

## Industrial Statewide Program

	<b>Mission</b>
<b>SW Program: Industrial</b>	To address energy challenges the industrial sector faces, the Statewide Industrial Program offers California’s industrial segment a statewide-consistent suite of products and services designed to meet customer needs, overcome market barriers to optimized energy management, enhance adoption of integrated demand-side management (IDSM) practices, and advance the industry toward achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan. The program overcomes barriers through strategies that provide an integrated solution to the customer; create heightened awareness through education and outreach; and foster continuous energy improvement (CEI). The program also promotes use of commonly accepted standards—such as those established by the ISO or DOE SEP program to document a facility’s attainment of high resource management levels—and branding and certification to garner market recognition for this achievement. In addition, it supports training to create a highly skilled energy efficiency workforce that is accessible to industry.

<b>CA EESP Goals/Strategies Addressed by SW <u>Program</u>:</b>	<b>CA EESP Ref. pp. #</b>
1. Support California industry’s adoption of energy efficiency by integrating energy efficiency savings with achievement of GHG goals and other resource management objectives.	Goals, Page 45
2. Provide centralized technical and public policy guidance for resource efficiency and workforce training.	
3. By 2020, energy efficiency certification and benchmarking will become a standard industrial practice for businesses that are responsible for 80% of the sectoral energy usage.	
4. By 2020, energy intensity (per gross dollar of production value) will be reduced by at least 25%.	
5. There will be a trained workforce in energy management and systems energy efficiency.	

<b>Short-term (2010-2012) “SMART” <u>Program</u> Objectives:</b>	<b>Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP,</b>	<b>Comments</b>

\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes\*\*\*

	or Staff)*	
<p>1. By 2012, the percent of participation among small or hard-to-reach customers will increase by X/Y/Z% (by NAICS or SIC code). Want to see the programs having comprehensive outreach to do IDSM across all sizes, segments of customers. Also want customers to engage in continuous improvement. Equity issue: utilities engaged with 'leaders' but want to see increased activity with the rest of this segment.</p>	DR, IOUs, Staff	<p>IOU Proposal: By the end of 2012, the percent of participation among customers less than 200kW or 50K therms will be tracked. IOU Comments: Establishing a baseline will require a fairly large and long market study. The need and value of an increase should be defined based on the baseline results.</p>
<p>2. By 2012, the percent of decision-maker awareness of integrated demand side management opportunities will increase by X%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action vs awareness <i>definitions</i>.</li> <li>• Who is the decision maker? Who are we asking about whether they are aware?</li> <li>• How do you measure 'awareness'?</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective:</b> Awareness now (action later down the road). Issues: How do you measure awareness in the Industrial segment: talk to which type of personnel? Awareness is very hard to measure; Action is easier for the utility to track/report on. Awareness can be measured but it is expensive and would need to be measured by utility.</p>	Staff, PIPs (SCE p293, PG&E p36)	<p>IOU Proposal: Moved to IDSM.</p>
<p>3. By 2012, the percent of participant awareness of Continuous Energy Improvement steps will increase by X%.</p> <p>Increase in customers' awareness of the STEPS of CEI, not necessarily the 'branded' CEI platform. Without intervention, however, getting customers to understand and work through the CEI steps is very difficult. Difficult to get customers to commit to the level of investment required by CEI.</p>	IOUs, Staff	<p>IOU Proposal: Removed.</p>
<p>4.</p>		<p>IOU Proposal: By the end of 2012, the number of first time participants in Energy Efficiency Programs will be tracked</p>

\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\*

	IOU Comments: Objective coming from Deemed and Calculated (Obj.#1) with modification because awareness would be too difficult to measure with market study.
--	--

Short-term <u>Program</u> PPMs:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Metric Type (2a or 2b)**	Baseline Study Required (Y/N)	Comments
1. Participation rate among small or hard-to-reach customers (by NAICS or SIC code) in each of the following subprograms: (a) Continuous Energy Improvement (b) Non-Residential Audits (c) Deemed Incentives and (d) Calculated Incentives – Need to define Small and Hard to Reach: under 200kW it's hard to distinguish btwn Sm & Med. HTR – often keyed to zip codes. For Industrial, HTR might be small, might be remote... What is Industrial by NAICS? Utilities currently have facility level NAICS in use for CIA program distinction. Typically the small customer is the unassigned customer – and then hard-to-reach b/c of lack of direct relationship with utility. <b>Can we develop a better definition for participation, small, HTR, etc. (firm up definitions by when? Through statewide bi-monthly meetings? In next week, can sub-set of SW team come up with a definition for these terms?) so that this metric might be more Type 2 in future cycles?</b> How is measurement going to occur: % of all participants that are either “small” or “HTR”. Harder to look at entire population and determine % who participated. Easier to start measurement with those who participated.	IOUs, Staff	1 – tracking, not reporting	N	IOU Proposal: Number of customers participating in programs (Deemed, Customized and CEI) per NAICS code and size (+/-200 kW) and (+/-50,000 therms per year for gas)  IOU Comment: In order to track something that is more easily defined, we have chosen the size of customers and their NAICS.
2. “Decision maker” awareness of IDSM practices in each of the following subprograms: (a) Continuous Energy Improvement (b)	PIPs	2b Where	Y	

\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\*

<p>Non-Residential Audits (c) Deemed Incentives and (d) Calculated Incentives. How do you define Awareness? How accurate is it? Will the baseline be too “soft” to be able to determine increase in awareness over time?          Performance target to increase awareness of all participants toward a “goal % of customers” aware.          Should “Participant” be “decision maker” instead?          This metric will be held Tuesday in IDSM session, including “awareness” definition, whether the metric will stay in IDSM or be fed back to each Segment, etc. and will report back to Industrial group.          Proposed metric: track participation of Industrial customers in DR or DSM activity after they’ve participated in EE.</p>		are we now?		
<p>3. Participant in Subprograms (not p in CEI) awareness of Continuous Energy Improvement steps in each of the following subprograms: (a) Non-Residential Audits (b) Deemed Incentives and (c) Calculated Incentives.          The utilities are just beginning CEI – Should we measure something that is just getting launched and has very few participants or do we want to have success that we can take to additional customers? CEI is listed in the PIPs multiple times – so is it too much to ask to measure awareness now and/or what can we track to determine whether the subprograms are feeding the right customers into CEI? Since the PIPs discussed the subprograms feeding CEI, how can this be measured?          What about measuring # of customers the IOUs attract to attend educational workshops about CEI, etc.? What are types of activities IOUs are already tracking?          ED wants to stay away from metrics around things that will be tracked in the M&amp;V.          Proposal: Utilities invite customers to CEI training (an ‘intake’</p>	IOUs, Staff	2b	Y	IOU Proposal: Removed



\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes\*\*\*

<p>mechanism), measure # of attendees, and measure attendees' awareness before/after attending the training.  <b>UTILITIES TO PROVIDE METRIC PROPOSAL: What will be meaningful and do-able around attracting customers to CEI (i.e. education/marketing) and interest/awareness once pursued by utility.</b></p>				
--	--	--	--	--

\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]

\*\*Metric type: 2a = reported annually, 2b = reported by end of cycle.

Long-Term (2013-2020) "SMART" Program Objectives:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Comments
<p>1. By 2020, the percentage of participants in each of the following subprograms who go on to implement a long-term energy plan under the Continuous Energy Improvement subprogram will exceed the following thresholds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Non-Residential Audit – X%</li> <li>(b) Calculated Incentives – Y%</li> <li>(c) Deemed Incentives – Z%</li> </ul> <p>This was initially a short term metric, but was too aggressive so made it into the LT metrics.</p>	IOUs, Staff	<p>IOU Proposal: By the end of 2020, the percentage of participants in the Industrial programs who go on to implement a long-term energy plan will reach X%..</p> <p>IOU Comments: X will be defined by the end of 2012 based on a baseline study done during the cycle.</p>
<p>2. By 2020, energy intensity (per gross dollar of production value (define?)) will be reduced by least 25 percent. Need to define: Production Value... or Define energy intensity for Industrial</p>	SP	<p>IOU Proposal: By the end of 2020, energy intensity (per gross dollar of production value) will be reduced by least 25 percent compared to 2008</p> <p>IOU Comment: This objective makes sense at the state level but utilities cannot be solely accountable for achieving it through their energy efficiency programs. Should this objective be part of this document?</p>

\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes\*\*\*

<p>3. By 2020, the percentage of large customers (businesses that are responsible for 80% of sectoral energy usage) that adopt energy efficiency certification and benchmarking will increase by X% [relative to a baseline].</p>	<p>SP</p>	<p>IOU Proposal: By the end of 2020, the percentage of participating large customers (businesses that are responsible for 80% of sector energy usage) that adopt energy efficiency certification and/or benchmarking will reach X% IOU Comments: The number X will be set by the end of 2012 when certification (ISO 50001, SEP, ASME 2000, etc.) and industrial facility benchmarking will be better defined.</p>
---	-----------	--

\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]

Long-Term MT Indicators:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Metric Type (3)**	Baseline Study Required (Y/N)	Comments
<p>1. Percent of participants in each of the following subprograms who go on to implement a long-term energy plan under the Continuous Energy Improvement program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Non-Residential Audit,</li> <li>(b) Calculated Incentives and</li> <li>(c) Deemed Incentives</li> </ul> <p>Linking to CEI might not be the best tactic due to limited CEI program plan, budget, etc. Perhaps a modification should be proposed to better link market transformation in the Industrial sector.</p> <p>Do you start here with an awareness study? (Gary S)</p>	<p>IOUs, Staff</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>IOU Proposal: Percentage of participants in the Industrial programs who go on to implement a long-term energy plan.</p>
<p>2. Energy intensity (per gross dollar of production value) of which population (all) will be reduced by least 25 percent.</p>	<p>SP</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>IOU Proposal: Remove (not utility dependent)</p>

\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\*

<p>This metric is appropriate, although word of caution with regards to the economy and <b>normalizing</b> energy intensity for economic up- and down-turns, commodity costs, etc. Baseline study required to capture concerns above.</p>				
<p>3. Percent of large customers (i.e., businesses that are responsible for 80% of sectoral energy usage) that adopt energy efficiency certification and benchmarking. (Verbatim from the SP – Superior Energy Performance (SEP) ISO 50001 certification). Branding, Marketing                  Is this an interim step on the way to the customer engaging in an energy plan and saving energy?                  Benchmarking: can this be done with Industrial (as easily as for commercial via Energy Star?)                   Other than benchmarking, however, this metric makes sense.</p>	SP	3	N	IOU Proposal: Percentage of large customers participating in programs (businesses that are responsible for 80% of sector energy usage) that adopt energy efficiency certification and/or benchmarking

\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]

\*\*Metric type: 3 = data collection, tracking, and reporting [by IOUs, CPUC staff, and/or other entities] to be determined later.

## Industrial – Continuous Energy Improvement Subprogram

	Mission
SW Program: <b>Industrial</b>	Continuous Energy Improvement (CEI), a non-resource sub-program, describes a collection of strategic planning tools and resources that lay the groundwork for long-term integrated energy planning and serve as a launching platform for other utility and non-utility programs and services. Through analysis, benchmarking, long-term goal setting, project implementation support, performance monitoring, and potentially access to energy management certification
SW <u>Sub-program</u> : <b>Continuous Energy Improvement</b>	

CA EESP Goals/Strategies Addressed by SW Subprogram:	CA EESP Ref. pp. #
See program level.	

Short-term (2010-2012) “SMART” <u>Sub-program</u> Objectives:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Comments
1. By 2012 lessons learned, best practices, and plan to ramp up the CEI Program (if desirable) will be developed (Y/N)	Statewide PIP (PG&E) p. 33	IOU Proposal: By the end of 2012 lessons learned, best practices, and recommendation to ramp up the CEI Program (if desirable) will be developed (Y/N).
2. By 2012, X% of targeted industrial customers will implement long-term energy planning via CEI		IOU Proposal: By the end of 2012, the number of industrial customers who created an energy plan via CEI will be tracked.
3. By 2012, X% of industrial CEI participants are meeting their short-term milestones	IOUs, Staff	IOU Proposal: By the end of 2012, the number of industrial CEI participants that meet short-term (2010- 2012) milestones from their plan will be tracked



\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\*

4. By 2012, participant awareness of IDSM opportunities as a result of participating in the CEI program will exceed X%	PIPs	Moved to IDSM
--	------	---------------

Short-term <u>Sub-program</u> PPMs:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Metric Type (2a or 2b)**	Baseline Study Required (Y/N)	Comments
1. Lessons learned, best practices, and a plan to ramp up the CEI Program are developed (Y/N) (To be covered in CEI discussion)	PIP	2b	N	IOU Proposal: Lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations to ramp up the CEI Program are developed, if appropriate (Y/N)
2. Percent of targeted industrial customers who are defined (or created) an energy plan via CEI (A plan would have long and short term goals) Utilities to define <i>targeted industrial</i> customers: likely the 'pipeline' of potential customers. Kay's suggested definition of "Targeted": Those the utilities wish to bring into the program, not just those who have heard about the program.  Utilities do not want to sell CEI to customers who are not 'ready'. Some customers may be screened "out" of CEI by utility.		2a		IOU Proposal: Number of industrial customers who created an energy plan via CEI
3. Percent of industrial CEI participants meeting their short-term milestones from their plan. Goal: To find out if the customers who have signed up for CEI actually implementing their plan. Did customers sign up and then not act? Are customers acting on their short term goals? Did they start working on their plan as layed out?	IOUs, Staff	2a	N	IOU Proposal: Number of industrial CEI participants meeting short-term (2010- 2012) milestones from their energy plan

\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\*

4. Participant awareness of IDSM opportunities as a result of participating in the CEI program Will be discussed in IDSM section (on Tuesday)	PIPs	2b	Y	IOU Proposal: Move this PPM to IDSM
--	------	----	---	--

\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page ref when applicable.]

\*\*Metric type: 2a = reported annually, 2b = reported by end of cycle.

Long-Term (2013-2020) "SMART" <u>Sub-program</u> Objectives:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Comments
1. By 2015, the percent of Calculated Incentive customers who go on to implement a long-term energy plan under the CEI program will increase by X%.	IOUs, Staff	IOU Proposal: By the end of 2015, the number of CEI participants who go on to implement a long-term energy plan will reach X. IOU Comments: The number X will be set by the end of 2012 when better visibility on CEI impact will be available.
2. By 2015, the number of CEI industrial participants who achieve longer-term milestones as identified their long term energy plans increases by X% [or X].	Staff	IOU Proposal: By the end of 2015, the number of CEI participants who achieve milestones as identified in their long term energy plans will reach X. IOU Comments: The number X will be set by the end of 2012 when better visibility on CEI impact will be available.
3. By 2015 industrial customers who are implementing a long-term CEI plan, without IOU support, will increase by X%		IOU Proposal: Removed IOU Comments: Not under utilities' control

**\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\***

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

<b>Long-Term Sub-program MT Indicators:</b>	<b>Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*</b>	<b>Metric Type (3)**</b>	<b>Baseline Study Required (Y/N)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1. Percent of industrial CEI participants who achieve longer-term milestones as identified in their long-term energy plans				IOU Proposal: Number of CEI participants who achieve milestones as identified in their long term energy plans
2. Percent of industrial IOU customers who continue to implement a long-term energy plan via the CEI program, without IOU support	IOUs, Staff	3	N	IOU Proposal: Removed.

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

*\*\*Metric type: 3 = data collection, tracking, and reporting [by IOUs, CPUC staff, and/or other entities] to be determined later.*

## Industrial – Non-Residential Audit Subprogram

Mission	
SW Program: <b>Industrial</b>	Nonresidential Audits, including basic audits and Integrated Audits plus Retro-Commissioning (RCx) audits, provide an inventory of technical project opportunities and financial analysis information that can be used to support a customer’s short- or long-term energy plan, and overcome both informational and technical customer barriers.
SW <u>Sub-program</u> : <b>Non- Residential Audits</b>	

CA EESP Goals/Strategies Addressed by SW Subprogram:	CA EESP Ref. pp. #
See program level.	

Short-term (2010-2012) “SMART” <u>Sub-program</u> Objectives:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*
1. By 2012, the number of onsite audits that are integrated will exceed X%. (IDSM)	p. 3 – PIP/D 09-090047 (p. 215)
2. By 2012, NRA participants that also participate in another IOU-sponsored EE, DR or DG program exceeds X%. (IDSM)	D 09-09-047, p. 3
3. By 2012 X% of NRA participants implement measures without needing an IOU incentive	PIP p.2 Audit Section (audits table)
4. By 2012, the percent of each customer class receiving integrated and non-integrated audits will increase by X%.	PIP p.2 Audit Section (audits table)
5. By 2012, the percent of customers who receive audits that adopt audit-recommended technologies, processes and practices will increase by X%.	Staff

Short-term <u>Sub-program</u> PPMs:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Metric Type (2a or 2b)**	Baseline Study Required (Y/N)	Comments



\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\*

<p>1. Percentage of onsite audits that are integrated. (IDSM)</p>	<p>Staff, DR</p>	<p>2a</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>IOU Proposal: Move this PPM to IDSM</p>
<p>2. Participation rate in another IOU-sponsored EE, DG or DR program. (IDSM)</p>	<p>PIPs</p>	<p>2a</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>IOU Proposal: Move this PPM to IDSM</p>
<p>3. Participation rate of non-residential audits (onsite) by customer class (as appropriate for onsite audits). Staff believes it is important to see distribution of audits over types of customers. IOUs: what if certain types of customers are better suited for audits?</p> <p>Participation rate = # within a “customer class” of those who have and have not participated on a cumulative (over <i>what</i> timeframe?) basis in a non-res audit. # of audits per year per class: quantity vs quantity of audits - Timeframe: within what timeframe is the information from the audit still relevant and meaningful for action on the part of the customer? (Example: 5 years? Rolling 5 years?)</p> <p>Customer class = NAICS II (facility) and SIC codes Hard to track: Several non-res audits offerings do not collect customers’ NAICS codes. (objective: included for an equity question? Yes, as well as getting knowledge base of who is getting audits currently)</p> <p>Proposed by David J.: Audits directly/indirectly influenced xxx kWh. Cons: audits aren’t the only influencing factor.</p>	<p>Staff, DR</p>	<p>2a</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>IOU Proposal: Move this PPM to IDSM</p>
<p>4. Proportion of customers who receive audits that go on to adopt audit-recommended technologies, processes and procedures.</p>	<p>PIP</p>	<p>2B</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>IOU Proposal: Move this PPM to IDSM</p>

**\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\***

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

*\*\*Metric type: 2a = reported annually, 2b = reported by end of cycle.*

<b>Long-Term (2013-2020) "SMART" Sub-program Objectives:</b>	<b>Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*</b>
None proposed at subprogram level. (See program level)	

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

<b>Long-Term Sub-program MT Indicators:</b>	<b>Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*</b>	<b>Metric Type (3)**</b>	<b>Baseline Study Required (Y/N)</b>
None proposed at subprogram level (See program level)			

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

*\*\*Metric type: 3 = data collection, tracking, and reporting [by IOUs, CPUC staff, and/or other entities] to be determined later.*

## Industrial – Deemed Incentives Subprogram

	Mission
SW Program: <b>Industrial</b>	The Deemed rebate offering provides utility representatives, equipment vendors, and customers an easy-to-use mechanism to cost-effectively subsidize and encourage adoption of mass market efficiency measures through fixed incentive amounts per unit/measure for energy saved/projects installed. While Deemed rebates lend themselves well to penetrating the small and medium customer market, they are also a cost-effective and efficient way to process large customer projects targeted through large customer strategies.
SW <u>Sub</u> -program: <b>Deemed Incentives</b>	

CA EESP Goals/Strategies Addressed by SW Subprogram:	CA EESP Ref. pp. #
See program level.	

Short-term (2010-2012) “SMART” <u>Sub-program</u> Objectives:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Comments
1. By 2012, the percent of industrial customers who are aware of the Deemed Incentives program will increase by X%.	PIPs (PG&E p12)	IOU Proposal: Moved to Industrial over-arching (#4)
2. By 2012, the supply of qualified industrial specialists will increase by X%.	Staff, SP	IOU Proposal: Moved to WET
3. By 2012, customer implementation of integrated opportunities (e.g., EE, DR, waste management measures, etc.) will increase by X%.	PIPs (SCE p293, PG&E p14)	IOU Proposal: Moved to IDSM
5. By 2012, the percent in the number of installed measures that are ETP or “advanced technology” relative to baseline will increase by X%.	PIPs (SCE p293-4, 322; PG&E p11)	IOU Proposal: By the end of 2012, the number of new, improved, or ETP measures will increase by X% relative to the baseline (2006-2008). IOU Comments:

\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\*

		The X will be provided by the end of 2010. The baseline will be established in analyzing the 2006-2008 catalog of deemed measures.
--	--	--

Short-term <u>Sub-program</u> PPMs:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Metric Type (2a or 2b)**	Baseline Study Required (Y/N)	Comments
1. Participant adoption rate of installed measures that are ETP or "advanced technologies." Suggestion: measure # of 1 <sup>st</sup> time participants	PIPs, DR?	2a	Y	IOU Proposal: Number of ETP, new and improved measures in program, when available.

\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]

\*\*Metric type: 2a = reported annually, 2b = reported by end of cycle.

Long-Term (2013-2020) "SMART" <u>Sub-program</u> Objectives:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Comments
1. By 2015, and every three years thereafter, all measures determined to be "standard practice" are moved out of the Deemed program, and replaced by ETP or "Advanced Technology" measures.	Staff	IOU Proposal: By 2015, and every three years thereafter, measures determined to be "standard practice" are phased out at various levels of the program (depending on the type of technology within the customer class) and replaced by new, improved, or ETP measures. IOU Comments: "Standard Practice" will be defined by the end of 2012.



**\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\***

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

Long-Term Sub-program MT Indicators:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Metric Type (3)**	Baseline Study Required (Y/N)	Comments
1. Measures determined to be “standard practice” are moved out of the program, and program focused on ET/Advanced technology (Y/N)	Staff	3	N	IOU Proposal: Measures determined to be “standard practice” are phased out at various levels of the program (depending on the type of technology within the customer class) and replaced by new, improved, or ETP measures. (Y/N)

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

*\*\*Metric type: 3 = data collection, tracking, and reporting [by IOUs, CPUC staff, and/or other entities] to be determined later.*

## Industrial – Calculated Incentives Subprogram

	Mission
SW Program: <b>Industrial</b>	The Calculated program offering provides standardized incentives for customized and integrated energy efficiency/DR projects in new construction, retrofit, and RCx projects, and offers comprehensive technical and design assistance for each. It overcomes information, technical, and financial barriers. As a more customized calculation method that can consider system and resource interactions, it will also be the preferred approach for supporting the integrated, whole system, and multi-resource management strategies of the Strategic Plan.
SW Sub-program: <b>Calculated Incentives</b>	

CA EESP Goals/Strategies Addressed by SW Subprogram:	CA EESP Ref. pp. #
See program level.	

Short-term (2010-2012) “SMART” Sub-program Objectives: (Please note that items in <b>BOLD&gt;</b> are consistent with proposed objectives in the Statewide Commercial and Agricultural programs)	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Comments
1. By 2012, the percent of industrial customers who are aware of the Calculated Incentives program will increase by X%.	PIPs (PG&E p12)	IOU Proposal: Moved to Industrial over-arching (#4)
2. By 2012, the supply of qualified industrial specialists will increase by X%. This objective comes from the SP; doesn't have a PPM to go with it, but ED wanted to highlight it as something that might be incorporated into PIPs in the future. ME&O training efforts as part of the Industrial program.	Staff, SP	IOU Proposal: Moved to WET
3. By 2012, customer implementation of integrated opportunities (e.g., EE, DR, waste management measures, etc.) will increase by X%.	PIPs (SCE p293, PG&E p14)	IOU Proposal: Moved to IDSM
4. By 2012, the number of installed measures that are ETP or “advanced technology” relative to baseline will increase by X%. Trying to stay away from standard practice. So can we measure the degree to which the ETP/AT	PIPs (SCE p293-4, 322; PG&E p11)	IOU Proposal: By the end of 2012, the number of completed calculated projects that include an ETP

\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\*

<p>is being encourage/supported by the utilities.                  ETP and AT definition: can utilities suggest definitions for ETP and AT?                  Refer to naming convention proposed to be used by the utilities so that customized projects could be reviewed for “ETP” technologies.                  Not goal of converting technologies from ET Program but to measure the progressive solutions offered to customers (beyond ‘standard practice’).</p>	<p>measure will be tracked relative to baseline (2006-2008).                  IOU Comments:                  The baseline will be established by analyzing the 2006-2008 calculated projects. Difficulties will come form embedded ET measures in not flagged projects. Moving forward we will need to flag projects that include ET measures.</p>
---	--

Short-term <u>Sub-program</u> PPMs:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Metric Type (2a or 2b)**	Baseline Study Required (Y/N)	
<p>1. Participant adoption rate of installed measures that are ETP or “advanced technologies.”  <b>Goal: Trying to get more customer to adopt advanced or emerging technologies. To what extent are we moving customers beyond standard practice and moving standard technologies out of the program?</b>                  Confer with ETP teams to find out what they are measuring, etc. and how we can leverage this?                  Q: # of technologies versus penetration? A: Penetration as % of customers that adopt one of these technologies. (Utilities need to define this)                  ED reviewing workpapers that are questionable (Peter Ly) – Can these projects be tracked?                  ETP provides a pipeline of new technologies, but whether that pipeline includes opportunities for Industrial is not guaranteed.                  Blue sky, underadopted “old” technologies, underadopted “new” technologies...</p> <p>Suggestion: measure # of 1<sup>st</sup> time participants</p>	PIPs, DR?	2a	Y	IOU Proposal: Number of projects with ETP when available included

\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\*

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

*\*\*Metric type: 2a = reported annually, 2b = reported by end of cycle.*

Long-Term (2013-2020) "SMART" <u>Sub-program Objectives</u> :	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Comments
1. By 2015, and every three years thereafter, all measures determined to be "standard practice" are moved out of the incentive program, and replaced by ETP or "Advanced Technology" measures.	Staff	IOU Proposal: By 2015, and every three years thereafter, measures determined to be "standard practice" are phased out at various levels of the program (depending on the type of technology within the customer class) and replaced by ETP measures. IOU Comments: "Standard Practice" will be defined by the end of 2012.

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

Long-Term Sub-program MT Indicators:	Source (SP, AL, DR, PIP, or Staff)*	Metric Type (3)**	Baseline Study Required (Y/N)	Comments
1. Number of measures determined to be "standard practice" from the previous program cycle that remain in the current incentive program	Staff	3	Y	IOU Proposal: Measures determined to be "standard practice" are phased out at various levels of the program (depending on the type of technology within the customer class) and replaced by ETP measures.



**\*\*\*Draft for Discussion Purposes \*\*\***

			(Y/N)
--	--	--	-------

*\*SP=Strategic Plan, AL=Advice Letter, DR=Data Request Response, PIP=program plans, Staff=ED proposed. [Include page reference when applicable.]*

*\*\*Metric type: 3 = data collection, tracking, and reporting [by IOUs, CPUC staff, and/or other entities] to be determined later.*