program implementers, CPUC, and the California Technical Forum (CaITF). Given the movement to a third-party program design, we suggest convening a stakeholder workshop to establish protocols to achieve this ultimate goal. Such protocols should emphasize early and consistent communication and include touchpoints at interim stages, such as workpaper development and CaITF documentation. We acknowledge that the measure development process can continue long after an ETP project is recommended for adoption, which makes it challenging to track down the outcome of the process, but by having third-party implementers establish communication and reporting protocols, we are confident that ETP can increase the number of measure codes it records for its projects (Section 4.1.2).</p>	<p>CEDARS. The SWEETP implementer can provide strategies and recommendations to support the adoption of technologies assessed through ETP and monitor the inclusion of the technology (or lack thereof) into the IOU portfolios for deemed custom, and other programs. Moreover, uptake or scaling of technologies assessed through ETP is reliant on resource program implementers.</p> <p>Given the jurisdiction of SWEETP, the SWEETP third-party implementer has limited control over the actions of downstream players such as resource program implementers and even less so with the decisions and approvals by CaITF and the CPUC. For this reason, requiring the SWEETP third-party implementer to establish communication and reporting protocols would result in overreach beyond its jurisdiction. The task of establishing communication and reporting protocols by which all players, including resource program implementers, CPUC, and CaITF, must abide would be better suited for a stakeholder that has jurisdiction of all programs: non-resource (i.e., SWEETP), resource, market adoption, and others.</p> <p>Given that SWEETP is now implemented by third parties, the implementer can change from one</p>	<p>third-party program design, we suggest convening a stakeholder workshop to establish protocols to achieve this ultimate goal." We recognize that any decision that involves metrics, data tracking, and/or reporting would require coordination across third-party implementers, PAs, and CPUC, CaITF, and CEDARS, among others; hence, our recommendation of holding a stakeholder workshop.</p>

Comment #	"Committer	Page	Findings	"Best Practice/Recommendations	Comment/Feedback/Change Requested	Evaluator's Response
			should be considered when developing third-party tracking processes."		program cycle to another. The implementer from one program cycle may have little idea of who the implementer(s) would be for the next program cycle. To have the implementer from the previous cycle dictate what the implementer from the next program cycle must do without resolving any potential conflicts of viewpoints beforehand would result in perpetuating practices that may not be applicable to the ensuing implementer(s). Another entity other than the third-party implementer of SWEETP would be better suited for establishing communication and reporting protocols to increase the number of measure codes mapped to ETP projects.	
2b	Joint IOU (SCE and SDG&E)			Recommendation: Track the outcome of each ETP project in the ETP database. The ETP third-party administrator should collect the outcomes of each ETP project: (1) whether it was recommended for adoption; (2) whether a workpaper was developed, and if so, what the workpaper ID is; (3) the eventual measure codes associated with the technology; and (4) savings associated with those measure codes.	"The practice of tracking outcome(s) of each ETP project in the ETP database, whether it is for IOU-led or third-party implemented ETP, is already in place. Outcomes (1) through (3) are part of the information input or requested, depending on whether it is IOU- or third party-led. The information can be found in the last few columns of a downloadable Excel worksheet, which has been made available for review by Energy Division through response to data request(s) in past program years.	As the report is an addendum to the year 1 study and includes the year 1 report, we have retained recommendations from year 1 and edited or added to them based on any relevant findings in the addendum. Recommendations that have been addressed may be ignored.

Comment #	"Committer	Page	Findings	"Best Practice/Recommendations	Comment/Feedback/Change Requested	Evaluator's Response
					<p>As for outcome (4), claimed savings of measure codes mapped to ETP studies are available through CEDARS. The Joint IOUs respectfully reject that savings associated with those measure codes be added in the ETP database, since it would require expenditure of additional ratepayer money to add this information, which it already available through CEDARS. Also adding this information to the ETP database could further associate claimed savings to ETP over which it has limited jurisdiction and impact as a non-resource program."</p>	
2c	Joint IOU (SCE and SDG&E)			<p>Recommendation: Assign unique identifiers to custom measures and track EE programs that promote or implement process or behavioral changes that have been supported by ETP and adopted and assess any energy or non-energy related savings achieved by these measures or activities.</p>	<p>"Please see response to Recommendation 2a. Prior to release of the Addendum to "Emerging Technologies Program (ETP) Technology to Portfolio Evaluation," a field has been added in CEDARS to track which savings claims could be mapped to ETP studies.</p> <p>However, the IOUs would like to respectfully point out that attributing energy or non-energy related savings by these measures or EE program activities to ETP would be fallacious. As stated in previous comments and also in the most current SWEETP Implementation Plan, ETP, as a non-resource program, provides strategies and recommendations to</p>	<p>As the report is an addendum to the year 1 study and includes the year 1 report, we have retained recommendations from year 1 and edited or added to them based on any relevant findings in the addendum. Recommendations that have been addressed may be ignored.</p>

Comment #	"Commenter	Page	Findings	"Best Practice/Recommendations	Comment/Feedback/Change Requested	Evaluator's Response
					support adoption of technologies assessed through ETP, and monitor inclusion of the technology (or lack thereof) into the IOU portfolios for deemed, custom, and other programs. Uptake or scaling of technologies assessed through ETP is reliant on resource program implementers and other drivers that are not within ETP's control."	
3	Energy Solutions	5			"The ETP-2 Report and findings are valuable in part because it tracks ETP-associated project impacts from 2009-2022. However, the transition to third-party administration of SWEETP means the program administrator may change between program cycles. The ETP-2 Report acknowledges that "the measure development process can continue long after an ETP project is recommended for adoption, which makes it challenging to track down the outcome of the process."1 Tracking impacts is especially difficult across multiple EE programs, third-party implementers, and stakeholders. Successfully implementing a system as described by the ETP-2 Report would include extensive coordination between multiple stakeholder groups, including the California Technical Forum (Cal TF), the California Market Transformation Administrator (CalMTA), California EE Coordinating Committee (CAEECC),	Thank you for your comments/feedback and suggestion. Similar to our response above, we understand the concern. As stated in the recommendation, "Given the movement to a third-party program design, we suggest convening a stakeholder workshop to establish protocols to achieve this ultimate goal." We recognize that any decision that involves metrics, data tracking, and/or reporting would require coordination across third-party implementers, PAs, and CPUC, CalITF, and CEDARS, among others; hence, our recommendation of holding a stakeholder workshop.

Comment #	"Committer	Page	Findings	"Best Practice/Recommendations	Comment/Feedback/Change Requested	Evaluator's Response
					<p>IOU EE programs, IOU Codes & Standards programs, Community Choice Aggregators (CCAs), Regional Energy Networks (RENs) and numerous research groups that are beyond the scope of SWEETP's current coordination with these groups. The ETP-2 Report thus recommends that a stakeholder working group could establish protocols that could facilitate tracking the influence of ETP-associated measures.</p> <p>Energy Solutions recommends that the development and implementation of the metrics and tracking system be led by a separate entity and not be incumbent upon the third-party ETP implementer, as the development of this system and tracking of these metrics is a time-consuming process that extends beyond implementation periods of SWEETP contracts."</p>	

For more information, please contact:

Olivia Patterson
Senior Vice President

510-214-0191 tel
opatterson@opiniondynamics.com

1 Kaiser Plaza
Oakland, CA 94612



Opinion **Dynamics**

Boston | Headquarters

617 492 1400 tel
617 492 7944 fax
800 966 1254 toll free

1000 Winter Street
Waltham, MA 02451

San Francisco Bay

510 444 5050 tel
510 444 5222 fax

1 Kaiser Plaza
Suite 445
Oakland, CA 94612

San Diego

858 270 5010 tel
858 270 5211 fax

7590 Fay Avenue
Suite 406
La Jolla, CA 92037

Portland

503 287 9136 tel

3934 NE Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Suite 300
Portland, OR 97212