

THREE-YEAR TERM REPORT TEMPLATE

PART ONE: Program Administrator-Specific Data Tables

- Tables with set outputs and ability to be manipulated by users.
- Data at core initiative level, unless noted otherwise.
- Include planned, preliminary (using the evaluation factors used in planning), and evaluated (using the evaluation factors updated in this report) data.
- Use evaluated results from each Plan-Year Report for Year 1 and Year 2 in the Term Report (evaluated values, once reported, will not be amended by new factors).
- Worksheets in Term Report to include:
 - Data
 - Budget vs. Expenditures, including columns showing total dollars spent per participant and total resource benefits per dollar spent
 - Planned vs. evaluated benefits, including a column showing total resource benefits per participant
 - Planned vs. evaluated savings
 - Planned cost-effectiveness vs. evaluated cost-effectiveness
 - Variances calculated as the difference between three-year planned values and three-year actuals (goal/actual-1)
 - Example: In program X, Program Administrator planned to achieve 100 therms/kWh by the end of the three-year term. At the end of 2015, if the Program Administrator achieved 95 therms/kWh, the variance would be -5 percent.

PART TWO:

1. Program Administrator-Specific Narrative Explanations

a. Significant Core Initiative Variances

Three-year core initiative significant variance explanations for:

- (1) variances between planned and actual core initiative budget of 20 percent or greater;
 - (2) variances between planned and preliminary core initiative total lifetime savings showing a decrease of 20 percent or greater;
 - (3) variances between preliminary and evaluated core initiative total benefits showing a decrease of 20 percent or greater;
- Explain the source of the variance:
 - Identify the primary reasons for the variance (e.g.,

participation, installed measure mix, “ebb and flow,” etc.);

- Provide a detailed explanation of how and why the primary reasons caused the variance (e.g., Why was participation lower than expected? What led to the difference in installed measure mix? Which factors were ebbing? Why do the Program Administrators expect or not expect those factors will return to prior levels?);
- If multiple reasons for a significant variance exist, describe how each specific reason contributed to the variance, indicating which reasons were most influential; and
- If the variance is mainly due to an evaluation, measurement, and verification study, explain which factor (or other components of the savings algorithm) the study affected.

b. Program Cost-Effectiveness

Show benefit-cost ratio. Provide cost-effectiveness explanation if core initiative is not cost-effective, including:

- why the program was not cost-effective; and
- how the Program Administrator has determined to proceed with the program (e.g., modify program implementation, modify program budget, terminate the program, etc.) and why this course of action is appropriate.

2. Low-Income Cost Allocation

- The Green Communities Act requires that energy efficiency programs spend a certain amount on low-income programs. G.L. c. 25 §§ 19(c).
- A table will summarize and compare planned and actual program budget allocation by customer sector.
- If the low-income budget did not meet the statutory minimum of the amount expended for energy efficiency programs (10 percent for electric Program Administrators and 20 percent for gas Program Administrators), the Program Administrator will fully explain why.

3. Minimization of Administrative Costs

- The Green Communities Act requires that energy efficiency programs minimize administrative costs. G.L. c. 25 §§ 19(b).
- A table will summarize and compare planned and actual program planning and administration (“PP&A”) costs as a percent of total program costs by core initiative.
- Program Administrators will explain the reasons for increases of 20% or greater between planned and actual PP&A spending in any sector.

4. Competitive Procurement

- The Green Communities Act requires that energy efficiency programs utilize competitive procurement processes. G.L. c. 25 §§ 19(b).
- A table will summarize and compare planned and actual program outsourced activities by customer sector.
- Program Administrators will explain the reasons for any significant differences between planned and actual outsourced activities and competitively procured activities.

5. Benefit-Cost Ratio Screening Tool

- Provide as working Microsoft Excel spreadsheets with all cell references and formulae intact.

6. Statewide Technical Reference Manual - Report Version

- To be provided electronically by PAs in the most current format, such as a website link

7. Statewide Evaluation Studies Annual Summary for Year 3

- Incorporate Evaluation Studies from Plan-Year Reports for Years 1 and 2 by reference
- Provide a table identifying the studies, the applicable fuel, and their appendix location.
- Provide a summary of the studies with the most significant effects.
- For each study:
 - Describe the objective of the study.
 - Identify the core initiative to which the results of the study apply. Explain how the study affected program results statewide (and by Program Administrator if not the same statewide (e.g., custom study)).
 - For all finalized evaluation studies:
 - provide a summary of the results of the study;
 - explain how the results of the study affect programs, including the significance of those effects;
 - provide an overview of the study method that could include data collection and analysis, sample size, precision, etc.; and
 - explain, where applicable, how the results of the study are to be used.
 - Provide the complete study as an appendix

8. Three-Year Costs

- *For the Term Report for 2013-2015 Only:* The Program Administrator will describe: (1) how it has resolved any inconsistencies in the allocation of C&I Direct Install costs; and (2) the method of assigning these costs to program implementation cost categories. See 2011 and 2012 Annual Report Orders.
- Provide an invoice summary table for each core initiative, sorted by budget category. The Program Administrators will continue to maintain all invoices associated with the implementation of their energy efficiency programs. See 2011 and 2012 Annual Report Orders.

9. Statewide Performance Incentive Model

- Provide statewide three-year performance incentive model