

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1

Q1. How many individuals have energy efficiency and/or energy management among their responsibilities?

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
1	158	120	3	35	5	12	9	8	9	-	51	26	17	5	3	2	6	59	95	145
	18%	16%	24%	36% za	21%	16%	19%	14%	14%	-	22% m	18%	28% m	9%	16%	13%	13%	14%	22% q	17%
2 to 3	261	235	5	21	9	31	11	17	17	12	67	46	15	8	5	1	19	147	112	259
	30% m	31%	43%	22%	36%	41% m	24%	30%	26%	67%	29%	31% m	25%	15%	25%	7%	40% m	34% r	26%	30%
4 to 5	125	113	*	11	4	9	6	5	9	1	32	24	7	16	1	2	6	63	59	133
	14%	15%	4%	11%	16%	12%	14%	9%	13%	8%	14%	17%	11%	28% zegjll	3%	12%	13%	15%	14%	15%
6 to 10	137	120	1	16	2	9	8	11	17	1	28	18	10	11	8	7	7	61	75	137
	16%	16%	10%	17%	7%	11%	17%	19%	27% ejk	4%	12%	12%	17%	21%	41%	40%	15%	14%	18%	16%
11 to 20	65	63	1	2	1	9	3	5	6	2	15	12	3	2	1	2	3	37	26	69
	8%	8%	5%	2%	6%	11%	7%	8%	10%	11%	7%	9%	5%	4%	4%	12%	5%	9%	6%	8%
More than 20	96	85	1	10	3	6	8	4	5	2	27	15	6	11	2	3	4	47	49	100
	11%	11%	9%	11%	13%	7%	18%	7%	8%	10%	12%	10%	10%	20% ze	11%	16%	9%	11%	11%	11%
Don't know / Refused	29	26	1	2	-	1	1	7	2	-	7	5	3	1	-	-	2	18	11	28
	3%	3%	5%	2%	-	1%	1%	12% zefjkm	3%	-	3%	3%	5%	2%	-	-	5%	4%	3%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 2

Q1. How many individuals have energy efficiency and/or energy management among their responsibilities?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
1	158	55	102	69	31	24	26	5	1	43	31	52	22	21	26	59	96	60	145
	18%h	33%zb	15%	34%zdefh	15%h	13%h	15%h	16%h	3%	14%	30%zjk	19%	53%	17%	18%	14%	15%	25%zp	17%
2 to 3	261	58	203	63	64	58	51	5	16	82	33	100	9	45	51	112	183	77	259
	30%	35%	29%	32%	31%	31%	28%	16%	30%	27%	32%	36%l	23%	37%	35%	27%	29%	33%	30%
4 to 5	125	19	106	25	38	19	33	2	7	55	9	34	2	14	25	63	96	28	133
	14%	11%	15%	13%	18%e	10%	18%e	8%	13%	18%j	8%	12%	5%	12%	17%	15%	15%	12%	15%
6 to 10	137	18	119	25	29	37	24	9	13	65	10	28	2	16	23	71	108	27	137
	16%k	11%	17%	12%	14%	19%	13%	29%cdf	24%	22%zjk	10%	10%	5%	13%	16%	17%	17%	11%	16%
11 to 20	65	3	62	3	18	22	14	5	4	27	5	21	1	10	9	30	47	19	69
	8%ac	2%	9%a	2%	9%c	11%c	7%c	15%c	7%c	9%	5%	7%	2%	8%	6%	7%	7%	8%	8%
More than 20	96	2	94	5	22	24	27	5	12	27	14	30	2	7	9	62	80	16	100
	11%ac	1%	13%a	3%	11%c	12%c	15%c	14%c	22%zcd	9%	14%	11%	5%	6%	6%	15%zmn	13%q	7%	11%
Don't know / Refused	29	10	19	9	4	7	7	1	1	3	2	15	2	9	2	11	18	10	28
	3%	6%	3%	4%	2%	4%	4%	2%	2%	1%	2%	5%l	6%	7%zno	1%	3%	3%	4%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 3

Q1. How many individuals have energy efficiency and/or energy management among their responsibilities?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
1	158	33	63	19	41	14	100	117	8	7	18	51	3	36	82	30	5	16	70	145
	18% <i>lnopq</i>	17%	15%	21%	28% <i>zab</i>	12%	17%	17% <i>i</i>	10%	7%	13%	14%	9%	16%	14% <i>p</i>	12%	5%	10%	28% <i>znopq</i>	17%
2 to 3	261	64	130	23	41	30	185	213	12	25	37	108	6	69	173	67	30	42	81	259
	30% <i>h</i>	33%	31%	25%	28%	26%	32%	31% <i>h</i>	15%	25%	26%	31%	19%	31%	29%	27%	34%	26%	33%	30%
4 to 5	125	26	71	17	10	14	88	102	13	14	22	51	5	35	97	40	12	28	24	133
	14% <i>d</i>	13%	17% <i>d</i>	19% <i>d</i>	7%	12%	15%	15%	16%	14%	16%	14%	16%	16%	16% <i>r</i>	16%	13%	17% <i>r</i>	10%	15%
6 to 10	137	36	63	11	23	23	87	110	22	24	28	65	10	32	111	49	16	33	24	137
	16% <i>r</i>	19%	15%	13%	15%	19%	15%	16%	28% <i>zg</i>	24% <i>zg</i>	20%	18%	33% <i>zm</i>	15%	19% <i>r</i>	19% <i>r</i>	18% <i>r</i>	21% <i>r</i>	10%	16%
11 to 20	65	12	35	5	11	9	48	54	11	11	16	26	5	18	49	21	14	21	17	69
	8%	6%	8%	6%	7%	8%	8%	8%	14% <i>z</i>	11%	12%	7%	15%	8%	8%	9%	16% <i>znr</i>	13% <i>z</i>	7%	8%
More than 20	96	17	52	11	15	19	54	68	14	19	18	45	2	24	74	39	13	17	19	100
	11%	9%	12%	12%	10%	17% <i>f</i>	9%	10%	17%	19% <i>zg</i>	13%	13%	7%	11%	12%	15% <i>r</i>	14%	11%	8%	11%
Don't know / Refused	29	6	10	3	8	6	16	24	-	1	2	6	-	6	13	5	-	3	13	28
	3%	3%	2%	4%	5%	5%	3%	4%	-	1%	2%	2%	-	3%	2%	2%	-	2%	5% <i>np</i>	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 4

Q1. How many individuals have energy efficiency and/or energy management among their responsibilities?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
1	158	77	7	74	158	34	22	11	19	7	67	66	22	64	62	26	145
	18% <i>kl</i>	15%	22%	24% <i>a</i>	18% <i>l</i>	28% <i>zdfghi</i>	13%	13%	15% <i>l</i>	6%	27% <i>zkl</i>	16%	12%	29% <i>zno</i>	14%	15%	17%
2 to 3	261	161	9	91	261	43	73	21	32	30	96	119	40	84	136	36	259
	30% <i>lo</i>	31%	30%	29%	30%	36%	43% <i>zdgih</i>	24%	25%	26%	39% <i>zkl</i>	29%	21%	39% <i>zno</i>	30% <i>o</i>	21%	30%
4 to 5	125	87	1	35	125	12	24	19	22	14	21	75	23	17	83	21	133
	14% <i>lm</i>	17% <i>c</i>	4%	11%	14%	10%	14%	21% <i>e</i>	17%	12%	9%	18% <i>j</i>	12%	8%	18% <i>m</i>	12%	15%
6 to 10	137	86	5	46	137	13	30	14	22	30	24	58	51	18	73	42	137
	16% <i>lm</i>	17%	15%	15%	16%	11%	18%	16%	16%	26% <i>zde</i>	10%	14%	27% <i>zjk</i>	8%	16% <i>m</i>	25% <i>zmn</i>	16%
11 to 20	65	35	4	26	65	3	9	12	17	11	12	31	21	13	30	21	69
	8%	7%	15%	8%	8%	2%	6%	14% <i>ef</i>	13% <i>zdef</i>	10% <i>e</i>	5%	8%	11% <i>j</i>	6%	7%	12% <i>n</i>	8%
More than 20	96	62	3	30	96	11	6	11	15	24	13	52	30	10	60	24	100
	11% <i>lm</i>	12%	10%	10%	11% <i>f</i>	9%	4%	13% <i>f</i>	11% <i>f</i>	20% <i>zdef</i>	5%	13% <i>j</i>	16% <i>j</i>	4%	13% <i>m</i>	14% <i>m</i>	11%
Don't know / Refused	29	15	1	11	29	4	4	-	3	1	12	10	1	11	11	1	28
	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%	2%	-	2%	-	5% <i>l</i>	2%	1%	5% <i>o</i>	3%	1%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 5

Q1. How many individuals have energy efficiency and/or energy management among their responsibilities?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
1	158	2	-	27	3	1	6	15	7	4	5	19	7	11	4	-	5	12	4	23	2	145
	18%	21%	-	16%	28%	12%	19%	19%	12%	19%	12%	25%	23%	25%	11%	-	12%	25%	14%	17%	28%	17%
2 to 3	261	1	2	51	1	2	6	29	10	9	10	33	10	15	13	2	19	10	5	32	-	259
	30%	8%	34%	30%	13%	40%	21%	36%	28%	24%	35%	45%zfqg	32%	34%	37%	38%	42%st	21%	17%	24%	-	30%
4 to 5	125	4	-	26	1	-	5	8	5	10	1	6	3	6	4	1	10	9	-	25	-	133
	14%	41%	-	15%	14%	-	16%	9%	14%	26%	5%	8%	11%	13%	11%	27%	22%	19%	-	18%	-	15%
6 to 10	137	2	3	32	2	-	3	13	7	9	4	8	4	5	4	2	6	4	8	21	2	137
	16%	20%	53%	18%	16%	-	10%	16%	18%	24%	14%	10%	12%	12%	11%	35%	13%	9%	27%	16%	22%	16%
11 to 20	65	-	-	15	2	1	3	6	3	5	2	2	3	4	4	-	2	1	6	9	-	69
	8%	-	-	9%	15%	25%	10%	7%	7%	17%	2%	7%	6%	12%	4	-	5%	1%	20%	7%	-	8%
More than 20	96	1	1	14	1	1	6	8	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	-	2	9	6	17	2	100
	11%	10%	13%	8%	12%	24%	18%k	10%	11%	7%	10%	5%	15%	9%	13%	-	5%	20%ck	22%	13%	23%	11%
Don't know / Refused	29	-	-	7	-	-	2	2	1	-	-	4	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	7	2	28
	3%	-	-	4%	-	-	6%	2%	2%	-	-	5%	-	-	4%	-	-	5%	-	6%	28%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 6

Q2. And is that the number of employees involved in energy efficiency at all your organisation's sites or just at the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants responsible for energy management in multi-site organisations, with known numbers of employees for EE

	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	177	162	5	10	7	16	12	10	6	6	46	29	11	11	1	3	16	110	66	177
Weighted total	169	148	3**	18**	6**	16**	11**	10**	7**	5**	45*	25**	9**	11**	1**	3**	15**	101*	67*	177
For all sites	69	58	2	9	3	7	5	5	4	2	18	10	4	4	1	1	3	35	34	73
	41%	39%	60%	48%	40%	45%	40%	48%	48%	31%	39%	41%	45%	39%	100%	56%	20%	34%	50%	41%
For sites I'm responsible for	100	89	1	10	4	9	7	5	4	4	28	15	5	7	-	1	12	67	34	104
	59%	61%	40%	52%	60%	55%	60%	52%	52%	69%	61%	59%	55%	61%	-	44%	80%	66%	50%	59%
Don't know / Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 7

Q2. And is that the number of employees involved in energy efficiency at all your organisation's sites or just at the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants responsible for energy management in multi-site organisations, with known numbers of employees for EE

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	177	-	177	38	37	40	36	5	19	64	23	54	6	21	23	87	124	53	177
Weighted total	169	-**	169	38*	37*	37*	32*	5**	18**	66*	22**	47*	6**	20**	24**	82*	116	53*	177
For all sites	69	-	69	14	19	16	11	2	6	24	8	20	1	11	7	30	49	19	73
	41%	-	41%	38%	51%	44%	35%	31%	35%	36%	37%	42%	21%	56%	29%	36%	42%	37%	41%
For sites I'm responsible for	100	-	100	24	18	21	21	3	11	42	14	27	5	9	17	53	67	33	104
	59%	-	59%	62%	49%	56%	65%	69%	65%	64%	63%	58%	79%	44%	71%	64%	58%	63%	59%
Don't know / Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 8

Q2. And is that the number of employees involved in energy efficiency at all your organisation's sites or just at the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants responsible for energy management in multi-site organisations, with known numbers of employees for EE

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	177	40	90	15	29	19	133	159	12	24	33	79	9	51	128	55	23	47	46	177
Weighted total	169	39*	89*	12**	26**	17**	125	148	12**	22**	31**	72*	8**	47*	121	48*	21**	45*	45*	177
For all sites	69 41%	20 50%	35 39%	3 29%	10 37%	7 38%	51 41%	57 39%	9 77%	4 21%	11 36%	29 40%	3 41%	15 32%	42 35%	16 32%	6 30%	13 30%	25 55% <i>noq</i>	73 41%
For sites I'm responsible for	100 59%	20 50%	54 61%	8 71%	17 63%	11 62%	75 59%	91 61%	3 23%	17 79%	20 64%	43 60%	5 59%	32 68%	79 65% <i>r</i>	33 68% <i>r</i>	15 70%	31 70% <i>r</i>	21 45%	104 59%
Don't know / Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 9

Q2. And is that the number of employees involved in energy efficiency at all your organisation's sites or just at the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants responsible for energy management in multi-site organisations, with known numbers of employees for EE

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	177	116	9	50	177	26	35	18	27	23	55	88	29	50	87	33	177
Weighted total	169	106	7**	52*	169	26**	33*	17**	25**	20**	49*	88*	26**	45*	85*	31**	177
For all sites	69	43	3	21	69	9	14	5	11	6	21	38	5	18	39	7	73
	41%	40%	40%	41%	41%	33%	44%	29%	43%	32%	44%	43%	21%	40%	45%	23%	41%
For sites I'm responsible for	100	64	4	31	100	18	19	12	14	14	27	50	21	27	47	24	104
	59%	60%	60%	59%	59%	67%	56%	71%	57%	68%	56%	57%	79%	60%	55%	77%	59%
Don't know / Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 10

Q2. And is that the number of employees involved in energy efficiency at all your organisation's sites or just at the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants responsible for energy management in multi-site organisations, with known numbers of employees for EE

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	177	4	1	39	4	1	4	8	8	7	9	9	19	5	-	6	7	1	34	2	177
Weighted total	169	4**	1**	35*	3**	1**	3**	10**	7**	9**	12**	7**	13**	6**	**	9**	8**	1**	29*	4**	177
For all sites	69	4	1	8	2	1	2	4	5	1	2	6	2	4	-	2	6	1	13	2	73
	41% ^c	100%	100%	23%	54%	100%	75%	43%	63%	15%	28%	47%	27%	31%	62%	26%	71%	100%	45%	46%	41%
For sites I'm responsible for	100	-	-	27	1	-	1	6	3	8	6	5	9	2	-	6	2	-	16	2	104
	59%	-	-	77% ^z	46%	-	25%	57%	37%	85%	72%	53%	73%	69%	38%	74%	29%	-	55%	54%	59%
Don't know / Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 11

Q3a. I'd now like you to think about how energy efficiency investment decisions are made within your organisation. Is board level approval ever required for energy investment spend?

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes	714	625	9	80	21	73	41	51	53	14	166	123	55	46	14	13	35	355	349	729
	82%j	82%	82%	82%	87%	96%zhjkmp	90%j	88%j	80%	83%	73%	84%j	91%jp	84%	75%	76%	74%	82%	82%	84%
No	148	130	2	15	3	3	5	7	13	3	59	21	5	8	5	4	10	74	72	135
	17%e	17%	18%	16%	13%	4%	10%	12%	20%e	17%	26%zefgkl	14%e	9%	14%	25%	24%	21%e	17%	17%	15%
Don't know / Refused	9	6	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2	-	1	-	-	2	4	5	7
	1%	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	2%	-	-	5%z	1%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 12

Q3a. I'd now like you to think about how energy efficiency investment decisions are made within your organisation. Is board level approval ever required for energy investment spend?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes	714	140	575	164	172	153	152	28	41	264	77	227	35	103	123	330	524	184	729
	82%	84%	82%	82%	83%	80%	84%	86%	74%	87% ^{ij}	74%	81%	84%	84%	84%	81%	83%	78%	84%
No	148	25	123	34	30	37	25	5	14	36	26	51	6	20	23	76	98	48	135
	17% ^{kl}	15%	17%	17%	15%	20%	14%	14%	26%	12%	25% ^{kl}	18% ^{kl}	16%	16%	16%	19%	16%	21%	15%
Don't know / Refused	9	2	7	1	4	-	4	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	2	6	3	7
	1%	1%	1%	*	2%	-	2%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 13

Q3a. I'd now like you to think about how energy efficiency investment decisions are made within your organisation. Is board level approval ever required for energy investment spend?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes	714	195	423	89	-	92	477	566	64	81	116	294	26	182	504	208	75	142	190	729
	82% <i>d</i>	100% <i>zd</i>	100% <i>zd</i>	100% <i>zd</i>	-	79%	83%	82%	81%	81%	83%	84%	84%	82%	84% <i>r</i>	83%	83%	90% <i>zr</i>	77%	84%
No	148	-	-	-	148	24	96	114	15	17	20	57	5	38	90	42	14	15	54	135
	17% <i>abcq</i>	-	-	-	100% <i>zabc</i>	21%	17%	17%	19%	18%	14%	16%	16%	17%	15%	17% <i>q</i>	15%	10%	22% <i>ng</i>	15%
Don't know / Refused	9	-	-	-	-	-	5	8	-	1	4	-	-	1	5	1	1	1	3	7
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	3%	-	-	*	1%	*	2%	1%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 14

Q3a. I'd now like you to think about how energy efficiency investment decisions are made within your organisation. Is board level approval ever required for energy investment spend?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes	714	443	28	240	714	93	145	74	104	102	178	361	160	165	387	149	729
	82%j	85%c	91%	77%	82%	77%	86%	83%	80%	88%	73%	88%zj	86%j	76%	85%m	87%ml	84%
No	148	74	3	69	148	28	23	15	27	15	65	49	27	50	69	23	135
	17%k	14%	9%	22%a	17%	23%	13%	17%	20%	12%	26%zkl	12%	14%	23%no	15%	13%	15%
Don't know / Refused	9	4	-	4	9	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	7
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	*	-	1%	*	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 15

Q3a. I'd now like you to think about how energy efficiency investment decisions are made within your organisation. Is board level approval ever required for energy investment spend?

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes	714	10	5	154	9	5	26	65	33	34	22	49	25	36	23	5	37	32	23	115	4	729
	82% <i>k</i>	94%	100%	90% <i>zkmq</i>	91%	100%	82%	81%	90% <i>kq</i>	90%	80%	65%	84%	79%	69%	100%	83%	69%	80%	85% <i>kq</i>	45%	84%
No	148	1	-	17	1	-	5	16	3	4	4	26	5	10	11	-	7	13	3	18	5	135
	17% <i>c</i>	6%	-	10%	9%	-	15%	19%	10%	10%	15%	35% <i>zchs</i>	16%	21% <i>c</i>	31%	-	17%	26% <i>chs</i>	12%	13%	55%	15%
Don't know / Refused	9	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	-	7
	1%	-	-	*	-	-	3%	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	8%	1%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 16

Q3b. Which, if any, of the following best describes when board level approval for energy efficiency investment spend is needed? Is board level approval needed...

Base: all participants who require board level approval for energy investment spend

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	729	670	17	42	26	76	47	48	45	14	150	148	59	50	11	11	37	370	349	729
Weighted total	714	625	9**	80*	21**	73*	41*	51*	53*	14**	166	123	55*	46*	14**	13**	35*	355	349	729
For any energy efficiency investment spend	195 27%	165 26%	3 29%	27 34%	6 30%	22 30%	7 17%	15 30%	13 24%	2 13%	48 29%	41 33% <i>f</i>	10 18%	10 21%	4 27%	5 36%	8 24%	83 23%	110 31% <i>q</i>	196 27%
Only if proposed energy efficiency investment spend is over an agreed minimum financial value	423 59%	373 60%	6 64%	45 56%	14 66%	49 67% <i>gk</i>	29 69% <i>gk</i>	24 46%	29 55%	9 61%	95 57%	62 50%	41 75% <i>zghjk</i>	30 65%	8 58%	8 64%	23 68%	224 63%	194 55%	436 60%
In certain circumstances, not linked to the proposed amount of investment	89 13% <i>e</i>	80 13%	1 7%	8 10%	1 4%	2 3%	5 11%	12 23% <i>el</i>	10 19% <i>e</i>	4 27%	22 13% <i>ee</i>	19 15% <i>e</i>	4 7%	6 14% <i>e</i>	2 14%	-	2 7%	44 12%	44 13%	89 12%
Don't know	6 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	1 2%	1 1%	1 2%	-	1 1%	2 1%	-	-	-	-	*	4 1%	2 1%	8 1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 17

Q3b. Which, if any, of the following best describes when board level approval for energy efficiency investment spend is needed? Is board level approval needed...

Base: all participants who require board level approval for energy investment spend

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	729	140	589	156	179	152	162	31	44	268	74	229	31	96	110	367	542	181	729
Weighted total	714	140	575	164	172	153	152	28**	41*	264	77*	227	35**	103*	123*	330	524	184	729
For any energy efficiency investment spend	195	42	153	61	41	40	38	5	7	72	36	64	13	20	36	86	126	67	196
	27%	30%	27%	37% <i>zdfh</i>	24%	26%	25%	19%	17%	27%	47% <i>zilk</i>	28%	38%	19%	30%	26%	24%	36% <i>zpq</i>	27%
Only if proposed energy efficiency investment spend is over an agreed minimum financial value	423	79	344	91	103	90	88	20	29	168	32	126	21	65	78	197	327	94	436
	59% <i>f</i>	57%	60%	55%	60%	59%	58%	71%	72%	64% <i>fj</i>	42%	55%	59%	64%	63%	60%	63% <i>q</i>	51%	60%
In certain circumstances, not linked to the proposed amount of investment	89	16	73	10	25	24	25	2	3	21	7	37	1	16	8	44	67	21	89
	13% <i>c</i>	11%	13%	6%	14% <i>c</i>	15% <i>c</i>	17% <i>c</i>	7%	8%	8%	9%	16% <i>l</i>	3%	16% <i>n</i>	6%	13%	13%	12%	12%
Don't know	6	2	4	2	2	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	-	1	1	3	4	2	8
	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	3%	3%	1%	2%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 18

Q3b. Which, if any, of the following best describes when board level approval for energy efficiency investment spend is needed? Is board level approval needed...

Base: all participants who require board level approval for energy investment spend

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	729	196	436	89	-	100	504	598	70	99	124	311	32	195	529	228	84	157	182	729
Weighted total	714	195	423	89*	-**	92*	477	566	64*	81*	116	294	26**	182	504	208	75*	142	190	729
For any energy efficiency investment spend	195	195	-	-	-	19	134	148	24	18	30	79	4	46	121	44	18	34	66	196
	27% <i>bc</i>	100% <i>zbc</i>	-	-	-	21%	26%	26%	37%	23%	26%	27%	15%	25%	24%	21%	24%	24%	35% <i>no</i>	27%
Only if proposed energy efficiency investment spend is over an agreed minimum financial value	423	-	423	-	-	63	276	341	36	46	70	171	18	117	317	137	47	99	99	436
	59% <i>ac</i>	-	100% <i>zac</i>	-	-	69%	56%	60%	56%	57%	60%	58%	70%	64%	63% <i>r</i>	66% <i>r</i>	62%	70% <i>zr</i>	52%	60%
In certain circumstances, not linked to the proposed amount of investment	89	-	-	89	-	10	62	72	3	15	17	40	4	19	62	24	10	9	23	89
	13% <i>abq</i>	-	-	100% <i>zab</i>	-	11%	13%	13%	4%	19% <i>h</i>	14%	14%	15%	10%	12%	12%	14%	6%	12%	12%
Don't know	6	-	-	-	-	-	4	5	1	1	-	3	-	-	3	2	-	-	3	8
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 19

Q3b. Which, if any, of the following best describes when board level approval for energy efficiency investment spend is needed? Is board level approval needed...

Base: all participants who require board level approval for energy investment spend

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	729	457	29	241	729	84	147	79	115	109	179	371	165	163	399	155	729
Weighted total	714	443	28**	240	714	93*	145	74*	104*	102*	178	361	160	165	387	149	729
For any energy efficiency investment spend	195	114	12	67	195	29	43	18	20	18	58	95	38	60	93	39	196
	27%	26%	43%	28%	27%	32% <i>f</i>	30%	24%	19%	18%	33%	26%	24%	36% <i>zn</i>	24%	26%	27%
Only if proposed energy efficiency investment spend is over an agreed minimum financial value	423	263	14	145	423	51	91	49	65	68	100	218	97	89	239	87	436
	59%	59%	49%	60%	59%	55%	63%	67%	62%	66%	56%	60%	61%	54%	62%	58%	60%
In certain circumstances, not linked to the proposed amount of investment	89	62	2	25	89	13	10	6	19	15	20	43	24	16	49	23	89
	13%	14%	8%	10%	13%	14%	7%	8%	18% <i>f</i>	15% <i>f</i>	11%	12%	15%	10%	13%	15%	12%
Don't know	6	4	-	3	6	-	1	1	-	1	-	5	1	-	5	1	8
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 20

Q3b. Which, if any, of the following best describes when board level approval for energy efficiency investment spend is needed? Is board level approval needed...

Base: all participants who require board level approval for energy investment spend

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)			
Unweighted total	729	9	5	171	12	8	36	54	40	26	12	23	37	29	50	17	3	36	29	17	125	2	729
Weighted total	714	10**	5**	154	9**	5**	26*	65*	33*	34**	22**	49*	25**	36*	23**	5**	37*	32**	23**	115	4**	729	
For any energy efficiency investment spend	195	1	2	39	1	-	13	19	6	8	5	13	3	14	9	2	9	8	3	38	-	196	
	27%	9%	40%	25%	15%	-	50% <i>zchkp</i>	30%	19%	22%	24%	26%	13%	40% <i>h</i>	39%	38%	25%	24%	14%	33%	-	27%	
Only if proposed energy efficiency investment spend is over an agreed minimum financial value	423	6	1	103	8	5	9	38	23	24	17	26	15	16	12	1	21	15	17	62	4	436	
	59% <i>f</i>	64%	28%	67% <i>fms</i>	85%	86%	36%	58%	70% <i>fm</i>	71%	76%	53%	61%	44%	52%	27%	56%	45%	71%	54%	100%	60%	
In certain circumstances, not linked to the proposed amount of investment	89	3	2	10	-	1	4	8	3	2	-	10	5	6	2	2	6	10	3	14	-	89	
	13% <i>c</i>	28%	32%	7%	-	14%	14%	12%	8%	7%	-	21% <i>c</i>	20%	16%	9%	35%	15%	31%	14%	12%	-	12%	
Don't know	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	8	
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	1%	-	1%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 21

Q4. Thinking back to the start of 2015, what level of priority would you say energy efficiency had at board level in your organisation at that time?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
1 - Very low priority	75	63	2	10	1	11	1	1	2	31	8	3	4	-	-	8	37	38	70	
	9%	8%	21%	10%	5%	15% <i>fghk</i>	2%	2%	2%	11%	14% <i>zlfghk</i>	6%	5%	7%	-	-	18% <i>zlfghkl</i>	9%	9%	8%
2	52	46	1	5	3	9	-	5	5	11	7	5	2	-	-	4	29	21	54	
	6%	6%	11%	5%	11%	12% <i>fj</i>	-	9%	8%	8%	5%	8%	4%	-	-	9% <i>f</i>	7%	5%	6%	
3	118	102	1	16	2	14	3	6	8	2	28	26	12	8	2	3	54	64	119	
	14%	13%	5%	16%	7%	19%	6%	11%	12%	11%	12%	18%	20%	14%	10%	9%	6%	12%	15%	14%
4	81	74	*	7	4	3	6	4	2	2	29	16	2	7	2	1	45	36	80	
	9%	10%	4%	8%	16%	4%	13% <i>p</i>	7%	3%	10%	13% <i>ep</i>	11%	4%	12%	12%	8%	2%	10%	8%	9%
5	103	96	1	7	3	6	14	12	6	3	26	16	2	4	-	4	7	53	50	107
	12% <i>l</i>	13%	6%	7%	13%	7%	31% <i>zehjklm</i>	20% <i>el</i>	9%	15%	11%	11%	3%	8%	-	20%	15% <i>l</i>	12%	12%	12%
6	94	86	*	7	4	10	5	8	3	2	21	15	11	4	4	2	5	45	48	93
	11%	11%	4%	7%	19%	13%	12%	14%	4%	13%	9%	10%	18% <i>h</i>	6%	21%	9%	10%	10%	11%	11%
7	133	110	3	20	3	8	9	3	16	4	27	28	13	14	1	7	69	64	136	
	15% <i>g</i>	14%	24%	20%	12%	11%	20% <i>g</i>	4%	24% <i>gj</i>	22%	12%	19% <i>g</i>	22% <i>g</i>	26% <i>egj</i>	4%	4%	15%	16%	15%	16%
8	115	103	1	12	4	6	2	15	12	1	30	16	10	6	3	6	4	58	56	115
	13%	14%	4%	12%	15%	8%	4%	25% <i>zefjk</i>	19% <i>f</i>	5%	13%	11%	17%	11%	15%	35%	9%	13%	13%	13%
9	35	30	-	5	-	3	2	1	5	-	6	2	1	2	4	3	5	12	22	35
	4%	4%	-	5%	2%	4%	5%	2%	7% <i>k</i>	-	2%	1%	2%	3%	21%	16%	10% <i>k</i>	3%	5%	4%
10 - Very high priority	37	29	1	7	-	5	2	1	6	1	8	8	1	2	2	-	2	22	15	37
	4%	4%	9%	7%	-	7%	4%	2%	4%	5%	4%	5%	1%	4%	8%	-	3%	5%	3%	4%
Don't know	28	23	1	4	-	1	1	2	3	-	12	5	-	3	2	-	1	10	15	25
	3%	3%	12%	4%	-	1%	1%	4%	4%	-	5%	4%	-	5%	10%	-	2%	2%	3%	3%
1-6	523	466	6	51	17	52	30	36	25	12	146	87	34	29	8	8	28	263	255	523
	60% <i>h</i>	61% <i>h</i>	51%	52%	71%	69% <i>h</i>	64% <i>h</i>	62% <i>h</i>	38% <i>h</i>	67%	64% <i>h</i>	60% <i>h</i>	58% <i>h</i>	52%	43%	45%	61% <i>h</i>	61% <i>h</i>	60%	60%
7-8	248	213	3	31	6	14	11	17	28	5	57	43	23	20	3	7	11	126	120	251
	28%	28%	28%	32%	27%	19%	25%	30%	43% <i>zej</i>	27%	25%	30%	39% <i>ej</i>	37% <i>e</i>	19%	39%	24%	29%	28%	29%
9-10	72	60	1	11	-	8	4	2	10	1	14	10	2	4	5	3	6	34	36	72
	8%	8%	9%	11%	2%	11%	10%	4%	15% <i>j</i>	5%	6%	7%	4%	6%	29%	16%	13%	8%	8%	8%
Net	-451	-406	-5	-40	-16	-44	-25	-34	-15	-11	-132	-78	-32	-25	-2	-5	-22	-229	-219	-451
	-52%	-53%	-42%	-41%	-69%	-58%	-55%	-58%	-23%	-62%	-58%	-53%	-54%	-46%	-13%	-29%	-47%	-53%	-51%	-52%
Mean	5.31	5.30	4.78	5.43	5.12	4.74	5.76 <i>ej</i>	5.56	6.25 <i>zej</i>	5.01	4.94	5.32	5.42	5.41	6.85	6.60	5.10	5.30	5.31	5.33

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 22

Q4. Thinking back to the start of 2015, what level of priority would you say energy efficiency had at board level in your organisation at that time?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites			Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
1 - Very low priority	75	15	59	26	16	15	15	3	1	23	9	30	8	9	17	32	48	27	70
	9%	9%	8%	13% ^h	8%	8%	8%	8%	1%	7%	8%	11%	20%	7%	11%	8%	8%	11%	8%
2	52	11	41	15	17	8	8	1	2	11	7	21	5	10	9	19	36	16	54
	6%	7%	6%	7%	8%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	7%	7%	12%	8%	6%	5%	6%	7%	6%
3	118	21	97	28	31	25	22	3	8	35	13	46	7	15	22	58	79	39	119
	14%	13%	14%	14%	15%	13%	12%	8%	15%	12%	12%	16%	16%	12%	15%	14%	13%	17%	14%
4	81	13	69	19	16	18	20	3	6	29	14	20	3	11	13	42	66	12	80
	9%	8%	10%	9%	8%	9%	11%	8%	12%	10%	13%	7%	8%	9%	9%	10%	10%	5%	9%
5	103	17	86	23	23	23	22	6	4	30	16	39	3	16	18	40	71	33	107
	12%	10%	12%	12%	11%	12%	12%	19%	8%	10%	15%	14%	8%	13%	12%	10%	11%	14%	12%
6	94	19	75	19	23	20	17	5	11	30	13	30	2	18	18	49	70	21	93
	11%	11%	11%	9%	11%	10%	10%	14%	19%	10%	13%	11%	5%	15%	12%	12%	11%	9%	11%
7	133	33	99	32	27	30	28	5	10	61	12	30	5	25	15	63	101	31	136
	15%	20%	14%	16%	13%	16%	15%	14%	19%	20% ^k	11%	11%	11%	20%	11%	15%	16%	13%	16%
8	115	17	99	18	30	27	26	5	8	43	11	38	4	11	23	56	87	28	115
	13%	10%	14%	9%	15%	14%	15%	15%	15%	14%	11%	14%	11%	9%	16%	14%	14%	12%	13%
9	35	9	25	10	8	6	9	1	1	18	2	13	2	3	4	21	24	11	35
	4%	6%	4%	5%	4%	3%	5%	2%	3%	6%	2%	5%	2%	2%	3%	5%	4%	4%	4%
10 - Very high priority	37	6	31	4	8	12	9	1	3	15	3	8	1	3	4	20	27	10	37
	4%	4%	4%	2%	4%	6%	5%	2%	6%	5%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	5%	4%	4%	4%
Don't know	28	5	23	5	7	7	5	1	-	8	5	3	-	2	3	8	19	9	25
	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	-	3%	5% ^k	1%	-	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	3%
1-6	523	96	427	130	127	109	104	20	32	158	71	187	29	78	96	240	369	147	523
	60% ^{ai}	58%	61%	65%	61%	57%	58%	62%	58%	52%	69% ^{ai}	67% ^{ai}	70%	64%	66%	59%	59%	62%	60%
7-8	248	50	198	50	58	57	54	10	18	104	23	68	9	36	38	119	188	59	251
	28%	30%	28%	25%	28%	30%	30%	30%	33%	34% ^{ijk}	22%	24%	22%	30%	26%	29%	30%	25%	29%
9-10	72	15	56	14	16	18	18	1	5	33	5	22	3	6	8	41	51	21	72
	8%	9%	8%	7%	8%	9%	10%	4%	8%	11%	5%	8%	7%	5%	6%	10%	8%	9%	8%
Net	-451	-80	-371	-115	-111	-90	-86	-19	-27	-124	-67	-165	-26	-73	-88	-199	-318	-126	-451
	-52%	-48%	-53%	-58%	-54%	-47%	-48%	-58%	-50%	-41%	-64%	-59%	-63%	-59%	-60%	-49%	-51%	-54%	-52%
Mean	5.31	5.33	5.30	4.87	5.22	5.51 ^c	5.49 ^c	5.39	5.82 ^c	5.70 ^{ijk}	4.95	5.02	4.32	5.18	5.03	5.46	5.39	5.07	5.33

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q4. Thinking back to the start of 2015, what level of priority would you say energy efficiency had at board level in your organisation at that time?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
1 - Very low priority	75	18	20	3	32	8	50	56	4	4	4	25	2	19	38	13	5	6	33	70
	9%bjq	9%b	5%	4%	21%zabc	7%	9%	8%j	5%	4%	3%	7%	6%	9%	6%	5%	5%	4%	14%znopq	8%
2	52	13	20	7	12	5	37	41	3	5	9	24	1	13	28	10	5	1	23	54
	6%q	6%	5%	8%	8%	5%	6%	6%	4%	5%	6%	7%	3%	6%	5%q	4%q	6%q	1%	9%noq	6%
3	118	27	60	9	21	19	80	98	13	4	13	45	2	41	82	39	8	19	35	119
	14%l	14%	14%	10%	14%	16%	14%	14%i	16%i	4%	9%	13%	6%	19%	14%	15%	8%	12%	14%	14%
4	81	22	40	8	12	8	62	67	10	8	9	32	5	17	53	20	7	15	29	80
	9%	11%	9%	9%	8%	7%	11%	10%	13%	8%	6%	9%	17%	8%	9%	8%	8%	9%	12%	9%
5	103	26	49	11	12	15	70	83	10	11	18	42	5	24	68	27	7	15	34	107
	12%	13%	12%	12%	8%	13%	12%	12%	13%	11%	13%	12%	17%	11%	11%	11%	8%	9%	14%	12%
6	94	16	50	10	17	9	66	75	3	14	22	37	3	27	66	30	8	13	26	93
	11%h	8%	12%	11%	12%	8%	11%	11%h	3%	14%h	16%h	10%	10%	12%	11%	12%	9%	8%	10%	11%
7	133	31	79	13	8	20	86	100	17	18	22	56	7	29	106	42	16	25	19	136
	15%dr	16%d	19%d	15%d	5%	17%	15%	14%	22%	19%	16%	16%	21%	13%	18%r	17%r	17%r	16%r	8%	16%
8	115	29	56	19	11	16	76	92	8	16	21	59	3	24	84	39	18	34	24	115
	13%	15%	13%	21%d	8%	13%	13%	13%	11%	16%	15%	17%	10%	11%	14%	16%	20%r	21%znr	10%	13%
9	35	5	22	4	3	4	21	28	7	8	9	18	-	9	26	11	8	12	9	35
	4%	2%	5%	5%	2%	3%	4%	4%	8%	8%	6%	5%	-	4%	4%	5%	9%z	8%z	4%	4%
10 - Very high priority	37	4	19	1	12	7	18	24	5	8	7	15	2	12	36	16	8	18	1	37
	4%r	2%	5%	1%	6%ac	6%	3%	3%	6%	8%g	5%	4%	8%	5%	6%r	6%r	9%r	11%znr	1%	4%
Don't know	28	4	8	3	7	5	12	24	-	2	6	-	1	4	11	4	1	2	14	25
	3%k	2%	2%	3%	5%	5%	2%	4%	-	2%	4%	-	2%k	2%k	2%	1%	1%	2%	6%no	3%
1-6	523	122	239	49	106	64	365	420	43	46	75	205	18	142	335	138	40	68	180	523
	60%ipq	62%	56%	55%	72%zbc	56%	63%	61%i	53%	47%	54%	58%	59%	64%	56%ppq	55%q	44%	43%	73%znopq	60%
7-8	248	60	135	32	19	36	162	192	26	35	43	114	10	53	190	82	34	58	43	251
	28%dr	31%d	32%d	36%d	13%	31%	28%	28%	32%	35%	31%	33%am	31%	24%	32%r	33%r	38%r	37%zr	18%	29%
9-10	72	9	41	5	16	11	39	52	12	16	16	32	2	22	62	27	16	30	10	72
	8%r	5%	10%	6%	11%	9%	7%	8%	15%g	16%zg	11%	9%	8%	10%	10%r	11%r	18%znr	19%znr	4%	8%
Net	-451	-113	-198	-44	-90	-54	-326	-368	-31	-30	-59	-172	-16	-120	-273	-111	-24	-38	-170	-451
	-52%	-58%	-47%	-49%	-61%	-46%	-56%	-53%	-39%	-30%	-42%	-49%	-51%	-54%	-46%	-44%	-26%	-24%	-69%	-52%
Mean	5.31dr	5.11	5.63zad	5.63d	4.47	5.47	5.19	5.26	5.68	6.29zg	5.91zq	5.50	5.64	5.19	5.61zr	5.72zr	6.24znr	6.43znr	4.47	5.33

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/a/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 24

Q4. Thinking back to the start of 2015, what level of priority would you say energy efficiency had at board level in your organisation at that time?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		(p)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871	
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871	
1 - Very low priority	75	31	4	40	75	16	9	3	5	2	75	-	-	70	4	-	70	
		9% <i>klno</i>	6%	13%	9%	13% <i>fg</i>	5%	4%	4%	2%	31% <i>zkl</i>	-	-	32% <i>zno</i>	1%	-	8%	
2	52	30	2	20	52	13	17	-	5	5	52	-	-	38	12	-	54	
		6% <i>gkln</i>	6%	5%	6% <i>g</i>	11% <i>gh</i>	10% <i>gh</i>	-	4%	5%	21% <i>zkl</i>	-	-	18% <i>zno</i>	3%	-	6%	
3	118	66	4	49	118	25	26	10	14	7	118	-	-	91	23	3	119	
		14% <i>klno</i>	13%	12%	14% <i>i</i>	20% <i>i</i>	15% <i>i</i>	11%	11%	6%	48% <i>zkl</i>	-	-	42% <i>zno</i>	5%	2%	14%	
4	81	47	4	30	81	14	19	13	16	7	-	81	-	7	73	1	80	
		9% <i>lmo</i>	9%	14%	9%	12%	11%	14%	12%	6%	-	20% <i>zjl</i>	-	3%	16% <i>zmo</i>	1%	9%	
5	103	63	3	38	103	18	17	8	13	12	-	103	-	7	85	10	107	
		12% <i>lmo</i>	12%	10%	12%	15%	10%	9%	10%	10%	-	25% <i>zjl</i>	-	3%	19% <i>zmo</i>	6%	12%	
6	94	60	2	31	94	4	18	11	19	17	-	94	-	2	85	6	93	
		11% <i>ejlmo</i>	12%	8%	10%	11% <i>e</i>	3%	11% <i>e</i>	13% <i>e</i>	15% <i>e</i>	14% <i>e</i>	-	23% <i>zjl</i>	-	1%	19% <i>zmo</i>	4%	11%
7	133	94	6	31	133	12	26	18	17	24	-	133	-	1	116	14	136	
		15% <i>ejlmo</i>	18% <i>c</i>	19%	15%	10%	16%	20%	13%	21% <i>e</i>	-	32% <i>zjl</i>	-	*	25% <i>zmo</i>	8% <i>m</i>	16%	
8	115	80	1	35	115	12	18	15	23	23	-	-	115	-	46	69	115	
		13% <i>km</i>	15%	3%	13%	10%	11%	17%	18%	20% <i>ef</i>	-	-	62% <i>zjk</i>	-	10% <i>m</i>	40% <i>zmn</i>	13%	
9	35	17	2	15	35	2	10	1	8	10	-	-	35	1	3	31	35	
		4% <i>jkmn</i>	3%	6%	4%	2%	6%	1%	6%	8% <i>eg</i>	-	-	19% <i>zjk</i>	*	1%	18% <i>zmn</i>	4%	
10 - Very high priority	37	19	3	15	37	3	4	8	8	9	-	-	37	-	3	34	37	
		4% <i>jkmn</i>	4%	10%	4%	2%	2%	9% <i>f</i>	6%	8%	-	-	20% <i>zjk</i>	-	1%	20% <i>zmn</i>	4%	
Don't know	28	14	-	11	28	3	4	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	6	3	25	
		3% <i>hklmn</i>	3%	-	3% <i>h</i>	2%	3%	2%	-	1%	-	-	-	*	1%	1%	3%	
1-6	523	297	19	207	523	89	105	45	73	50	244	278	-	215	283	21	523	
		60% <i>llo</i>	57%	62%	60% <i>i</i>	74% <i>zdghi</i>	63% <i>i</i>	51%	56%	43%	100% <i>zkl</i>	68% <i>zl</i>	-	99% <i>zno</i>	62% <i>o</i>	12%	60%	
7-8	248	174	7	65	248	23	44	33	40	48	-	133	115	1	162	83	251	
		28% <i>cjm</i>	33% <i>c</i>	22%	28%	19%	26%	37% <i>e</i>	31%	41% <i>zdef</i>	-	32% <i>j</i>	62% <i>zjk</i>	*	36% <i>zm</i>	49% <i>zmn</i>	29%	
9-10	72	37	5	30	72	5	14	9	17	19	-	-	72	1	6	65	72	
		8% <i>jkmn</i>	7%	16%	8%	4%	8%	10%	13% <i>e</i>	16% <i>zde</i>	-	-	38% <i>zjk</i>	*	1%	38% <i>zmn</i>	8%	
Net	-451	-260	-14	-177	-451	-85	-91	-36	-56	-31	-244	-278	72	-215	-277	44	-451	
		-52%	-50%	-46%	-56%	-52%	-70%	-54%	-41%	-43%	-27%	-100%	-68%	38%	-99%	-61%	26%	-52%
Mean	5.31ejm	5.52c	5.22	4.95	5.31e	4.30	5.19e	6.02zdef	5.92zdef	6.49zdef	2.18	5.68zj	8.58zjk	2.33	5.69zm	8.13zmn	5.33	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 25

Q4. Thinking back to the start of 2015, what level of priority would you say energy efficiency had at board level in your organisation at that time?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
1 - Very low priority	75	-	-	10	-	-	2	11	1	-	1	13	1	7	3	2	-	7	-	14	2	70
	9%	-	-	6%	-	-	6%	13% <i>p</i>	-	-	5%	18% <i>zchp</i>	5%	16% <i>chp</i>	9%	38%	-	14% <i>p</i>	-	11% <i>p</i>	28%	8%
2	52	-	-	7	-	1	1	4	2	-	3	4	2	4	3	-	7	3	-	11	-	54
	6%	-	-	4%	-	13%	3%	5%	6%	-	9%	5%	7%	10%	8%	-	15% <i>zc</i>	6%	-	8%	-	6%
3	118	2	2	30	4	-	8	5	1	3	2	10	4	8	10	-	7	5	3	15	-	119
	14% <i>h</i>	15%	34%	17% <i>gh</i>	36%	-	25% <i>ghs</i>	7%	2%	9%	9%	14%	13%	17% <i>h</i>	29%	-	15%	10%	12%	11%	-	14%
4	81	2	-	12	-	1	5	3	3	4	4	7	-	3	4	-	4	6	5	19	-	80
	9%	20%	-	7%	-	11%	17% <i>cg</i>	4%	7%	11%	13%	9%	2%	6%	12%	-	9%	12%	17%	14% <i>cg</i>	-	9%
5	103	1	1	22	2	1	5	4	5	4	1	12	3	8	1	-	9	10	-	16	-	107
	12%	12%	13%	13%	16%	12%	17% <i>g</i>	5%	14%	10%	3%	15%	11%	17% <i>g</i>	4%	-	20% <i>g</i>	21% <i>g</i>	-	11%	-	12%
6	94	2	-	21	*	1	2	9	3	4	2	8	5	5	-	-	3	6	6	14	2	93
	11%	20%	-	12%	4%	16%	7%	12%	8%	12%	9%	10%	17%	11%	-	-	6%	13%	20%	11%	22%	11%
7	133	2	1	32	3	1	4	15	8	4	3	8	6	3	9	-	7	1	3	21	2	136
	15% <i>q</i>	23%	13%	19% <i>m</i>	29%	14%	12%	19% <i>q</i>	22% <i>m</i>	11%	9%	11%	19%	6%	25%	-	16% <i>q</i>	2%	11%	15% <i>q</i>	23%	16%
8	115	1	-	15	1	2	2	20	9	12	4	10	5	4	3	3	3	5	1	16	-	115
	13%	10%	-	9%	8%	35%	8%	25% <i>zcfmps</i>	24% <i>cmp</i>	31%	13%	14%	17%	8%	8%	62%	7%	12%	3%	12%	-	13%
9	35	-	2	9	-	-	1	4	2	1	5	2	1	3	2	-	1	-	-	3	-	35
	4%	-	40%	5%	-	-	2%	5%	7%	4%	18%	3%	4%	6%	-	-	3%	-	-	2%	-	4%
10 - Very high priority	37	-	-	10	-	-	1	2	3	3	1	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	6	1	2	37
	4% <i>s</i>	-	-	6% <i>s</i>	-	-	2%	2%	8% <i>ms</i>	9%	12%	2%	5%	-	6%	-	3%	-	22%	*	28%	4%
Don't know	28	-	-	4	1	-	1	3	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	3	4	4	5	-	25
	3%	-	-	2%	6%	-	3%	4%	-	5%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	6%	9% <i>k</i>	15%	4%	-	3%
1-6	523	7	2	101	6	3	23	37	14	15	13	53	16	35	21	2	29	36	14	89	4	523
	60% <i>gh</i>	67%	47%	59% <i>h</i>	57%	51%	74% <i>gh</i>	46%	39%	41%	47%	71% <i>gh</i>	54%	76% <i>zcgh</i>	61%	38%	65% <i>h</i>	77% <i>zcgh</i>	49%	66% <i>gh</i>	49%	60%
7-8	248	4	1	47	4	3	6	35	17	16	6	18	11	6	11	3	11	6	4	37	2	251
	28% <i>m</i>	33%	13%	28% <i>m</i>	37%	49%	20%	44% <i>zcfkmpqs</i>	46% <i>zcfkmpqs</i>	42%	22%	24%	37%	14%	33%	62%	23%	14%	14%	27%	23%	29%
9-10	72	-	2	18	-	-	1	6	5	5	8	3	3	3	2	-	3	-	6	4	2	72
	8% <i>s</i>	-	40%	11% <i>qs</i>	-	-	4%	7%	15% <i>qs</i>	13%	30%	5%	9%	6%	6%	-	6%	-	22%	3%	28%	8%
Net	-451	-7	*	-83	-6	-3	-22	-31	-9	-11	-5	-50	-14	-32	-19	-2	-26	-36	-8	-85	-2	-451
	-52%	-67%	-7%	-48%	-57%	-51%	-70%	-39%	-25%	-28%	-17%	-67%	-46%	-70%	-55%	-38%	-59%	-77%	-27%	-63%	-22%	-52%
Mean	5.31 <i>m</i>	5.47	6.19	5.49 <i>kmqs</i>	5.13	5.96	4.72	5.69 <i>mqs</i>	6.52 <i>zcfkmpqs</i>	6.66	6.21	4.70	5.81	4.36	4.73	5.36	5.03	4.37	6.43	4.84	5.95	5.33

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 26

Q5. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	119 14%h	111	1	8	3	10	8	12	1	1	26	27	13	4	3	4	7	66	53	127
Increased slightly since early 2015	265 30%	224	4	37	10	20	16	17	19	5	72	41	16	25	4	4	13	119	142	257
Decreased significantly since early 2015	9 1%	8	-	2	-	-	1	2	1	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	1	4	5	9
Decreased slightly since early 2015	30 3%	26	-	4	-	5	2	-	3	9	4	-	2	1	-	-	3	16	13	30
Stayed the same	438 50%	387	5	45	10	42	19	28	41	9	119	70	28	24	9	10	22	223	209	440
Don't know	9 1%	6	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	3	2	-	2	-	-	5	4	8
Increased	385 44%	335	5	45	13	29	25	29	20	6	97	68	29	29	7	8	20	185	195	384
Decreased	39 4%	33	-	6	-	5	3	2	3	3	10	5	2	1	-	-	5	20	18	39

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 27

Q5. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	119	18	102	26	26	32	25	6	4	37	14	45	6	17	21	56	93	26	127
	14%	11%	14%	13%	13%	17%	14%	17%	8%	12%	13%	16%	15%	14%	14%	14%	15%	11%	15%
Increased slightly since early 2015	265	42	224	64	59	52	56	15	18	98	32	83	9	44	42	119	189	73	257
	30%	25%	32%	32%	28%	27%	31%	44%	32%	32%	31%	30%	23%	36%	29%	29%	30%	31%	30%
Decreased significantly since early 2015	9	3	6	3	2	3	-	-	2	3	-	5	2	1	1	4	5	4	9
	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	3% <i>f</i>	1%	-	2%	4%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Decreased slightly since early 2015	30	7	23	4	10	3	8	2	2	7	5	14	2	3	4	14	24	4	30
	3%	4%	3%	2%	5%	2%	4%	7%	4%	2%	5%	5%	4%	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%
Stayed the same	438	94	344	101	107	98	91	10	29	155	53	130	23	57	74	212	309	127	440
	50% <i>g</i>	56%	49%	51%	52% <i>g</i>	52% <i>g</i>	50%	31%	54%	51%	51%	47%	55%	46%	51%	52%	49%	54%	51%
Don't know	9	4	6	2	2	2	2	-	-	4	-	2	-	1	3	4	8	2	8
	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Increased	385	59	325	90	85	85	80	20	22	135	46	128	15	62	63	174	282	99	384
	44%	36%	46% <i>a</i>	45%	41%	44%	44%	62% <i>d</i>	40%	44%	44%	46%	38%	50%	43%	43%	45%	42%	44%
Decreased	39	10	29	7	12	6	8	2	4	9	5	20	3	4	5	18	30	8	39
	4%	6%	4%	4%	6%	3%	4%	7%	7%	3%	5%	7% <i>l</i>	7%	3%	3%	4%	5%	3%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 28

Q5. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	119 14%	26 13%	57 13%	14 16%	21 14%	19 17%	72 12%	94 14%	14 18%	28 26%zgj	16 11%	60 17%	3 10%	28 13%	83 14%	28 11%	11 13%	26 17%	33 13%	127 15%
Increased slightly since early 2015	265 30% <i>d</i>	62 32% <i>d</i>	135 32% <i>d</i>	33 36% <i>d</i>	30 20%	38 33%	176 31%	213 31%	27 34%	28 28%	49 35%	112 32%	14 46%	64 29%	179 30%	80 32%	21 23%	37 23%	78 31%	257 30%
Decreased significantly since early 2015	9 1%	3 1%	4 1%	- 2%	3 1%	1 1%	6 1%	7 1%	1 1%	- -	2 1%	5 2%	- -	* -	4 1%	- -	- -	2 1%	5 2%	9 1%
Decreased slightly since early 2015	30 3%	9 5%	14 3%	3 3%	2 1%	4 3%	17 3%	21 3%	2 3%	5 5%	5 4%	8 2%	- -	9 4%	23 4%	7 3%	3 4%	6 4%	7 3%	30 3%
Stayed the same	438 50% <i>f</i>	95 49%	210 50%	40 45%	88 60% <i>c</i>	51 44%	306 53%	347 50% <i>f</i>	36 45%	39 39%	66 47%	166 47%	13 44%	118 54%	302 50%	134 53%	55 61%	86 54%	122 49%	440 51%
Don't know	9 1%	- -	4 1%	- -	4 3% <i>g</i>	3 2% <i>f</i>	1 *	6 1%	- -	- -	2 2%	- -	- -	1 *	6 1%	2 1%	- -	2 1%	3 1%	8 1%
Increased	385 44%	88 45%	192 45% <i>d</i>	47 52% <i>d</i>	51 34%	57 49%	248 43%	307 45%	41 51%	56 56% <i>zg</i>	65 46%	172 49%	17 56%	92 42%	263 44%	108 43%	32 35%	64 40%	111 45%	384 44%
Decreased	39 4%	12 6%	17 4%	3 3%	5 3%	5 4%	22 4%	28 4%	3 4%	5 5%	7 5%	13 4%	- -	10 4%	27 5%	7 3%	3 4%	8 5%	12 5%	39 4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 29

Q5. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	119	107	2	10	119	19	24	15	16	15	36	75	8	31	75	12	127
	14%clo	20%zc	8%	3%	14%	16%	14%	16%	12%	13%	15%l	18%l	4%	14%o	16%o	7%	15%
Increased slightly since early 2015	265	212	5	46	265	40	63	18	39	38	66	152	34	62	166	28	257
	30%clo	41%zc	18%	15%	30%	33%	38%g	21%	30%	32%	27%	37%zl	18%	29%o	36%zo	16%	30%
Decreased significantly since early 2015	9	3	2	4	9	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	5	2	4	3	9
	1%	1%	8%	1%	1%	2%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Decreased slightly since early 2015	30	13	3	14	30	5	9	1	3	5	4	15	9	6	13	10	30
	3%	2%	10%	4%	3%	4%	6%	1%	2%	4%	2%	4%	5%	3%	3%	6%	3%
Stayed the same	438	183	17	237	438	52	71	52	73	58	136	165	130	115	198	119	440
	50%akn	35%	56%	76%za	50%	43%	42%	59%ef	56%f	50%	56%k	40%	70%zjk	53%n	43%	69%zmn	51%
Don't know	9	4	-	2	9	3	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	8
	1%n	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	1%
Increased	385	319	8	56	385	59	87	33	54	53	101	227	43	93	241	40	384
	44%clo	61%zc	26%	18%	44%	49%	52%g	37%	42%	46%	41%l	55%zl	23%	43%o	53%zmo	23%	44%
Decreased	39	16	5	18	39	7	10	2	3	5	7	17	14	9	18	13	39
	4%	3%	18%	6%	4%	6%	6%	2%	3%	5%	3%	4%	7%j	4%	4%	8%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 30

Q5. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	119	1	1	21	2	1	6	11	4	5	1	14	5	5	3	-	1	10	1	28	-	127
	14%p	7%	13%	12%	25%	16%	21%p	14%	10%	13%	3%	19%p	16%	10%	9%	-	2%	21%p	4%	20%zp	-	15%
Increased slightly since early 2015	265	5	-	47	1	1	12	25	11	3	14	8	14	12	1	22	15	16	44	2	257	
	30%	43%	-	27%	14%	24%	37%k	31%	31%	30%	11%	18%	27%	31%	36%	27%	45%zck	32%	54%	33%	22%	30%
Decreased significantly since early 2015	9	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	9
	1%	-	-	1%	16%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	3%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
Decreased slightly since early 2015	30	-	-	5	-	-	1	5	-	3	1	5	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	7	-	30
	3%	-	-	3%	-	-	5%	6%	-	7%	5%	6%	-	2%	-	-	5%	-	-	5%	-	3%
Stayed the same	438	5	4	93	4	3	12	40	21	16	21	40	17	25	18	4	19	22	12	53	6	440
	50% <i>s</i>	50%	87%	55% <i>s</i>	45%	60%	37%	49%	59% <i>s</i>	42%	45%	74%	55%	57%	54%	73%	42%	46%	41%	39%	78%	51%
Don't know	9	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	8
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	1%	-	2%	-	1%
Increased	385	5	1	68	4	2	18	37	15	16	4	28	13	19	15	1	23	25	17	72	2	384
	44%	50%	13%	40%	39%	40%	58% <i>c</i>	45%	41%	43%	14%	37%	43%	41%	45%	27%	51%	53%	59%	53% <i>ck</i>	22%	44%
Decreased	39	-	-	7	2	-	1	5	-	4	1	6	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	8	-	39
	4%	-	-	4%	16%	-	5%	6%	-	11%	5%	9%	-	4%	-	-	5%	-	-	6%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 31

Q6. Thinking back again to early 2015, what level of priority would you say your organisation as a whole placed on energy efficiency at that time?
Remember that we are interested in your own organization, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (g)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
1 - Very low priority	55	46	1	8	1	9	1	1	1	-	26	6	2	1	-	-	4	22	32	50
	6%	6%	11%	8%	5%	11%	2%	2%	3%	11%zk	4%	3%	1%	-	-	-	9%	5%	8%	6%
2	55	48	2	6	1	11	1	2	4	-	15	10	3	1	-	1	4	28	27	55
	6%	6%	15%	6%	5%	15%ztfjm	4%	7%	5%	7%	7%	5%	2%	-	8%	9%	9%	6%	6%	6%
3	108	92	-	16	2	13	4	9	6	4	21	18	12	7	1	2	4	49	58	108
	12%	12%	-	16%	10%	17%	9%	15%	9%	24%	9%	12%	13%	3%	9%	9%	9%	11%	14%	12%
4	88	84	-	3	2	5	4	8	3	4	27	18	2	9	1	-	4	49	36	86
	10%	11%	-	3%	11%	6%	8%	13%	5%	21%	12%	12%	4%	16%l	6%	-	8%	11%	9%	10%
5	115	103	2	11	4	2	12	7	7	3	33	18	10	9	1	1	7	67	48	120
	13%e	13%	15%	11%	19%	3%	27%zehk	12%e	10%	19%	15%e	13%e	16%e	17%e	6%	4%	15%e	16%	11%	14%
6	111	101	1	9	6	9	8	7	6	1	27	23	6	4	3	1	49	60	116	
	13%p	13%	8%	9%	26%	11%	18%p	13%	9%	5%	12%	16%p	11%	10%	20%	19%	2%	11%	14%	13%
7	143	124	3	16	4	10	6	5	17	1	33	28	12	13	2	11	73	69	144	
	16%	16%	26%	17%	17%	13%	13%	8%	26%g	7%	15%	19%	19%	23%	11%	9%	23%	17%	16%	17%
8	104	88	1	16	1	8	6	14	11	3	20	11	8	5	3	5	54	49	105	
	12%	12%	4%	16%	3%	10%	14%	23%z/jk	17%	17%	9%	8%	14%	10%	15%	51%	11%	12%	12%	12%
9	30	28	-	2	*	4	1	2	3	-	6	*	3	2	4	-	3	12	16	29
	3%k	4%	-	2%	2%	5%k	2%	4%	4%	-	3%	*	4%k	3%	21%	-	7%k	3%	4%	3%
10 - Very high priority	38	30	1	7	1	5	3	1	6	1	10	5	1	2	1	2	21	15	37	
	4%	4%	9%	7%	3%	7%	7%	2%	9%	5%	4%	3%	1%	2%	8%	-	3%	5%	4%	4%
Don't know	25	18	1	6	-	1	-	2	1	-	8	8	2	1	2	-	1	10	14	21
	3%	2%	12%	6%	-	1%	-	4%	1%	-	4%	5%	3%	2%	10%	-	2%	2%	3%	2%
1-6	532	474	6	52	18	48	30	34	28	12	150	93	35	33	7	7	25	264	262	535
	61%h	62%	49%	53%	76%	64%h	65%h	59%	43%	70%	66%h	64%h	58%	61%	36%	40%	53%	61%	62%	61%
7-8	247	212	3	32	5	18	12	18	28	4	54	39	20	18	5	11	16	127	118	249
	28%	28%	30%	32%	20%	23%	27%	32%	43%zejk	25%	23%	27%	33%	32%	25%	60%	34%	29%	28%	29%
9-10	67	58	1	8	1	9	4	3	9	1	16	5	3	3	5	-	5	33	32	66
	8%	8%	9%	9%	5%	12%k	8%	6%	13%k	5%	7%	4%	6%	5%	29%	-	11%	8%	7%	8%
Net	-464	-416	-5	-44	-17	-39	-26	-31	-19	-11	-134	-88	-31	-31	-1	-7	-20	-231	-231	-469
	-53%	-55%	-40%	-45%	-71%	-52%	-57%	-53%	-29%	-65%	-59%	-60%	-53%	-56%	-7%	-40%	-43%	-53%	-54%	-54%
Mean	5.39	5.38	5.33	5.50	5.21	4.93	5.87j	5.63	6.25zejk	5.29	5.04	5.24	5.47	5.49	7.18	6.50	5.36	5.45	5.30	5.42

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 32

Q6. Thinking back again to early 2015, what level of priority would you say your organisation as a whole placed on energy efficiency at that time?
Remember that we are interested in your own organization, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
1 - Very low priority	55	14	41	21	10	8	13	2	1	13	9	26	7	3	12	24	34	20	50
	6%	8%	6%	10% <i>eh</i>	5%	4%	7%	6%	1%	4%	8%	9% <i>f</i>	17%	2%	8%	6%	5%	9%	6%
2	55	9	46	14	20	11	9	1	-	20	6	19	5	13	11	22	35	20	55
	6%	5%	7%	7%	10% <i>h</i>	6%	5%	4%	-	6%	6%	7%	12%	11%	7%	5%	6%	9%	6%
3	108	21	87	28	27	21	19	5	7	27	17	42	8	13	18	51	71	36	108
	12%	13%	12%	14%	13%	11%	10%	16%	13%	9%	16%	15% <i>l</i>	20%	10%	13%	13%	11%	15%	12%
4	88	12	75	18	19	19	23	4	5	29	13	27	4	17	14	39	68	17	86
	10%	7%	11%	9%	9%	10%	13%	12%	10%	10%	13%	10%	10%	14%	10%	10%	11%	7%	10%
5	115	21	95	23	26	29	28	2	5	36	15	35	4	19	22	49	90	25	120
	13%	12%	13%	12%	13%	15%	16%	6%	9%	12%	14%	13%	10%	15%	15%	12%	14%	11%	14%
6	111	20	91	23	26	21	23	5	13	37	9	35	3	20	19	59	83	27	116
	13%	12%	13%	12%	13%	11%	13%	15%	23% <i>zce</i>	12%	9%	13%	8%	16%	13%	14%	13%	11%	13%
7	143	32	111	34	26	32	28	9	13	66	12	40	1	18	22	75	104	39	144
	16%	19%	16%	17%	13%	17%	15%	27% <i>d</i>	24% <i>d</i>	22% <i>jk</i>	11%	14%	3%	15%	15%	18%	17%	16%	17%
8	104	20	85	22	32	24	18	2	7	43	13	30	4	14	17	50	77	25	105
	12%	12%	12%	11%	15%	12%	10%	5%	14%	14%	13%	11%	9%	12%	12%	12%	12%	11%	12%
9	30	6	24	7	7	6	8	-	2	11	2	13	2	1	4	14	22	8	29
	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	-	4%	4%	2%	5%	6%	*	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%
10 - Very high priority	38	5	33	4	6	16	8	2	1	11	3	9	2	5	4	18	28	9	37
	4%	3%	5%	2%	3%	8% <i>zcd</i>	4%	6%	2%	4%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%	5%	4%	4%
Don't know	25	7	18	6	6	3	4	1	-	9	5	4	-	2	3	7	15	9	21
	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	4%	-	3%	5%	1%	-	1%	2%	2%	2%	4%	2%
1-6	532	97	435	126	129	110	115	19	31	162	69	184	32	83	96	244	381	146	535
	61% <i>i</i>	58%	62%	63%	62%	57%	64%	59%	56%	54%	66% <i>i</i>	66% <i>i</i>	77%	68%	66%	60%	61%	62%	61%
7-8	247	52	195	56	58	56	46	10	21	109	25	70	5	32	39	125	181	64	249
	28%	31%	28%	28%	28%	29%	25%	32%	38%	36% <i>zk</i>	24%	25%	13%	26%	27%	31%	29%	27%	29%
9-10	67	11	56	11	14	22	16	2	3	23	5	22	4	5	7	32	51	17	66
	8%	7%	8%	5%	7%	11%	9%	6%	6%	7%	5%	8%	10%	4%	5%	8%	8%	7%	8%
Net	-464	-86	-378	-115	-115	-88	-99	-17	-28	-140	-64	-162	-28	-78	-88	-213	-330	-129	-469
	-53%	-52%	-54%	-56%	-56%	-56%	-55%	-53%	-50%	-46%	-61%	-58%	-67%	-64%	-61%	-52%	-53%	-55%	-54%
Mean	5.39	5.35	5.40	5.04	5.31	5.71c	5.38	5.34	5.95c	5.69jk	4.96	5.12	4.34	5.28	5.11	5.50	5.49	5.11	5.42

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 33

Q6. Thinking back again to early 2015, what level of priority would you say your organisation as a whole placed on energy efficiency at that time? Remember that we are interested in your own organization, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
1 - Very low priority	55 6% ^b	18 9% ^b	12 3%	4 4%	20 13% ^{zbc}	7 6%	34 6%	39 6%	6 7%	2 2%	3 2%	14 4%	2 6%	16 7%	25 4%	10 4%	3 3%	4 2%	27 11% ^{znopq}	50 6%
2	55 6% ^{oq}	12 6%	24 6%	3 4%	15 10%	5 5%	39 7%	44 6%	4 6%	7 7%	8 6%	27 8%	1 3%	13 6%	25 4%	6 2%	3 3%	3 2%	30 12% ^{znopq}	55 6%
3	108 12% ^{fi}	30 15%	53 13%	9 10%	15 10%	14 12%	75 13% ⁱ	88 13% ⁱ	4 6%	3 3%	15 11% ⁱ	39 11%	4 12%	32 15%	72 12%	33 13%	5 6%	17 11%	35 14%	108 12%
4	88 10%	21 11%	39 9%	10 11%	17 12%	10 8%	69 12% ⁱ	78 11% ⁱ	7 9%	4 4%	12 9%	43 12%	5 16%	18 8%	59 10%	24 9%	7 8%	14 9%	29 12%	86 10%
5	115 13%	25 13%	54 13%	14 15%	18 12%	16 14%	80 14%	94 18%	14 16%	16 16%	20 14%	48 14%	3 10%	31 14%	83 14%	31 12%	7 8%	14 9%	32 13%	120 14%
6	111 13%	20 10%	59 14%	11 12%	21 14%	12 10%	73 13%	80 12%	12 15%	18 18%	19 13%	37 11%	4 12%	38 17% ^{kl}	79 13%	32 13%	15 16%	15 9%	30 12%	116 13%
7	143 16% ^{dr}	26 13%	87 21% ^{ad}	15 17%	12 8%	23 20%	94 16%	114 17%	13 16%	19 19%	24 17%	64 18%	7 24%	33 15%	114 19% ^r	58 23% ^{zr}	13 14%	27 17% ^r	22 9%	144 17%
8	104 12% ^d	28 15% ^d	54 13% ^d	13 15% ^d	8 5%	15 13%	66 11%	81 12%	13 16%	12 12%	16 12%	46 13%	3 10%	22 10%	73 12%	26 10%	18 20% ^{znor}	38 24% ^{znor}	25 10%	105 12%
9	30 3%	4 2%	15 4%	7 8% ^a	3 2%	4 3%	19 3%	23 3%	3 4%	6 6%	7 5%	15 4%	- 8%	6 3%	22 4%	14 6%	7 8% ^z	9 6%	7 3%	29 3%
10 - Very high priority	38 4%	6 3%	18 4%	3 3%	11 8%	6 5%	20 3%	28 4%	3 4%	9 9% ^{zg}	10 7%	17 5%	2 8%	8 3%	33 6% ^r	15 6% ^r	10 11% ^{zr}	15 9% ^{zr}	4 2%	37 4%
Don't know	25 3% ^k	4 2%	8 2%	1 1%	4 4%	4 3%	9 1%	19 3%	- -	2 2%	4 4%	2 1%	- -	4 2%	13 2%	2 1%	2 2%	3 2%	8 3%	21 2%
1-6	532 61% ^{pq}	127 65%	242 57%	51 57%	107 72% ^{zbc}	64 56%	370 64% ⁱ	422 61% ⁱ	48 60%	51 51%	77 55%	207 59%	18 59%	149 68% ^k	343 57% ^{pq}	136 54% ^q	40 44%	67 42%	181 73% ^{znopq}	535 61%
7-8	247 28% ^{dr}	54 28% ^d	141 33% ^d	28 32% ^d	20 14%	38 33%	160 28%	195 28%	26 32%	32 32%	41 29%	110 31%	10 34%	55 25%	187 31% ^r	84 33% ^r	31 35% ^r	65 41% ^{znr}	47 19%	249 29%
9-10	67 8%	10 5%	33 8%	10 11%	15 10%	9 8%	39 7%	51 7%	6 8%	15 15% ^{zg}	17 12%	32 9%	2 8%	13 6%	55 9% ^r	29 11% ^r	17 19% ^{znr}	24 15% ^{znr}	11 4%	66 8%
Net	-464 -53%	-117 -60%	-209 -49%	-41 -46%	-92 -63%	-55 -47%	-332 -57%	-371 -54%	-42 -53%	-35 -35%	-60 -43%	-175 -50%	-16 -51%	-136 -62%	-287 -48%	-107 -43%	-23 -25%	-43 -27%	-170 -69%	-469 -54%
Mean	5.39 ^{dr}	5.07	5.67 ^{ad}	5.79 ^{ad}	4.77	5.56	5.28	5.37	5.65	6.27 ^{zg}	5.86 ^{zg}	5.55	5.56	5.20	5.69 ^{zr}	5.83 ^{zr}	6.53 ^{znor}	6.41 ^{znor}	4.60	5.42

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/a/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 34

Q6. Thinking back again to early 2015, what level of priority would you say your organisation as a whole placed on energy efficiency at that time? Remember that we are interested in your own organization, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (a)	Increased (b)	Decreased (c)	Stayed the same (d)	£0 - no investment (e)	Less than £10,000 (f)	£10,000 - £49,999 (g)	£50,000 - £99,999 (h)	£100,000 - £499,999 (i)	£500,000 or more (j)	Low (k)	Medium (l)	High (m)	Low (n)	Medium (o)		High (p)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
1 - Very low priority	55	22	3	30	55	11	7	1	1	2	53	1	-	55	-	-	50
	6%hkln	4%	10%	9%a	6%h	9%ghi	4%	1%	1%	2%	22%zkl	*	-	25%zno	-	-	6%
2	55	33	2	20	55	16	12	4	9	2	52	3	-	55	-	-	55
	6%kln	6%	7%	6%	6%	13%zdi	7%	5%	7%	2%	21%zkl	1%	-	25%zno	-	-	6%
3	108	58	4	46	108	22	28	6	15	5	95	12	1	108	-	-	108
	12%klno	11%	12%	15%	12%i	18%gi	17%gi	7%	11%	4%	39%zkl	3%	*	50%zno	-	-	12%
4	88	60	2	26	88	23	18	10	6	11	14	73	1	-	88	-	86
	10%hlmo	11%	5%	8%	10%h	15%zdh	11%	12%	4%	9%	6%l	16%zjl	*	-	19%zmo	-	10%
5	115	72	4	39	115	11	22	11	24	11	19	87	6	-	115	-	120
	13%jimo	14%	13%	13%	13%	9%	13%	13%	18%	9%	8%	21%zjl	3%	-	25%zmo	-	14%
6	111	67	5	39	111	4	21	10	23	20	4	89	15	-	111	-	116
	13%eimo	13%	18%	12%	13%e	3%	13%e	12%e	18%e	17%e	2%	22%zjl	8%j	-	24%zmo	-	13%
7	143	97	4	42	143	11	30	25	28	2	110	30	-	143	-	-	144
	16%jmo	19%	13%	13%	16%	9%	18%	28%zde	17%	24%e	1%	27%zjl	16%j	-	31%zmo	-	17%
8	104	68	2	35	104	15	15	7	23	20	2	27	75	-	-	104	105
	12%jkmn	13%	5%	11%	12%	12%	9%	7%	17%fg	17%	1%	7%j	40%zjk	-	-	61%zmn	12%
9	30	14	3	13	30	2	5	4	4	8	1	27	4	-	-	30	29
	3%jkmn	3%	9%	4%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	7%	*	1%	14%zjk	-	-	17%zmn	3%
10 - Very high priority	38	18	2	18	38	4	5	8	5	9	1	2	33	-	-	38	37
	4%kmn	3%	7%	6%	4%	3%	3%	5%zdf	4%	8%	*	1%	18%zjk	-	-	22%zmn	4%
Don't know	25	14	-	5	25	2	4	2	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	21
	3%klmno	3%	-	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	2%
1-6	532	312	20	199	532	86	109	43	77	51	236	266	23	217	314	-	535
	61%qilo	60%	66%	64%	61%gi	72%zdgi	65%gi	49%	59%li	44%	97%zkl	65%li	12%	100%zno	69%zo	-	61%
7-8	247	165	6	77	247	26	45	31	45	48	5	137	105	-	143	104	249
	28%jlm	32%	18%	25%	28%	22%	27%	35%e	34%e	41%zdef	2%	33%j	56%zjk	-	31%lm	61%zmn	29%
9-10	67	31	5	31	67	6	11	12	9	17	1	4	60	-	-	67	66
	8%jkmn	6%	16%	10%	8%	5%	6%	14%e	7%	15%zdef	*	1%	32%zjk	-	-	39%zmn	8%
Net	-464	-281	-15	-168	-464	-80	-98	-31	-68	-34	-235	-262	37	-217	-314	67	-469
	-53%	-54%	-50%	-54%	-53%	-67%	-58%	-36%	-52%	-29%	-96%	-64%	20%	-100%	-69%	39%	-54%
Mean	5.39ejm	5.48	5.36	5.25	5.39e	4.50	5.21e	6.10zdef	5.85zdef	6.53zdefh	2.73	5.73zj	8.04zjk	2.24	5.68zm	8.61zmn	5.42

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 35

Q6. Thinking back again to early 2015, what level of priority would you say your organisation as a whole placed on energy efficiency at that time?
Remember that we are interested in your own organization, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)			
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871	
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871	
1 - Very low priority	55	-	-	6	-	-	3	9	1	-	1	13	1	3	2	-	2	-	12	-	12	-	50
	6%	-	-	4%	-	-	9%p	11%p	2%	-	5%	17%zchp	2%	7%	5%	38%	-	4%	-	9%c	-	6%	
2	55	2	-	9	-	-	2	3	1	-	3	3	1	6	4	-	3	5	-	12	2	55	
	6%	15%	-	5%	-	-	5%	4%	3%	-	9%	4%	3%	13%	12%	-	6%	11%	-	9%	28%	6%	
3	108	-	1	26	4	1	4	6	1	3	2	8	5	8	9	-	9	6	2	13	-	108	
	12%	-	19%	15%h	36%	13%	13%	8%	4%	9%	6%	10%	15%	18%h	28%	-	21%h	13%	7%	10%	-	12%	
4	88	2	-	10	-	-	6	5	4	6	4	8	1	2	4	-	3	7	4	23	-	86	
	10%	20%	-	6%	-	-	15%cm	7%	10%	15%	13%	11%	2%	4%	12%	-	6%	14%	13%	17%zcm	-	10%	
5	115	1	-	26	1	-	4	7	4	5	2	9	7	8	4	-	10	7	4	19	-	120	
	13%	8%	-	15%	14%	-	12%	9%	11%	13%	5%	11%	22%	17%	11%	-	21%	15%	15%	14%	-	14%	
6	111	1	1	19	2	2	3	14	2	4	1	6	4	5	1	1	8	8	6	19	2	116	
	13%	13%	26%	11%	20%	38%	10%	18%	7%	11%	2%	7%	15%	18%	4%	27%	19%	17%	20%	14%	22%	13%	
7	143	3	-	28	2	1	5	16	12	4	4	16	9	6	4	-	6	2	5	19	2	144	
	16%	25%	-	17%	16%	22%	15%	20%q	32%zcmqs	9%	13%	22%q	30%	12%	13%	-	14%	5%	16%	14%	23%	17%	
8	104	1	1	23	1	1	4	14	7	9	4	9	1	3	5	2	2	6	-	11	-	105	
	12%	7%	15%	14%	8%	27%	12%	18%	20%ps	25%	13%	12%	5%	8%	15%	35%	5%	12%	-	8%	-	12%	
9	30	1	2	9	-	-	1	1	1	-	4	3	1	3	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	29	
	3%	12%	40%	5%	-	-	2%	1%	3%	-	15%	3%	4%	6%	-	-	3%	-	-	2%	-	3%	
10 - Very high priority	38	-	-	8	1	-	-	3	3	5	3	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	6	1	2	37	
	4%	-	-	5%	6%	-	-	4%	8%e	14%	12%	2%	3%	2%	-	-	4%	-	22%	1%	28%	4%	
Don't know	25	-	-	6	-	-	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	2	4	-	21	
	3%	-	-	4%	-	-	3%	2%	-	5%	6%	-	-	3%	-	-	2%	9%zk	8%	3%	-	2%	
1-6	532	6	2	97	7	3	21	45	13	18	11	46	18	32	24	3	32	35	16	97	4	535	
	61%h	56%	46%	57%h	71%	51%	68%h	55%	37%	48%	41%	61%h	59%	69%h	72%	65%	72%h	74%h	54%	72%zcg	49%	61%	
7-8	247	3	1	51	2	3	8	30	19	13	7	25	10	30	9	2	9	8	5	30	2	249	
	28%	32%	15%	30%	23%	49%	27%	38%mq	52%zcfmpqs	34%	26%	34%	34%	20%	28%	35%	19%	17%	16%	22%	23%	29%	
9-10	67	1	2	17	1	-	1	4	4	5	8	4	2	3	-	-	3	-	6	5	2	66	
	8%	12%	40%	10%e	6%	-	2%	5%	11%qs	14%	27%	5%	7%	7%	-	-	7%	-	22%	3%	28%	8%	
Net	-464	-5	*	-80	-6	-3	-21	-41	-9	-13	-4	-42	-16	-28	-24	-3	-29	-35	-9	-93	-2	-469	
	-53%	-44%	-6%	-47%	-64%	-51%	-66%	-50%	-26%	-34%	-13%	-56%	-52%	-62%	-72%	-65%	-65%	-74%	-32%	-69%	-22%	-54%	
Mean	5.39s	5.68	6.92	5.63mq	5.32	6.35	4.89	5.59s	6.49zcfkmpqs	6.46	6.24	4.95	5.68	4.80	4.50	4.82	5.28	4.73	6.47	4.81	6.23	5.42	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 36

Q7. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	108	101	1	7	4	6	5	9	3	3	22	28	10	6	-	1	9	64	43	117
	12%	13%	5%	7%	19%	8%	11%	15%	5%	19%	9%	20% <i>z</i>	17%	11%	-	4%	19% <i>h</i>	15%	10%	13%
Increased slightly since early 2015	264	237	5	23	8	23	15	20	16	3	81	38	15	21	5	4	12	124	136	264
	30%	31%	44%	23%	34%	31%	32%	34%	24%	15%	35%	26%	32%	39%	26%	23%	25%	29%	32%	30%
Decreased significantly since early 2015	6	4	-	2	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	4	5
	1%	1%	-	2%	-	1%	2%	-	2%	-	1%	-	3% <i>k</i>	-	-	-	-	*	1%	1%
Decreased slightly since early 2015	23	21	-	2	-	3	1	5	2	1	1	3	1	3	1	-	1	14	9	23
	3%	3%	-	2%	-	5% <i>j</i>	2%	8% <i>zj</i>	3%	5%	1%	2%	2%	6% <i>fj</i>	4%	-	2%	3%	2%	3%
Stayed the same	461	395	5	61	11	42	24	24	43	11	121	72	31	24	13	13	25	226	228	455
	53%	52%	45%	62%	48%	56%	52%	41%	65% <i>gm</i>	61%	53%	50%	51%	44%	70%	72%	54%	52%	53%	52%
Don't know	9	5	1	4	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	4	2	-	-	-	-	4	5	7
	1%	1%	6%	4% <i>a</i>	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
Increased	373	338	6	29	12	29	20	29	20	6	102	66	25	27	5	5	20	189	180	381
	43%	44%	49%	30%	52%	39%	43%	49%	30%	34%	45%	46%	41%	50% <i>h</i>	26%	28%	44%	44%	42%	44%
Decreased	28	25	-	4	-	4	2	5	3	1	3	3	3	3	1	-	1	15	13	28
	3%	3%	-	4%	-	5%	4%	8% <i>j</i>	4%	5%	1%	2%	5%	6%	4%	-	2%	4%	3%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 37

Q7. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	108	19	90	21	28	33	18	4	5	36	13	41	4	16	16	53	78	30	117
	12%	11%	13%	10%	13%	17% <i>f</i>	10%	11%	9%	12%	13%	15%	9%	13%	11%	13%	12%	13%	13%
Increased slightly since early 2015	264	40	224	59	60	48	60	16	18	98	27	83	12	40	48	124	199	63	264
	30%	24%	32%	30%	29%	25%	33%	48% <i>z</i>	34% <i>d</i>	32%	26%	30%	29%	33%	33%	30%	32%	27%	30%
Decreased significantly since early 2015	6	3	3	3	1	-	2	-	-	1	1	3	1	-	1	2	3	3	5
	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	3%	-	1%	-	*	1%	1%
Decreased slightly since early 2015	23	4	19	3	7	8	3	2	-	8	1	10	2	3	6	8	20	3	23
	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	2%	6%	-	3%	1%	3%	4%	2%	4%	2%	3%	1%	3%
Stayed the same	461	100	361	112	108	99	98	11	31	157	62	140	23	63	73	219	321	136	455
	53% <i>g</i>	60%	51%	56% <i>g</i>	52%	52%	54% <i>g</i>	35%	57%	52%	60%	50%	55%	52%	50%	54%	51%	58%	52%
Don't know	9	1	8	1	4	3	-	-	-	4	-	3	-	1	2	2	7	2	7
	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%
Increased	373	59	314	80	87	81	78	19	23	134	40	125	16	56	64	177	277	92	381
	43%	35%	45%	40%	42%	43%	43%	59%	43%	44%	39%	45%	39%	45%	44%	43%	44%	39%	44%
Decreased	28	7	22	6	8	8	5	2	-	8	2	13	3	3	7	10	23	5	28
	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	6%	-	3%	2%	4%	6%	2%	5%	2%	4%	2%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 38

Q7. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	108 12%	25 13%	51 12%	13 14%	13 13%	16 14%	67 12%	85 12%	17 21% <i>zgj</i>	28 26% <i>zgj</i>	18 13%	66 19% <i>zm</i>	3 10%	23 11%	80 13%	29 11%	10 11%	24 15%	25 10%	117 13%
Increased slightly since early 2015	264 30%	61 31%	128 30%	32 36%	39 26%	48 41% <i>zf</i>	173 30%	215 31%	25 31%	31 31%	47 34%	106 30%	12 39%	63 29%	191 32%	78 31%	23 25%	45 28%	64 26%	264 30%
Decreased significantly since early 2015	6 1%	2 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	4 1%	3 *	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	2 1%	6 1%	2 1%	-	1 *	-	5 1%
Decreased slightly since early 2015	23 3%	4 2%	10 2%	3 4%	5 3%	3 3%	14 2%	18 3%	-	2 2%	3 2%	7 2%	-	7 3%	15 3%	6 2%	-	1 *	6 3%	23 3%
Stayed the same	461 53% <i>ei</i>	104 53%	228 54%	40 45%	83 56%	46 40%	317 55% <i>ee</i>	360 52% <i>fi</i>	37 46%	39 39%	69 49%	173 49%	16 51%	123 56%	301 50%	136 54%	57 64% <i>ni</i>	89 56%	148 60% <i>ni</i>	455 52%
Don't know	9 1%	-	3 1%	1 1%	3 2%	2 2%	3 *	7 1%	-	-	2 2%	-	-	2 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	4 2%	7 1%
Increased	373 43%	86 44%	179 42%	45 50%	57 39%	64 56% <i>zf</i>	240 42%	300 44%	42 52%	59 59% <i>zg</i>	65 46%	172 49% <i>m</i>	15 49%	87 39%	271 45% <i>r</i>	107 43%	33 36%	69 44%	90 36%	381 44%
Decreased	28 3%	6 3%	13 3%	3 4%	5 3%	3 3%	18 3%	21 3%	1 1%	2 2%	4 3%	7 2%	-	9 4%	21 4%	8 3%	-	1 1%	6 3%	28 3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q7. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		(p)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	108	100	-	8	108	10	23	14	18	14	36	58	13	31	66	7	117
	12%co	19%zc	-	3%	12%	8%	14%	15%	14%	12%	15%l	14%l	7%	14%o	14%o	4%	13%
Increased slightly since early 2015	264	208	6	48	264	43	59	20	33	40	67	140	44	61	174	22	264
	30%co	40%zc	20%	15%	30%	36%	35%g	22%	26%	34%	28%	34%l	23%	28%o	38%zmo	13%	30%
Decreased significantly since early 2015	6	2	1	3	6	2	-	-	-	1	3	3	-	3	2	1	5
	1%	*	4%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	*	1%	1%	-	1%	*	1%	1%
Decreased slightly since early 2015	23	6	2	15	23	2	1	2	5	2	7	8	6	2	12	7	23
	3%	1%	5%	5%a	3%	2%	*	2%	4%f	2%	3%	2%	3%	1%	3%	4%	3%
Stayed the same	461	201	22	238	461	62	86	54	74	61	132	200	124	120	204	134	455
	53%an	39%	72%	76%za	53%	51%	51%	61%	57%	52%	54%	49%	66%zjk	55%n	45%	78%zmn	52%
Don't know	9	5	-	1	9	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	7
	1%n	1%	-	*	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%
Increased	373	308	6	57	373	53	82	33	52	53	103	198	57	92	240	29	381
	43%co	59%zc	20%	18%	43%	44%	49%	37%	39%	46%	42%l	48%l	31%	42%o	52%zmo	17%	44%
Decreased	28	8	3	18	28	4	1	2	5	2	10	11	6	5	13	8	28
	3%	1%	9%	6%a	3%	3%	*	2%	4%f	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	5%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 40

Q7. And now thinking about your organisation currently in 2016, has this level of priority increased or decreased since early 2015, and has this been significantly or slightly, or has the level of priority stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Increased significantly since early 2015	108	-	1	22	2	1	6	14	2	4	1	11	5	5	5	-	-	5	2	24	-	117
	12%p	-	13%	13%p	17%	16%	20%p	17%p	7%	10%	2%	15%p	16%	17%p	15%	-	-	10%	6%	18%p	-	13%
Increased slightly since early 2015	264	6	-	43	2	2	12	27	13	11	2	12	8	16	12	3	21	11	9	54	-	264
	30%k	53%	-	25%	22%	32%	39%k	34%k	36%k	28%	9%	16%	26%	35%k	36%	62%	47%zckq	24%	31%	46%zck	-	30%
Decreased significantly since early 2015	6	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	5
	1%	-	-	1%	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%z	-	1%
Decreased slightly since early 2015	23	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	2	1	3	-	2	2	-	1	1	1	3	-	23
	3%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	3%	2%	5%	5%	4%	-	5%	6%	-	2%	3%	5%	2%	-	3%
Stayed the same	461	5	4	101	4	3	13	38	20	22	22	49	18	22	15	2	22	28	15	50	8	455
	53% <i>s</i>	47%	87%	59% <i>fs</i>	45%	52%	41%	46%	56% <i>s</i>	57%	45%	78%	52%	65% <i>fgs</i>	59%	48%	43%	50%	60% <i>ss</i>	51%	37%	100%
Don't know	9	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	-	-	7
	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	3%	8%	-	-	1%
Increased	373	6	1	65	4	3	18	41	15	15	3	23	12	21	17	3	21	16	11	78	-	381
	43%	53%	13%	38%	39%	48%	59% <i>ckq</i>	51% <i>k</i>	43%	38%	11%	31%	41%	46%	51%	62%	47%	34%	37%	58% <i>zckq</i>	-	44%
Decreased	28	-	-	3	2	-	-	2	1	2	1	3	-	2	2	-	1	1	1	7	-	28
	3%	-	-	2%	16%	-	-	3%	2%	5%	5%	4%	-	5%	6%	-	2%	3%	5%	5%	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 41

Q8a. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have a set goal for a reduction in our energy use as a business

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	233 27% <i>c</i>	220 29% <i>c</i>	2	11	9	21	15	9	11	5	61	39	17	16	5	4	15	124	107	262 30%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	316 36% <i>r</i>	279 37%	6	32	10	25	12	22	31	4	73	56	23	24	11	7	17	185 43% <i>zr</i>	129	327 38%
This does not apply to our organisation	339 39% <i>q</i>	284 37%	4	52	7	33	17	24	25	9	102	53	20	18	5	7	13	141 33%	195	307 35% <i>zq</i>
Don't know	25 3%	21 3%	1	4	-	2	2	5	3	-	2	3	3	1	-	-	2	9 2%	11 3%	22 3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 42

Q8a. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have a set goal for a reduction in our energy use as a business

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	233	40	193	45	56	54	47	15	15	83	18	86	7	23	37	128	167	66	262
	27%	24%	27%	23%	27%	29%	26%	46%zcdff	28%	27%	18%	31%j	17%	19%	25%	31%m	27%	28%	30%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	316	52	263	52	73	59	77	15	38	115	32	98	5	34	46	179	245	68	327
	36%c	31%	37%	26%	35%	31%	43%ce	46%c	70%zcddefg	38%	31%	35%	12%	27%	31%	44%zmn	39%q	29%	38%
This does not apply to our organisation	339	74	265	111	77	79	55	8	5	110	56	106	29	65	66	123	228	108	307
	39%fho	44%	38%	56%zdefgh	37%h	41%fh	31%h	25%	10%	36%	54%zik	38%	71%	53%zo	46%o	30%	36%	46%p	35%
Don't know	25	3	22	-	8	3	9	1	1	8	1	6	-	2	2	8	20	3	22
	3%c	2%	3%	-	4%c	2%	5%c	4%c	3%c	3%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q8a. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have a set goal for a reduction in our energy use as a business

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	233 27% <i>rr</i>	56 29%	115 27%	26 30%	31 21%	38 33%	151 26%	191 28%	23 29%	54 54% <i>zgh</i>	58 41% <i>zg</i>	112 32%	9 30%	58 26%	184 31% <i>r</i>	85 34% <i>zr</i>	38 42% <i>znr</i>	65 41% <i>znr</i>	41 17%	262 30%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	316 36% <i>rr</i>	60 31%	171 40% <i>a</i>	36 40%	47 32%	58 50% <i>zf</i>	201 35%	254 37%	33 41%	43 43%	51 36%	130 37%	19 60% <i>zk</i>	91 41%	247 41% <i>r</i>	134 54% <i>znr</i>	43 48% <i>zr</i>	73 46% <i>zr</i>	60 24%	327 38%
This does not apply to our organisation	339 38% <i>ejllnopq</i>	85 44% <i>b</i>	144 34%	29 33%	76 52% <i>zbc</i>	30 26%	237 41% <i>e</i>	262 38% <i>ij</i>	28 35% <i>l</i>	15 15%	39 28% <i>l</i>	125 36% <i>l</i>	4 14%	79 36% <i>l</i>	190 32% <i>opq</i>	54 21%	16 18%	28 18%	143 58% <i>znopq</i>	307 35%
Don't know	25 3%	1 1%	16 4% <i>ad</i>	4 4% <i>d</i>	-	1 1%	15 3%	19 3%	-	2 2%	1 1%	4 1%	1 2%	4 2%	15 3%	2 1%	-	2 1%	5 2%	22 3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 44

Q8a. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have a set goal for a reduction in our energy use as a business

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	233	174	6	53	233	20	49	33	32	49	50	114	63	45	126	55	262
	27% <i>ce</i>	33% <i>zc</i>	21%	17%	27% <i>e</i>	16%	25% <i>e</i>	37% <i>e</i>	25%	42% <i>zdefh</i>	21%	28%	34% <i>j</i>	21%	28%	32% <i>um</i>	30%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	316	183	18	115	316	28	59	28	70	65	58	159	96	49	179	86	327
	36% <i>ejm</i>	35%	58%	37%	36% <i>e</i>	24%	35%	32%	54% <i>zdefg</i>	56% <i>zdefg</i>	24%	39% <i>j</i>	51% <i>zk</i>	22%	39% <i>m</i>	50% <i>zmn</i>	38%
This does not apply to our organisation	339	183	7	145	339	70	67	23	37	18	138	152	34	126	165	37	307
	39% <i>ghilo</i>	35%	25%	46% <i>za</i>	39% <i>ghi</i>	58% <i>zdfghi</i>	40% <i>gi</i>	27%	29% <i>i</i>	57% <i>zkl</i>	37% <i>l</i>	18%	58% <i>zno</i>	36% <i>o</i>	22%	35%	35%
Don't know	25	13	-	10	25	4	2	4	-	-	3	12	3	2	13	3	22
	3%	3%	-	3%	3%	3%	1%	5% <i>hi</i>	-	-	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%	2%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 45

Q8a. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have a set goal for a reduction in our energy use as a business

Base: all participants

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	233	4	2	53	1	1	16	15	10	4	12	16	13	11	8	-	10	3	9	45	2	262
	27% <i>q</i>	40%	32%	31% <i>q</i>	12%	21%	51% <i>zcgghkmpqsl</i>	9%	28% <i>q</i>	10%	42%	22% <i>q</i>	42%	25% <i>q</i>	22%	-	21%	5%	30%	33% <i>q</i>	28%	30%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	316	4	2	70	3	4	9	31	21	11	9	27	11	16	15	5	11	7	11	46	2	327
	36% <i>q</i>	37%	32%	41% <i>q</i>	34%	79%	30%	39% <i>q</i>	58% <i>zcfkmpqs</i>	30%	32%	36% <i>q</i>	36%	35% <i>q</i>	44%	100%	24%	16%	38%	34% <i>q</i>	22%	38%
This does not apply to our organisation	339	4	3	53	5	-	9	35	8	23	7	37	7	18	14	-	27	34	8	46	2	307
	39% <i>h</i>	40%	68%	31%	48%	-	28%	43% <i>h</i>	21%	31%	60%	49% <i>cfh</i>	25%	39%	40%	-	60% <i>zcfhs</i>	72% <i>zcfghkms</i>	27%	34%	28%	35%
Don't know	25	-	-	5	1	-	1	-	-	-	3	2	-	1	-	-	1	3	3	3	2	22
	3%	-	-	3%	5%	-	3%	-	-	-	12%	3%	-	2%	-	-	2%	7% <i>g</i>	11%	2%	23%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 46

Q8b. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have an agreed action plan/strategy in place to meet our energy reduction or efficiency goal

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	310	285	4	21	14	30	19	25	17	6	74	51	18	21	5	9	17	157	150	340
	36% c	37% c	39%	21%	61%	39%	41%	42%	26%	32%	32%	35%	29%	38%	28%	51%	37%	36%	35%	39%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	282	242	3	36	9	22	16	15	23	4	71	43	20	17	15	6	17	154	126	279
	32%	32%	24%	37%	37%	29%	35%	25%	35%	22%	31%	30%	33%	32%	80%	32%	37%	36%	30%	32%
This does not apply to our organisation	310	263	4	43	4	31	13	18	26	9	95	53	23	21	1	3	11	140	166	287
	36%	35%	33%	43%	18%	41%	28%	30%	39%	52%	42% p	37%	38%	38%	3%	17%	24%	32%	39%	33%
Don't know	21	21	1	-	-	-	1	4	3	-	4	5	1	1	-	-	3	11	7	20
	2%	3%	5%	-	-	-	1%	6% e	5%	-	2%	3%	2%	2%	-	-	7% e	3%	2%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 47

Q8b. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have an agreed action plan/strategy in place to meet our energy reduction or efficiency goal

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	310	48	262	61	77	65	65	17	25	113	26	99	7	32	52	173	236	73	340
	36%	29%	37%	31%	37%	34%	36%	50% <i>c</i>	46%	37% <i>f</i>	25%	36%	17%	26%	36%	42% <i>zm</i>	38%	31%	39%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	282	42	239	39	69	54	72	14	31	108	31	88	3	28	36	160	218	61	279
	32% <i>c</i>	25%	34%	20%	34% <i>c</i>	28%	40% <i>ce</i>	43% <i>c</i>	56% <i>szcdef</i>	36%	29%	32%	8%	23%	24%	39% <i>zmn</i>	35% <i>q</i>	26%	32%
This does not apply to our organisation	310	77	233	104	68	72	50	8	5	97	48	107	31	64	61	103	197	111	287
	36% <i>ho</i>	46% <i>zb</i>	33%	52% <i>zdefgh</i>	33% <i>h</i>	38% <i>fh</i>	28% <i>h</i>	24%	9%	32%	46% <i>i</i>	38%	75%	53% <i>zo</i>	42% <i>o</i>	25%	31%	47% <i>zp</i>	33%
Don't know	21	2	20	1	4	6	8	1	3	4	1	5	-	3	2	8	18	1	20
	2%	1%	3%	*	2%	3%	4% <i>c</i>	4% <i>c</i>	5% <i>c</i>	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	3% <i>q</i>	*	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 48

Q8b. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have an agreed action plan/strategy in place to meet our energy reduction or efficiency goal

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871	
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	310	65	165	32	48	49	201	245	36	64	70	142	9	73	233	107	39	69	69	340
	36%r	33%	39%	35%	32%	42%	35%	36%	45%	65%zghj	50%zg	40%	29%	33%	39%r	43%r	43%r	44%r	28%	39%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	282	57	149	33	39	45	178	222	25	39	41	109	13	80	221	122	41	76	51	279
	32%r	29%	35%	37%	27%	39%	31%	32%	31%	39%	29%	31%	41%	36%	37%r	49%znr	46%zr	46%znr	21%	32%
This does not apply to our organisation	310	81	130	27	66	33	213	245	19	6	37	123	9	77	176	52	19	25	129	287
	36%ijnopq	41%b	31%	30%	45%bc	29%	37%	36%ij	24%l	6%	26%k	35%	28%	35%	29%oq	21%	21%	16%	52%znopq	33%
Don't know	21	3	7	5	1	1	18	19	1	3	2	3	1	5	15	2	3	4	5	20
	2%	1%	2%	6%bd	1%	3%	3%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q8b. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have an agreed action plan/strategy in place to meet our energy reduction or efficiency goal

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	310	226	8	77	310	31	60	40	49	60	58	163	86	50	179	78	340
	36% <i>cjm</i>	43% <i>zc</i>	25%	24%	36%	26%	36%	45% <i>e</i>	38%	51% <i>zdefh</i>	24%	40% <i>fj</i>	46% <i>zj</i>	23%	39% <i>m</i>	45% <i>zmn</i>	39%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	282	160	14	106	282	21	44	36	54	62	42	141	92	40	152	83	279
	32% <i>ejm</i>	31%	46%	34%	32% <i>e</i>	18%	26%	41% <i>ef</i>	41% <i>ef</i>	53% <i>zdef</i>	17%	34% <i>ij</i>	49% <i>zjk</i>	19%	33% <i>m</i>	48% <i>zmn</i>	32%
This does not apply to our organisation	310	165	9	132	310	66	67	17	34	18	146	129	23	129	144	26	287
	36% <i>ghilo</i>	32%	29%	42% <i>a</i>	36% <i>ghi</i>	55% <i>zdfghi</i>	40% <i>ghi</i>	19%	26%	16%	60% <i>zkl</i>	31% <i>il</i>	12%	60% <i>zno</i>	32% <i>o</i>	15%	33%
Don't know	21	8	-	13	21	3	2	1	3	-	4	10	-	3	12	-	20
	2% <i>l</i>	2%	-	4% <i>a</i>	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	1%	3% <i>o</i>	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 50

Q8b. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have an agreed action plan/strategy in place to meet our energy reduction or efficiency goal

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	310	5	2	55	2	3	18	29	14	12	11	21	12	16	9	1	15	13	9	58	4	340
	36%	46%	46%	32%	20%	48%	58% <i>zcgkmpq</i>	36%	38%	31%	38%	28%	40%	35%	27%	27%	34%	28%	32%	43%	49%	39%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	282	2	3	64	2	4	7	21	19	16	9	32	12	15	9	4	9	8	12	31	4	279
	32% <i>s</i>	14%	72%	37% <i>pqs</i>	16%	68%	22%	26%	51% <i>zlgpqs</i>	42%	32%	42% <i>pqs</i>	41%	34%	26%	73%	20%	17%	42%	23%	45%	32%
This does not apply to our organisation	310	4	1	58	6	-	8	31	6	14	10	30	6	17	16	-	23	21	8	46	2	287
	36% <i>h</i>	40%	15%	34% <i>h</i>	59%	-	26%	39% <i>h</i>	17%	36%	37%	40% <i>h</i>	22%	38% <i>h</i>	48%	-	50% <i>fh</i>	44% <i>h</i>	29%	34% <i>h</i>	28%	33%
Don't know	21	-	-	3	1	-	1	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	6	2	4	-	20
	2%	-	-	2%	5%	-	3%	3%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	13% <i>zchkms</i>	7%	3%	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 51

Q8c. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification to ISO14001

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	110 13%	101 13%	1 9%	7 7%	2 7%	8 11%	6 12%	5 9%	12 19%	2 10%	31 14%	13 9%	11 18%	8 14%	2 8%	1 5%	10 22% <i>k</i>	58 13%	49 12%	120 14%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	270 31% <i>scr</i>	259 34% <i>c</i>	1 10%	10 10%	9 39%	20 26%	19 41% <i>fj</i>	16 28%	20 31%	3 19%	59 26%	50 35%	17 29%	20 36%	7 39%	4 23%	21 46% <i>ej</i>	173 40% <i>zr</i>	94 22%	307 35%
This does not apply to our organisation	454 52% <i>ppq</i>	374 49%	8 71%	72 74% <i>za</i>	10 41%	44 58% <i>p</i>	19 42%	34 58% <i>p</i>	36 55% <i>p</i>	12 69%	128 56% <i>p</i>	73 50% <i>p</i>	29 49% <i>p</i>	29 52% <i>p</i>	8 41%	11 61%	13 28%	193 44%	257 60% <i>zq</i>	414 48%
Don't know	59 7%	47 6%	1 10%	11 11%	3 14%	5 7%	2 5%	5 8%	2 3%	1 7%	16 7%	13 9% <i>m</i>	5 8% <i>m</i>	-	2 12%	2 10%	3 7%	23 5%	34 8%	52 6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 52

Q8c. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification to ISO14001

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	110	16	94	26	25	23	22	7	6	37	15	29	2	12	15	55	81	27	120
13%	13%	9%	13%	13%	12%	12%	12%	21%	12%	12%	14%	10%	5%	10%	11%	14%	13%	13%	14%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	270	45	225	51	55	67	66	5	24	97	28	80	10	17	37	164	216	53	307
31% <i>m</i>	27%	27%	32%	26%	27%	35% <i>g</i>	37% <i>cdg</i>	15%	44% <i>cdg</i>	32%	27%	29%	25%	14%	26% <i>m</i>	40% <i>zmn</i>	34% <i>q</i>	23%	35%
This does not apply to our organisation	454	99	355	121	106	93	95	19	19	162	53	154	26	88	83	184	308	142	414
52% <i>h</i>	60%	50%	61% <i>eh</i>	51% <i>h</i>	49%	53% <i>h</i>	58% <i>h</i>	34%	53%	51%	55%	63%	72% <i>zno</i>	57% <i>o</i>	45%	49%	60% <i>z</i>	48%	
Don't know	59	10	49	10	22	11	5	3	6	15	8	24	4	10	13	16	37	20	52
7% <i>f</i>	6%	7%	5%	11% <i>cf</i>	6%	3%	9%	10% <i>f</i>	5%	7%	9%	9%	8%	9% <i>o</i>	4%	6%	9%	6%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 53

Q8c. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification to ISO14001

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	110 13%	28 15%	55 13%	10 11%	14 10%	19 16%	70 12%	86 12%	16 20%	29 25% <i>zg</i>	29 21% <i>zg</i>	51 14%	5 17%	23 10%	88 15% <i>r</i>	38 15% <i>r</i>	19 21% <i>zr</i>	27 17% <i>r</i>	21 9%	120 14%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	270 31% <i>r</i>	62 32%	138 33%	27 30%	38 26%	40 35%	187 32%	223 32%	31 38%	52 52% <i>zgj</i>	42 30%	123 35%	14 44%	72 33%	205 34% <i>r</i>	98 39% <i>zr</i>	48 53% <i>znor</i>	63 40% <i>zr</i>	58 23%	307 35%
This does not apply to our organisation	454 52% <i>lopq</i>	88 45%	221 52%	49 55%	90 61% <i>a</i>	54 47%	296 51%	350 51% <i>l</i>	33 41% <i>l</i>	22 22%	65 46% <i>l</i>	173 49%	12 38%	118 53%	284 47% <i>p</i>	111 44% <i>p</i>	22 24%	68 43% <i>p</i>	160 65% <i>znopq</i>	414 48%
Don't know	59 7%	22 11% <i>zb</i>	20 5%	7 8%	8 6%	6 6%	39 7%	46 7%	3 4%	3 3%	10 7%	17 5%	-	13 6%	39 7%	13 5%	5 6%	7 4%	12 5%	52 6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 54

Q8c. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification to ISO14001

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	110	70	5	33	110	9	27	12	16	20	24	52	30	21	55	29	120
	13%	13%	15%	11%	13%	7%	16%	14%	12%	17%	10%	13%	16%	10%	12%	17%	14%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	270	156	15	97	270	29	54	32	48	45	63	135	66	53	157	58	307
	31%	30%	48%	31%	31%	24%	32%	36%	37%e	38%e	26%	33%	35%j	24%	34%m	34%	35%
This does not apply to our organisation	454	283	11	160	454	74	84	42	63	56	150	207	86	135	229	80	414
	52%	54%	36%	51%	52%	61%	50%	47%	48%	48%	61%zkl	50%	46%	62%zno	50%	47%	48%
Don't know	59	27	1	29	59	9	6	4	10	4	12	25	13	14	28	10	52
	7%	5%	4%	9%a	7%	8%	4%	4%	8%	4%	5%	6%	7%	6%	6%	6%	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 55

Q8c. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification to ISO14001

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	110	2	1	25	1	1	7	6	7	3	5	2	10	6	1	-	3	2	5	24	-	120
	13%k	16%	13%	14%k	5%	14%	23%gkq	7%	19%k	7%	19%	3%	33%	12%k	3%	-	8%	5%	17%	18%k	-	14%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	270	5	4	84	6	2	18	12	16	3	12	8	10	21	16	9	4	4	4	48	-	307
	31%gkppq	45%	87%	49%zgzkqps	56%	34%	58%zgzkqps	15%	45%gkppq	7%	42%	11%	34%	46%zgzkppq	26%	-	8%	9%	15%	36%gkppq	-	35%
This does not apply to our organisation	454	4	-	63	3	4	7	57	13	27	10	59	11	17	22	5	34	35	19	54	8	414
	52%zcjhms	39%	-	37%	33%	66%	24%	70%zclhms	35%	71%	36%	75%zclhms	36%	38%	66%	100%	76%zclhms	75%zclhms	66%	40%	100%	48%
Don't know	59	-	-	5	1	-	-	7	*	6	4	5	2	3	2	-	5	6	2	11	-	52
	7%c	-	-	3%	6%	-	-	8%	1%	17%	13%	7%	7%	7%	5%	-	11%c	13%cf	7%	8%c	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 56

Q8d. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification/are working towards certification to ISO50001

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	103	97	3	3	6	4	6	6	5	2	26	22	5	6	3	4	9	60	41	115
	12%	13% <i>c</i>	23%	3%	24%	5%	12%	10%	8%	10%	12%	15% <i>e</i>	8%	11%	16%	25%	19% <i>e</i>	14%	10%	13%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	31	31	1	-	1	3	2	1	5	2	6	4	2	1	1	-	3	18	13	38
	4%	4%	5%	-	4%	3%	5%	2%	8%	10%	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	-	6%	4%	3%	4%
This does not apply to our organisation	654	569	7	78	15	61	33	48	53	14	174	107	48	44	11	9	27	320	327	650
	75% <i>p</i>	75%	60%	80%	65%	81% <i>p</i>	71%	81% <i>p</i>	80% <i>p</i>	83%	76% <i>p</i>	73%	81% <i>p</i>	81% <i>p</i>	59%	49%	59%	74%	77%	75%
Don't know	88	70	1	17	2	9	6	4	3	1	23	15	5	3	4	5	7	38	47	75
	10%	9%	12%	18%	9%	11%	12%	7%	5%	7%	10%	10%	8%	6%	21%	26%	16%	9%	11%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 57

Q8d. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification/are working towards certification to ISO50001

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	103	17	86	20	18	26	24	2	12	40	10	29	1	6	12	67	80	22	115
12%	12%	10%	12%	10%	9%	14%	13%	7%	22% <i>zc</i>	13%	9%	10%	4%	5%	8%	17% <i>zmn</i>	13%	10%	13%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	31	3	28	4	7	6	7	1	6	12	2	11	1	1	4	22	24	6	38
4%	4%	2%	4%	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%	11% <i>zcde</i>	4%	2%	4%	2%	1%	3%	5% <i>m</i>	4%	3%	4%
This does not apply to our organisation	654	130	524	159	156	138	141	28	31	220	76	217	33	107	117	292	470	179	650
75% <i>h</i>	78%	74%	80% <i>h</i>	75% <i>h</i>	72% <i>h</i>	76% <i>h</i>	84% <i>h</i>	56%	73%	73%	78%	81%	87% <i>zo</i>	80%	72%	75%	76%	75%	75%
Don't know	88	17	71	17	27	22	10	2	7	32	16	25	5	9	15	28	58	29	75
10%	10%	10%	8%	13% <i>f</i>	11%	6%	6%	12%	11%	16%	9%	13%	8%	10%	7%	9%	12%	9%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 58

Q8d. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification/are working towards certification to ISO50001

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871	
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	103	22	49	16	14	12	54	67	21	65	22	54	4	25	85	45	21	27	18	115
	12%	11%	12%	18%	10%	10%	9%	10%	27%zg	66%zghj	15%	15%	13%	11%	14%r	18%zr	23%znr	17%r	7%	13%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	31	2	19	3	6	7	14	18	7	18	7	15	1	9	29	21	8	10	2	38
	4%r	1%	4%	3%	4%	6%	2%	3%	9%zg	18%zgj	5%	4%	3%	4%	5%r	8%zr	9%zr	6%r	1%	4%
This does not apply to our organisation	654	141	324	60	118	88	456	538	50	14	102	253	23	172	432	176	54	110	208	650
	75%hip	72%	76%	67%	80%	76%	79%	78%hi	63%i	14%	72%i	72%	74%	78%	72%p	70%	60%	69%	84%znopq	75%
Don't know	88	32	34	11	10	10	56	69	3	7	12	32	3	16	58	13	8	13	21	75
	10%o	16%zbd	8%	12%	7%	9%	10%	10%	4%	7%	9%	9%	10%	7%	10%o	5%	8%	8%	9%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 59

Q8d. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification/are working towards certification to ISO50001

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	103	70	5	28	103	9	26	14	16	24	15	57	29	14	60	27	115
	12% <i>m</i>	13%	16%	9%	12%	7%	15%	16%	12%	21% <i>zde</i>	6%	14% <i>fj</i>	16% <i>j</i>	6%	13% <i>m</i>	16% <i>m</i>	13%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	31	14	2	15	31	4	4	5	6	7	2	16	13	1	18	12	38
	4% <i>m</i>	3%	8%	5%	4%	3%	2%	6%	5%	6%	1%	4% <i>fj</i>	7% <i>j</i>	*	4% <i>m</i>	7% <i>m</i>	4%
This does not apply to our organisation	654	394	24	235	654	98	130	62	96	77	211	300	126	185	345	110	650
	75% <i>lo</i>	75%	78%	75%	75%	81% <i>jl</i>	77%	70%	74%	66%	86% <i>szkl</i>	73%	67%	85% <i>zno</i>	75% <i>o</i>	64%	75%
Don't know	88	46	1	38	88	11	10	8	13	8	17	41	21	17	38	24	75
	10%	9%	4%	12%	10%	9%	6%	9%	10%	7%	7%	10%	11%	8%	8%	14%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 60

Q8d. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have certification/are working towards certification to ISO50001

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	103	-	1	30	1	1	8	12	7	3	3	5	3	2	3	-	4	3	2	15	-	115
	12%	-	13%	17% <i>zm</i>	10%	21%	26% <i>zkmpqs</i>	14%	19% <i>em</i>	7%	9%	7%	9%	5%	10%	-	9%	7%	8%	11%	-	13%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	31	-	-	10	1	-	3	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	5	-	38
	4%	-	-	6%	11%	8%	10% <i>zq</i>	2%	9% <i>q</i>	2%	6%	2%	5%	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	3%	-	4%
This does not apply to our organisation	654	9	4	124	8	4	20	59	25	25	19	60	22	36	30	5	36	36	23	102	8	650
	75%	86%	87%	72%	80%	70%	64%	72%	68%	65%	67%	80%	72%	79%	88%	100%	80%	76%	78%	76%	100%	75%
Don't know	88	2	-	8	-	-	1	9	2	10	6	8	4	6	1	-	4	8	4	15	-	75
	10% <i>c</i>	14%	-	5%	-	-	4%	11%	5%	26%	21%	11%	14%	13% <i>c</i>	2%	-	9%	16% <i>c</i>	13%	11% <i>c</i>	-	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 61

Q8e. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have training or other processes to encourage and support staff in reducing energy consumption

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	275	236	5	35	12	25	15	17	24	9	56	50	18	21	4	7	15	131	139	295
	32%	31%	42%	36%	53%	33%	31%	29%	37%	51%	24%	34%	29%	39% <i>j</i>	21%	41%	32%	30%	33%	34%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	337	298	4	35	6	29	16	16	30	9	79	55	26	25	11	5	22	186	149	340
	39%	39%	33%	36%	24%	38%	34%	28%	46%	52%	35%	38%	44%	45%	59%	30%	46%	43% <i>r</i>	35%	39%
This does not apply to our organisation	260	247	3	31	8	27	15	26	13	1	92	45	18	14	5	5	10	131	145	264
	32%	32%	24%	32%	36%	35%	33%	44% <i>hp</i>	20%	8%	40% <i>zhp</i>	31%	31%	25%	24%	29%	22%	30%	34%	30%
Don't know	15	14	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	3	6	-	-	1	-	1	7	8	14
	2%	2%	6%	-	-	1%	4%	-	-	-	1%	4% <i>z</i>	-	-	6%	-	2%	2%	2%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 62

Q8e. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have training or other processes to encourage and support staff in reducing energy consumption

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	275 32%q	41 24%	235 33%a	63 31%	55 27%	67 35%	48 27%	19 57%zcdef	24 43%df	95 31%	30 29%	82 29%	11 27%	28 22%	46 31%	147 36%m	217 35%q	56 24%	295 34%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	337 39%c	53 32%	284 40%	52 26%	79 38%c	79 41%c	83 46%c	16 48%c	26 48%c	117 39%	40 39%	113 40%	9 21%	49 40%	53 38%	166 41%	258 41%q	77 33%	340 39%
This does not apply to our organisation	280 32%gh	73 44%zb	208 29%	91 46%zdefgh	71 35%gh	50 26%h	54 30%h	5 15%	5 9%	98 32%	36 35%	91 32%	22 53%	45 37%	51 35%	115 28%	176 28%	103 44%zp	264 30%
Don't know	15 2%	2 1%	13 2%	-	6 3%	3 2%	4 2%	-	2 3%c	6 2%	-	4 1%	-	3 3%	2 1%	6 2%	8 1%	4 2%	14 2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 63

Q8e. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have training or other processes to encourage and support staff in reducing energy consumption

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871	
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	275	52	142	31	46	45	163	206	34	53	51	122	11	64	206	88	28	60	62	295
	32%	27%	33%	35%	31%	39%^f	28%	30%	43%^g	54%^{zgj}	37%	35%	35%	29%	35%^r	35%^r	31%	38%^r	25%	34%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	337	77	178	39	41	45	234	268	32	45	59	146	14	88	249	120	41	70	77	340
	39%^d	39%^d	42%^d	44%^d	28%	39%	41%	39%	40%	45%	42%	42%	45%	40%	42%^r	46%^{zr}	45%^r	44%^r	31%	39%
This does not apply to our organisation	280	67	122	20	62	31	188	226	17	8	36	100	7	68	164	52	24	36	110	264
	32%^{loq}	34%	29%	22%	42%^{zbc}	27%	33%	33%^{hi}	21%^d	8%	26%^l	28%	22%	31%	27%	21%	26%	23%	44%^{znopq}	30%
Don't know	15	6	3	3	3	11	15	1	2	2	3	-	7	11	7	1	3	3	3	14
	2%	3%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 64

Q8e. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have training or other processes to encourage and support staff in reducing energy consumption

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	275	210	10	55	275	35	59	35	35	49	59	130	80	50	157	64	295
	<i>32%cm</i>	<i>40%zc</i>		<i>17%</i>	<i>32%</i>	<i>29%</i>	<i>35%</i>	<i>40%</i>	<i>27%</i>	<i>42%zdh</i>	<i>24%</i>	<i>32%</i>	<i>43%zk</i>	<i>23%</i>	<i>34%rn</i>	<i>37%sm</i>	<i>34%</i>
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	337	198	15	118	337	40	65	29	56	61	65	169	96	55	188	87	340
	<i>39%jm</i>	<i>38%</i>	<i>49%</i>	<i>38%</i>	<i>39%</i>	<i>34%</i>	<i>39%</i>	<i>33%</i>	<i>43%</i>	<i>52%zdefg</i>	<i>27%</i>	<i>41%j</i>	<i>51%zk</i>	<i>25%</i>	<i>41%rn</i>	<i>51%zm</i>	<i>39%</i>
This does not apply to our organisation	280	130	5	145	280	47	49	27	36	18	126	118	22	115	123	30	264
	<i>32%allo</i>	<i>25%</i>	<i>17%</i>	<i>46%za</i>	<i>32%l</i>	<i>40%l</i>	<i>29%l</i>	<i>30%l</i>	<i>28%l</i>	<i>16%</i>	<i>51%zkl</i>	<i>29%l</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>53%zno</i>	<i>27%o</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>30%</i>
Don't know	15	12	-	3	15	-	2	-	7	2	1	10	1	2	11	-	14
	<i>2%</i>	<i>2%</i>		<i>1%</i>	<i>2%</i>		<i>1%</i>		<i>5%zdefg</i>	<i>1%</i>		<i>3%</i>	<i>1%</i>	<i>1%</i>	<i>2%</i>		<i>2%</i>

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 65

Q8e. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

We have training or other processes to encourage and support staff in reducing energy consumption

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871	
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	275	5	1	54	1	4	14	25	14	9	17	12	17	9	3	15	18	9	36	2	295	
	32%	43%	13%	31%	15%	75%	43%k	31%	39%	23%	35%	23%	41%	38%	27%	62%	34%	37%	33%	27%	22%	34%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	337	5	3	69	2	2	10	24	14	19	17	26	10	21	14	3	15	13	14	56	2	340
	39%	44%	68%	40%	18%	32%	34%	29%	40%	50%	59%	34%	32%	47%	42%	65%	33%	28%	46%	41%	23%	39%
This does not apply to our organisation	280	5	2	55	7	1	8	30	8	9	4	36	9	12	-	17	18	5	42	5	264	
	32%	43%	32%	32%	67%	12%	27%	38%lm	21%	24%	14%	46%zctfms	29%	20%	34%	-	39%	37%	16%	31%	55%	30%
Don't know	15	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	3	-	14	
	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	4%	-	3%	-	2%	-	3%	-	2%	3%	5%	2%	-	2%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 66

Q8a-e. I'm now going to read out a number of policies that your organisation may or may not have in place. For each one please tell me whether this is something your organisation either has or doesn't have, and whether it was introduced or updated since early 2015.

Summary

Base: all participants

	We have a set goal for a reduction in our energy use as a business	We have an agreed action plan/strategy in place to meet our energy reduction or efficiency goal	We have certification to ISO14001	We have certification/are working towards certification to ISO50001	We have training or other processes to encourage and support staff in reducing energy consumption
Unweighted total	871	871	871	871	871
Weighted total	871	871	871	871	871
Introduced or updated since early 2015	233 27%	310 36%	110 13%	103 12%	275 32%
In place before 2015, and unchanged since then	316 36%	282 32%	270 31%	31 4%	337 39%
This does not apply to our organisation	339 39%	310 36%	454 52%	654 75%	280 32%
Don't know	25 3%	21 2%	59 7%	88 10%	15 2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 67

Q9a. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Heating system (including changes to boilers, pumps, controls, insulation or fuels)

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	366	315	4	47	12	35	18	22	33	7	93	49	28	25	12	8	18	163	199	376
	42%	41%	34%	48%	51%	46%	39%	38%	51% <i>k</i>	39%	41%	34%	46%	45%	63%	43%	38%	38%	47% <i>q</i>	43%
Yes - done since early 2015	337	281	4	53	10	24	18	25	27	5	90	52	28	22	5	13	13	151	185	330
	39%	37%	32%	54% <i>z</i>	41%	32%	38%	42%	42%	31%	40%	35%	46%	39%	27%	75%	28%	35%	43% <i>q</i>	38%
Yes - being considered	170	151	-	19	6	15	7	10	20	4	46	24	9	13	4	5	7	93	78	169
	20%	20%	4%	19%	24%	19%	15%	17%	30%	21%	20%	17%	14%	24%	21%	30%	14%	21%	18%	19%
Don't know	32	29	-	4	-	3	-	1	3	1	8	5	4	1	2	-	3	18	9	26
	4%	4%	-	4%	-	4%	-	2%	5%	4%	3%	3%	7%	2%	10%	-	6%	4%	2%	3%
None of these	229	200	5	24	4	20	17	15	10	4	71	44	12	13	4	2	14	121	106	228
	26%	26%	44%	25%	18%	26%	36% <i>h</i>	26%	15%	22%	31% <i>h</i>	30% <i>h</i>	19%	24%	19%	12%	30%	28%	25%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 68

Q9a. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Heating system (including changes to boilers, pumps, controls, insulation or fuels)

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	366	50	315	53	81	92	80	19	40	145	29	97	8	42	66	192	271	90	376
	42% <i>acj</i>	30%	45% <i>aa</i>	26%	39% <i>c</i>	48% <i>c</i>	45% <i>c</i>	58% <i>c</i>	73% <i>zdef</i>	48% <i>jk</i>	28%	35%	19%	34%	45%	47% <i>m</i>	43%	38%	43%
Yes - done since early 2015	337	39	298	56	89	80	71	14	25	135	28	95	13	53	63	152	249	84	330
	39% <i>acj</i>	23%	42% <i>aa</i>	28%	43% <i>c</i>	42% <i>c</i>	39% <i>c</i>	42%	45% <i>c</i>	44% <i>jk</i>	27%	34%	31%	43%	43%	37%	40%	36%	38%
Yes - being considered	170	21	149	22	45	39	38	7	16	68	16	40	6	15	30	89	129	40	169
	20% <i>c</i>	13%	21% <i>aa</i>	11%	22% <i>c</i>	20% <i>c</i>	21% <i>c</i>	22%	30% <i>c</i>	23% <i>k</i>	15%	14%	15%	12%	21%	22% <i>m</i>	21%	17%	19%
Don't know	32	8	24	6	5	5	11	1	2	4	4	15	2	4	4	11	20	10	26
	4% <i>f</i>	5%	3%	3%	3%	3%	6%	4%	3%	1%	4%	5% <i>l</i>	5%	4%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%
None of these	229	69	160	90	51	39	34	8	6	67	39	94	17	34	36	100	159	70	228
	26% <i>fh</i>	42% <i>zb</i>	23%	45% <i>zdefgh</i>	25% <i>h</i>	21%	19%	24%	11%	22%	38% <i>zl</i>	33% <i>zl</i>	42%	28%	25%	24%	25%	30%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q9a. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Heating system (including changes to boilers, pumps, controls, insulation or fuels)

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	366 42% ^r	73 37%	183 43%	40 45%	67 45%	57 49%	230 40%	278 40%	43 54% ^g	54 54% ^z	71 51% ^g	150 43%	10 33%	95 43%	289 46% ^z	146 58% ^{znqr}	43 47% ^r	71 45% ^r	67 27%	376 43%
Yes - done since early 2015	337 38% ^r	69 35%	177 42%	35 39%	53 36%	48 42%	211 37%	258 38%	33 41%	42 43%	69 48% ^{zg}	134 38%	14 46%	94 43%	266 44% ^{zpr}	118 47% ^{zpq}	27 30%	57 36% ^r	60 24%	330 38%
Yes - being considered	170 20%	30 15%	90 21%	22 24%	26 18%	30 25%	112 19%	134 20%	14 17%	25 25%	31 22%	67 19%	10 32%	45 21%	131 22% ^r	69 28% ^{zr}	20 22%	37 23% ^r	35 14%	169 19%
Don't know	32 4%	7 4%	16 4%	2 2%	4 3%	3 2%	19 3%	27 4%	2 2%	3 3%	5 3%	8 2%	1 2%	5 2%	17 3%	9 3%	3 4%	6 4%	11 4%	26 3%
None of these	229 26% ^e	60 31% ^b	92 22%	24 27%	44 30%	18 16%	164 28% ^e	181 26% ^j	13 16%	17 17%	22 16%	97 28%	4 14%	45 20%	117 20%	38 15%	23 26% ^o	33 21%	110 44% ^{znopq}	228 26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 70

Q9a. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Heating system (including changes to boilers, pumps, controls, insulation or fuels)

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	366 42% <i>fjm</i>	217 41%	15 48%	135 43%	366 42% <i>f</i>	43 36%	48 28%	41 47% <i>f</i>	75 57% <i>zdef</i>	77 66% <i>zdefg</i>	82 34%	175 43% <i>j</i>	104 55% <i>zjk</i>	65 30%	201 44% <i>m</i>	96 56% <i>zmn</i>	376 43%
Yes - done since early 2015	337 39% <i>e</i>	226 43% <i>c</i>	4 14%	103 33%	337 39% <i>e</i>	27 22%	69 41% <i>e</i>	26 29%	66 50% <i>zdeg</i>	68 58% <i>zdefg</i>	82 33%	156 38%	90 48% <i>zjk</i>	73 33%	178 39%	79 46% <i>m</i>	330 38%
Yes - being considered	170 20%	102 20%	2 6%	64 21%	170 20%	14 11%	37 22% <i>e</i>	18 20%	33 25% <i>e</i>	36 30% <i>zde</i>	47 19%	79 19%	40 21%	39 18%	88 19%	38 22%	169 19%
Don't know	32 4%	17 3%	1 2%	13 4%	32 4%	3 2%	8 5% <i>f</i>	4 4% <i>j</i>	1 1%	-	8 3%	12 3%	5 3%	8 4%	15 3%	3 2%	26 3%
None of these	229 26% <i>hi</i>	119 23%	11 37%	99 32% <i>a</i>	229 26% <i>hi</i>	52 43% <i>zdfghi</i>	39 23% <i>h</i>	14 16%	17 13%	18 16%	80 33% <i>f</i>	106 26%	35 19%	78 36% <i>zno</i>	114 25%	32 19%	228 26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 71

Q9a. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Heating system (including changes to boilers, pumps, controls, insulation or fuels)

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)			
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871	
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871	
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	366	3	2	78	2	2	10	36	10	22	7	26	15	18	11	5	32	21	8	52	6	376	
	42%	24%	46%	46%	23%	29%	33%	44%	29%	58%	23%	35%	50%	39%	34%	100%	71%	zcfghkms	6%	26%	38%	72%	43%
Yes - done since early 2015	337	2	2	53	2	3	8	30	15	21	7	28	17	15	14	5	34	17	15	48	2	330	
	39%	17%	32%	31%	16%	49%	27%	37%	40%	55%	26%	37%	56%	33%	41%	100%	76%	zcfghkms	6%	50%	36%	22%	38%
Yes - being considered	170	4	2	33	1	2	4	12	7	8	6	7	11	10	7	1	11	9	5	25	4	169	
	20%	40%	47%	19%	7%	39%	14%	14%	19%	22%	21%	10%	38%	22%	19%	27%	25%	19%	17%	19%	45%	19%	
Don't know	32	-	-	5	1	-	2	3	-	2	3	3	1	-	3	-	-	3	2	4	-	26	
	4%	-	-	3%	6%	-	7%	m	3%	-	5%	12%	5%	4%	-	10%	-	6%	7%	3%	-	3%	
None of these	229	5	2	44	5	2	9	20	10	6	11	26	7	16	8	-	3	13	6	35	2	228	
	26%p	46%	40%	26%p	48%	37%	28%p	25%p	28%p	15%	40%	35%p	22%	35%p	22%	-	7%	29%p	19%	26%p	28%	26%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 72

Q9b. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Cooling system (including changes to chillers, pumps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263 30%f	230 30%	3 25%	31 31%	9 38%	24 32%f	5 11%	14 23%	31 48%zfgjkm	6 32%	73 32%f	36 25%	22 36%f	15 27%	7 39%	1 5%	17 37%f	130 30%	130 30%	270 31%
Yes - done since early 2015	246 28%	213 28%	3 27%	29 30%	6 26%	17 23%	10 22%	16 27%	15 23%	4 21%	78 34%	41 28%	22 36%	11 20%	4 20%	5 30%	15 33%	123 28%	122 29%	248 28%
Yes - being considered	108 12%	98 13%	-	9 9%	5 22%	11 15%	4 9%	3 5%	7 11%	1 7%	31 14%	22 15%	4 7%	9 17%	2 11%	-	7 15%	63 15%	44 10%	109 13%
Don't know	35 4%	30 4%	-	5 5%	-	1 2%	-	1 2%	3 5%	-	15 6%	6 4%	2 3%	3 5%	-	2 9%	-	15 3%	15 4%	28 3%
None of these	381 44%	327 43%	7 59%	48 49%	9 37%	34 45%	29 63%zhklp	32 55%	24 36%	8 45%	90 40%	64 44%	23 39%	26 48%	10 51%	10 56%	16 35%	176 41%	201 47%	378 43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 73

Q9b. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Cooling system (including changes to chillers, pumps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263 30% <i>cm</i>	48 29%	215 30%	43 22%	56 27%	50 26%	63 35% <i>c</i>	14 42% <i>c</i>	35 65% <i>zcdelf</i>	95 31%	27 26%	80 28%	7 16%	17 14%	35 24%	154 38% <i>zmn</i>	189 30%	69 29%	270 31%
Yes - done since early 2015	246 28% <i>aj</i>	30 18%	216 31% <i>aa</i>	44 22%	56 27%	58 30%	50 28%	11 33%	25 46% <i>zcdf</i>	92 31% <i>j</i>	16 15%	89 32% <i>j</i>	5 12%	30 24%	45 31%	127 31%	183 29%	59 25%	248 28%
Yes - being considered	108 12% <i>ac</i>	8 5%	100 14% <i>aa</i>	12 6%	28 14% <i>c</i>	20 10%	27 15% <i>c</i>	4 13%	15 27% <i>zcd</i>	46 15%	9 9%	28 10%	4 11%	9 7%	16 11%	64 16% <i>m</i>	76 12%	30 13%	109 13%
Don't know	35 4% <i>f</i>	8 5%	27 4%	6 3%	11 5%	6 3%	10 6%	1 4%	1 1%	4 7% <i>f</i>	7 5% <i>f</i>	15 5% <i>f</i>	1 3%	4 3%	4 3%	13 3%	21 3%	12 5%	28 3%
None of these	381 44% <i>ho</i>	86 52% <i>b</i>	295 42%	115 58% <i>zdefgh</i>	93 45% <i>h</i>	86 45% <i>h</i>	66 37% <i>h</i>	12 36% <i>h</i>	8 14%	132 44%	55 53%	113 41%	29 70%	72 58% <i>zo</i>	71 49% <i>o</i>	146 36%	277 44%	104 44%	378 43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 74

Q9b. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Cooling system (including changes to chillers, pumps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263 30% <i>af</i>	61 31%	125 30%	29 32%	47 32%	51 44% <i>zf</i>	156 27%	201 29%	29 37%	39 39% <i>g</i>	55 38% <i>zg</i>	106 30%	8 25%	70 32%	212 35% <i>ar</i>	118 47% <i>znr</i>	42 46% <i>zr</i>	68 42% <i>zr</i>	45 18%	270 31%
Yes - done since early 2015	246 28% <i>af</i>	49 25%	131 31%	26 29%	40 27%	35 30%	162 28%	196 29%	23 29%	33 33%	47 34%	104 29%	10 31%	68 31%	194 32% <i>ar</i>	97 39% <i>zpr</i>	24 26%	53 33% <i>ar</i>	42 17%	248 28%
Yes - being considered	108 12% <i>af</i>	20 10%	56 13%	14 16%	15 10%	26 22% <i>zf</i>	69 12%	89 13%	12 15%	17 17%	27 20% <i>zf</i>	41 12%	5 16%	31 14%	90 15% <i>ar</i>	46 18% <i>zr</i>	17 19% <i>ar</i>	29 18% <i>ar</i>	15 6%	109 13%
Don't know	35 4%	7 4%	13 3%	3 3%	8 5%	3 2%	21 4%	29 4%	2 2%	3 3%	4 3%	10 3%	1 2%	5 2%	19 3%	6 3%	3 3%	7 4%	12 5%	28 3%
None of these	381 44% <i>ejnopq</i>	94 48%	177 42%	38 42%	65 44%	34 30%	263 46% <i>e</i>	296 43% <i>j</i>	29 36%	40 40%	44 32%	157 45%	13 43%	87 39%	223 37% <i>oq</i>	70 28%	28 31%	40 25%	151 61% <i>znopq</i>	378 43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 75

Q9b. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Cooling system (including changes to chillers, pumps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263 30%em	171 33%	9 31%	82 26%	263 30%e	18 15%	47 28%	28 32%e	55 42%zdef	61 52%zdefg	60 24%	125 30%	76 41%zjk	48 22%	137 30%	73 43%zmn	270 31%
Yes - done since early 2015	246 26%e	169 32%e	4 13%	71 23%	246 26%e	15 13%	38 23%	28 32%e	51 39%zdef	52 45%zdef	61 25%	113 28%	71 38%zjk	52 24%	135 30%	56 33%	248 28%
Yes - being considered	108 12%e	71 14%	-	37 12%	108 12%e	6 5%	20 12%	8 10%	26 20%zde	29 25%zdefg	24 10%	59 14%	22 12%	20 9%	66 15%	20 11%	109 13%
Don't know	35 4%	20 4%	1 2%	14 5%	35 4%	4 4%	5 3%	2 2%	4 3%	1 1%	9 4%	10 2%	8 4%	9 4%	16 4%	5 3%	28 3%
None of these	381 44%hil	201 38%	18 60%	159 51%a	381 44%hi	80 67%zdfghi	77 46%hi	33 37%	38 29%	32 28%	126 52%zkl	177 43%	63 34%	119 55%zno	190 42%	60 35%	378 43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 76

Q9b. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Cooling system (including changes to chillers, pumps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263	2	2	53	4	1	8	31	8	16	5	23	12	14	18	3	15	6	7	34	2	270
	30%q	20%	32%	31%q	42%	27%	24%	38%q	22%	42%	19%	30%	39%	31%q	52%	65%	33%q	12%	25%	25%	22%	31%
Yes - done since early 2015	246	3	2	52	-	1	9	29	9	10	9	25	12	12	10	3	15	5	8	29	2	248
	28%q	28%	32%	31%q	-	22%	28%	36%qs	25%	27%	31%	34%q	41%	26%	29%	65%	34%q	11%	27%	21%	23%	28%
Yes - being considered	108	2	2	23	-	1	2	7	2	8	3	7	5	6	5	1	12	3	3	14	-	109
	12%	22%	47%	14%	-	27%	5%	9%	6%	21%	10%	10%	16%	14%	14%	27%	26%zlfghkqs	6%	10%	10%	-	13%
Don't know	35	2	-	3	1	-	2	2	2	2	-	7	1	1	1	-	-	4	4	4	4	28
	4%	16%	-	2%	6%	-	5%	3%	5%	-	6%	9%c	2%	2%	4%	-	-	9%c	15%	3%	-	3%
None of these	381	2	3	73	5	4	14	26	16	15	13	29	11	21	11	2	20	34	12	66	5	378
	44%	22%	53%	43%	52%	65%	44%	32%	44%	38%	48%	39%	38%	47%	32%	35%	45%	72%zcfghkmps0	10%	49%g	55%	43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 77

Q9c. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Hot water system

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	272 31% <i>k</i>	235 31%	3 24%	35 36%	7 30%	19 25%	13 29%	16 27%	30 45% <i>ek</i>	6 34%	72 31%	32 22%	21 36% <i>k</i>	20 37% <i>k</i>	10 52%	8 43%	12 26%	112 26%	159 37% <i>q</i>	272 31%
Yes - done since early 2015	215 25%	180 24%	2 20%	33 34%	8 35%	18 24%	7 14%	14 24%	21 32% <i>f</i>	3 19%	57 25%	28 19%	23 38% <i>zrfjk</i>	13 24%	4 20%	5 26%	10 20%	89 21%	125 29% <i>q</i>	211 24%
Yes - being considered	110 13%	95 12%	- 4%	15 15%	4 15%	12 15%	5 11%	6 10%	7 10%	2 12%	30 13%	15 10%	8 13%	9 16%	1 6%	7 42%	4 8%	55 13%	54 13%	111 13%
Don't know	50 6%	45 6%	1 12%	4 4%	- 6%	5 6%	1 3%	1 2%	3 5%	- 4%	13 5%	12 8%	5 9%	3 5%	- 9%	2 9%	4 9%	27 6%	19 4%	46 5%
None of these	382 44%	332 44%	6 54%	44 45%	11 45%	30 39%	24 52%	30 51%	24 36%	7 40%	109 48%	72 50% <i>f</i>	20 33%	21 38%	8 40%	6 33%	20 42%	208 48% <i>r</i>	170 40%	385 44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 78

Q9c. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Hot water system

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	272	38	234	40	53	65	61	14	38	114	21	68	8	40	44	139	194	73	272
	31% <i>cjk</i>	23%	33% <i>aa</i>	20%	26%	34% <i>c</i>	34% <i>c</i>	44% <i>cd</i>	69% <i>zdefg</i>	38% <i>jk</i>	20%	24%	19%	33%	30%	34%	31%	31%	31%
Yes - done since early 2015	215	29	187	32	53	46	51	13	21	93	14	61	8	37	40	97	156	56	211
	25% <i>cj</i>	17%	26% <i>aa</i>	16%	26% <i>c</i>	24%	28% <i>c</i>	38% <i>c</i>	38% <i>zc</i>	31% <i>jk</i>	14%	22%	20%	30%	27%	24%	25%	24%	24%
Yes - being considered	110	6	104	10	26	21	31	7	12	45	8	21	3	12	17	58	79	30	111
	13% <i>ack</i>	4%	15% <i>aa</i>	5%	12% <i>c</i>	11%	17% <i>c</i>	22% <i>c</i>	22% <i>zce</i>	15% <i>k</i>	8%	8%	6%	10%	11%	14%	13%	13%	13%
Don't know	50	14	36	14	13	9	10	2	2	11	8	21	3	8	4	24	32	17	46
	6%	8%	5%	7%	6%	4%	5%	5%	3%	3%	8%	7%	8%	7%	3%	6%	5%	7%	5%
None of these	382	92	290	118	94	82	67	11	10	111	61	141	22	49	71	170	283	99	385
	44% <i>h</i>	55% <i>zb</i>	41%	55% <i>zdefgh</i>	45% <i>h</i>	43% <i>h</i>	37% <i>h</i>	34%	17%	37%	59% <i>zl</i>	51% <i>l</i>	54%	40%	48%	42%	45%	42%	44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 79

Q9c. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Hot water system

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	272 31% <i>ar</i>	43 22%	133 31% <i>a</i>	32 35% <i>a</i>	63 42% <i>zab</i>	41 36%	172 30%	209 30%	31 38%	41 41% <i>g</i>	57 41% <i>zg</i>	108 31%	9 28%	79 36%	219 37% <i>zr</i>	114 46% <i>znqr</i>	33 37% <i>r</i>	55 35% <i>r</i>	46 19%	272 31%
Yes - done since early 2015	215 25% <i>r</i>	40 21%	112 26%	25 28%	36 25%	29 25%	136 24%	161 23%	20 24%	31 31%	53 37% <i>zg</i>	73 21%	8 27%	71 32% <i>zk</i>	167 26% <i>qr</i>	87 35% <i>zqr</i>	21 23%	31 19%	40 16%	215 24%
Yes - being considered	110 13% <i>r</i>	20 10%	59 14%	14 16%	14 9%	22 19% <i>f</i>	66 11%	84 12%	15 19%	16 16%	23 17%	45 13%	5 18%	24 11%	94 16% <i>r</i>	50 20% <i>zr</i>	15 16% <i>r</i>	21 13% <i>r</i>	14 6%	110 13%
Don't know	50 6%	8 4%	22 5%	6 6%	12 8%	3 3%	36 6%	41 6%	4 5%	4 4%	4 3%	19 5%	1 2%	7 3%	26 4%	9 3%	6 6%	7 5%	19 8%	50 5%
None of these	382 44% <i>hjo</i>	109 56% <i>zbcd</i>	170 40%	37 42%	56 38%	47 41%	257 45%	305 44% <i>hj</i>	25 32%	37 37%	41 29%	160 46%	13 42%	84 38%	231 39%	81 32%	36 40%	68 43% <i>o</i>	144 58% <i>znopq</i>	385 44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 80

Q9c. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Hot water system

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	272 31% <i>fjm</i>	165 32%	12 39%	96 31%	272 31% <i>f</i>	31 26%	36 22%	33 37% <i>f</i>	56 43% <i>zdef</i>	58 49% <i>zdef</i>	57 23%	136 33% <i>j</i>	73 39% <i>j</i>	42 19%	148 32% <i>m</i>	75 44% <i>zmn</i>	272 31%
Yes - done since early 2015	215 25%	146 28% <i>c</i>	5 18%	62 20%	215 25%	20 16%	39 23%	22 25%	48 37% <i>zdef</i>	51 44% <i>zdefg</i>	55 22%	104 25%	53 28%	51 24%	116 25%	45 26%	211 24%
Yes - being considered	110 13% <i>j</i>	75 14%	5 17%	30 10%	110 13% <i>j</i>	10 8%	18 11%	8 9%	21 16%	32 27% <i>zdefg</i>	17 7%	57 14% <i>j</i>	34 18% <i>j</i>	17 8%	59 13%	32 19% <i>m</i>	111 13%
Don't know	50 6% <i>l</i>	30 6%	-	19 6%	50 6% <i>l</i>	6 5%	8 5%	3 4%	4 3%	1 1%	17 7%	17 4%	11 6%	16 7%	24 5%	6 4%	46 5%
None of these	382 44% <i>hi</i>	207 40%	14 47%	158 50% <i>a</i>	382 44% <i>hi</i>	65 54% <i>ghi</i>	80 47% <i>hi</i>	30 34%	41 32%	36 31%	125 51% <i>f</i>	177 43%	69 37%	114 52% <i>zno</i>	199 44%	60 35%	385 44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 81

Q9c. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Hot water system

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	272	2	1	48	2	1	8	21	12	16	3	25	7	15	15	5	29	19	7	32	4	272
	31%	20%	13%	28%	22%	13%	26%	25%	32%	41%	12%	33%	23%	34%	44%	100%	65%	zcfghkmqsl0%	24%	24%	49%	31%
Yes - done since early 2015	215	-	1	28	1	1	9	15	6	14	3	18	8	10	12	5	23	12	12	34	4	211
	25% ^c	-	13%	17%	12%	19%	30%	18%	17%	36%	11%	24%	26%	22%	37%	100%	50%	zcgghkmqs26%	40%	25%	45%	24%
Yes - being considered	110	2	1	15	1	-	2	14	7	8	4	5	6	6	2	3	12	6	3	12	2	111
	13%	14%	28%	9%	9%	-	7%	17%	18%	21%	13%	6%	21%	13%	6%	65%	26%	zcfks	13%	11%	9%	22%
Don't know	50	3	-	8	1	-	2	2	2	-	6	8	1	*	3	-	1	4	2	7	-	46
	6%	29%	-	5%	12%	-	5%	2%	5%	-	20%	11%	2%	1%	10%	-	3%	9%	7%	5%	-	5%
None of these	382	4	3	87	5	4	13	41	13	15	32	19	22	9	-	7	18	9	64	2	385	
	44% ^p	37%	72%	51% ^p	49%	68%	42% ^p	51% ^p	36%	34%	53%	43% ^p	63%	49% ^p	27%	-	16%	39% ^p	30%	47% ^p	28%	44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 82

Q9d. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Lighting (including changes to fittings, lamps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	46*	60*	55*	19**	18**	433	426	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	450 52%	397 52%	4 35%	49 50%	16 68%	44 58%	22 48%	30 52%	34 52%	7 37%	112 49%	64 44%	39 65%jk	30 56%	13 70%	9 52%	21 46%	211 49%	231 54%	460 53%
Yes - done since early 2015	515 59%	449 59%	6 57%	60 61%	15 62%	43 56%	31 67%	33 56%	49 74%zjk	12 70%	124 54%	82 56%	42 71%j	31 57%	8 41%	12 70%	27 58%	241 56%	265 62%	522 60%
Yes - being considered	196 23%	179 24%	2 19%	15 15%	7 31%	20 26%	7 16%	9 15%	12 19%	5 31%	54 24%	32 22%	10 17%	18 33%g	5 26%	6 37%	9 18%	105 24%	92 21%	208 24%
Don't know	13 1%	13 2%	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	4 2%	2 1%	1 2%	1 2%	-	2 9%	-	5 1%	6 1%	10 1%
None of these	103 12%	79 10%	3 24%	22 22%za	1 3%	7 9%	4 8%	8 13%	3 5%	3 18%	42 19%zhl	16 11%	2 3%	6 11%	3 14%	1 4%	5 10%	51 12%	51 12%	91 10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 83

Q9d. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Lighting (including changes to fittings, lamps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	450 52% <i>acjq</i>	70 42%	380 54% <i>ea</i>	82 41%	102 50%	104 55% <i>c</i>	95 52% <i>c</i>	23 71% <i>zcd</i>	42 76% <i>zcd</i>	177 59% <i>jk</i>	40 38%	126 45%	12 28%	51 42%	72 49%	236 58% <i>zm</i>	348 56% <i>q</i>	99 42%	460 53%
Yes - done since early 2015	515 59% <i>aj</i>	79 48%	436 62% <i>ea</i>	106 53%	126 61%	117 61%	110 61%	22 67%	31 56%	199 66% <i>jk</i>	42 41%	157 56% <i>j</i>	18 43%	71 58%	87 60%	248 61%	383 61%	127 54%	522 60%
Yes - being considered	196 23% <i>m</i>	29 17%	167 24%	34 17%	41 20%	45 23%	43 24%	10 31%	20 37% <i>zcd</i>	74 24%	19 18%	59 21%	10 24%	15 12%	36 25% <i>m</i>	100 24% <i>m</i>	149 24%	45 19%	208 24%
Don't know	13 1%	6 3% <i>b</i>	7 1%	3 1%	2 1%	1 1%	6 3%	1 4% <i>e</i>	-	1 3% <i>i</i>	3 2%	6 2%	1 3%	3 2%	1 1%	5 1%	7 1%	6 2%	10 1%
None of these	103 12% <i>l</i>	35 21% <i>zb</i>	68 10%	43 22% <i>zdefgh</i>	21 10%	22 11%	15 8%	1 2%	2 4%	18 6%	25 24% <i>zl</i>	46 16% <i>l</i>	15 37%	23 19% <i>zo</i>	14 10%	34 8%	60 10%	43 16% <i>zp</i>	91 10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 84

Q9d. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Lighting (including changes to fittings, lamps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	450 52% ^r	101 52%	228 54%	47 52%	67 45%	70 60%	289 50%	352 51%	47 59%	61 61%	79 56%	192 55%	13 41%	112 50%	340 57% ^r	181 72% ^{znqr}	57 63% ^r	88 55% ^r	98 39%	460 53%
Yes - done since early 2015	515 59% ^r	117 60%	260 61%	48 54%	81 55%	73 63%	335 58%	408 59%	51 64%	67 67%	95 67%	206 59%	21 69%	132 60%	380 64% ^r	157 63% ^r	51 56%	98 62% ^r	121 49%	522 60%
Yes - being considered	196 23%	40 21%	104 25%	21 23%	29 20%	32 28%	128 22%	158 23%	16 20%	28 28%	34 24%	93 27%	4 12%	45 20%	140 23%	80 32% ^{znr}	25 27%	40 25%	52 21%	208 24%
Don't know	13 1%	1 1%	4 1%	-	6 4% ^b	2 2%	8 1%	11 2%	-	1 1%	1 1%	2 -	-	4 2%	5 1%	3 1%	-	-	6 2%	10 1%
None of these	103 12% ^{eo}	22 11%	35 8%	11 13%	31 21% ^{zab}	5 4%	68 12% ^e	75 11%	7 8%	6 7%	10 7%	36 10%	3 10%	19 9%	51 8% ^o	6 2%	7 8% ^o	13 8% ^o	52 21% ^{znopq}	91 10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 85

Q9d. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Lighting (including changes to fittings, lamps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	450 52% <i>m</i>	258 49%	18 58%	172 55%	450 52%	50 42%	80 48%	48 54%	82 63% <i>zdef</i>	84 72% <i>zdefg</i>	110 45%	210 51%	117 62% <i>zjk</i>	87 40%	251 55% <i>m</i>	103 60% <i>m</i>	460 53%
Yes - done since early 2015	515 59% <i>ce</i>	333 64% <i>c</i>	20 64%	157 50%	515 59% <i>e</i>	54 45%	118 70% <i>zde</i>	56 63% <i>e</i>	89 68% <i>e</i>	83 71% <i>zde</i>	129 53%	251 61%	119 64% <i>j</i>	119 55%	271 59%	112 65%	522 60%
Yes - being considered	196 23%	120 23%	8 25%	69 22%	196 23%	21 17%	40 24%	17 20%	36 27%	35 30% <i>e</i>	52 21%	92 22%	45 24%	44 20%	106 23%	40 24%	208 24%
Don't know	13 1%	5 1%	-	8 2%	13 1%	-	2 1%	-	-	-	5 2%	2 1%	3 2%	5 2%	3 1%	2 1%	10 1%
None of these	103 12% <i>fghi</i>	46 9%	5 15%	52 17% <i>za</i>	103 12% <i>fghi</i>	31 26% <i>zdfghi</i>	8 5%	3 4%	5 4%	5 4%	46 19% <i>zkl</i>	40 10%	15 8%	45 20% <i>zno</i>	42 9%	15 9%	91 10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 86

Q9d. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Lighting (including changes to fittings, lamps or controls)

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	450	7	1	96	6	5	11	49	22	25	11	27	18	17	16	5	32	17	18	62	4	460
	52%km	65%	28%	56%fkmq	63%	84%	36%	60%fkmq	59%fkmq	66%	39%	36%	60%	37%	48%	100%	72%zfkmq	36%	62%	46%	45%	53%
Yes - done since early 2015	515	8	2	108	3	4	17	53	20	22	18	33	16	27	23	5	37	22	21	75	2	522
	59%k	74%	41%	63%k	33%	75%	53%	65%k	54%	59%	63%	44%	54%	60%	68%	100%	82%zcfhkms	46%	73%	55%	22%	60%
Yes - being considered	196	2	1	45	4	2	6	14	8	6	7	14	4	10	8	3	16	9	4	30	2	208
	23%	17%	28%	27%	37%	38%	19%	18%	23%	17%	24%	19%	13%	22%	25%	65%	35%	19%	15%	22%	22%	24%
Don't know	13	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	3	1	-	1	-	-	4	-	1	-	10
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	3%c	-	-	-	6%	3%c	2%	-	4%	-	-	5%zogs	-	1%	-	1%
None of these	103	-	3	15	3	-	4	2	2	3	5	18	3	9	4	-	11	2	15	5	91	
	12%g	-	59%	8%	25%	-	13%g	3%	5%	7%	18%	24%zcghps	11%	19%cgph	13%	-	2%	23%zcghp	6%	11%	55%	10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 87

Q9e. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Computers & IT solutions

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	309 35%	275 36%	4 35%	31 31%	13 57%	27 36%	18 38%	21 36%	28 43% <i>m</i>	6 36%	85 37%	47 32%	18 30%	12 22%	9 47%	7 42%	13 28%	162 37%	141 33%	316 36%
Yes - done since early 2015	314 36%	275 36%	3 26%	37 38%	9 38%	21 27%	14 31%	19 32%	28 43%	8 45%	90 39%	46 31%	22 36%	23 43%	6 31%	9 52%	14 31%	150 35%	155 36%	311 36%
Yes - being considered	115 13%	101 13%	2 15%	13 13%	5 19%	18 23% <i>zfgkm</i>	4 8%	4 7%	7 10%	2 11%	34 15%	14 10%	9 15%	3 5%	3 17%	6 35%	7 16%	62 14%	52 12%	116 13%
Don't know	91 10%	77 10%	1 4%	14 14%	-	8 11%	2 5%	6 11%	7 10%	2 10%	26 11%	16 11%	2 15% <i>p</i>	5 9%	3 15%	2 13%	1 2%	39 9%	50 12%	83 10%
None of these	272 31%	237 31%	4 39%	31 31%	6 25%	25 33%	17 37%	19 32%	15 23%	5 31%	67 29%	49 34%	21 35%	22 41%	6 35%	2 9%	16 35%	139 32%	134 31%	279 32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 88

Q9e. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Computers & IT solutions

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	309 35%a	37 22%	272 39%a	56 28%	72 35%	69 36%	67 37%	15 46%	28 50%zcd	105 35%	34 33%	98 35%	11 26%	33 27%	44 30%	167 41%mn	230 37%	78 33%	316 36%
Yes - done since early 2015	314 36%	49 29%	266 38%	68 34%	68 33%	70 36%	71 40%	14 44%	22 39%	107 35%	30 29%	111 40%	10 23%	43 35%	49 34%	147 36%	230 37%	84 36%	311 36%
Yes - being considered	115 13%	14 8%	101 14%	24 12%	21 10%	26 14%	24 13%	8 26%zcd	10 19%	40 13%	13 13%	37 13%	11 28%	12 10%	18 12%	52 13%	84 13%	31 13%	116 13%
Don't know	91 10%k	20 12%	72 10%	16 8%	18 9%	20 10%	24 13%	4 12%	6 11%	44 15%k	7 6%	14 5%	2 4%	7 5%	18 12%	48 12%	65 10%	23 10%	83 10%
None of these	272 31%	68 41%zb	205 29%	83 42%zgh	66 32%	63 33%	43 24%	5 16%	12 23%	88 29%	40 38%	97 35%	19 47%	49 40%o	52 35%	112 27%	185 29%	84 36%	279 32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q9e. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Computers & IT solutions

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	309 35% <i>r</i>	65 33%	138 33%	36 41%	65 44% <i>b</i>	50 43%	198 34%	247 36%	34 42%	51 52% <i>z</i> <i>g</i>	60 42%	133 38%	14 45%	80 36%	233 39% <i>r</i>	115 46% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	39 43% <i>r</i>	65 41% <i>r</i>	66 27%	316 36%
Yes - done since early 2015	314 36%	75 39%	151 36%	34 38%	53 36%	41 35%	210 36%	249 36%	30 37%	41 42%	62 44%	124 35%	17 55% <i>z</i> <i>k</i> <i>m</i>	74 33%	220 37%	90 36%	33 37%	57 36%	89 36%	311 36%
Yes - being considered	115 13%	24 12%	57 13%	12 13%	22 15%	19 16%	67 12%	88 13%	15 19%	20 20% <i>g</i>	22 16%	61 17% <i>m</i>	2 8%	24 11%	83 14%	45 18%	14 16%	22 14%	28 12%	116 13%
Don't know	91 10% <i>c</i>	19 10% <i>c</i>	50 12% <i>c</i>	2 2%	16 11% <i>c</i>	11 9%	58 10%	67 10%	7 8%	9 9%	16 11%	29 8%	-	23 10%	69 12%	27 11%	9 10%	11 7%	16 7%	83 10%
None of these	272 31%	64 33%	132 31%	30 34%	40 27%	30 26%	189 33%	217 31%	19 23%	23 24%	34 24%	112 32%	7 23%	68 31%	166 28%	67 27%	24 27%	47 30%	104 42% <i>s</i> <i>n</i> <i>o</i> <i>p</i> <i>q</i>	279 32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 90

Q9e. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Computers & IT solutions

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	309 35% <i>m</i>	185 36%	13 44%	110 35%	309 35%	36 30%	60 35%	34 39%	54 42%	47 40%	70 29%	151 37%	84 45% <i>zj</i>	55 25%	171 37% <i>lm</i>	81 47% <i>zmn</i>	316 36%
Yes - done since early 2015	314 36%	212 41% <i>c</i>	4 13%	97 31%	314 36%	37 31%	70 42%	34 38%	51 39%	45 38%	77 32%	157 38%	73 39%	69 32%	171 37%	71 41%	311 36%
Yes - being considered	115 13%	77 15%	1 3%	37 12%	115 13%	16 13%	33 20% <i>zdg</i>	8 9%	14 11%	19 16%	35 14%	48 12%	30 16%	29 14%	56 12%	29 17%	116 13%
Don't know	91 10% <i>f</i>	50 10%	2 5%	37 12%	91 10% <i>f</i>	9 8%	7 4%	11 13% <i>f</i>	12 9%	16 13% <i>f</i>	22 9%	38 9%	18 10%	19 9%	45 10%	13 8%	83 10%
None of these	272 31%	147 28%	14 46%	112 36% <i>a</i>	272 31%	46 39%	48 29%	23 26%	40 31%	31 27%	96 38% <i>zkl</i>	120 29%	50 26%	91 42% <i>zno</i>	133 29%	42 25%	279 32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 91

Q9e. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Computers & IT solutions

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	309	2	-	63	3	1	15	20	12	13	12	33	9	21	14	5	17	12	7	46	4	316
	35%	14%	-	37%	34%	25%	47%g	24%	34%	33%	43%	44%g	29%	46%g	41%	100%	38%	27%	25%	34%	51%	36%
Yes - done since early 2015	314	4	1	53	2	2	13	21	9	13	11	33	9	20	21	3	21	13	11	52	2	311
	36%	33%	13%	31%	21%	38%	42%	26%	26%	34%	38%	44%g	31%	45%g	61%	62%	47%g	27%	37%	39%	22%	36%
Yes - being considered	115	1	-	24	1	1	3	8	1	5	3	10	1	9	11	1	10	6	2	19	-	116
	13%h	7%	-	14%h	9%	25%	9%	9%	2%	12%	10%	13%	4%	21%h	31%	27%	23%h	14%	6%	14%h	-	13%
Don't know	91	1	1	15	2	-	2	16	3	4	5	5	6	1	1	-	6	8	2	13	-	83
	10%	13%	13%	9%	16%	-	8%	20%zckm	9%	10%	19%	6%	21%	4%	-	-	13%	16%m	7%	9%	-	10%
None of these	272	4	3	61	5	3	9	26	12	13	7	17	8	11	5	-	9	20	13	43	2	279
	31%	40%	74%	35%	49%	62%	28%	32%	32%	35%	26%	23%	27%	25%	15%	-	19%	43%kp	43%	32%	28%	32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 92

Q9f. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Building fabric, including windows and doors

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	241 28%	202 27%	3 29%	35 36%	8 33%	19 25%	12 26%	13 23%	25 38%p	5 31%	59 26%	38 26%	19 31%	16 30%	7 36%	9 52%	7 14%	101 23%	139 33%q	243 28%
Yes - done since early 2015	226 26%	185 24%	3 30%	37 38%a	8 32%	21 28%	6 14%	17 29%	19 29%	4 25%	55 24%	31 22%	21 35%fk	16 29%	3 14%	10 55%	11 23%	105 24%	120 28%	222 25%
Yes - being considered	124 14%	107 14%	- 4%	17 18%	4 17%	11 15%	3 7%	9 15%	10 15%	3 17%	30 13%	21 15%	7 12%	11 20%	1 4%	5 26%	8 18%	59 14%	64 15%	117 13%
Don't know	31 4%	29 4%	- -	2 2%	- -	2 3%	- -	1 2%	4 6%	1 5%	7 3%	5 3%	3 5%	2 4%	2 10%	2 9%	- -	9 2%	17 4%	28 3%
None of these	445 51%	395 52%	6 57%	44 45%	11 46%	39 52%	27 59%	34 58%	28 43%	8 46%	130 57%	73 50%	28 46%	26 47%	7 37%	5 26%	25 55%	236 55%	205 48%	450 52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 93

Q9f. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Building fabric, including windows and doors

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	241	36	205	48	59	54	44	12	22	107	18	54	9	27	56	109	174	65	243
	28% <i>k</i>	21%	29%	24%	29%	28%	24%	36%	41% <i>zcf</i>	35% <i>zjk</i>	18%	19%	22%	22%	38% <i>zmo</i>	27%	28%	28%	28%
Yes - done since early 2015	226	35	191	44	56	54	39	9	21	109	15	57	9	31	49	101	172	51	222
	26% <i>j</i>	21%	27%	22%	27%	28%	22%	28%	38% <i>zcf</i>	36% <i>zjk</i>	14%	20%	21%	26%	34%	25%	27%	22%	25%
Yes - being considered	124	12	112	11	32	28	25	6	19	50	12	34	7	11	23	62	80	43	117
	14% <i>ac</i>	7%	16% <i>aa</i>	6%	15% <i>c</i>	15% <i>c</i>	14% <i>c</i>	18% <i>c</i>	35% <i>zcddef</i>	17%	12%	12%	17%	9%	16%	15%	13%	18%	13%
Don't know	31	10	21	6	5	6	11	-	2	5	6	11	-	5	4	9	21	10	28
	4%	6%	3%	3%	3%	3%	6%	-	4%	2%	6% <i>f</i>	4%	-	4%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%
None of these	445	93	352	122	102	93	94	18	17	126	65	165	26	69	64	214	325	117	450
	51% <i>hi</i>	56%	50%	61% <i>zdeh</i>	49% <i>h</i>	49% <i>h</i>	52% <i>h</i>	56% <i>h</i>	30%	42%	63% <i>zi</i>	59% <i>zi</i>	64%	56%	44%	52%	52%	50%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 94

Q9f. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Building fabric, including windows and doors

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	241	46	124	24	43	38	150	189	26	37	48	98	12	62	182	83	23	44	49	243
	26% <i>f</i>	23%	29%	27%	29%	33%	26%	27%	32%	37%	34%	28%	37%	28%	30% <i>r</i>	33% <i>r</i>	25%	28%	20%	28%
Yes - done since early 2015	226	66	106	17	34	30	139	164	36	30	50	89	11	59	169	71	19	43	46	222
	26% <i>f</i>	34% <i>zbc</i>	25%	19%	23%	26%	24%	24%	45% <i>zg</i>	31%	35% <i>zg</i>	25%	36%	27%	28% <i>r</i>	28% <i>r</i>	21%	27%	19%	25%
Yes - being considered	124	22	65	13	24	19	76	95	8	20	22	50	1	36	98	51	19	26	24	117
	14%	11%	15%	15%	16%	17%	13%	14%	11%	20%	15%	14%	4%	16%	16% <i>r</i>	20% <i>zr</i>	21% <i>r</i>	16%	10%	13%
Don't know	31	3	15	3	7	-	21	24	3	3	5	7	1	5	12	8	2	4	15	28
	4%	1%	3%	3%	5%	-	4%	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	6% <i>r</i>	3%
None of these	445	101	208	53	78	56	309	362	26	42	61	181	12	112	287	116	45	74	153	450
	51% <i>h</i>	52%	49%	59%	53%	49%	54%	53% <i>h</i>	32%	42%	44%	51%	39%	51%	48%	46%	50%	47%	62% <i>znoq</i>	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q9f. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Building fabric, including windows and doors

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	241	160	5	75	241	24	38	24	50	44	50	121	65	41	137	60	243
	28% <i>jm</i>	31%	17%	24%	28%	20%	22%	27%	39% <i>zdef</i>	38% <i>zdef</i>	21%	29% <i>j</i>	35% <i>j</i>	19%	30% <i>m</i>	35% <i>m</i>	28%
Yes - done since early 2015	226	153	4	68	226	19	39	17	53	47	54	111	58	45	122	56	222
	26% <i>e</i>	29% <i>c</i>	13%	22%	26% <i>e</i>	16%	23%	19%	40% <i>zdefg</i>	40% <i>zdefg</i>	22%	27%	31%	21%	27%	32% <i>m</i>	25%
Yes - being considered	124	80	2	43	124	5	28	9	29	31	24	58	37	18	69	33	117
	14% <i>em</i>	15%	7%	14%	14% <i>e</i>	4%	17% <i>e</i>	10%	22% <i>zdeg</i>	26% <i>zdeg</i>	10%	14%	20% <i>j</i>	8%	15% <i>m</i>	19% <i>m</i>	13%
Don't know	31	15	-	14	31	3	8	3	-	1	7	12	6	7	13	6	28
	4% <i>h</i>	3%	-	4%	4% <i>h</i>	2%	5% <i>hi</i>	4% <i>h</i>	-	*	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
None of these	445	243	21	177	445	83	85	46	45	48	152	205	76	140	229	66	450
	51% <i>hlo</i>	47%	71%	57% <i>a</i>	51% <i>h</i>	69% <i>zdfghi</i>	51% <i>h</i>	52% <i>h</i>	35%	41%	62% <i>zkl</i>	50%	41%	65% <i>zno</i>	50% <i>o</i>	38%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q9f. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Building fabric, including windows and doors

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	241	3	1	42	3	1	6	22	9	17	4	15	8	9	11	3	25	18	7	32	4	243
	28%	31%	13%	25%	27%	16%	20%	28%	25%	45%	14%	20%	27%	20%	33%	62%	55% <i>zcfghkms</i>	37%	24%	24%	45%	28%
Yes - done since early 2015	226	1	1	35	2	2	7	22	6	22	4	19	10	11	14	3	21	14	5	23	2	222
	26% <i>s</i>	8%	13%	21%	24%	35%	24%	27%	18%	57%	14%	26%	34%	27%	42%	62%	46% <i>zcfhkms</i>	30%	18%	17%	22%	25%
Yes - being considered	124	1	1	20	1	-	2	10	4	10	4	8	7	4	6	1	18	11	6	8	2	117
	14% <i>s</i>	10%	13%	12%	7%	-	7%	12%	11%	27%	16%	11%	22%	12%	9%	17%	40% <i>zcfghkms</i>	24% <i>s</i>	19%	6%	22%	13%
Don't know	31	1	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	2	4	3	1	1	1	-	1	4	2	7	-	28
	4%	13%	-	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	6%	15%	4%	2%	1%	4%	-	3%	8% <i>c</i>	7%	5% <i>c</i>	-	3%
None of these	445	6	4	96	5	4	18	42	20	8	16	38	16	27	14	2	12	21	13	81	5	450
	51% <i>p</i>	56%	87%	56% <i>p</i>	47%	65%	57% <i>p</i>	52% <i>p</i>	54% <i>p</i>	20%	58%	51% <i>p</i>	54%	59% <i>p</i>	42%	38%	27%	44%	43%	60% <i>p</i>	55%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 97

Q9g. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Ventilation system (including changes to fans or addition of heat recovery)

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	218 25% <i>k</i>	193 25%	2 19%	22 23%	6 27%	21 28%	9 18%	8 13%	25 38% <i>fgkm</i>	2 12%	65 29% <i>gk</i>	25 17%	18 29% <i>g</i>	9 16%	8 42%	3 15%	17 36% <i>gkm</i>	101 23%	111 26%	223 26%
Yes - done since early 2015	189 22%	165 22%	1 11%	22 23%	8 34%	19 25%	7 14%	8 13%	21 32% <i>fgkm</i>	3 20%	56 25%	25 17%	14 23%	8 15%	4 21%	3 17%	11 24%	92 21%	92 22%	187 21%
Yes - being considered	85 10% <i>c</i>	84 11% <i>c</i>	1 5%	1 1%	5 21%	5 6%	4 9%	5 9%	6 9%	2 11%	24 10%	15 11%	7 12%	4 7%	2 11%	2 14%	4 8%	49 11%	37 9%	95 11%
Don't know	44 5%	41 5%	-	4 4%	1 3%	3 3%	1 3%	-	1 1%	1 4%	13 6%	10 7%	4 7%	5 9% <i>g</i>	-	2 9%	2 5%	27 6%	16 4%	39 4%
None of these	478 55%	411 54%	9 75%	59 60%	10 44%	40 52%	29 63%	41 71% <i>z</i>	32 49%	10 57%	120 53%	83 57%	33 54%	33 61%	10 54%	12 66%	20 43%	229 53%	247 58%	474 54%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 98

Q9g. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Ventilation system (including changes to fans or addition of heat recovery)

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	218	34	184	33	51	47	42	14	30	89	13	58	6	27	36	105	148	65	223
	25% <i>cj</i>	21%	26%	17%	25%	24%	23%	43% <i>zcd</i>	55% <i>zcd</i>	29% <i>jk</i>	13%	21%	15%	22%	25%	26%	24%	28%	26%
Yes - done since early 2015	189	23	165	27	43	48	34	12	24	73	17	59	5	23	35	95	133	52	187
	22% <i>ac</i>	14%	23% <i>a</i>	14%	21%	25% <i>c</i>	19%	35% <i>cf</i>	43% <i>zcd</i>	24%	17%	21%	12%	19%	24%	23%	21%	22%	21%
Yes - being considered	85	10	76	9	16	18	22	7	12	40	6	17	2	6	17	49	57	27	95
	10% <i>c</i>	6%	11%	5%	8%	9%	12% <i>c</i>	20% <i>cd</i>	21% <i>zcd</i>	13% <i>k</i>	6%	6%	4%	5%	12%	12% <i>m</i>	9%	12%	11%
Don't know	44	10	35	8	9	10	11	1	3	11	5	17	2	4	7	19	31	13	39
	5%	6%	5%	4%	4%	5%	6%	2%	6%	4%	5%	6%	5%	4%	5%	5%	5%	6%	4%
None of these	478	105	374	138	114	101	98	14	10	160	69	161	28	72	82	216	357	120	474
	55% <i>h</i>	63% <i>b</i>	53%	70% <i>zdefgh</i>	55% <i>h</i>	53% <i>h</i>	55% <i>h</i>	43% <i>h</i>	19%	53%	66% <i>i</i>	58%	68%	58%	56%	53%	57%	51%	54%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q9g. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Ventilation system (including changes to fans or addition of heat recovery)

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECS (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	218	44	107	31	31	39	142	181	27	34	53	101	7	53	182	101	34	56	32	223
	25% <i>r</i>	23%	25%	35% <i>ad</i>	21%	33%	25%	26%	34%	34%	38% <i>zg</i>	29%	23%	24%	30% <i>zr</i>	40% <i>znr</i>	38% <i>zr</i>	35% <i>zr</i>	13%	26%
Yes - done since early 2015	189	48	89	24	25	36	111	142	20	26	43	70	8	60	153	80	31	47	25	187
	22% <i>r</i>	25%	21%	27%	17%	31% <i>zf</i>	19%	21%	25%	26%	31% <i>zg</i>	20%	25%	27%	26% <i>r</i>	32% <i>zr</i>	34% <i>zr</i>	30% <i>zr</i>	10%	21%
Yes - being considered	85	21	40	13	11	18	57	68	8	15	21	37	4	20	74	45	15	22	9	95
	10% <i>r</i>	11%	9%	14%	7%	15%	10%	10%	10%	15%	15%	11%	12%	9%	12% <i>r</i>	18% <i>znr</i>	17% <i>zr</i>	14% <i>r</i>	4%	11%
Don't know	44	11	17	2	12	1	32	34	3	11	7	18	4	7	28	12	5	7	13	39
	5% <i>e</i>	6%	4%	2%	8%	1%	5% <i>e</i>	5%	4%	11% <i>zg</i>	5%	5%	14% <i>zkm</i>	3%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%
None of these	478	111	232	42	85	51	328	377	37	42	54	187	13	116	290	96	34	64	180	474
	55% <i>eljnopq</i>	57%	55%	47%	57%	44%	57% <i>e</i>	55% <i>jj</i>	46%	42%	38%	53%	41%	52%	48% <i>o</i>	38%	38%	40%	73% <i>znopq</i>	54%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 100

Q9g. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Ventilation system (including changes to fans or addition of heat recovery)

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	218	125	9	84	218	18	27	25	48	49	37	115	61	28	126	61	223
	25% <i>effjm</i>	24%	30%	27%	25% <i>ef</i>	15%	16%	28% <i>ef</i>	37% <i>zdef</i>	42% <i>zdefg</i>	15%	28% <i>j</i>	32% <i>j</i>	13%	28% <i>m</i>	36% <i>zm</i>	26%
Yes - done since early 2015	189	132	3	54	189	13	20	25	38	54	37	87	60	34	97	57	187
	22% <i>eff</i>	25% <i>c</i>	9%	17%	22% <i>ef</i>	11%	12%	29% <i>ef</i>	29% <i>ef</i>	46% <i>zdefgh</i>	15%	21%	32% <i>zjk</i>	16%	21%	33% <i>zmn</i>	21%
Yes - being considered	85	55	+	30	85	3	9	9	21	28	11	44	27	14	44	25	95
	10% <i>ej</i>	11%	1%	9%	10% <i>e</i>	2%	5%	11% <i>e</i>	16% <i>zdef</i>	24% <i>zdefg</i>	5%	11% <i>j</i>	15% <i>j</i>	6%	10%	15% <i>m</i>	11%
Don't know	44	21	2	19	44	2	12	3	3	5	12	20	9	10	24	5	39
	5%	4%	6%	6%	5%	1%	7% <i>e</i>	4%	2%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	3%	4%
None of these	478	278	17	180	478	89	112	39	52	37	163	214	85	147	246	71	474
	55% <i>hilo</i>	53%	56%	57%	55% <i>hi</i>	74% <i>zdghi</i>	67% <i>zdghi</i>	44%	40%	32%	67% <i>zkl</i>	52%	45%	67% <i>zno</i>	54% <i>o</i>	41%	54%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 101

Q9g. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Ventilation system (including changes to fans or addition of heat recovery)

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871	
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	218	2	1	51	3	1	4	20	8	12	6	22	7	10	6	1	19	5	12	27	-	223
	25%	20%	26%	30% iq	31%	12%	12%	24%	23%	31%	21%	29%	25%	22%	19%	27%	42% zftqs	12%	40%	20%	-	26%
Yes - done since early 2015	189	2	1	39	-	1	4	18	4	9	6	17	7	8	8	1	19	6	9	25	4	187
	22%	14%	13%	23%	-	21%	14%	22%	12%	25%	21%	23%	22%	18%	23%	27%	43% zcfghkms	2%	32%	19%	45%	21%
Yes - being considered	85	1	1	22	1	-	2	12	2	5	3	3	3	4	2	1	8	2	4	9	-	95
	10%	7%	13%	13%	9%	-	7%	14%	6%	14%	10%	5%	10%	8%	6%	27%	19% ks	5%	12%	7%	-	11%
Don't know	44	1	-	7	1	-	2	6	3	1	4	5	1	1	5	-	1	4	1	3	-	39
	5%	13%	-	4%	6%	-	5%	7%	8%	2%	15%	6%	2%	2%	16%	-	3%	8%	4%	2%	-	4%
None of these	478	5	3	87	5	4	20	42	20	15	38	17	28	17	4	19	33	9	85	5	474	
	55%	45%	74%	51%	54%	67%	63%	52%	56%	54%	54%	51%	58%	62%	51%	73%	42%	70% cp	32%	63% cp	55%	54%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 102

Q9h. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Processes (including process re-engineering or changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps etc)

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263 30%	223 29%	3 23%	38 39%	9 39%	24 32%	14 31%	12 21%	19 29%	2 10%	67 30%	37 25%	20 33%	20 37%	11 60%	6 35%	17 36%	125 29%	136 32%	276 32%
Yes - done since early 2015	258 30%	220 29%	1 9%	37 37%	11 48%	16 21%	12 26%	14 24%	22 33%	4 26%	64 28%	39 27%	16 27%	20 37%	10 54%	7 42%	15 31%	122 28%	133 31%	266 31%
Yes - being considered	130 15%	114 15%	1 9%	16 16%	5 21%	11 14%	8 17%	4 7%	8 12%	2 14%	33 14%	21 14%	12 20%	12 21%	4 20%	4 25%	8 17%	69 16%	61 14%	138 16%
Don't know	46 5%	42 5%	1 6%	4 4%	- -	4 5%	- -	1 2%	2 3%	3 17%	13 6%	10 7%	4 6%	3 5%	- -	3 19%	2 3%	26 6%	15 4%	39 4%
None of these	410 47%	359 47%	8 66%	43 43%	7 29%	37 48%	22 48%	37 63% <i>zmp</i>	31 48%	9 53%	118 52%	71 48%	27 45%	21 39%	3 17%	5 30%	18 39%	201 46%	205 48%	398 46%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 103

Q9h. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Processes (including process re-engineering or changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps etc)

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263 30% <i>cm</i>	43 26%	221 31%	42 21%	62 30%	54 28%	56 31% <i>c</i>	14 43% <i>c</i>	36 65% <i>zdef</i>	109 36% <i>jk</i>	21 21%	71 25%	4 11%	17 14%	45 31% <i>m</i>	146 36% <i>m</i>	197 31%	64 27%	276 32%
Yes - done since early 2015	258 30% <i>aj</i>	34 20%	224 32% <i>aa</i>	47 24%	56 27%	66 35% <i>c</i>	51 28%	12 36%	26 47% <i>zcdf</i>	121 40% <i>zjk</i>	14 14%	67 24%	6 15%	31 25%	50 34%	126 31%	195 31%	59 25%	266 31%
Yes - being considered	130 15% <i>jm</i>	19 11%	112 16%	29 15%	23 11%	33 17%	27 15%	7 21%	11 20%	59 19% <i>j</i>	5 5%	37 13% <i>kl</i>	4 9%	7 6%	22 15% <i>m</i>	70 17% <i>m</i>	94 15%	33 14%	138 16%
Don't know	46 5%	11 7%	35 5%	11 6%	10 5%	13 7%	8 5%	- 1%	1 1%	11 4%	11 10% <i>i</i>	18 6%	2 5%	9 7%	10 7%	12 3%	26 4%	20 8% <i>p</i>	39 4%
None of these	410 47% <i>hi</i>	84 50%	326 46%	112 56% <i>zeh</i>	104 50% <i>h</i>	83 43% <i>h</i>	85 47% <i>h</i>	13 40%	11 20%	116 38%	65 63% <i>zl</i>	143 51% <i>l</i>	28 69%	75 61% <i>zno</i>	59 40%	177 43%	292 47%	117 49%	398 46%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 104

Q9h. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Processes (including process re-engineering or changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps etc)

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263 30% <i>f</i>	53 27%	141 33%	30 34%	36 24%	44 38% <i>f</i>	158 27%	203 29%	31 39%	42 42% <i>zg</i>	54 38% <i>g</i>	126 36% <i>m</i>	10 34%	59 27%	227 36% <i>zr</i>	128 51% <i>znr</i>	50 55% <i>znr</i>	84 53% <i>znr</i>	29 12%	276 32%
Yes - done since early 2015	258 30% <i>f</i>	52 27%	142 33% <i>d</i>	28 32%	33 22%	33 28%	163 28%	197 29%	27 34%	40 40% <i>zg</i>	54 38% <i>g</i>	110 31%	11 35%	71 32%	214 36% <i>zr</i>	108 43% <i>zr</i>	40 45% <i>zr</i>	73 46% <i>znr</i>	37 15%	266 31%
Yes - being considered	130 15% <i>f</i>	21 11%	73 17%	17 20%	18 12%	19 17%	85 15%	102 15%	11 14%	21 21%	23 17%	58 16%	5 16%	35 16%	105 18% <i>r</i>	62 25% <i>znr</i>	28 31% <i>znr</i>	40 25% <i>znr</i>	23 9%	138 16%
Don't know	46 5% <i>o</i>	9 4%	21 5%	3 4%	10 7%	2 2%	34 6%	40 6%	1 1%	5 5%	6 4%	11 3%	2 6%	10 5%	23 4%	5 2%	3 4%	4 2%	17 7% <i>o</i>	39 4%
None of these	410 47% <i>fjnopq</i>	104 53% <i>b</i>	177 42%	38 43%	81 55% <i>b</i>	47 41%	288 50%	328 48% <i>ij</i>	33 42% <i>l</i>	27 27%	50 35%	158 45%	9 31%	96 44%	232 39% <i>opq</i>	70 28%	17 19%	36 23%	168 68% <i>znopq</i>	398 46%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q9h. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Processes (including process re-engineering or changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps etc)

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263 30% <i>efjm</i>	163 31%	8 26%	93 30%	263 30% <i>ef</i>	18 15%	37 22%	32 36% <i>ef</i>	56 43% <i>zdef</i>	65 55% <i>zdefg</i>	43 17%	137 33% <i>j</i>	78 41% <i>zj</i>	38 17%	136 30% <i>m</i>	84 49% <i>zmn</i>	276 32%
Yes - done since early 2015	258 30% <i>cefjm</i>	179 34% <i>c</i>	7 22%	73 23%	258 30% <i>ef</i>	17 15%	35 21%	32 36% <i>ef</i>	53 41% <i>zdef</i>	71 60% <i>zdefgh</i>	43 17%	133 32% <i>j</i>	77 41% <i>zj</i>	41 19%	134 29% <i>m</i>	78 45% <i>zmn</i>	266 31%
Yes - being considered	130 15% <i>j</i>	83 16%	2 6%	45 14%	130 15% <i>j</i>	12 10%	16 9%	13 14%	28 22% <i>ef</i>	34 29% <i>zdefg</i>	22 9%	70 17% <i>j</i>	36 19% <i>j</i>	21 10%	72 16%	36 21% <i>m</i>	138 16%
Don't know	46 5% <i>o</i>	25 5%	1 2%	19 6%	46 5% <i>o</i>	2 2%	11 7%	4 4%	4 3%	2 2%	9 4%	22 5%	8 4%	6 3%	31 7% <i>o</i>	2 1%	39 4%
None of these	410 47% <i>ghilo</i>	223 43%	17 55%	166 53% <i>a</i>	410 47% <i>ghi</i>	83 69% <i>zdghi</i>	96 57% <i>zdghi</i>	31 35% <i>l</i>	40 31% <i>l</i>	18 15%	159 65% <i>zkl</i>	170 41%	67 36%	140 64% <i>zno</i>	206 45% <i>o</i>	54 32%	398 46%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 106

Q9h. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Processes (including process re-engineering or changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps etc)

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871	
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	263 30% <i>f</i>	3 32%	2 47%	74 43% <i>zfgmqms</i>	4 35%	5 88%	4 13%	17 22%	11 29%	13 34%	7 24%	23 30%	10 23%	4 11%	4 73%	19 43% <i>fgms</i>	11 23%	6 21%	34 25%	4 45%	276 32%	
Yes - done since early 2015	258 30% <i>s</i>	3 32%	5 100%	78 45% <i>zfgkmqs</i>	2 20%	4 70%	8 27%	15 19%	11 30%	5 37%	18 24%	11 36%	10 23%	2 6%	3 62%	16 36% <i>s</i>	10 20%	14 47%	27 20%	2 23%	266 31%	
Yes - being considered	130 15% <i>g</i>	2 17%	2 47%	41 24% <i>zfgs</i>	2 21%	1 25%	2 5%	4 20% <i>fg</i>	7 15%	6 9%	2 13%	5 18%	6 14%	1 3%	1 27%	10 23% <i>fg</i>	6 13%	1 5%	17 13%	2 23%	138 16%	
Don't know	46 5%	1 13%	-	3 2%	1 6%	-	2 6%	5 6%	-	4 10%	5 19%	1 9% <i>c</i>	2 2%	5 16%	-	-	3 6%	3 11%	4 3%	-	39 4%	
None of these	410 47% <i>c</i>	4 41%	-	50 29%	4 43%	-	17 56% <i>c</i>	49 61% <i>zch</i>	14 39%	13 35%	15 54%	35 47% <i>c</i>	14 47%	25 55% <i>c</i>	24 70%	-	21 47% <i>c</i>	29 63% <i>ch</i>	11 37%	77 57% <i>zch</i>	5 55%	398 46%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 107

Q9a-h. Still thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, I'd now like to ask you about any energy efficiency improvements that have been made to your organisation's sites in the last five years, or which are planned in the near future. For each of the categories I read out, please tell me whether energy-related improvements in these areas have either been implemented: before 2015, but less than five years ago, or implemented since early 2015, or are currently under consideration

Summary

Base: all participants

	Heating system (including changes to boilers, pumps, controls, insulation or fuels)	Cooling system (including changes to chillers, pumps or controls)	Hot water system	Lighting (including changes to fittings, lamps or controls)	Computers & IT solutions	Building fabric, including windows and doors	Ventilation system (including changes to fans or addition of heat recovery)	Processes (including process re-engineering or changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps etc)
Unweighted total	871	871	871	871	871	871	871	871
Weighted total	871	871	871	871	871	871	871	871
Yes - done before 2015, but less than five years ago	366 42%	263 30%	272 31%	450 52%	309 35%	241 28%	218 25%	263 30%
Yes - done since early 2015	337 39%	246 28%	215 25%	515 59%	314 36%	226 26%	189 22%	258 30%
Yes - being considered	170 20%	108 12%	110 13%	196 23%	115 13%	124 14%	85 10%	130 15%
Don't know	32 4%	35 4%	50 6%	13 1%	91 10%	31 4%	44 5%	46 5%
None of these	229 26%	381 44%	382 44%	103 12%	272 31%	445 51%	478 55%	410 47%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 108

Q10.1 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	198	181	3	14	7	16	18	14	15	3	42	38	15	14	2	5	7	96	102	198
Weighted total	202	172	2**	28**	7**	17**	17**	14**	18**	2**	47*	32*	13**	14**	3**	8**	7**	98*	104*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	104	88	2	14	4	5	7	7	13	1	25	19	6	8	2	4	*	48	56	100
	51%	51%	100%	50%	56%	32%	44%	47%	70%	64%	52%	58%	51%	58%	73%	56%	6%	49%	54%	51%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	80	66	*	13	1	7	7	2	7	1	25	8	7	7	2	3	1	39	41	74
	39%	39%	29%	45%	17%	40%	43%	11%	39%	36%	52%k	24%	58%	48%	73%	46%	19%	40%	39%	37%
Don't know	7	5	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	2	-	3	3	5
	3%	3%	-	7%	-	11%	4%	-	-	-	4%	-	4%	-	-	20%	-	3%	3%	3%
None of these	53	46	-	6	3	4	4	8	4	-	9	9	2	2	1	2	5	26	26	53
	26%	27%	-	23%	36%	24%	21%	53%	23%	-	20%	27%	14%	12%	27%	24%	74%	27%	25%	27%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 109

Q10.1 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	198	31	167	30	64	46	41	8	7	83	18	58	6	26	35	95	148	50	198
Weighted total	202	32**	170	31**	64*	48*	41*	8**	-	85*	23**	55*	8**	27**	37**	92*	152	50*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	104	11	92	13	30	27	25	5	5	48	9	25	1	15	21	54	82	22	100
51%	51%	36%	54%	41%	47%	56%	60%	62%	62%	56%	37%	45%	17%	55%	58%	58%	54%	44%	51%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	80	6	73	7	26	19	19	3	6	34	9	17	1	6	19	38	65	14	74
39%	39%	20%	43%	21%	40%	40%	46%	39%	72%	40%	39%	32%	16%	21%	52%	41%	43%	28%	37%
Don't know	7	2	5	1	4	-	-	-	-	3	4	1	-	2	-	1	3	4	5
3%	3%	5%	3%	2%	6%	-	-	-	-	3%	15%	1%	-	6%	-	1%	2%	8%	3%
None of these	53	14	38	13	16	15	6	1	2	19	7	20	6	8	6	21	37	16	53
26%	26%	45%	23%	42%	26%	32%	13%	12%	21%	23%	28%	37%	68%	31%	17%	23%	24%	31%	27%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 110

Q10.1 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	198	34	112	26	22	27	136	165	14	30	34	85	10	58	153	62	15	40	39	198
Weighted total	202	32**	114*	26**	25**	27**	129	156	15**	27**	31*	81*	9**	54*	153	60*	13**	37*	42*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	104	12	62	16	13	13	66	75	12	18	18	39	3	32	84	32	4	14	17	100
51%		37%	54%	63%	51%	49%	51%	48%	77%	64%	56%	49%	35%	59%	55%	53%	33%	38%	41%	51%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	80	9	48	12	8	2	64	65	5	13	10	30	5	21	65	27	7	13	12	74
39%		26%	42%	45%	32%	9%	50%	41%	35%	49%	33%	38%	9%	39%	42%	45%	54%	36%	29%	37%
Don't know	7	3	-	-	4	2	1	3	1	-	-	1	-	1	3	1	1	1	2	5
3%		8%	-	-	16%	7%	1%	2%	4%	-	-	1%	-	1%	2%	2%	5%	2%	4%	3%
None of these	53	11	29	6	5	10	31	43	2	7	9	26	2	12	36	15	3	14	16	53
26%		34%	25%	23%	22%	35%	24%	28%	15%	24%	29%	32%	17%	21%	24%	24%	22%	37%	38%	27%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 111

Q10.1 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	198	136	4	57	198	19	42	22	38	30	53	102	39	42	118	34	198
Weighted total	202	135	5**	60*	202	24**	41*	23**	35*	32**	51*	106*	40*	42*	121	34**	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	104	73	3	26	104	9	19	9	25	27	25	54	23	19	60	21	100
51%	51%	54%	67%	43%	51%	36%	47%	38%	73% <i>zdf</i>	87%	49%	50%	57%	46%	50%	62%	51%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	80	52	1	27	80	9	18	8	15	17	18	42	20	14	50	16	74
39%	39%	39%	16%	44%	39%	39%	43%	36%	42%	54%	34%	40%	50%	33%	41%	47%	37%
Don't know	7	4	-	2	7	2	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	5
3%	3%	-	4%	3%	8%	-	-	2%	-	-	5%	2%	-	6%	2%	-	3%
None of these	53	35	1	17	53	8	11	7	4	3	15	28	9	13	31	9	53
26%	26%	17%	27%	26%	35%	27%	29%	12%	9%	29%	27%	24%	30%	25%	28%	27%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 112

Q10.1 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	(u)	
Unweighted total	198	4	2	40	2	1	8	13	12	9	8	11	8	11	2	3	12	11	9	31	1	198
Weighted total	202	4**	2**	37*	1**	1**	6**	15**	11**	13**	6**	14**	10**	7**	3**	5**	13**	14**	10**	27**	2**	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	104	1	-	17	1	-	2	5	8	9	1	9	7	4	2	5	5	9	6	13	-	100
51%	19%	-	46%	49%	-	39%	37%	73%	68%	21%	60%	70%	55%	60%	100%	37%	68%	60%	46%	-	-	51%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	80	3	-	10	-	-	3	6	4	6	3	4	8	1	1	2	6	5	6	9	2	74
39%	81%	-	28%	-	-	56%	44%	34%	44%	54%	27%	76%	15%	40%	35%	44%	35%	58%	34%	100%	-	37%
Don't know	7	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	5
3%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	11%	-	-	-	-	3%
None of these	53	-	2	14	1	1	2	3	2	3	2	5	1	2	-	-	4	3	-	10	-	53
26%	-	100%	39%	51%	100%	28%	23%	14%	23%	25%	33%	8%	30%	-	-	27%	20%	-	37%	-	-	27%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 113

Q10.2 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Building management system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	198	181	3	14	7	16	18	14	15	3	42	38	15	14	2	5	7	96	102	198
Weighted total	202	172	2**	28**	7**	17**	17**	14**	18**	2**	47*	32*	13**	14**	3**	8**	7**	98*	104*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	53	1	16	4	5	3	3	8	1	24	8	4	4	2	-	3	30	39	64
34%	31%	60%	55%	56%	28%	18%	21%	44%	64%	51%k	24%	31%	30%	73%	-	45%	31%	38%	32%	
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	51	42	*	8	1	4	4	-	4	-	16	7	5	6	2	-	2	29	22	48
25%	25%	29%	28%	17%	21%	23%	-	21%	-	35%	21%	41%	43%	73%	-	23%	29%	21%	24%	
Don't know	12	10	-	3	-	2	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	2	-	4	-	6	7	10
6%	6%	-	10%	-	12%	-	-	4%	-	4%	-	4%	14%	-	57%	-	6%	6%	5%	
None of these	90	83	1	6	3	7	10	11	9	1	15	19	4	5	1	3	2	46	44	94
45%	48%	40%	23%	36%	39%	59%	79%	49%	36%	31%	58%j	32%	33%	27%	43%	33%	47%	42%	47%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 114

Q10.2 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Building management system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	198	31	167	30	64	46	41	8	7	83	18	58	6	26	35	95	148	50	198
Weighted total	202	32**	170	31**	64*	48*	41*	8**	8**	85*	23**	55*	8**	27**	37**	92*	152	50*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	12	57	11	26	13	11	4	4	40	2	12	*	10	16	34	51	19	64
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	51	2	49	6	10	13	11	3	7	21	2	15	3	3	10	29	39	12	48
Don't know	12	2	10	1	4	4	2	-	-	1	6	1	-	2	2	3	10	2	10
None of these	90	16	74	16	28	25	18	2	-	37	12	29	6	14	14	39	69	21	94
	45%	50%	44%	53%	44%	52%	45%	22%	-	43%	53%	52%	68%	52%	38%	43%	46%	41%	47%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 115

Q10.2 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Building management system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	198	34	112	26	22	27	136	165	14	30	34	85	10	58	153	62	15	40	39	198
Weighted total	202	32**	114*	26**	25**	27**	129	156	15**	27**	31*	81*	9**	54*	153	60*	13**	37*	42*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	7	45	14	3	9	42	50	4	10	12	26	4	19	63	29	3	12	6	64
	34%	21%	39%	53%	13%	31%	33%	32%	27%	35%	37%	32%	44%	36%	41% <i>r</i>	48% <i>r</i>	25%	32%	13%	32%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	51	7	28	10	5	2	37	38	3	13	14	22	1	14	45	23	2	8	4	48
	25% <i>r</i>	23%	24%	37%	19%	9%	28%	25%	18%	46%	44% <i>z</i>	27%	9%	25%	29% <i>r</i>	38% <i>r</i>	14%	22%	9%	24%
Don't know	12	2	4	-	7	2	5	8	2	1	1	3	1	2	4	1	-	-	7	10
	6%	6%	3%	-	27%	7%	4%	5%	17%	4%	4%	4%	12%	3%	2%	1%	-	-	16% <i>noq</i>	5%
None of these	90	18	50	8	11	16	60	75	7	9	7	36	3	25	61	20	8	19	27	94
	45% <i>r</i>	56%	44%	32%	43%	57%	47%	48% <i>j</i>	47%	31%	23%	45%	35%	46%	40%	32%	60%	52%	64% <i>zno</i>	47%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 116

Q10.2 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Building management system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	198	136	4	57	198	19	42	22	38	30	53	102	39	42	118	34	198
Weighted total	202	135	5**	60*	202	24**	41*	23**	35*	32**	51*	106*	40*	42*	121	34**	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	48	3	19	69	3	17	7	15	20	16	32	22	14	41	14	64
34%	34%	35%	59%	32%	34%	10%	41%	31%	42%	63%	30%	30%	56% <i>zjk</i>	33%	34%	41%	32%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	51	33	-	18	51	3	6	6	16	15	7	28	15	4	36	12	48
25% <i>m</i>	24%	-	30%	25%	13%	14%	25%	46% <i>zdf</i>	47%	13%	26%	39% <i>j</i>	8%	29% <i>m</i>	34%	24%	
Don't know	12	8	1	4	12	4	3	1	-	1	2	8	-	1	6	3	10
6%	6%	25%	6%	6%	15%	7%	5%	-	2%	4%	8%	-	3%	5%	8%	5%	
None of these	90	61	1	26	90	15	19	9	9	9	30	45	13	24	50	12	94
45%	45%	16%	43%	45%	61%	47%	39%	27%	27%	58% <i>l</i>	42%	32%	58%	42%	36%	47%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 117

Q10.2 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Building management system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	(u)	
Unweighted total	198	4	2	40	2	1	8	13	12	9	8	11	8	11	2	3	12	11	9	31	1	198
Weighted total	202	4**	2**	37*	1**	1**	6**	15**	11**	13**	6**	14**	10**	7**	3**	5**	13**	14**	10**	27**	2**	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	3	-	10	-	-	1	2	-	8	2	8	2	2	5	7	4	6	7	-	-	64
34%		61%	-	28%	-	-	9%	17%	-	61%	35%	15%	75%	31%	60%	100%	50%	30%	64%	26%	-	32%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	51	2	-	6	-	-	1	2	2	5	2	4	6	2	1	2	5	1	1	7	2	48
25%		44%	-	17%	-	-	13%	12%	17%	37%	39%	29%	61%	21%	40%	35%	35%	10%	9%	26%	100%	24%
Don't know	12	-	-	1	-	-	1	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	2	-	10
6%		-	-	1%	-	-	14%	22%	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	-	6%	-	5%
None of these	90	1	2	22	1	1	4	9	7	2	8	2	4	7	-	-	4	4	3	14	-	94
45%		21%	100%	59%	100%	100%	64%	61%	64%	18%	26%	56%	16%	62%	-	-	32%	32%	27%	52%	-	47%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 118

Q10.3 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	198	181	3	14	7	16	18	14	15	3	42	38	15	14	2	5	7	96	102	198
Weighted total	202	172	2**	28**	7**	17**	17**	14**	18**	2**	47*	32*	13**	14**	3**	8**	7**	98*	104*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	17	11	-	6	-	3	-	-	5	-	4	*	1	3	-	-	1	8	9	15
8%	6%	-	21%	-	-	17%	-	-	27%	-	8%	1%	7%	20%	-	-	11%	8%	9%	8%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	24	14	-	10	1	3	1	-	6	-	5	4	1	3	-	-	-	17	7	19
12%	8%	-	34%	19%	18%	3%	-	31%	-	11%	12%	7%	23%	-	-	-	17% <i>r</i>	7%	7%	10%
Don't know	20	18	*	2	-	1	1	-	1	-	8	3	3	1	-	2	1	9	12	18
10%	11%	29%	6%	-	5%	8%	-	7%	-	17%	10%	25%	6%	-	20%	8%	9%	11%	9%	
None of these	147	131	1	15	6	10	15	14	9	2	31	25	8	9	3	6	6	69	78	151
73%	76%	71%	53%	81%	60%	89%	100%	52%	100%	66%	79%	61%	63%	100%	80%	81%	70%	75%	76%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 119

Q10.3 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	198	31	167	30	64	46	41	8	7	83	18	58	6	26	35	95	148	50	198
Weighted total	202	32**	170	31**	64*	48*	41*	8**	8**	85*	23**	55*	8**	27**	37**	92*	152	50*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	17	*	16	*	5	5	3	1	3	10	-	1	*	3	-	9	9	7	15
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	24	2	21	1	8	4	7	2	2	15	-	3	*	1	7	16	20	4	19
Don't know	12%	8%	13%	5%	12%	7%	17%	31%	23%	18% <i>k</i>	-	5%	5%	2%	19%	17%	13%	8%	10%
None of these	20	3	17	2	7	2	6	-	-	12	4	5	-	8	4	7	15	6	18
	10%	10%	10%	7%	12%	5%	15%	-	-	14%	15%	9%	-	29%	10%	7%	10%	11%	9%
	147	26	121	27	44	41	25	5	5	53	20	47	8	15	26	65	113	34	151
	73%	82%	71%	88%	69%	85% <i>f</i>	61%	69%	62%	62%	85%	85% <i>l</i>	95%	58%	70%	71%	74%	68%	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 120

Q10.3 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	198	34	112	26	22	27	136	165	14	30	34	85	10	58	153	62	15	40	39	198
Weighted total	202	32**	114*	26**	25**	27**	129	156	15**	27**	31*	81*	9**	54*	153	60*	13**	37*	42*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	17	4	8	5	-	1	9	9	2	3	2	3	2	4	16	7	-	2	1	15
8%	13%	7%	18%	-	3%	7%	6%	16%	11%	8%	3%	3%	21%	8%	10%	11%	-	7%	2%	8%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	24	3	12	5	3	4	11	14	2	2	2	9	2	5	24	13	3	6	-	19
12% ^r	9%	11%	20%	12%	13%	9%	9%	13%	8%	8%	11%	13%	17%	10%	16% ^r	21% ^r	21%	17% ^r	-	10%
Don't know	20	*	13	-	6	2	14	16	1	3	1	3	1	7	12	1	1	3	7	18
10%	2%	11%	-	22%	7%	11%	10%	4%	9%	2%	4%	7%	12%	8%	2%	10%	8%	16% ^o	9%	9%
None of these	147	25	85	19	17	21	97	118	10	20	26	67	5	39	108	43	9	25	35	151
73%	77%	75%	72%	66%	78%	75%	76%	67%	74%	83%	84%	56%	72%	70%	71%	69%	68%	82%	76%	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 121

Q10.3 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	198	136	4	57	198	19	42	22	38	30	53	102	39	42	118	34	198
Weighted total	202	135	5**	60*	202	24**	41*	23**	35*	32**	51*	106*	40*	42*	121	34**	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	17	12	2	3	17	2	4	-	1	9	4	6	6	2	10	5	15
8%	9%	42%	5%	8%	8%	8%	9%	-	4%	27%	8%	6%	16%	5%	8%	13%	8%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	24	17	2	5	24	-	3	4	6	8	5	9	10	4	13	6	19
12%	13%	42%	8%	12%	-	7%	19%	17%	26%	10%	8%	26% zk	10%	11%	19%	10%	
Don't know	20	16	-	5	20	1	2	2	5	3	4	11	3	4	12	2	18
10%	12%	-	8%	10%	3%	5%	7%	14%	10%	7%	10%	8%	9%	10%	7%	9%	
None of these	147	96	1	48	147	21	33	17	23	17	38	81	25	32	88	23	151
73%	71%	16%	79%	73%	89%	80%	74%	67%	53%	74%	77%	63%	77%	73%	69%	76%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 122

Q10.3 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	(u)
Unweighted total	198	4	2	40	2	1	8	13	12	9	8	11	11	2	3	12	11	9	31	1	198
Weighted total	202	4**	2**	37*	1**	1**	6**	15**	11**	13**	6**	14**	7**	3**	5**	13**	14**	10**	27**	2**	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	17	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	*	-	2	5	1	-	2	-	15
8%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	8%	11%	-	-	24%	6%	-	35%	36%	7%	-	7%	-	8%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	24	2	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	6	*	2	5	1	-	-	2	-	19
12%	36%	-	9%	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	14%	8%	6%	60%	100%	5%	-	-	8%	-	10%
Don't know	20	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	2	4	1	2	-	-	-	4	2	1	1	-	18
10%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	19%	20%	28%	11%	14%	-	-	-	27%	15%	11%	5%	-	9%
None of these	147	3	2	31	1	6	9	7	9	4	11	4	7	1	-	5	11	9	23	2	151
73%	64%	100%	84%	100%	100%	100%	64%	70%	72%	67%	78%	44%	94%	40%	-	37%	78%	89%	84%	100%	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 123

Q10.4 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	198	181	3	14	7	16	18	14	15	3	42	38	15	14	2	5	7	96	102	198
Weighted total	202	172	2**	28**	7**	17**	17**	14**	18**	2**	47*	32*	13**	14**	3**	8**	7**	98*	104*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	110	96	*	14	4	10	8	11	10	1	28	14	8	8	2	3	1	48	62	108
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	55%	56%	29%	48%	56%	58%	46%	79%	54%	64%	58%	44%	60%	52%	73%	46%	19%	49%	60%	55%
Don't know	42	36	*	6	1	2	2	1	3	1	12	5	3	4	2	3	2	17	25	37
None of these	21%	21%	29%	21%	19%	11%	14%	5%	15%	38%	26%	16%	27%	26%	73%	37%	23%	18%	24%	19%
Don't know	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	2	-	3	2	3
None of these	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	4%	-	-	20%	-	3%	1%	2%
Unweighted total	76	60	1	15	3	7	8	3	7	1	13	16	4	7	1	3	4	43	33	77
Weighted total	38%	35%	71%	52%	44%	42%	46%	21%	40%	36%	28%	50%	28%	48%	27%	34%	59%	44%	32%	39%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 124

Q10.4 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	198	31	167	30	64	46	41	8	7	83	18	58	6	26	35	95	148	50	198
Weighted total	202	32**	170	31**	64*	48*	41*	8**	8**	85*	23**	55*	8**	27**	37**	92*	152	50*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	110	16	94	15	36	26	24	3	5	46	9	31	2	17	22	50	87	23	108
	55%	51%	55%	49%	56%	54%	60%	44%	64%	54%	39%	56%	29%	64%	60%	55%	57%	47%	55%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	42	2	40	1	13	9	11	3	5	15	5	13	2	3	11	22	37	5	37
	21%	7%	24%	4%	21%	19%	26%	44%	60%	18%	23%	23%	21%	10%	29%	24%	24%	11%	19%
Don't know	4	2	3	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	-	2	-	1	2	2	3
	2%	5%	1%	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	15%	1%	-	6%	-	1%	1%	4%	2%
None of these	76	13	64	15	21	22	12	4	1	37	8	20	5	7	14	34	54	23	77
	38%	40%	37%	50%	33%	46%	29%	56%	15%	44%	35%	36%	55%	25%	38%	37%	35%	45%	39%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 125

Q10.4 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	198	34	112	26	22	27	136	165	14	30	34	85	10	58	153	62	15	40	39	198
Weighted total	202	32**	114*	26**	25**	27**	129	156	15**	27**	31*	81*	9**	54*	153	60*	13**	37*	42*	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	110	12	65	18	13	15	72	86	8	19	20	42	4	35	83	29	4	15	26	108
55%	55%	37%	57%	68%	53%	54%	55%	55%	55%	70%	63%	52%	41%	64%	54%	49%	35%	42%	62%	55%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	42	2	25	7	6	3	29	33	2	8	9	17	1	11	33	18	1	4	9	37
21%	21%	7%	22%	28%	23%	12%	22%	21%	15%	29%	28%	21%	13%	20%	21%	28% q	5%	11%	21%	19%
Don't know	4	-	-	-	4	2	1	3	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	3
2%	2%	-	-	-	16%	7%	*	2%	4%	-	-	1%	-	-	*	1%	-	-	4%	2%
None of these	76	18	42	7	8	9	47	56	6	8	8	32	4	17	62	27	8	21	11	77
38%	38%	56%	37%	27%	31%	34%	36%	36%	41%	30%	25%	40%	46%	32%	41%	44%	65%	56% r	27%	39%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 126

Q10.4 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	198	136	4	57	198	19	42	22	38	30	53	102	39	42	118	34	198
Weighted total	202	135	5**	60*	202	24**	41*	23**	35*	32**	51*	106*	40*	42*	121	34**	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015	110	78	3	28	110	11	24	13	20	19	29	58	23	22	69	19	108
55%	55%	58%	75%	47%	55%	47%	59%	59%	57%	62%	56%	55%	58%	52%	57%	56%	58%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	42	30	-	12	42	6	7	3	11	10	8	22	12	5	26	12	37
21%	21%	22%	-	20%	21%	23%	17%	14%	30%	31%	16%	21%	31%	12%	21%	34%	19%
Don't know	4	4	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	3
2%	2%	3%	-	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	2%
None of these	76	44	1	29	76	11	14	9	12	11	22	38	14	20	40	13	77
38%	33%	25%	48%	38%	47%	35%	41%	33%	35%	43%	36%	35%	47%	33%	38%	39%	39%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 127

Q10.4 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total 198	4	2	40	2	1	8	13	12	9	8	11	8	11	2	3	12	11	9	31	1	198
Weighted total 202	4**	2**	37*	1**	1**	6**	15**	11**	13**	6**	14**	10**	7**	3**	5**	13**	14**	10**	27**	2**	198
Has done this at any site since early 2015 110 55%	1	1	19	-	-	4	6	7	9	3	10	4	3	2	5	8	9	6	14	-	108
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future 42 21%	1	-	6	-	-	-	1	1	3	1	6	1	-	1	3	4	4	-	9	-	37
Don't know 4 2%	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	3
None of these 76 38%	3	1	18	1	1	2	6	4	4	3	2	5	4	-	-	4	3	4	10	2	77
	75%	43%	47%	100%	100%	32%	40%	35%	32%	45%	14%	54%	56%	-	-	27%	24%	38%	37%	100%	39%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 128

Q10.1-4 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category heating and boilers. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Summary

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to heating and boilers

	New more efficient boiler or burner	Building management system	Connect to existing district heating	Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control
Unweighted total	198	198	198	198
Weighted total	202	202	202	202
Has done this at any site since early 2015	104 51%	69 34%	17 8%	110 55%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	80 39%	51 25%	24 12%	42 21%
Don't know	7 3%	12 6%	20 10%	4 2%
None of these	53 26%	90 45%	147 73%	76 38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 129

Q10.5 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	130	121	1	8	5	11	5	10	5	2	29	32	11	8	-	1	9	75	55	130
Weighted total	131	116	1**	14**	4**	12**	5**	11**	5**	2**	36**	27**	10**	6**	-**	2**	10**	73*	58*	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	57	54	1	2	2	1	3	4	2	21	11	4	1	-	2	4	30	26	58	
	43%	46%	100%	16%	48%	8%	64%	36%	41%	100%	58%	39%	39%	20%	-	100%	36%	42%	26	45%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	53	46	-	7	1	5	1	2	4	16	12	4	3	-	-	5	27	26	50	
	41%	40%	-	48%	20%	40%	15%	19%	84%	45%	40%	43%	46%	-	-	47%	37%	26	45%	38%
Don't know	8	8	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	6	1	1	1	-	-	-	7	1	7	
	6%	7%	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	16%	2%	6%	12%	-	-	-	9%	2%	5%	
None of these	36	31	-	5	1	5	2	5	1	5	8	4	2	-	-	3	19	17	38	
	28%	27%	-	37%	31%	47%	36%	45%	16%	14%	29%	38%	33%	-	-	25%	27%	29%	29%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 130

Q10.5 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	130	14	116	23	30	29	28	5	12	46	10	47	1	12	18	79	104	24	130
Weighted total	131	14**	117*	22**	31**	29**	26**	4**	13**	49*	10**	47*	2**	14**	23**	71*	102*	27**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	57	5	51	7	13	10	14	3	10	23	3	19	-	5	11	35	46	9	58
43%	43%	37%	44%	33%	41%	33%	54%	71%	73%	47%	31%	41%	-	39%	48%	50%	45%	32%	45%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	53	5	48	5	12	11	13	3	10	22	1	15	2	4	6	32	45	5	50
41%	41%	35%	41%	21%	38%	37%	48%	71%	75%	44%	11%	32%	100%	27%	26%	46%	45%	19%	38%
Don't know	8	1	7	6	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	3	-	-	4	3	1	7	7
6%	6%	9%	6%	28%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	43%	5%	-	-	16%	4%	1%	26%	5%
None of these	36	3	33	6	11	10	6	1	-	12	3	15	-	5	5	19	28	8	38
28%	28%	23%	28%	25%	34%	35%	24%	29%	-	24%	26%	32%	-	39%	21%	26%	27%	32%	29%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 131

Q10.5 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	130	24	72	14	20	25	89	109	14	19	21	50	3	43	98	48	12	30	29	130
Weighted total	131	25**	75*	12**	20**	25**	87*	108*	12**	15**	22**	45*	2**	48*	97*	45*	10**	28**	29**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	57	7	34	7	9	12	41	49	5	9	9	20	2	26	44	28	6	18	13	58
43%	43%	28%	46%	59%	43%	47%	47%	46%	40%	56%	40%	44%	100%	54%	45%	62%z	57%	63%	45%	45%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	53	11	26	6	11	14	31	44	6	8	16	15	1	24	42	21	7	10	7	50
41%	41%	45%	34%	50%	53%	57%	36%	41%	50%	55%	71%	32%	77%	51%	44%	48%	73%	37%	26%	38%
Don't know	8	2	3	1	3	2	6	8	1	-	2	3	-	-	4	1	-	-	2	7
6%	6%	10%	4%	5%	13%	8%	7%	8%	4%	-	9%	6%	-	-	4%	3%	-	-	8%	5%
None of these	36	8	23	2	2	4	23	28	2	4	2	15	-	7	28	10	1	7	8	38
28%	28%	34%	31%	16%	12%	18%	27%	26%	17%	26%	8%	33%	-	15%	29%	22%	12%	26%	28%	29%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 132

Q10.5 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	130	84	-	45	130	11	21	11	27	22	34	64	29	28	76	23	130
Weighted total	131	83*	-**	47*	131	12**	20**	11**	26**	22**	32**	68*	28**	27**	77*	23**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	57	35	-	22	57	4	6	4	14	18	10	35	12	9	38	10	58
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	43%	42%	-	47%	43%	36%	29%	36%	53%	83%	31%	52%	42%	33%	49%	45%	45%
Don't know	53	35	-	18	53	1	10	4	12	16	14	28	11	11	32	10	50
None of these	41%	42%	-	39%	41%	9%	51%	33%	44%	71%	45%	41%	40%	41%	41%	45%	38%
	8	4	-	4	8	-	-	1	1	-	1	4	1	1	2	3	7
	6%	5%	-	8%	6%	-	-	6%	2%	-	4%	6%	2%	5%	3%	11%	5%
	36	22	-	13	36	7	5	3	7	1	9	17	9	9	19	6	38
	28%	26%	-	28%	28%	55%	27%	25%	26%	6%	28%	25%	31%	33%	25%	24%	29%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 133

Q10.5 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total 130	3	1	36	-	1	6	13	5	3	3	8	3	9	2	-	8	2	2	24	1	130
Weighted total 131	3**	1**	33*	-**	**	4**	17**	5**	4**	3**	11**	2**	7**	2**	-**	11**	2**	2**	21**	2**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015 57 43%	1	1	18	-	-	2	6	2	4	-	6	2	2	-	-	5	1	-	6	-	58
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future 53 41%	-	1	13	-	-	-	3	4	4	-	5	1	3	1	-	6	1	1	7	2	50
Don't know 8 6%	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	7
None of these 36 28%	1	-	6	-	-	2	7	1	-	3	1	-	2	1	-	5	-	1	7	-	38
	29%	-	18%	-	-	46%	40%	18%	-	100%	11%	-	27%	47%	-	45%	-	42%	32%	-	29%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 134

Q10.6 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Control system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	130	121	1	8	5	11	5	10	5	2	29	32	11	8	-	1	9	75	55	130
Weighted total	131	116	1**	14**	4**	12**	5**	11**	5**	2**	36**	27**	10**	6**	-**	2**	10**	73*	58*	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	56	53	-	3	1	-	3	4	3	1	18	10	5	1	-	2	6	32	24	54
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	43%	46%	-	23%	30%	-	53%	38%	65%	46%	50%	37%	55%	20%	-	100%	60%	44%	42%	42%
Don't know	39	37	-	2	2	3	1	1	3	1	11	10	2	3	-	-	3	19	20	39
None of these	29%	32%	-	11%	39%	23%	15%	10%	60%	46%	30%	38%	20%	46%	-	-	25%	26%	34%	30%
Don't know	9	9	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	3	1	1	-	-	-	8	2	9
None of these	7%	7%	100%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	13%	9%	6%	14%	-	-	-	11%	3%	7%
Unweighted total	45	36	-	9	1	8	2	6	1	1	11	7	4	2	-	-	2	23	22	45
Weighted total	34%	31%	-	66%	31%	71%	47%	52%	16%	54%	30%	25%	40%	30%	-	-	23%	32%	38%	35%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 135

Q10.6 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Control system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)		Yes (p)	No (q)
Unweighted total	130	14	116	23	30	29	28	5	12	46	10	47	1	12	18	79	104	24	130
Weighted total	131	14**	117*	22**	31**	29**	26**	4**	13**	49*	10**	47*	2**	14**	23**	71*	102*	27**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	56	3	53	4	13	12	12	3	13	20	1	23	2	9	6	34	47	7	54
43%	43%	22%	46%	16%	40%	40%	46%	71%	100%	40%	13%	49%	100%	64%	27%	48%	46%	27%	42%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	39	5	34	4	9	6	11	3	5	16	1	9	-	2	5	23	32	5	39
29%	29%	35%	29%	18%	29%	20%	42%	82%	38%	32%	7%	19%	-	15%	23%	33%	32%	19%	30%
Don't know	9	1	9	5	2	-	*	-	-	2	3	3	-	-	2	5	3	6	9
7%	7%	4%	7%	20%	8%	-	2%	-	-	4%	30%	7%	-	-	9%	8%	3%	22%	7%
None of these	45	6	40	10	11	12	8	1	-	20	5	14	-	3	11	22	35	10	45
34%	34%	39%	34%	46%	36%	43%	30%	18%	-	41%	50%	31%	-	21%	50%	31%	34%	39%	35%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 136

Q10.6 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Control system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	130	24	72	14	20	25	89	109	14	19	21	50	3	43	98	48	12	30	29	130
Weighted total	131	25**	75*	12**	20**	25**	87*	108*	12**	15**	22**	45*	2**	48*	97*	45*	10**	28**	29**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	56	6	33	9	9	14	37	47	6	8	10	19	2	27	42	27	8	12	13	54
43%	23%	44%	75%	45%	56%	42%	44%	47%	50%	43%	42%	100%	56%	43%	61%z	78%	44%	44%	42%	42%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	39	8	22	4	5	12	24	35	4	7	12	12	1	16	34	17	6	10	5	39
29%	31%	29%	37%	23%	49%	27%	33%	31%	46%	56%	26%	77%	33%	35%	38%	56%	35%	17%	17%	30%
Don't know	9	2	4	1	3	2	7	9	1	*	2	3	-	-	7	1	-	*	1	9
7%	9%	5%	5%	13%	8%	8%	9%	4%	3%	9%	8%	-	-	7%	2%	-	2%	2%	7%	7%
None of these	45	10	27	2	6	4	29	32	3	5	3	17	-	11	33	12	1	10	10	45
34%	41%	36%	13%	31%	15%	33%	30%	23%	32%	15%	37%	-	24%	34%	28%	8%	38%	36%	35%	35%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 137

Q10.6 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Control system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	130	84	-	45	130	11	21	11	27	22	34	64	29	28	76	23	130
Weighted total	131	83*	-**	47*	131	12**	20**	11**	26**	22**	32**	68*	28**	27**	77*	23**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	56	39	-	17	56	3	4	4	14	19	13	31	12	11	35	11	54
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	43%	47%	-	38%	43%	24%	20%	38%	52%	85%	41%	46%	43%	39%	45%	49%	42%
Don't know	39	24	-	15	39	1	9	1	8	12	8	22	8	7	25	7	39
None of these	29%	29%	-	32%	29%	9%	47%	7%	30%	53%	25%	32%	30%	25%	32%	31%	30%
	9	3	-	6	9	1	-	-	2	-	2	5	1	2	3	3	9
	7%	4%	-	13%	7%	5%	-	-	8%	-	6%	7%	2%	7%	4%	11%	7%
	45	26	-	17	45	7	8	6	8	3	10	23	11	10	26	7	45
	34%	31%	-	37%	34%	61%	40%	55%	29%	11%	30%	34%	40%	36%	34%	31%	35%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 138

Q10.6 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Control system

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	130	3	1	36	-	1	6	13	5	3	3	8	3	9	2	-	8	2	2	24	1	130
Weighted total	131	3**	1**	33*	-**	**	4**	17**	5**	4**	3**	11**	2**	7**	2**	-**	11**	2**	2**	21**	2**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	56	1	1	13	-	-	2	8	3	4	-	6	2	4	1	-	6	-	-	5	-	54
43%	43%	47%	100%	39%	-	100%	52%	45%	65%	100%	-	57%	69%	54%	53%	-	53%	-	-	26%	-	42%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	39	-	1	10	-	-	-	1	3	4	-	4	1	1	-	-	6	-	1	7	-	39
29%	29%	-	100%	29%	-	-	-	5%	56%	100%	-	35%	31%	17%	-	-	55%	-	58%	33%	-	30%
Don't know	9	1	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	*	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	9
7%	7%	29%	-	2%	-	-	-	20%	-	-	-	24%	-	7%	-	-	-	38%	-	3%	-	7%
None of these	45	1	-	13	-	-	2	5	1	-	3	1	-	1	1	-	4	1	1	9	2	45
34%	34%	24%	-	39%	-	-	48%	30%	18%	-	100%	11%	-	22%	47%	-	32%	62%	42%	43%	100%	35%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 139

Q10.7 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	130	121	1	8	5	11	5	10	5	2	29	32	11	8	-	1	9	75	55	130
Weighted total	131	116	1**	14**	4**	12**	5**	11**	5**	2**	36**	27**	10**	6**	-**	2**	10**	73*	58*	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	25	-	9	1	6	1	3	2	-	7	5	5	1	-	-	3	18	16	29
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	26%	21%	-	61%	19%	50%	26%	27%	38%	-	20%	18%	51%	8%	-	-	25%	24%	27%	22%
Don't know	22	22	-	-	1	2	-	3	2	-	9	2	1	-	-	-	3	17	5	21
None of these	17%	19%	-	-	20%	14%	-	28%	38%	-	24%	8%	8%	-	-	-	28%	24% <i>r</i>	8%	16%
	13	10	1	2	-	1	1	-	1	-	5	4	1	-	-	-	1	8	5	14
	10%	9%	100%	16%	-	6%	15%	-	18%	-	14%	15%	6%	-	-	-	9%	11%	9%	11%
	70	67	-	3	2	4	3	5	2	2	20	17	3	6	-	2	4	36	34	72
	53%	57%	-	23%	61%	30%	59%	44%	43%	100%	56%	63%	36%	92%	-	100%	38%	49%	59%	55%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 140

Q10.7 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)		Yes (p)	No (q)
Unweighted total	130	14	116	23	30	29	28	5	12	46	10	47	1	12	18	79	104	24	130
Weighted total	131	14**	117*	22**	31**	29**	26**	4**	13**	49*	10**	47*	2**	14**	23**	71*	102*	27**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	2	31	3	12	7	4	1	5	14	3	11	2	5	5	15	29	4	29
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	22	3	19	2	6	2	7	1	4	10	1	6	-	-	6	14	19	3	21
Don't know	13	3	10	5	3	-	2	1	1	5	3	3	-	1	2	7	9	4	14
None of these	70	7	63	14	13	21	15	2	5	22	4	29	-	8	12	39	50	17	72
	53%	52%	54%	60%	41%	71%	56%	55%	38%	46%	43%	62%	-	57%	53%	56%	49%	65%	55%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 141

Q10.7 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	130	24	72	14	20	25	89	109	14	19	21	50	3	43	98	48	12	30	29	130
Weighted total	131	25**	75*	12**	20**	25**	87*	108*	12**	15**	22**	45*	2**	48*	97*	45*	10**	28**	29**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	6	19	3	6	6	17	24	1	5	7	12	*	12	26	11	2	7	4	29
26%	25%	25%	28%	28%	22%	20%	23%	6%	32%	29%	28%	23%	24%	24%	27%	25%	16%	26%	15%	22%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	22	3	12	3	4	6	15	18	4	6	5	8	1	10	20	14	5	4	2	21
17%	11%	16%	24%	22%	25%	17%	16%	34%	42%	21%	17%	39%	20%	20%	32%z	45%	16%	8%	8%	16%
Don't know	13	2	7	1	3	3	7	9	2	1	1	5	1	1	10	3	-	1	1	14
10%	9%	10%	10%	13%	14%	8%	8%	8%	18%	8%	7%	10%	38%	3%	10%	7%	-	4%	4%	11%
None of these	70	15	41	6	9	13	53	64	5	6	12	23	-	28	49	21	5	15	21	72
53%	59%	55%	49%	43%	54%	61%	60%	42%	39%	54%	52%	-	58%	51%	47%	51%	54%	73%	55%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 142

Q10.7 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	130	84	-	45	130	11	21	11	27	22	34	64	29	28	76	23	130
Weighted total	131	83*	-**	47*	131	12**	20**	11**	26**	22**	32**	68*	28**	27**	77*	23**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	17	-	15	34	5	6	3	6	7	8	17	8	8	17	7	29
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	22	12	-	10	22	1	3	3	6	8	2	11	9	1	17	5	21
Don't know	13	10	-	3	13	1	1	-	1	1	4	6	1	4	6	1	14
None of these	70	48	-	22	70	6	12	5	15	10	17	40	12	14	43	13	72
	53%	58%	-	47%	53%	47%	58%	47%	59%	46%	53%	58%	44%	51%	56%	56%	55%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 143

Q10.7 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	130	3	1	36	-	1	6	13	5	3	8	3	9	2	-	8	2	2	24	1	130
Weighted total	131	3**	1**	33*	**	4**	17**	5**	4**	3**	11**	2**	7**	2**	**	11**	2**	2**	21**	2**	130
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	1	-	5	-	1	3	2	2	2	3	1	3	1	-	4	-	-	4	2	29
	26%	47%	-	16%	-	100%	14%	16%	42%	47%	53%	27%	31%	40%	47%	39%	-	-	19%	100%	22%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	22	-	1	6	-	-	2	2	2	-	4	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	3	-	21
	17%	-	100%	18%	-	-	11%	32%	47%	-	39%	-	11%	47%	-	10%	-	-	12%	-	16%
Don't know	13	-	-	6	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	*	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	14
	10%	-	-	18%	-	15%	12%	-	-	-	6%	-	7%	53%	-	13%	38%	-	3%	-	11%
None of these	70	2	-	16	-	3	11	1	2	1	6	2	3	-	-	5	1	2	14	-	72
	53%	53%	-	48%	-	71%	66%	26%	53%	47%	55%	69%	43%	-	-	49%	62%	100%	65%	-	55%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 144

Q10.5-7 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category cooling. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Summary

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to cooling

	Plant replacement / upgrade	Control system	Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling
Unweighted total	130	130	130
Weighted total	131	131	131
Has done this at any site since early 2015	57 43%	56 43%	34 26%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	53 41%	39 29%	22 17%
Don't know	8 6%	9 7%	13 10%
None of these	36 28%	45 34%	70 53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 145

Q10.8 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	101	96	2	3	3	13	5	5	9	2	22	17	6	10	2	-	6	50	50	101
Weighted total	94*	87*	1**	6**	2**	11**	4**	6**	11**	2**	22**	14**	5**	10**	2**	**	5**	46*	47*	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	30	1	2	1	1	2	*	5	-	10	6	1	4	1	-	2	16	18	35
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20	18	-	2	1	3	1	1	1	-	4	2	2	4	-	-	-	10	9	21
Don't know	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	1	-	-	5	1	5
None of these	43	41	-	2	*	7	2	5	5	2	8	5	2	3	-	-	3	21	22	48
	46%	47%	-	34%	23%	65%	60%	75%	45%	100%	35%	39%	43%	29%	-	-	60%	44%	46%	48%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 146

Q10.8 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	101	15	86	12	31	18	33	3	4	42	5	27	4	14	16	48	76	24	101
Weighted total	94*	15**	79*	10**	32**	16**	31**	3**	3**	43*	4**	24**	4**	15**	17**	41*	70*	24**	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	8	26	2	13	7	10	-	2	17	-	9	2	7	7	10	25	8	35
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20	4	16	3	9	1	6	-	1	7	1	5	2	2	4	7	12	8	21
Don't know	5	-	5	1	-	2	2	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	3	4	-	5
None of these	43	5	38	5	14	7	15	2	-	18	3	13	2	7	7	23	33	11	48
	46%	33%	48%	51%	44%	43%	49%	76%	-	43%	65%	54%	36%	45%	39%	57%	47%	46%	48%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 147

Q10.8 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	101	17	62	9	12	14	75	84	8	11	19	36	6	35	84	39	15	24	16	101
Weighted total	94*	16**	57*	7**	13**	13**	69*	76*	9**	8**	18**	32*	6**	32*	76*	32*	13**	21**	18**	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	9	19	1	4	3	26	27	6	3	8	14	3	12	27	10	4	10	6	35
36%	36%	56%	34%	19%	31%	24%	38%	35%	70%	36%	43%	43%	52%	39%	36%	30%	30%	50%	32%	35%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20	2	14	2	1	4	12	16	-	1	4	6	2	6	18	8	5	6	2	21
21%	21%	14%	24%	21%	8%	34%	18%	22%	-	9%	21%	18%	28%	18%	23%	24%	37%	28%	11%	21%
Don't know	5	1	4	1	-	2	3	5	-	-	1	1	-	-	3	1	-	1	2	5
5%	5%	4%	7%	10%	-	14%	5%	7%	-	-	4%	4%	-	-	4%	2%	-	6%	10%	5%
None of these	43	5	27	4	8	5	32	35	3	5	8	14	1	17	35	17	5	6	8	48
46%	46%	32%	47%	50%	61%	42%	46%	45%	30%	56%	44%	44%	21%	52%	46%	52%	38%	28%	47%	48%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 148

Q10.8 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	101	66	3	32	101	13	19	13	22	16	27	50	22	23	58	19	101
Weighted total	94*	60*	3**	31**	94*	12**	20**	12**	20**	13**	28**	48*	17**	24**	54*	15**	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	22	1	11	34	-	10	4	7	6	9	20	3	8	19	6	35
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20	17	1	2	20	2	6	3	1	4	4	8	7	4	7	8	21
Don't know	5	3	-	2	5	-	-	1	1	-	2	2	2	2	3	1	5
None of these	43	25	2	17	43	11	5	3	11	5	14	22	7	12	26	5	48
	46%	42%	46%	53%	46%	87%	28%	23%	57%	40%	51%	46%	40%	51%	49%	31%	48%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 149

Q10.8 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	101	1	-	18	2	-	8	7	7	2	1	3	5	9	5	-	8	3	2	20	-	101
Weighted total	94*	2**	-**	15**	1**	-**	7**	8**	6**	2**	1**	3**	5**	6**	7**	-**	9**	3**	2**	17**	-**	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34	-	-	6	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	2	3	6	-	3	2	1	5	-	35
36%	-	-	-	42%	-	-	21%	13%	12%	100%	-	-	34%	45%	87%	-	33%	65%	60%	29%	-	35%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20	2	-	2	-	-	1	2	2	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	5	-	-	2	-	21
21%	100%	-	-	11%	-	-	19%	23%	28%	-	-	26%	22%	17%	28%	-	52%	-	-	13%	-	21%
Don't know	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5
5%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	32%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	5%
None of these	43	-	-	8	1	-	4	3	3	-	1	2	3	3	1	-	2	1	1	10	-	48
46%	-	-	-	54%	100%	-	59%	32%	48%	-	100%	74%	66%	55%	13%	-	25%	35%	40%	57%	-	48%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 150

Q10.9 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	101	96	2	3	3	13	5	5	9	2	22	17	6	10	2	-	6	50	50	101
Weighted total	94*	87*	1**	6**	2**	11**	4**	6**	11**	2**	22**	14**	5**	10**	2**	**	5**	46*	47*	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	28	1	2	1	4	2	3	3	1	8	3	1	2	-	-	3	17	14	33
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	32%	32%	52%	34%	35%	34%	46%	42%	31%	60%	38%	25%	25%	17%	-	-	55%	36%	29%	33%
Don't know	14	14	-	-	1	1	2	-	1	1	2	3	-	3	-	-	-	5	8	15
None of these	14%	16%	-	-	42%	7%	62%	-	5%	40%	11%	20%	-	31%	-	-	-	11%	18%	15%
Don't know	6	5	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	5	1	7
None of these	6%	6%	48%	-	-	9%	14%	-	-	12%	6%	-	-	39%	-	-	-	11%	1%	7%
None of these	50	46	-	4	*	5	1	4	7	-	9	8	4	6	1	-	2	20	28	51
None of these	53%	52%	-	66%	23%	50%	24%	58%	64%	-	44%	55%	75%	61%	61%	-	45%	44%	60%	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 151

Q10.9 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	101	15	86	12	31	18	33	3	4	42	5	27	4	14	16	48	76	24	101
Weighted total	94*	15**	79*	10**	32**	16**	31**	3**	3**	43*	4**	24**	4**	15**	17**	41*	70*	24**	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	2	29	2	11	7	8	-	2	15	2	6	1	7	3	16	20	10	33
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	32%	11%	36%	21%	35%	47%	25%	-	68%	36%	49%	25%	23%	49%	18%	39%	29%	43%	33%
Don't know	14	2	12	2	5	1	6	-	-	5	1	2	2	1	1	7	10	3	15
	14%	12%	15%	17%	15%	6%	19%	-	-	12%	20%	7%	42%	4%	5%	18%	15%	13%	15%
	6	1	5	1	-	2	2	1	1	1	-	2	1	1	-	2	4	1	7
	6%	4%	7%	5%	-	13%	5%	24%	32%	1%	-	6%	22%	4%	-	4%	6%	2%	7%
None of these	50	12	38	7	17	6	18	2	-	24	1	16	2	6	14	18	38	11	51
	53%	80%	47%	66%	53%	40%	57%	76%	-	55%	31%	65%	36%	43%	82%	44%	55%	48%	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 152

Q10.9 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	101	17	62	9	12	14	75	84	8	11	19	36	6	35	84	39	15	24	16	101
Weighted total	94*	16**	57*	7**	13**	13**	69*	76*	9**	8**	18**	32*	6**	32*	76*	32*	13**	21**	18**	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	4	16	3	7	3	23	24	5	3	8	11	3	10	25	9	2	6	5	33
32%	23%	28%	47%	58%	22%	33%	31%	50%	34%	46%	36%	22%	45%	31%	33%	28%	16%	31%	28%	33%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	14	5	6	2	1	1	11	12	1	2	3	5	2	4	12	2	3	4	2	15
14%	28%	11%	21%	9%	6%	16%	15%	10%	19%	18%	14%	6%	28%	13%	15%	6%	23%	20%	11%	15%
Don't know	6	1	4	1	-	1	5	6	-	1	1	1	1	2	6	3	1	2	-	7
6%	3%	8%	10%	-	8%	7%	7%	7%	-	6%	4%	2%	17%	7%	8%	10%	8%	11%	-	7%
None of these	50	9	32	2	5	8	34	39	4	3	6	17	1	18	37	18	7	9	12	51
53%	57%	57%	22%	42%	65%	49%	50%	40%	41%	36%	53%	10%	55%	49%	55%	53%	42%	68%	50%	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 153

Q10.9 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	101	66	3	32	101	13	19	13	22	16	27	50	22	23	58	19	101
Weighted total	94*	60*	3**	31**	94*	12**	20**	12**	20**	13**	28**	48*	17**	24**	54*	15**	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	19	-	11	30	1	5	3	9	7	8	17	3	8	17	4	33
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	32%	32%	-	37%	32%	11%	25%	24%	47%	52%	29%	36%	20%	34%	31%	27%	33%
Don't know	14	12	1	1	14	3	2	3	3	-	3	8	3	3	5	5	15
None of these	14%	19%	26%	4%	14%	22%	12%	26%	13%	-	9%	16%	15%	10%	9%	34%	15%
	6	3	1	2	6	-	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	7
	6%	5%	29%	6%	6%	-	3%	6%	7%	14%	2%	6%	14%	2%	6%	11%	7%
	50	30	2	18	50	8	13	6	8	5	19	22	9	15	29	6	51
	53%	51%	46%	57%	53%	67%	65%	51%	39%	34%	67%	47%	51%	61%	53%	40%	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 154

Q10.9 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	101	1	-	18	2	-	8	7	7	2	1	3	5	9	5	-	8	3	2	20	-	101
Weighted total	94*	2**	-**	15**	1**	-**	7**	8**	6**	2**	1**	3**	5**	6**	7**	-**	9**	3**	2**	17**	-**	101
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	-	-	5	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	2	3	4	4	-	4	1	-	4	-	33
	32%	-	-	32%	-	-	22%	-	26%	30%	-	52%	55%	70%	52%	-	48%	35%	-	25%	-	33%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	14	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	1	-	3	-	15
	14%	100%	-	12%	-	-	13%	-	13%	-	-	-	27%	12%	-	-	19%	35%	-	19%	-	15%
Don't know	6	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	7
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	9%	27%	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	7%
None of these	50	-	-	9	1	-	4	8	2	1	1	2	1	3	-	-	4	2	2	7	-	51
	53%	-	-	62%	100%	-	57%	91%	34%	70%	100%	48%	45%	9%	48%	-	43%	65%	100%	43%	-	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 155

Q10.8-9 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category hot water.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Summary

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to hot water

	Distribution improvements	Point of use heaters
Unweighted total	101	101
Weighted total	94	94
Has done this at any site since early 2015	34 36%	30 32%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20 21%	14 14%
Don't know	5 5%	6 6%
None of these	43 46%	50 53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 156

Q10.10 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	346	319	8	19	13	33	21	25	25	9	61	71	28	24	5	6	21	174	167	346
Weighted total	342	299	5**	38**	10**	33**	18**	27**	32**	9**	66*	60*	26**	22**	6**	8**	20**	169	167	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	214	184	4	25	5	16	11	16	14	4	50	35	24	16	4	5	11	99	112	219
	62%	62%	80%	68%	48%	48%	60%	59%	45%	52%	76%k	58%	93%	71%	64%	67%	57%	58%	67%	63%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	108	94	-	14	3	11	5	9	10	3	22	13	6	10	5	3	5	54	53	107
	32%	31%	-	38%	27%	33%	25%	32%	30%	41%	33%	23%	24%	45%	81%	32%	23%	32%	32%	31%
Don't know	5	5	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5
	2%	2%	-	-	-	5%	-	-	10%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	1%
None of these	83	76	1	6	4	8	6	8	10	3	10	18	2	3	1	2	6	50	33	83
	24%	25%	20%	15%	42%	24%	34%	31%	31%	38%	15%	30%	7%	14%	19%	24%	33%	29%	20%	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 157

Q10.10 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	346	62	284	84	75	86	68	13	18	120	30	112	12	44	51	180	251	91	346
Weighted total	342	58*	283	87*	67*	91*	65*	12**	18**	120*	33**	110*	13**	45*	54*	172	249	89*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	214	31	183	43	42	57	47	7	16	72	18	68	5	30	22	114	154	58	219
	62% <i>n</i>	52%	65%	50%	62%	62%	72% <i>c</i>	62%	90%	60%	54%	62%	43%	67% <i>n</i>	40%	66% <i>n</i>	62%	65%	63%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	108	14	94	22	19	33	24	3	8	38	7	36	4	11	19	61	82	24	107
	32%	24%	33%	25%	28%	36%	38%	29%	43%	32%	22%	33%	30%	24%	34%	35%	33%	27%	31%
Don't know	5	1	5	1	2	3	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	3	1	5
	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	3%	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	-	2%	2%	*	1%	2%	1%
None of these	83	22	61	33	15	18	11	4	1	32	11	30	7	11	18	39	59	23	83
	24%	38% <i>zb</i>	22%	38% <i>zef</i>	23%	20%	17%	38%	3%	27%	32%	27%	57%	24%	34%	22%	24%	26%	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 158

Q10.10 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	346	78	183	33	47	55	231	288	36	48	57	152	14	82	246	99	33	61	93	346
Weighted total	342	82*	177	32**	45*	52*	217	276	33**	40*	55*	147	12**	73*	237	90*	30**	53*	100*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	214	44	114	23	28	36	133	174	23	32	40	92	9	52	159	60	21	32	52	219
	62%	54%	64%	72%	62%	69%	61%	63%	70%	78%z	73%	63%	79%	71%	67%r	67%	69%	61%	52%	63%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	108	33	54	10	11	18	66	83	10	14	18	47	4	22	85	33	10	17	23	107
	32%	40%	30%	31%	24%	34%	30%	30%	29%	34%	33%	32%	32%	31%	36%r	37%	32%	32%	23%	31%
Don't know	5	1	1	2	1	1	3	5	1	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	3	5
	2%	1%	-	6%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	-	-	*	-	2%	1%	1%	-	-	3%	1%
None of these	83	23	41	4	14	9	56	67	4	6	8	40	-	11	48	22	8	14	33	83
	24%	28%	23%	11%	32%	17%	26%	24%	12%	15%	15%	27%	-	15%	20%	24%	26%	27%	33%r	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 159

Q10.10 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	346	214	16	113	346	47	94	45	49	36	93	169	72	86	186	63	346
Weighted total	342	210	17**	109*	342	46*	95*	42*	43*	37**	91*	167	69*	87*	185	56*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	214	145	10	55	214	21	59	24	34	30	54	103	48	50	116	39	219
	62% c	69% c	58%	50%	62%	47%	62%	58%	78% zdeg	82%	60%	62%	69%	58%	63%	70%	63%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	108	73	6	29	108	12	32	10	17	19	29	52	24	29	62	16	107
	32%	35%	35%	27%	32%	27%	34%	22%	39%	51%	32%	31%	34%	34%	34%	28%	31%
Don't know	5	1	-	5	5	-	1	1	-	-	2	1	-	1	4	-	5
	2%	*	-	4% a	2%	-	1%	3%	-	-	2%	*	-	1%	2%	-	1%
None of these	83	38	5	38	83	17	21	12	6	4	25	37	17	25	40	13	83
	24%	18%	29%	35% za	24%	37% h	22%	28%	13%	11%	27%	22%	25%	29%	22%	24%	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 160

Q10.10 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	346	6	1	81	6	5	14	31	18	6	17	15	11	26	10	1	17	14	9	57	1	346
Weighted total	342	6**	1**	73*	4**	3**	10**	39**	15**	8**	16**	17**	10**	17**	15**	2**	17**	14**	15**	57*	2**	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	214	5	1	36	3	2	4	28	11	2	11	11	9	12	12	2	13	8	12	29	2	219
62% ^c		79%	100%	50%	73%	71%	43%	73%	74%	26%	67%	65%	91%	70%	80%	100%	74%	61%	78%	51%	100%	63%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	108	2	-	22	2	2	2	13	3	2	5	5	6	7	-	9	3	5	12	2	107	
32%		38%	-	30%	51%	45%	20%	34%	16%	24%	28%	29%	54%	51%	-	53%	23%	35%	22%	100%	31%	
Don't know	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	5	
2%		-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	13%	1%	-	1%	
None of these	83	-	-	26	*	1	4	5	4	4	4	1	3	1	-	2	3	-	19	-	83	
24%		-	-	35%	10%	29%	41%	13%	26%	51%	24%	23%	9%	17%	9%	-	13%	26%	-	34%	-	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 161

Q10.11 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	346	319	8	19	13	33	21	25	25	9	61	71	28	24	5	6	21	174	167	346
Weighted total	342	299	5**	38**	10**	33**	18**	27**	32**	9**	66*	60*	26**	22**	6**	8**	20**	169	167	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	133	119	2	12	5	9	6	12	9	1	31	29	15	10	1	1	3	68	64	137
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	39%	40%	40%	33%	54%	28%	35%	42%	29%	9%	47%	48%	58%	47%	19%	10%	13%	40%	38%	40%
Don't know	49	46	-	4	2	3	2	5	-	2	11	10	3	6	1	1	2	26	23	56
None of these	14%	15%	-	10%	20%	8%	13%	18%	-	24%	17%	17%	11%	27%	19%	9%	10%	15%	14%	16%
Don't know	36	28	1	7	-	2	3	2	4	2	9	3	3	3	-	3	1	12	22	34
None of these	11%	9%	29%	18%	-	6%	19%	9%	14%	21%	13%	6%	13%	13%	-	35%	6%	7%	13%	10%
Unweighted total	154	136	1	17	3	20	9	11	18	5	26	24	6	8	5	4	15	80	72	153
Weighted total	45%	45%	31%	44%	26%	60%	47%	40%	58%	55%	39%	40%	24%	34%	81%	46%	74%	47%	43%	44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 162

Q10.11 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	346	62	284	84	75	86	68	13	18	120	30	112	12	44	51	180	251	91	346
Weighted total	342	58*	283	87*	67*	91*	65*	12**	18**	120*	33**	110*	13**	45*	54*	172	249	89*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	133	21	112	31	30	41	21	1	7	44	5	42	3	17	20	69	97	34	137
	39%	37%	39%	36%	44%	45%	32%	12%	40%	37%	16%	38%	20%	39%	37%	40%	39%	38%	40%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	49	9	40	12	9	14	10	1	3	14	2	16	2	3	12	20	41	9	56
	14%	16%	14%	14%	13%	16%	15%	12%	16%	11%	7%	15%	13%	6%	22%	11%	16%	10%	16%
Don't know	36	7	30	10	9	10	6	2	-	13	5	10	1	4	5	19	27	9	34
	11%	11%	10%	11%	13%	11%	9%	17%	-	11%	16%	9%	6%	8%	9%	11%	11%	10%	10%
None of these	154	26	129	41	27	33	36	8	9	60	20	51	9	23	22	80	109	43	153
	45%	44%	45%	47%	40%	36%	56%e	64%	53%	50%	61%	47%	74%	51%	40%	46%	44%	49%	44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q10.11 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	346	78	183	33	47	55	231	288	36	48	57	152	14	82	246	99	33	61	93	346
Weighted total	342	82*	177	32**	45*	52*	217	276	33**	40*	55*	147	12**	73*	237	90*	30**	53*	100*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	133	30	72	11	19	27	82	112	14	20	29	58	6	33	94	31	13	20	36	137
39%		37%	41%	33%	43%	52%	38%	41%	43%	49%	54%	40%	53%	45%	40%	34%	45%	38%	36%	40%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	49	12	26	4	7	12	30	42	4	4	8	26	2	8	36	13	6	8	13	56
14%		15%	14%	13%	16%	23%	14%	15%	13%	10%	15%	18%	19%	12%	15%	15%	19%	15%	13%	16%
Don't know	36	6	19	5	4	6	18	32	4	3	2	13	1	7	22	5	2	3	13	34
11%		7%	11%	17%	9%	12%	8%	11%	11%	7%	4%	9%	6%	9%	9%	6%	7%	6%	13%	10%
None of these	154	41	78	15	18	15	105	117	14	17	19	66	4	29	106	48	13	26	48	153
45%		50%	44%	46%	40%	28%	48%	42%	43%	42%	35%	45%	33%	39%	45%	54%	43%	49%	48%	44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 164

Q10.11 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	346	214	16	113	346	47	94	45	49	36	93	169	72	86	186	63	346
Weighted total	342	210	17**	109*	342	46*	95*	42*	43*	37**	91*	167	69*	87*	185	56*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	133	86	7	37	133	14	41	19	21	9	32	69	24	31	76	20	137
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	39%	41%	39%	34%	39%	30%	44%	45%	48%	26%	35%	42%	35%	36%	41%	36%	40%
Don't know	49	33	2	14	49	5	13	3	9	6	11	24	10	11	30	8	56
None of these	14%	16%	15%	13%	14%	12%	13%	6%	21%	16%	12%	15%	15%	12%	16%	14%	16%
	36	23	1	12	36	6	11	2	1	5	11	15	5	9	16	7	34
	11%	11%	7%	11%	11%	13%	12%	5%	3%	15%	12%	9%	8%	11%	9%	12%	10%
	154	90	8	54	154	22	39	20	18	19	44	71	37	44	81	26	153
	45%	43%	45%	50%	45%	48%	42%	47%	42%	53%	49%	42%	53%	50%	44%	47%	44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 165

Q10.11 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	346	6	1	81	6	5	14	31	18	6	17	15	11	26	10	1	17	14	9	57	1	346
Weighted total	342	6**	1**	73*	4**	3**	10**	39**	15**	8**	16**	17**	10**	17**	15**	2**	17**	14**	15**	57*	2**	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	133	6	1	31	2	-	2	15	6	1	4	6	3	6	3	-	9	6	8	22	-	137
	39%	100%	100%	42%	53%	-	23%	40%	41%	12%	25%	37%	35%	37%	19%	-	54%	45%	51%	39%	-	40%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	49	1	-	10	1	-	3	3	-	2	2	2	4	2	2	-	5	2	-	10	-	56
	14%	17%	-	14%	31%	-	29%	7%	-	24%	14%	9%	22%	26%	13%	-	27%	15%	-	17%	-	16%
Don't know	36	-	-	1	-	-	1	6	5	1	1	-	2	4	-	2	2	6	5	-	-	34
	11% ^c	-	-	2%	-	-	5%	17%	29%	14%	5%	4%	11%	24%	-	10%	17%	42%	9%	-	-	10%
None of these	154	-	-	36	1	3	5	17	5	4	11	10	6	7	8	2	6	4	1	25	2	153
	45%	-	-	50%	30%	100%	47%	44%	29%	51%	64%	59%	65%	43%	56%	100%	36%	30%	7%	44%	100%	44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 166

Q10.12 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	346	319	8	19	13	33	21	25	25	9	61	71	28	24	5	6	21	174	167	346
Weighted total	342	299	5**	38**	10**	33**	18**	27**	32**	9**	66*	60*	26**	22**	6**	8**	20**	169	167	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	269	237	3	29	8	24	16	22	25	8	58	45	21	18	4	7	13	130	134	270
	79%	79%	61%	76%	80%	73%	89%	80%	78%	91%	87%	76%	80%	79%	64%	84%	65%	76%	80%	78%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	136	122	1	13	7	12	7	10	9	6	26	16	11	12	5	4	9	70	64	143
	40%	41%	23%	34%	70%	38%	37%	37%	29%	68%	39%	27%	41%	55%	81%	49%	44%	42%	39%	41%
Don't know	5	3	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	3	2	5
	1%	1%	-	4%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	6%	-	-	-	6%	2%	1%	1%
None of these	26	25	1	-	-	3	1	2	1	-	3	9	1	1	1	1	2	15	11	29
	8%	8%	25%	-	-	10%	6%	7%	3%	-	5%	15%	5%	4%	19%	6%	11%	9%	6%	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 167

Q10.12 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	346	62	284	84	75	86	68	13	18	120	30	112	12	44	51	180	251	91	346
Weighted total	342	58*	283	87*	67*	91*	65*	12**	18**	120*	33**	110*	13**	45*	54*	172	249	89*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	269	44	225	61	56	72	54	10	14	101	23	82	10	36	39	135	197	70	270
	79%	75%	79%	70%	83%	79%	84%	88%	81%	84%	71%	75%	80%	81%	73%	78%	79%	78%	78%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	136	18	119	29	23	38	29	6	10	53	8	44	5	12	25	76	102	32	143
	40%	30%	42%	33%	34%	42%	45%	53%	59%	44%	24%	40%	37%	28%	46%	44%	41%	36%	41%
Don't know	5	-	5	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	4	1	5
	1%	-	2%	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	6%	2%	-	-	-	1%	2%	1%	1%
None of these	26	9	17	11	6	5	3	-	1	3	4	14	3	4	4	13	17	8	29
	8%	15% ^b	6%	13%	8%	6%	5%	-	3%	2%	11%	13% ^d	20%	9%	8%	7%	7%	10%	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 168

Q10.12 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	346	78	183	33	47	55	231	288	36	48	57	152	14	82	246	99	33	61	93	346
Weighted total	342	82*	177	32**	45*	52*	217	276	33**	40*	55*	147	12**	73*	237	90*	30**	53*	100*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	269	67	137	27	33	43	172	220	27	36	48	115	10	57	199	76	25	44	67	270
	79% ^r	82%	78%	83%	72%	82%	79%	80%	81%	89%	88%	78%	80%	78%	84% ^r	85% ^r	85%	84% ^r	67%	78%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	136	32	74	10	19	23	87	110	13	18	18	71	3	26	102	51	16	25	34	143
	40%	39%	42%	30%	43%	45%	40%	40%	40%	45%	32%	48%	24%	36%	43%	57% ^{znr}	55%	47%	34%	41%
Don't know	5	1	3	-	-	1	2	3	-	-	-	2	-	1	2	-	-	-	2	5
	1%	2%	2%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	2%	1%
None of these	26	5	11	2	7	3	17	22	2	2	2	9	1	7	9	2	1	1	15	29
	8%	6%	6%	7%	15%	5%	8%	8%	5%	4%	4%	6%	6%	9%	4%	2%	2%	1%	15% ^{noq}	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 169

Q10.12 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	346	214	16	113	346	47	94	45	49	36	93	169	72	86	186	63	346
Weighted total	342	210	17**	109*	342	46*	95*	42*	43*	37**	91*	167	69*	87*	185	56*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	269	175	13	79	269	24	81	35	37	32	69	130	58	71	142	47	270
	79%e	83%c	79%	72%	79%e	53%	85%e	83%e	86%e	89%	76%	78%	84%	81%	77%	84%	78%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	136	77	7	53	136	14	39	13	25	19	40	65	27	39	73	23	143
	40%	37%	40%	48%	40%	31%	41%	30%	57%zdeg	51%	45%	39%	39%	45%	39%	40%	41%
Don't know	5	1	-	2	5	1	-	1	-	-	1	3	1	1	1	2	5
	1%	*	-	2%	1%	1%	-	3%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	*	4% <i>n</i>	1%
None of these	26	13	2	9	26	11	4	3	1	1	7	9	7	4	16	4	29
	8%	6%	12%	9%	8%	23%zdfgh	4%	6%	1%	2%	8%	5%	10%	4%	9%	6%	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 170

Q10.12 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	346	6	1	81	6	5	14	31	18	6	17	15	11	26	10	1	17	14	9	57	1	346
Weighted total	342	6**	1**	73*	4**	3**	10**	39**	15**	8**	16**	17**	10**	17**	15**	2**	17**	14**	15**	57*	2**	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	269	6	1	56	4	2	5	37	11	5	13	10	9	12	13	2	14	12	15	42	2	270
79%	89%	100%	77%	83%	71%	46%	94%	69%	62%	78%	58%	95%	70%	89%	100%	82%	88%	100%	73%	100%	2	78%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	136	2	-	37	3	3	3	10	6	4	5	9	4	7	7	-	14	3	2	17	2	143
40%	28%	-	50%	62%	74%	31%	26%	38%	47%	32%	51%	39%	41%	51%	-	80%	21%	13%	30%	100%	2	41%
Don't know	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	5
1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	1%	-	1%
None of these	26	-	-	4	-	-	3	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	29
8%	-	-	6%	-	-	34%	6%	15%	14%	12%	13%	5%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 171

Q10.13 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	346	319	8	19	13	33	21	25	25	9	61	71	28	24	5	6	21	174	167	346
Weighted total	342	299	5**	38**	10**	33**	18**	27**	32**	9**	66*	60*	26**	22**	6**	8**	20**	169	167	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	187	168	2	17	4	15	12	15	15	7	35	35	19	14	3	4	8	84	101	190
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	105	93	-	12	2	10	5	6	9	4	19	12	8	11	2	7	7	51	53	102
Don't know	31%	31%	-	32%	16%	30%	26%	23%	27%	50%	28%	20%	33%	51%	34%	84%	36%	30%	33%	29%
None of these	30	24	1	5	-	3	2	2	4	-	9	5	2	1	-	-	2	17	11	27
	9%	8%	12%	14%	-	10%	9%	12%	-	14%	8%	6%	5%	-	-	10%	10%	10%	6%	8%
	84	75	2	7	4	11	4	8	7	1	17	16	5	2	3	1	6	45	37	91
	24%	25%	53%	17%	44%	32%	22%	30%	21%	9%	26%	26%	18%	10%	55%	6%	29%	26%	22%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 172

Q10.13 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	346	62	284	84	75	86	68	13	18	120	30	112	12	44	51	180	251	91	346
Weighted total	342	58*	283	87*	67*	91*	65*	12**	18**	120*	33**	110*	13**	45*	54*	172	249	89*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	187	30	157	38	42	49	41	5	11	63	15	65	8	28	28	92	130	57	190
	55%	51%	55%	44%	63% <i>c</i>	54%	63% <i>c</i>	41%	65%	52%	45%	59%	67%	63%	51%	53%	52%	64%	55%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	105	14	92	20	19	36	21	3	7	40	7	37	2	12	21	55	75	29	102
	31%	23%	32%	23%	28%	39% <i>c</i>	33%	26%	39%	33%	20%	34%	13%	28%	40%	32%	30%	33%	29%
Don't know	30	6	23	10	1	9	5	3	1	5	5	11	2	2	5	12	25	4	27
	9% <i>d</i>	11%	8%	12% <i>d</i>	1%	10% <i>d</i>	7%	23%	7%	4%	15%	10%	15%	4%	10%	7%	10%	5%	8%
None of these	84	16	67	27	20	19	11	3	4	35	8	23	2	10	12	48	64	17	91
	24%	28%	24%	31%	29%	20%	17%	23%	24%	29%	23%	21%	18%	22%	23%	28%	26%	19%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 173

Q10.13 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	346	78	183	33	47	55	231	288	36	48	57	152	14	82	246	99	33	61	93	346
Weighted total	342	82*	177	32**	45*	52*	217	276	33**	40*	55*	147	12**	73*	237	90*	30**	53*	100*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	187	43	99	18	24	32	118	153	15	23	36	85	5	49	133	50	20	33	52	190
55%	55%	52%	56%	56%	53%	61%	54%	55%	46%	57%	66%	58%	42%	68% ^z	56%	56%	68%	64%	52%	55%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	105	27	56	9	13	15	69	88	11	13	13	56	4	21	79	32	10	18	26	102
31%	31%	33%	32%	27%	28%	29%	32%	32%	33%	33%	24%	38%	38%	28%	33%	35%	33%	35%	26%	29%
Don't know	30	9	14	5	2	6	18	23	2	4	2	9	*	1	16	5	1	2	13	27
9% ^m	10%	8%	17%	5%	12%	8%	8%	8%	7%	11%	3%	6%	4%	2%	7%	5%	4%	4%	13%	8%
None of these	84	19	40	5	17	10	55	68	8	9	14	33	3	14	60	25	7	10	21	91
24%	24%	23%	23%	17%	37%	20%	25%	25%	24%	22%	26%	22%	22%	19%	25%	28%	22%	19%	21%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 174

Q10.13 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	346	214	16	113	346	47	94	45	49	36	93	169	72	86	186	63	346
Weighted total	342	210	17**	109*	342	46*	95*	42*	43*	37**	91*	167	69*	87*	185	56*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	187	122	9	56	187	18	52	32	27	23	49	85	46	47	98	35	190
55%	55%	58%	51%	51%	55%	40%	55%	75% <i>zdef</i>	62% <i>ee</i>	63%	54%	51%	67% <i>kl</i>	54%	53%	62%	55%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	105	67	5	32	105	12	35	10	18	16	27	47	27	28	53	21	102
31%	31%	32%	29%	29%	31%	26%	36%	23%	42%	43%	29%	28%	40%	32%	29%	38%	29%
Don't know	30	16	-	12	30	5	6	3	3	4	8	16	3	9	16	3	27
9%	9%	8%	-	11%	9%	10%	7%	6%	6%	10%	9%	10%	4%	10%	9%	5%	8%
None of these	84	42	6	33	84	15	20	6	9	6	25	41	14	22	47	12	91
24%	24%	20%	37%	30%	24%	33% <i>g</i>	21%	13%	22%	18%	28%	24%	20%	26%	25%	21%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 175

Q10.13 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	346	6	1	81	6	5	14	31	18	6	17	15	11	26	10	1	17	14	9	57	1	346
Weighted total	342	6**	1**	73*	4**	3**	10**	39**	15**	8**	16**	17**	10**	17**	15**	2**	17**	14**	15**	57*	2**	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	187	4	1	39	3	2	4	26	7	2	9	8	4	6	9	-	12	10	13	27	2	190
55%	55%	56%	100%	53%	58%	71%	37%	68%	43%	26%	57%	47%	44%	34%	58%	-	72%	77%	87%	47%	100%	55%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	105	2	-	24	2	3	2	11	5	5	4	5	2	3	5	-	11	3	2	14	2	102
31%	31%	28%	-	33%	37%	74%	24%	28%	32%	61%	27%	30%	22%	20%	32%	-	67%	21%	13%	24%	100%	29%
Don't know	30	1	-	5	-	-	-	4	2	1	2	-	1	1	4	-	-	1	2	6	-	27
9%	9%	10%	-	7%	-	-	5%	10%	13%	14%	10%	-	8%	8%	25%	-	-	9%	13%	11%	-	8%
None of these	84	1	-	21	1	-	4	5	4	1	5	6	5	8	1	2	3	1	-	15	-	91
24%	24%	22%	-	28%	25%	-	42%	14%	28%	13%	33%	37%	48%	49%	6%	100%	15%	7%	-	26%	-	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 176

Q10.14 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	346	319	8	19	13	33	21	25	25	9	61	71	28	24	5	6	21	174	167	346
Weighted total	342	299	5**	38**	10**	33**	18**	27**	32**	9**	66*	60*	26**	22**	6**	8**	20**	169	167	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	162	147	*	14	4	16	11	16	12	6	21	33	18	12	4	5	5	83	77	170
47% ^j	49%	49%	9%	37%	40%	49%	57%	57%	37%	65%	32%	55% ^j	69%	55%	64%	67%	26%	49%	46%	49%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	89	75	1	13	3	15	5	6	6	4	6	9	7	10	4	7	4	40	47	88
26% ^j	25%	23%	33%	30%	47%	30%	21%	17%	50%	9%	47%	14%	27%	43%	70%	84%	24%	28%	28%	25%
Don't know	22	19	-	2	-	1	-	3	2	-	8	5	1	1	-	-	1	10	10	19
6%	7%	-	6%	-	4%	-	11%	6%	-	12%	9%	2%	2%	-	-	4%	6%	6%	6%	5%
None of these	122	102	4	17	5	7	6	8	14	3	35	17	7	6	1	1	11	62	60	121
36%	34%	77%	46%	50%	23%	31%	28%	46%	29%	53% ^{zk}	29%	29%	27%	19%	6%	55%	36%	36%	35%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 177

Q10.14 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	346	62	284	84	75	86	68	13	18	120	30	112	12	44	51	180	251	91	346
Weighted total	342	58*	283	87*	67*	91*	65*	12**	18**	120*	33**	110*	13**	45*	54*	172	249	89*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	162	22	140	32	37	47	29	6	11	72	10	33	6	21	20	92	122	40	170
47%k		38%	49%	37%	54% <i>c</i>	52%	45%	49%	62%	60% <i>zk</i>	31%	30%	44%	48%	37%	53%	49%	44%	49%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	89	12	77	20	17	31	16	2	3	43	5	19	4	11	18	46	68	19	88
26%		21%	27%	23%	25%	34%	24%	18%	19%	36% <i>k</i>	15%	17%	30%	24%	33%	27%	27%	22%	25%
Don't know	22	4	17	6	3	6	4	1	2	4	1	11	-	1	3	13	14	7	19
6%		7%	6%	7%	5%	7%	6%	7%	9%	3%	2%	10%	-	1%	5%	8%	6%	7%	5%
None of these	122	26	97	43	19	23	25	5	5	25	20	58	7	17	21	51	84	36	121
36% <i>l</i>		44%	34%	49% <i>zde</i>	28%	26%	39%	44%	29%	21%	61%	53% <i>z</i>	56%	37%	39%	29%	34%	40%	35%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 178

Q10.14 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	346	78	183	33	47	55	231	288	36	48	57	152	14	82	246	99	33	61	93	346
Weighted total	342	82*	177	32**	45*	52*	217	276	33**	40*	55*	147	12**	73*	237	90*	30**	53*	100*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	162	34	97	14	15	35	99	137	20	23	32	80	6	37	133	54	16	34	27	170
	47% <i>af</i>	42%	55% <i>d</i>	45%	34%	67% <i>zf</i>	46%	50%	62%	56%	58%	55%	53%	51%	56% <i>r</i>	60% <i>zr</i>	53%	64% <i>zr</i>	27%	49%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	89	29	44	7	8	11	56	70	15	11	18	49	2	17	74	30	6	15	15	88
	26% <i>af</i>	36%	25%	21%	18%	21%	26%	25%	44%	27%	32%	34%	21%	23%	31% <i>r</i>	33% <i>r</i>	22%	29% <i>r</i>	15%	25%
Don't know	22	5	7	4	3	6	11	18	1	5	4	5	*	4	12	4	3	1	9	19
	6%	6%	4%	13%	6%	12%	5%	7%	4%	11%	6%	4%	4%	6%	5%	4%	10%	2%	9%	5%
None of these	122	33	54	11	22	8	83	93	5	9	12	43	4	25	65	22	10	12	55	121
	36% <i>ej</i>	40%	31%	34%	50% <i>b</i>	15%	38% <i>e</i>	34%	16%	21%	21%	29%	30%	34%	28%	25%	32%	22%	55% <i>znog</i>	35%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 179

Q10.14 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	346	214	16	113	346	47	94	45	49	36	93	169	72	86	186	63	346
Weighted total	342	210	17**	109*	342	46*	95*	42*	43*	37**	91*	167	69*	87*	185	56*	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	162	98	12	49	162	10	49	26	31	23	35	84	40	34	89	35	170
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	89	55	6	28	89	9	28	10	14	15	23	39	25	22	45	21	88
Don't know	22	17	-	5	22	1	5	4	-	3	7	7	3	6	11	2	19
None of these	122	71	4	43	122	29	31	8	9	5	40	56	20	38	64	14	121
	36%g	34%	23%	40%	36%g	62%zdfgh	33%	18%	21%	14%	44%	33%	29%	44%o	35%	24%	35%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 180

Q10.14 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting.
For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	346	6	1	81	6	5	14	31	18	6	17	15	11	26	10	1	17	14	9	57	1	346
Weighted total	342	6**	1**	73*	4**	3**	10**	39**	15**	8**	16**	17**	10**	17**	15**	2**	17**	14**	15**	57*	2**	346
Has done this at any site since early 2015	162	5	1	46	1	2	3	21	14	3	5	2	6	5	4	2	10	5	9	17	2	170
	47% s	79%	100%	63% z	35%	71%	27%	53%	87%	39%	31%	12%	63%	27%	27%	100%	57%	36%	58%	30%	100%	49%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	89	2	-	20	2	2	2	10	5	4	1	1	4	5	2	10	4	2	8	2	88	
	26%	28%	-	28%	42%	53%	17%	26%	32%	47%	26%	5%	15%	21%	31%	100%	57%	27%	13%	15%	100%	25%
Don't know	22	1	-	2	1	-	-	4	-	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	1	4	4	-	19
	6%	10%	-	3%	14%	-	5%	10%	-	-	5%	16%	8%	-	-	-	-	5%	29%	8%	-	5%
None of these	122	-	-	15	1	-	5	12	1	1	10	12	3	11	9	-	4	5	2	33	-	121
	36% c	-	-	20%	20%	-	51%	31%	5%	14%	59%	71%	29%	63%	61%	-	21%	39%	13%	57% z	-	35%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 181

Q10.10-14 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category lighting. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Summary

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to lighting

	Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls	Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent	Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED	Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED	Replace external lighting with LED
Unweighted total	346	346	346	346	346
Weighted total	342	342	342	342	342
Has done this at any site since early 2015	214 62%	133 39%	269 79%	187 55%	162 47%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	108 32%	49 14%	136 40%	105 31%	89 26%
Don't know	5 2%	36 11%	5 1%	30 9%	22 6%
None of these	83 24%	154 45%	26 8%	84 24%	122 36%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 182

Q10.15 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

PC power management

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	191	174	6	11	6	15	7	10	8	5	60	28	11	16	3	6	13	106	81	191
Weighted total	192	166	4**	22**	5**	15**	6**	11**	10**	5**	64*	22**	11**	13**	3**	9**	13**	106*	82*	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	81	71	1	10	2	6	4	7	5	3	28	12	4	7	-	2	2	42	37	81
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	29	29	*	-	1	5	3	-	1	2	6	5	2	2	-	-	3	19	11	32
Don't know	15%	17%	13%	-	24%	30%	46%	-	8%	40%	9%	25%	17%	13%	-	-	23%	18%	13%	17%
None of these	21	16	2	4	-	3	-	-	1	-	8	4	-	1	-	2	3	12	8	22
	11%	9%	54%	16%	-	18%	-	-	8%	-	12%	20%	-	5%	-	18%	26%	12%	10%	12%
	74	65	1	9	2	4	-	5	4	1	26	3	6	6	3	5	4	43	30	73
	39%	39%	18%	40%	48%	27%	-	42%	43%	16%	40%	15%	54%	44%	100%	58%	32%	41%	37%	38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 183

Q10.15 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

PC power management

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	191	38	153	45	39	45	40	10	12	68	23	65	10	25	27	96	136	55	191
Weighted total	192	38*	154	50*	38*	47*	36*	10**	11**	69*	26**	66*	13**	28**	29**	89*	135	57*	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	81	15	66	17	15	23	16	7	3	27	10	32	3	11	17	32	57	25	81
42%	39%	43%	33%	40%	50%	46%	67%	31%		39%	38%	49%	23%	38%	58%	36%	42%	43%	42%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	29	7	23	10	4	7	7	1	1	9	4	14	3	4	3	14	21	8	32
15%	17%	15%	19%	11%	15%	19%	12%	5%		13%	16%	21%	25%	13%	9%	16%	16%	15%	17%
Don't know	21	2	19	4	4	4	6	1	3	5	6	5	4	2	2	6	14	7	22
11%	6%	12%	8%	9%	9%	17%	8%	26%		7%	24%	7%	29%	8%	8%	7%	10%	12%	12%
None of these	74	17	58	25	16	16	10	2	5	32	6	23	5	14	8	42	55	20	73
39%	43%	37%	49%	43%	35%	27%	25%	43%		47%	22%	36%	39%	50%	28%	48%	40%	35%	38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 184

Q10.15 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

PC power management

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	191	47	95	14	35	20	135	153	24	31	35	89	10	43	128	57	19	33	58	191
Weighted total	192	51*	92*	14**	35**	18**	129	148	25**	26**	32*	80*	8**	44*	121	52*	19**	33**	64*	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	81	20	42	10	10	8	57	62	13	14	16	32	5	18	48	24	7	11	29	81
	42%	39%	45%	71%	28%	42%	44%	42%	53%	56%	49%	40%	65%	42%	40%	46%	36%	35%	45%	42%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	29	8	16	1	4	2	21	20	4	6	9	13	-	10	18	5	4	7	10	32
	15%	15%	17%	11%	12%	9%	16%	14%	15%	24%	27%	17%	-	24%	15%	10%	19%	21%	15%	17%
Don't know	21	9	5	1	7	1	11	14	-	1	2	6	-	7	10	4	-	-	10	22
	11%	17% ^b	5%	4%	21%	4%	8%	10%	-	5%	6%	8%	-	16%	8%	7%	-	-	15%	12%
None of these	74	17	39	3	15	10	51	63	8	8	10	34	3	14	54	23	10	17	20	73
	39%	32%	43%	25%	43%	54%	39%	42%	32%	31%	31%	42%	35%	32%	44%	44%	54%	52%	31%	38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 185

Q10.15 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

PC power management

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	191	121	4	65	191	26	54	18	23	20	53	97	37	49	105	35	191
Weighted total	192	125	3**	63*	192	26**	53*	18**	22**	18**	54*	94*	39**	50*	100*	39**	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	81	59	1	20	81	10	20	8	12	6	21	37	21	18	42	20	81
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	29	21	-	8	29	3	13	4	3	2	9	12	8	8	17	5	32
Don't know	21	12	1	8	21	2	7	1	2	-	7	8	3	7	8	5	22
None of these	74	45	1	28	74	12	19	8	7	11	21	43	11	21	40	13	73
	39%	36%	58%	44%	39%	44%	36%	44%	31%	59%	39%	45%	27%	42%	40%	34%	38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 186

Q10.15 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

PC power management

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	191	1	-	38	2	3	14	7	8	5	8	15	4	22	12	1	9	5	2	35	-	191
Weighted total	192	1**	-**	33*	1**	2**	10**	11**	6**	7**	6**	21**	4**	17**	18**	1**	10**	6**	3**	35*	-**	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	81	1	-	10	1	3	-	-	2	6	4	9	4	5	10	1	3	3	-	17	-	81
	42%	100%	-	30%	61%	64%	32%	-	36%	86%	69%	42%	100%	31%	53%	100%	32%	56%	-	50%	-	42%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	29	-	-	5	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	3	1	5	4	-	-	-	-	7	-	32
	15%	-	-	17%	39%	35%	11%	-	-	-	15%	16%	22%	28%	22%	-	-	9%	-	21%	-	17%
Don't know	21	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	4	-	2	2	-	3	3	-	3	-	22
	11%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	11%	32%	-	-	20%	-	13%	10%	-	29%	44%	-	7%	-	12%
None of these	74	-	-	16	-	1	6	10	2	1	2	5	-	7	4	-	4	-	3	13	-	73
	39%	-	-	50%	-	36%	62%	89%	32%	14%	31%	23%	-	45%	21%	-	40%	-	100%	38%	-	38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 187

Q10.16 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	191	174	6	11	6	15	7	10	8	5	60	28	11	16	3	6	13	106	81	191
Weighted total	192	166	4**	22**	5**	15**	6**	11**	10**	5**	64*	22**	11**	13**	3**	9**	13**	106*	82*	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	122	106	2	13	5	11	4	7	8	3	37	14	8	5	-	7	8	65	54	123
	63%	64%	64%	58%	100%	73%	71%	62%	85%	56%	58%	62%	70%	37%	-	82%	59%	62%	66%	64%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	41	36	*	4	1	6	2	-	1	1	15	7	4	2	-	1	-	26	15	40
	21%	22%	13%	16%	13%	39%	37%	-	8%	30%	24%	30%	37%	16%	-	16%	-	24%	18%	21%
Don't know	11	10	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	5	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	5	7	12
	6%	6%	36%	-	-	-	12%	-	-	8%	11%	-	-	36%	18%	-	-	5%	8%	6%
None of these	49	41	-	8	-	3	1	3	1	2	18	4	2	7	2	-	5	30	16	48
	25%	25%	-	35%	-	23%	9%	27%	15%	44%	28%	19%	15%	56%	64%	-	41%	28%	20%	25%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 188

Q10.16 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	191	38	153	45	39	45	40	10	12	68	23	65	10	25	27	96	136	55	191
Weighted total	192	38*	154	50*	38*	47*	36*	10**	11**	69*	26**	66*	13**	28**	29**	89*	135	57*	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	122	23	99	32	20	29	25	8	8	46	16	43	7	16	21	58	84	38	123
	63%	59%	64%	64%	51%	62%	70%	77%	73%	66%	60%	66%	59%	59%	72%	65%	62%	67%	64%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	41	8	33	14	4	11	6	1	4	10	7	17	5	3	5	17	29	12	40
	21%	20%	21%	29%	10%	24%	17%	12%	31%	15%	25%	26%	39%	11%	16%	19%	21%	20%	21%
Don't know	11	2	9	1	6	-	3	-	2	2	2	2	-	2	2	4	9	3	12
	6%	6%	6%	1%	15% <i>ce</i>	-	9%	-	17%	4%	8%	3%	-	5%	6%	5%	6%	5%	6%
None of these	49	9	40	13	11	14	8	2	1	18	5	17	4	10	6	24	35	14	48
	25%	23%	26%	26%	28%	31%	21%	23%	10%	26%	20%	25%	32%	36%	21%	27%	26%	25%	25%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 189

Q10.16 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	191	47	95	14	35	20	135	153	24	31	35	89	10	43	128	57	19	33	58	191
Weighted total	192	51*	92*	14**	35**	18**	129	148	25**	26**	32*	80*	8**	44*	121	52*	19**	33**	64*	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	122	34	62	7	18	14	82	96	19	20	24	54	5	27	85	37	11	22	33	123
	63%	67%	67%	54%	53%	73%	63%	64%	78%	76%	75%	67%	60%	63%	70% ^r	71%	56%	67%	52%	64%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	41	9	23	1	7	5	25	29	3	7	11	16	1	9	27	12	5	8	12	40
	21%	18%	24%	11%	21%	27%	20%	20%	13%	27%	36%	20%	12%	22%	22%	24%	26%	24%	19%	21%
Don't know	11	3	3	2	3	-	9	9	*	1	2	3	*	3	8	4	1	1	3	12
	6%	7%	3%	17%	8%	-	7%	6%	2%	3%	6%	4%	5%	6%	7%	7%	7%	4%	5%	6%
None of these	49	10	22	4	12	5	33	37	5	5	5	19	3	13	22	10	5	7	25	48
	25%	20%	24%	30%	35%	27%	25%	25%	20%	18%	16%	24%	35%	29%	18%	19%	26%	21%	38% ^{no}	25%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 190

Q10.16 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	191	121	4	65	191	26	54	18	23	20	53	97	37	49	105	35	191
Weighted total	192	125	3**	63*	192	26**	53*	18**	22**	18**	54*	94*	39**	50*	100*	39**	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	122	86	2	33	122	14	33	12	17	11	29	61	31	31	62	28	123
63%	69% <i>c</i>	81%	53%	63%	63%	55%	62%	67%	76%	63%	53%	64%	80%	62%	62%	70%	64%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	41	25	-	13	41	3	15	4	4	3	11	18	9	13	18	7	40
21%	20%	-	21%	21%	13%	29%	22%	16%	19%	21%	19%	24%	26%	18%	19%	21%	21%
Don't know	11	9	-	3	11	1	1	1	-	1	1	11	-	-	10	1	12
6%	7%	-	4%	6%	3%	2%	4%	-	8%	1%	11%	-	-	10% <i>m</i>	3%	6%	6%
None of these	49	24	1	24	49	11	13	5	5	5	24	17	6	18	20	10	48
25%	19%	19%	39% <i>a</i>	25%	43%	25%	29%	24%	26%	44% <i>z</i> <i>k</i>	18%	15%	36%	20%	26%	25%	25%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 191

Q10.16 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	191	1	-	38	2	3	14	7	8	5	8	15	4	22	12	1	9	5	2	35	-	191
Weighted total	192	1**	-**	33*	1**	2**	10**	11**	6**	7**	6**	21**	4**	17**	18**	1**	10**	6**	3**	35*	-**	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	122	-	-	21	1	4	7	3	7	4	17	2	9	9	1	8	3	3	20	-	123	
63%		-	-	65%	100%	64%	36%	66%	49%	100%	60%	84%	59%	53%	47%	100%	84%	56%	100%	57%	-	64%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	41	-	-	7	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	6	3	3	4	-	2	-	-	12	-	40
21%		-	-	21%	-	35%	15%	-	-	-	15%	28%	62%	18%	23%	-	25%	9%	-	35%	-	21%
Don't know	11	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	2	3	-	2	-	12	
6%		100%	-	-	-	12%	-	10%	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	16%	44%	-	5%	-	6%	
None of these	49	-	-	9	-	1	4	4	3	-	3	1	-	5	10	-	-	-	9	-	48	
25%		-	-	29%	-	36%	42%	34%	41%	-	40%	6%	-	31%	53%	-	-	-	27%	-	25%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 192

Q10.17 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	191	174	6	11	6	15	7	10	8	5	60	28	11	16	3	6	13	106	81	191
Weighted total	192	166	4**	22**	5**	15**	6**	11**	10**	5**	64*	22**	11**	13**	3**	9**	13**	106*	82*	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	99	89	2	8	3	7	3	5	8	1	32	13	6	6	1	4	6	52	44	98
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	52%	54%	49%	35%	56%	43%	56%	44%	79%	16%	50%	58%	54%	46%	27%	48%	46%	49%	54%	51%
Don't know	39	32	2	5	1	4	2	2	-	4	12	5	2	2	-	5	-	19	20	40
None of these	20%	19%	49%	22%	15%	24%	29%	18%	-	84%	19%	24%	21%	13%	-	60%	-	17%	25%	21%
	26	23	1	2	1	2	-	3	1	-	8	4	2	1	1	1	2	15	11	27
	13%	14%	33%	7%	11%	11%	-	26%	14%	-	13%	20%	15%	9%	36%	9%	13%	14%	13%	14%
	47	39	-	8	2	4	1	3	1	-	18	3	4	5	1	-	5	31	14	45
	24%	23%	-	36%	33%	28%	15%	25%	7%	-	28%	15%	31%	41%	37%	-	41%	29%	18%	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 193

Q10.17 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)		Yes (p)	No (q)
Unweighted total	191	38	153	45	39	45	40	10	12	68	23	65	10	25	27	96	136	55	191
Weighted total	192	38*	154	50*	38*	47*	36*	10**	11**	69*	26**	66*	13**	28**	29**	89*	135	57*	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	99	19	80	23	15	26	20	7	7	38	13	37	4	16	19	46	69	30	98
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	52%	49%	52%	46%	39%	56%	56%	76%	65%	55%	50%	55%	30%	60%	65%	52%	51%	53%	51%
Don't know	39	11	28	12	7	9	8	-	3	10	5	17	2	8	5	16	25	13	40
	20%	28%	18%	24%	18%	19%	22%	-	27%	14%	20%	25%	17%	28%	19%	18%	19%	24%	21%
None of these	26	2	23	8	3	6	6	2	2	8	4	7	1	1	3	11	20	5	27
	13%	6%	15%	15%	8%	13%	16%	13%	13%	11%	15%	11%	8%	3%	10%	13%	15%	9%	14%
	47	8	38	11	15	13	5	1	2	18	6	16	6	5	4	25	35	12	45
	24%	22%	25%	21%	39% <i>f</i>	29%	15%	8%	17%	26%	24%	24%	45%	17%	15%	28%	26%	21%	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 194

Q10.17 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	191	47	95	14	35	20	135	153	24	31	35	89	10	43	128	57	19	33	58	191
Weighted total	192	51*	92*	14**	35**	18**	129	148	25**	26**	32*	80*	8**	44*	121	52*	19**	33**	64*	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	99	28	43	6	21	7	70	76	13	10	13	42	5	22	62	27	7	13	33	98
52%	55%	47%	46%	60%	39%	54%	52%	51%	39%	42%	52%	56%	51%	51%	53%	35%	40%	51%	51%	51%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	39	7	21	4	7	3	24	30	7	8	10	23	-	8	27	12	4	6	12	40
20%	13%	23%	31%	20%	18%	18%	18%	20%	27%	32%	31%	28%	-	19%	22%	22%	23%	19%	19%	21%
Don't know	26	4	15	2	4	4	19	22	2	3	5	10	2	5	16	8	2	2	10	27
13%	9%	16%	13%	13%	20%	15%	15%	9%	13%	16%	13%	23%	12%	12%	13%	16%	9%	7%	15%	14%
None of these	47	15	23	3	7	6	29	34	5	7	7	16	2	11	27	10	9	14	17	45
24%	29%	25%	19%	19%	33%	22%	23%	18%	28%	23%	20%	21%	26%	23%	20%	45%	44%	27%	24%	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 195

Q10.17 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	191	121	4	65	191	26	54	18	23	20	53	97	37	49	105	35	191
Weighted total	192	125	3**	63*	192	26**	53*	18**	22**	18**	54*	94*	39**	50*	100*	39**	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	99	69	2	28	99	14	26	10	13	9	29	49	19	27	55	16	98
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	52%	55%	81%	45%	52%	52%	49%	55%	59%	48%	53%	52%	49%	55%	55%	41%	51%
Don't know	39	27	1	12	39	8	14	5	3	2	12	14	13	13	16	10	40
None of these	20%	21%	19%	19%	20%	31%	26%	27%	15%	9%	22%	15%	33%	26%	16%	26%	21%
	26	14	-	10	26	1	6	3	2	2	6	15	2	5	13	6	27
	13%	11%	-	16%	13%	3%	11%	15%	11%	11%	11%	16%	6%	11%	13%	14%	14%
	47	28	-	19	47	7	12	4	5	6	15	22	9	13	22	11	45
	24%	22%	-	30%	24%	25%	23%	19%	24%	35%	27%	24%	24%	27%	22%	28%	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 196

Q10.17 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	191	1	-	38	2	3	14	7	8	5	8	15	4	22	12	1	9	5	2	35	-	191
Weighted total	192	1**	-**	33*	1**	2**	10**	11**	6**	7**	6**	21**	4**	17**	18**	1**	10**	6**	3**	35*	-**	191
Has done this at any site since early 2015	99	-	-	15	-	1	4	7	2	5	2	12	2	7	9	1	7	3	3	18	-	98
52%	-	-	45%	-	64%	44%	61%	37%	80%	24%	59%	38%	43%	48%	100%	74%	61%	100%	51%	-	-	51%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	39	-	-	6	1	1	1	3	2	-	1	5	1	5	2	-	2	3	-	7	-	40
20%	-	-	19%	39%	35%	6%	26%	25%	-	15%	25%	22%	32%	11%	-	25%	56%	-	19%	-	-	21%
Don't know	26	1	-	4	1	-	1	-	1	-	2	3	2	2	1	-	2	1	-	5	-	27
13%	100%	-	12%	61%	-	5%	-	19%	-	26%	15%	41%	12%	5%	-	20%	17%	-	15%	-	-	14%
None of these	47	-	-	12	-	1	5	1	1	1	2	3	-	4	6	-	1	-	-	8	-	45
24%	-	-	36%	-	36%	50%	13%	20%	20%	35%	16%	-	26%	35%	-	6%	-	-	24%	-	-	24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 197

Q10.15-17 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category Computers and IT solutions. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Summary

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to computers and IT solutions

	PC power management	Upgrade to more efficient screens	Energy efficient file storage or server replacement
Unweighted total	191	191	191
Weighted total	192	192	192
Has done this at any site since early 2015	81 42%	122 63%	99 52%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	29 15%	41 21%	39 20%
Don't know	21 11%	11 6%	26 13%
None of these	74 39%	49 25%	47 24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 198

Q10.18 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	118	108	4	6	6	18	3	9	6	3	20	22	11	9	1	2	6	55	62	118
Weighted total	116	103*	2**	11**	5**	15**	3**	10**	7**	3**	19**	20**	11**	12**	1**	3**	7**	57*	58*	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	25	22	1	2	-	5	-	*	-	-	5	2	4	4	-	2	-	10	15	26
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	21%	21%	57%	17%	-	32%	-	5%	-	-	24%	13%	41%	39%	-	70%	-	17%	26%	22%
Don't know	26	24	-	2	2	4	-	*	2	1	3	5	2	2	1	2	2	10	15	26
None of these	22%	23%	-	17%	32%	28%	-	5%	29%	35%	16%	24%	21%	15%	100%	70%	25%	18%	27%	22%
Don't know	8	8	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	2	1	1	-	-	-	5	3	8
None of these	7%	8%	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	21%	10%	6%	7%	-	-	-	9%	5%	7%
None of these	70	60	1	9	3	7	3	10	5	2	10	12	6	6	-	1	5	36	33	70
	60%	58%	43%	83%	68%	44%	100%	95%	71%	65%	50%	63%	53%	54%	-	30%	75%	63%	56%	59%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 199

Q10.18 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	118	19	99	21	29	26	27	2	12	50	7	32	4	13	22	62	91	25	118
Weighted total	116	20**	97*	20**	29**	29**	25**	2**	12**	46*	7**	34**	3**	14**	24**	55*	86*	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	25	4	20	3	4	10	4	-	3	14	2	4	1	3	8	10	20	4	26
21%	21%	22%	21%	16%	15%	36%	14%	-	27%	31%	34%	11%	22%	23%	31%	19%	23%	13%	22%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	26	6	20	4	6	6	6	1	3	13	2	5	-	3	6	14	23	3	26
22%	22%	31%	20%	21%	20%	21%	24%	41%	29%	28%	25%	13%	-	24%	26%	25%	27%	10%	22%
Don't know	8	4	4	2	4	1	1	1	-	2	-	5	-	-	2	3	4	3	8
7%	7%	21%	4%	9%	13%	4%	3%	59%	-	4%	-	13%	-	-	7%	5%	5%	12%	7%
None of these	70	8	62	13	17	16	16	-	8	23	5	23	2	9	12	33	50	20	70
60%	60%	41%	64%	66%	58%	55%	63%	-	65%	51%	66%	66%	78%	66%	51%	60%	58%	72%	59%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 200

Q10.18 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	118	36	50	9	21	18	83	100	12	11	25	52	3	38	83	41	12	21	31	118
Weighted total	116	33*	51*	9**	22**	17**	78*	95*	11**	11**	21**	52*	2**	35*	84*	38*	12**	19**	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	25	4	10	3	8	1	20	22	4	2	6	11	1	8	21	10	2	5	4	26
21%	21%	12%	20%	34%	35%	7%	26%	23%	35%	15%	27%	22%	29%	24%	24%	25%	16%	24%	13%	22%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	26	7	12	4	3	5	17	21	4	3	7	14	-	5	22	10	3	4	3	26
22%	22%	21%	23%	43%	15%	27%	21%	22%	35%	30%	32%	27%	-	15%	26%	27%	22%	21%	12%	22%
Don't know	8	2	5	-	1	1	5	7	-	1	2	4	-	2	6	3	3	4	1	8
7%	7%	5%	9%	-	6%	5%	7%	8%	-	12%	9%	7%	-	5%	8%	7%	22%	19%	4%	7%
None of these	70	23	32	3	11	12	45	55	7	5	11	32	2	20	47	20	5	9	20	70
60%	60%	69%	63%	34%	51%	67%	58%	58%	65%	48%	52%	62%	71%	57%	56%	53%	39%	47%	71%	59%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 201

Q10.18 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	118	72	5	41	118	8	21	15	27	20	32	56	26	26	68	21	118
Weighted total	116	68*	4**	44*	116	8**	23**	13**	27**	19**	31**	54*	27**	24**	68*	21**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	25	16	*	8	25	2	3	3	3	8	8	12	4	6	16	2	26
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	21%	24%	12%	18%	21%	30%	11%	21%	11%	42%	26%	22%	14%	26%	23%	10%	22%
Don't know	26	15	1	9	26	1	5	1	7	8	4	14	8	3	18	4	26
None of these	22%	22%	38%	21%	22%	18%	23%	5%	27%	42%	11%	26%	30%	13%	27%	21%	22%
	8	7	1	1	8	-	4	-	1	1	-	3	4	-	8	-	8
	7%	10%	19%	3%	7%	-	17%	-	4%	5%	-	6%	16%	-	11%	-	7%
	70	40	2	29	70	5	14	10	16	8	22	33	13	15	38	15	70
	60%	58%	42%	64%	60%	70%	60%	75%	59%	43%	68%	60%	49%	65%	55%	73%	59%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 202

Q10.18 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	118	-	-	22	4	1	5	11	6	7	1	8	6	6	3	-	9	6	3	19	1	118
Weighted total	116	**	**	22**	3**	1**	4**	12**	5**	8**	1**	11**	5**	4**	4**	**	9**	7**	4**	16**	2**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	25	-	-	5	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	2	1	2	-	3	-	2	5	2	26
21%	-	-	24%	-	-	14%	11%	14%	-	-	6%	32%	37%	51%	-	30%	-	39%	33%	100%	22%	
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	26	-	-	2	1	-	1	6	2	1	-	1	+	1	-	2	1	2	4	2	26	
22%	-	-	7%	24%	-	29%	48%	37%	11%	-	9%	9%	37%	-	-	28%	13%	39%	26%	100%	22%	
Don't know	8	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	8	
7%	-	-	-	19%	-	22%	8%	14%	12%	-	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	7%	
None of these	70	-	-	16	2	1	2	5	2	6	1	6	3	2	2	-	5	6	3	9	-	70
60%	-	-	72%	57%	100%	49%	44%	35%	77%	100%	55%	68%	63%	49%	-	53%	87%	61%	56%	-	59%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 203

Q10.19 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	118	108	4	6	6	18	3	9	6	3	20	22	11	9	1	2	6	55	62	118
Weighted total	116	103*	2**	11**	5**	15**	3**	10**	7**	3**	19**	20**	11**	12**	1**	3**	7**	57*	58*	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	38	34	1	4	1	4	1	3	4	-	5	3	7	5	-	3	1	17	21	38
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	25	22	*	2	2	3	-	4	3	-	3	2	2	-	1	2	2	9	15	25
Don't know	8	7	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	4	1	1	1	-	-	-	7	1	7
None of these	62	54	1	7	3	9	1	6	2	3	10	15	4	6	-	-	4	30	31	63
	53%	53%	24%	65%	59%	58%	16%	57%	34%	100%	51%	76%	33%	51%	-	-	63%	53%	52%	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 204

Q10.19 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)		Yes (p)	No (q)
Unweighted total	118	19	99	21	29	26	27	2	12	50	7	32	4	13	22	62	91	25	118
Weighted total	116	20**	97*	20**	29**	29**	25**	2**	12**	46*	7**	34**	3**	14**	24**	55*	86*	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	38	4	35	5	8	14	9	1	1	20	2	6	1	7	11	14	29	8	38
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	25	5	19	3	5	7	7	1	2	10	2	6	1	5	6	10	20	5	25
Don't know	8	2	6	1	3	1	2	-	-	1	-	5	-	1	1	1	4	3	7
None of these	62	12	50	12	17	12	10	1	10	23	5	19	1	6	12	35	46	16	63
	53%	59%	52%	62%	59%	41%	41%	59%	81%	51%	66%	56%	31%	42%	49%	65%	53%	58%	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 205

Q10.19 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	118	36	50	9	21	18	83	100	12	11	25	52	3	38	83	41	12	21	31	118
Weighted total	116	33*	51*	9**	22**	17**	78*	95*	11**	11**	21**	52*	2**	35*	84*	38*	12**	19**	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	38	6	13	5	14	6	25	32	5	4	7	20	1	11	31	14	2	4	7	38
33%		17%	25%	61%	65%	36%	33%	33%	46%	33%	34%	38%	61%	31%	36%	37%	16%	21%	26%	32%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	25	5	9	5	6	6	14	19	4	3	6	14	-	5	20	8	3	3	4	25
21%		14%	19%	55%	26%	34%	18%	20%	35%	30%	28%	28%	-	15%	24%	22%	22%	17%	15%	21%
Don't know	8	2	4	-	1	2	4	8	-	-	1	3	-	1	4	1	3	3	2	7
7%		7%	8%	-	3%	9%	6%	8%	-	-	6%	5%	-	2%	5%	2%	22%	14%	8%	6%
None of these	62	24	31	2	6	7	43	48	6	6	12	27	1	19	44	21	5	11	16	63
53%		72%	60%	17%	27%	38%	55%	51%	54%	59%	55%	53%	39%	54%	52%	54%	39%	56%	55%	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 206

Q10.19 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	118	72	5	41	118	8	21	15	27	20	32	56	26	26	68	21	118
Weighted total	116	68*	4**	44*	116	8**	23**	13**	27**	19**	31**	54*	27**	24**	68*	21**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	38	24	*	14	38	2	8	6	9	6	12	19	8	10	24	4	38
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	33%	35%	12%	31%	33%	30%	34%	48%	35%	32%	38%	35%	29%	44%	36%	17%	32%
Don't know	25	15	1	8	25	1	3	2	9	6	3	13	10	2	18	5	25
None of these	21%	22%	38%	18%	21%	18%	12%	17%	32%	33%	8%	23%	36%	10%	26%	22%	21%
	8	4	1	3	8	-	4	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	6	-	7
	7%	6%	19%	6%	7%	-	18%	-	-	-	-	8%	7%	-	9%	-	6%
	62	35	2	25	62	5	10	6	14	11	18	28	13	12	35	14	63
	53%	51%	42%	57%	53%	70%	44%	49%	53%	58%	57%	52%	50%	50%	51%	65%	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 207

Q10.19 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	118	-	-	22	4	1	5	11	6	7	1	8	6	6	3	-	9	6	3	19	1	118
Weighted total	116	**	**	22**	3**	1**	4**	12**	5**	8**	1**	11**	5**	4**	**	9**	7**	4**	16**	2**	118	
Has done this at any site since early 2015	38	-	-	7	1	-	1	3	1	1	-	1	4	*	2	-	6	1	4	6	-	38
	33%	-	-	34%	24%	-	37%	27%	17%	14%	-	6%	82%	13%	51%	-	66%	18%	84%	35%	-	32%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	25	-	-	1	1	-	1	4	2	2	-	1	3	4	-	-	2	2	2	4	-	25
	21%	-	-	4%	24%	-	29%	36%	37%	25%	-	9%	50%	13%	-	-	22%	28%	39%	26%	-	21%
Don't know	8	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	7
	7%	-	-	-	19%	-	22%	-	14%	-	-	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	6%
None of these	62	-	-	14	1	1	1	8	2	6	1	6	1	3	2	-	3	4	1	8	2	63
	53%	-	-	63%	33%	100%	27%	64%	49%	75%	100%	52%	18%	87%	49%	-	29%	53%	16%	53%	100%	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 208

Q10.20 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	118	108	4	6	6	18	3	9	6	3	20	22	11	9	1	2	6	55	62	118
Weighted total	116	103*	2**	11**	5**	15**	3**	10**	7**	3**	19**	20**	11**	12**	1**	3**	7**	57*	58*	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	28	25	1	2	2	6	-	3	2	1	3	1	4	4	-	2	-	13	15	28
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	24%	25%	29%	17%	37%	39%	-	27%	29%	35%	16%	3%	34%	33%	-	70%	-	23%	25%	24%
Don't know	21	20	-	2	2	3	-	2	2	-	1	3	3	2	-	2	2	9	12	21
None of these	18%	19%	-	17%	32%	17%	-	23%	29%	-	5%	16%	27%	15%	-	70%	25%	16%	21%	18%
	8	8	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	1	1	1	-	-	-	7	2	8
	7%	7%	29%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	25%	5%	6%	7%	-	-	-	-	12%	3%	7%
	71	61	1	9	2	7	3	7	5	2	10	15	6	7	1	1	5	34	36	72
	61%	59%	43%	83%	44%	48%	100%	63%	71%	65%	54%	76%	55%	60%	100%	30%	75%	59%	61%	61%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 209

Q10.20 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)		Yes (p)	No (q)
Unweighted total	118	19	99	21	29	26	27	2	12	50	7	32	4	13	22	62	91	25	118
Weighted total	116	20**	97*	20**	29**	29**	25**	2**	12**	46*	7**	34**	3**	14**	24**	55*	86*	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	28	4	24	4	4	10	8	1	2	12	1	6	1	1	8	15	22	4	28
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	24%	18%	25%	19%	13%	36%	31%	41%	15%	27%	9%	17%	22%	4%	31%	28%	26%	15%	24%
Don't know	21	6	16	3	2	6	5	1	3	8	2	6	1	3	5	10	18	3	21
None of these	18%	29%	16%	17%	9%	22%	20%	41%	29%	17%	25%	17%	33%	24%	21%	18%	21%	12%	18%
	8	2	6	1	4	1	1	-	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	2	3	4	8
	7%	10%	6%	3%	16%	4%	4%	-	8%	4%	14%	8%	31%	5%	4%	3%	4%	13%	7%
	71	12	59	15	19	14	15	1	7	29	4	21	*	9	13	36	52	18	72
	61%	58%	61%	74%	66%	47%	59%	59%	63%	64%	52%	63%	14%	68%	55%	65%	61%	66%	61%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 210

Q10.20 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	118	36	50	9	21	18	83	100	12	11	25	52	3	38	83	41	12	21	31	118
Weighted total	116	33*	51*	9**	22**	17**	78*	95*	11**	11**	21**	52*	2**	35*	84*	38*	12**	19**	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	28	4	13	6	4	1	22	24	1	4	7	15	1	9	23	11	1	4	4	28
24%	12%	25%	72%	21%	7%	28%	25%	12%	36%	33%	29%	7%	29%	26%	28%	30%	10%	22%	14%	24%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	21	4	11	4	2	3	14	17	3	3	6	15	-	4	20	10	2	6	1	21
18%	11%	21%	50%	10%	18%	18%	18%	18%	29%	32%	26%	25% <i>m</i>	-	10%	24%	26%	13%	30%	4%	18%
Don't know	8	1	5	-	2	1	6	8	-	-	1	3	-	2	6	1	4	2	2	8
7%	2%	10%	-	8%	6%	7%	9%	9%	-	-	3%	6%	-	5%	7%	3%	31%	10%	6%	7%
None of these	71	27	29	*	14	13	44	55	8	5	12	29	2	21	47	22	5	10	22	72
61%	82% <i>zb</i>	56%	5%	64%	77%	56%	57%	71%	50%	56%	56%	71%	59%	55%	57%	46%	51%	76%	61%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 211

Q10.20 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	118	72	5	41	118	8	21	15	27	20	32	56	26	26	68	21	118
Weighted total	116	68*	4**	44*	116	8**	23**	13**	27**	19**	31**	54*	27**	24**	68*	21**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	28	17	-	11	28	2	2	4	9	6	10	12	6	9	16	3	28
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	21	14	1	6	21	1	5	-	5	8	1	12	8	2	15	4	21
Don't know	8	6	1	1	8	-	3	-	-	1	2	2	3	1	5	1	8
None of these	71	38	2	31	71	5	14	9	17	9	19	34	15	14	41	14	72
	61%	56%	55%	69%	61%	70%	60%	71%	61%	49%	61%	63%	56%	57%	61%	68%	61%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 212

Q10.20 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total 118	-	-	22	4	1	5	11	6	7	1	8	6	6	3	-	9	6	3	19	1	118
Weighted total 116	-**	-**	22**	3**	1**	4**	12**	5**	8**	1**	11**	5**	4**	4**	-**	9**	7**	4**	16**	2**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015 28 24%	-	-	6	-	-	1	3	1	1	-	1	2	1	3	-	3	2	-	3	2	28
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future 21 18%	-	-	2	-	-	1	3	2	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	2	2	3	2	21
Don't know 8 7%	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	8
None of these 71 61%	-	-	14	3	1	2	9	2	6	1	7	3	2	-	-	6	4	3	8	-	72
	-	-	67%	81%	100%	49%	73%	49%	74%	100%	66%	68%	63%	-	-	72%	50%	61%	50%	-	61%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 213

Q10.21 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	118	108	4	6	6	18	3	9	6	3	20	22	11	9	1	2	6	55	62	118
Weighted total	116	103*	2**	11**	5**	15**	3**	10**	7**	3**	19**	20**	11**	12**	1**	3**	7**	57*	58*	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	32	26	2	4	1	4	1	3	2	1	7	2	4	2	-	3	1	10	21	36
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	27%	25%	76%	36%	28%	26%	16%	33%	37%	35%	35%	12%	33%	15%	-	100%	12%	18%	37% ^q	31%
None of these	69	63	1	5	3	9	2	7	4	2	7	14	7	7	1	-	6	34	33	69
Don't know	7	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2	-	2	-	-	-	7	-	5
	6%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	11%	-	17%	-	-	-	13% ^r	-	4%
	59%	61%	24%	49%	59%	61%	46%	67%	63%	65%	38%	69%	67%	60%	100%	-	88%	61%	56%	58%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 214

Q10.21 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	118	19	99	21	29	26	27	2	12	50	7	32	4	13	22	62	91	25	118
Weighted total	116	20**	97*	20**	29**	29**	25**	2**	12**	46*	7**	34**	3**	14**	24**	55*	86*	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	32	1	31	3	9	10	8	-	2	18	1	3	1	4	10	12	23	8	36
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	27%	4%	32%	15%	31%	34%	31%	-	21%	39%	9%	10%	36%	32%	40%	22%	26%	28%	31%
Don't know	18	2	16	2	3	3	6	2	2	9	-	-	*	1	3	9	12	6	18
None of these	15%	8%	17%	10%	11%	10%	23%	100%	21%	19%	-	-	14%	9%	11%	17%	14%	21%	15%
	7	2	5	-	3	3	1	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	3	1	4	2	5
	6%	10%	6%	-	12%	11%	3%	-	-	8%	-	8%	-	-	11%	3%	5%	7%	4%
	69	16	53	15	15	15	13	-	9	20	6	28	2	8	12	36	54	15	69
	59%	78%	55%	77%	54%	51%	53%	-	79%	44%	91%	82%	64%	59%	48%	66%	62%	54%	58%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 215

Q10.21 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	118	36	50	9	21	18	83	100	12	11	25	52	3	38	83	41	12	21	31	118
Weighted total	116	33*	51*	9**	22**	17**	78*	95*	11**	11**	21**	52*	2**	35*	84*	38*	12**	19**	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	32	6	9	3	13	5	22	27	2	1	9	13	1	10	23	9	1	4	9	36
27%	27%	17%	18%	34%	61%	26%	28%	28%	17%	8%	40%	25%	61%	29%	27%	23%	10%	20%	30%	31%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	18	5	7	1	4	4	10	14	1	*	4	8	-	5	14	5	3	2	3	18
15%	15%	14%	14%	11%	18%	22%	13%	14%	6%	4%	19%	15%	-	15%	16%	14%	22%	8%	10%	15%
Don't know	7	1	4	-	2	-	7	7	-	-	1	3	-	2	7	3	2	3	-	5
6%	6%	4%	8%	-	9%	-	9%	8%	-	-	3%	5%	-	6%	9%	7%	17%	14%	-	4%
None of these	69	24	35	6	4	10	45	54	9	10	11	34	1	18	49	24	6	13	17	69
59%	59%	72%	68%	66%	19%	59%	58%	57%	83%	92%	53%	66%	39%	52%	58%	63%	51%	66%	61%	58%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 216

Q10.21 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	118	72	5	41	118	8	21	15	27	20	32	56	26	26	68	21	118
Weighted total	116	68*	4**	44*	116	8**	23**	13**	27**	19**	31**	54*	27**	24**	68*	21**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	32	20	*	11	32	1	2	6	9	7	11	15	6	10	18	3	36
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	27%	30%	12%	25%	27%	13%	7%	48%	35%	36%	35%	27%	21%	40%	27%	16%	31%
Don't know	18	13	1	3	18	-	-	*	5	7	6	7	4	4	9	2	18
None of these	15%	19%	38%	8%	15%	-	-	3%	19%	38%	19%	13%	14%	18%	13%	9%	15%
	7	2	1	5	7	-	3	-	1	-	2	3	2	-	7	-	5
	6%	3%	19%	10%	6%	-	12%	-	5%	-	6%	6%	7%	-	11%	-	4%
	69	40	2	27	69	7	19	7	13	10	15	33	18	11	41	17	69
	59%	59%	42%	61%	59%	87%	81%	52%	49%	54%	47%	61%	68%	47%	59%	80%	58%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 217

Q10.21 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	118	-	-	22	4	1	5	11	6	7	1	8	6	6	3	-	9	6	3	19	1	118
Weighted total	116	**	**	22**	3**	1**	4**	12**	5**	8**	1**	11**	5**	4**	**	9**	7**	4**	16**	2**	118	
Has done this at any site since early 2015	32	-	-	8	1	-	1	1	3	-	1	5	*	1	-	3	1	-	6	2	36	
	27%	-	-	35%	24%	-	14%	5%	17%	41%	-	6%	91%	13%	24%	35%	13%	-	36%	100%	31%	
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	18	-	-	2	-	-	1	3	2	1	-	-	+	-	-	1	1	-	3	2	18	
	15%	-	-	7%	-	-	37%	26%	37%	15%	-	-	9%	13%	-	12%	18%	-	22%	100%	15%	
Don't know	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	5	
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	14%	-	-	19%	-	-	51%	-	-	-	8%	-	4%	
None of these	69	-	-	12	2	1	2	7	2	5	1	8	+	3	1	5	5	4	9	-	69	
	59%	-	-	57%	76%	100%	63%	57%	49%	59%	100%	75%	9%	87%	25%	58%	68%	100%	57%	-	58%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 218

Q10.22 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	118	108	4	6	6	18	3	9	6	3	20	22	11	9	1	2	6	55	62	118
Weighted total	116	103*	2**	11**	5**	15**	3**	10**	7**	3**	19**	20**	11**	12**	1**	3**	7**	57*	58*	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	22	20	-	2	1	3	2	3	1	-	*	7	4	-	-	-	1	12	10	23
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	12	12	-	-	-	2	1	2	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	2	1	7	5	12
Don't know	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	3
None of these	85	73	2	9	4	12	2	7	5	3	15	13	6	11	1	5	39	44	86	
	73%	71%	100%	81%	84%	76%	46%	64%	82%	100%	76%	66%	58%	94%	100%	75%	68%	76%	73%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 219

Q10.22 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	118	19	99	21	29	26	27	2	12	50	7	32	4	13	22	62	91	25	118
Weighted total	116	20**	97*	20**	29**	29**	25**	2**	12**	46*	7**	34**	3**	14**	24**	55*	86*	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	22	3	19	4	7	3	7	-	1	14	-	7	-	4	5	10	15	5	23
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	19%	15%	19%	20%	25%	9%	27%	-	7%	30%	-	20%	-	29%	19%	18%	17%	20%	19%
Don't know	12	3	9	3	2	2	5	-	1	6	-	4	-	-	4	7	10	3	12
None of these	11%	15%	10%	13%	8%	6%	19%	-	10%	13%	-	13%	-	-	16%	12%	11%	10%	10%
	4	2	2	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	2	3
	3%	10%	2%	-	7%	4%	2%	-	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	1%	1%	7%	3%
	85	14	71	16	18	23	15	2	10	29	7	24	3	10	17	40	67	18	86
	73%	70%	73%	80%	64%	80%	60%	100%	83%	63%	100%	72%	100%	71%	69%	73%	78%	63%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 220

Q10.22 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	118	36	50	9	21	18	83	100	12	11	25	52	3	38	83	41	12	21	31	118
Weighted total	116	33*	51*	9**	22**	17**	78*	95*	11**	11**	21**	52*	2**	35*	84*	38*	12**	19**	28**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	22	5	7	2	6	2	14	18	3	3	4	10	-	7	16	10	*	6	5	23
19%	19%	15%	15%	20%	30%	12%	18%	19%	31%	26%	21%	19%	-	21%	19%	25%	4%	33%	18%	19%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	12	2	7	1	3	2	8	12	3	2	4	7	-	2	12	7	1	4	-	12
11%	11%	5%	14%	11%	12%	13%	10%	12%	23%	21%	20%	14%	-	6%	14%	18%	9%	19%	-	10%
Don't know	4	-	3	1	-	1	3	4	-	-	1	3	-	-	4	-	2	2	-	3
3%	3%	-	6%	6%	-	3%	4%	4%	-	-	3%	5%	-	-	4%	-	17%	10%	-	3%
None of these	85	27	38	6	14	14	56	67	8	7	14	37	2	27	58	26	8	10	23	86
73%	73%	79%	74%	63%	65%	79%	72%	71%	69%	67%	64%	71%	100%	76%	69%	69%	70%	52%	82%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 221

Q10.22 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	118	72	5	41	118	8	21	15	27	20	32	56	26	26	68	21	118
Weighted total	116	68*	4**	44*	116	8**	23**	13**	27**	19**	31**	54*	27**	24**	68*	21**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	22	11	2	9	22	1	2	4	10	1	6	13	2	6	13	3	23
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	19%	16%	41%	21%	19%	18%	7%	31%	38%	8%	19%	25%	8%	25%	19%	13%	19%
Don't know	12	6	1	6	12	1	2	3	1	4	2	5	6	-	7	5	12
None of these	11%	8%	26%	13%	11%	18%	7%	21%	2%	21%	7%	8%	21%	-	11%	24%	10%
	4	3	-	1	4	-	2	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	4	-	3
	3%	4%	-	3%	3%	-	9%	-	-	3%	-	3%	7%	-	5%	-	3%
	85	53	1	30	85	6	18	9	17	13	25	38	18	18	49	14	86
	73%	78%	33%	68%	73%	82%	78%	69%	62%	68%	78%	70%	68%	75%	72%	69%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 222

Q10.22 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	118	-	-	22	4	1	5	11	6	7	1	8	6	6	3	-	9	6	3	19	1	118
Weighted total	116	**	**	22**	3**	1**	4**	12**	5**	8**	1**	11**	5**	4**	4**	**	9**	7**	4**	16**	2**	118
Has done this at any site since early 2015	22	-	-	9	-	-	-	3	1	2	-	-	4	*	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	23
19%	-	-	-	42%	-	-	-	28%	14%	23%	-	-	77%	13%	-	-	-	18%	16%	-	-	19%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	12	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	1	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	12
11%	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	26%	19%	-	-	9%	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	23%	-	10%
Don't know	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3
3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	3%
None of these	85	-	-	13	3	1	3	8	3	6	1	8	1	3	4	-	9	6	4	11	2	86
73%	-	-	-	58%	100%	100%	86%	62%	66%	77%	100%	73%	23%	87%	100%	-	100%	82%	84%	70%	100%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 223

Q10.18-22 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category building fabric, including windows. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Summary

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to building fabric, including windows

	Wall insulation	Roof / loft insulation	Draught-proofing	Replacement with double/triple glazing	Automatic / revolving doors
Unweighted total	118	118	118	118	118
Weighted total	116	116	116	116	116
Has done this at any site since early 2015	25 21%	38 33%	28 24%	32 27%	22 19%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	26 22%	25 21%	21 18%	18 15%	12 11%
Don't know	8 7%	8 7%	8 7%	7 6%	4 3%
None of these	70 60%	62 53%	71 61%	69 59%	85 73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
 Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
 Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 224

Q10.23 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	103	98	1	4	5	8	5	7	9	2	22	23	9	5	1	2	5	51	49	103
Weighted total	99*	91*	1**	8**	4**	7**	5**	8**	13**	2**	26**	18**	7**	3**	1**	2**	4**	49*	47*	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	42	37	-	5	2	3	1	2	4	-	15	8	4	-	-	-	1	26	16	42
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20	20	-	-	2	-	2	1	1	-	9	2	1	1	-	-	1	13	7	22
Don't know	21%	22%	-	-	49%	-	42%	16%	8%	-	36%	11%	21%	20%	-	-	14%	27%	16%	21%
None of these	15	15	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	-	1	1	7	5	13
	15%	16%	-	-	-	-	18%	16%	100%	6%	17%	24%	18%	-	63%	26%	15%	12%	13%	
	38	34	1	3	1	4	3	4	5	-	10	6	1	2	-	1	2	14	22	42
	38%	38%	100%	42%	16%	55%	58%	53%	42%	-	37%	34%	18%	61%	-	37%	40%	29%	47%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 225

Q10.23 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)		Yes (p)	No (q)
Unweighted total	103	15	88	15	25	18	26	5	12	35	13	33	4	11	18	57	80	22	103
Weighted total	99*	16**	84*	16**	25**	19**	22**	4**	12**	31*	14**	35**	4**	13**	18**	50*	75*	23**	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	42%	8	34	7	13	6	5	2	9	12	6	21	3	4	10	20	32	8	42
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	21%	6%	23%	19%	8%	23%	19%	25%	48%	21%	8%	31%	26%	10%	21%	25%	22%	16%	21%
None of these	38%	47%	37%	53%	25%	30%	58%	47%	12%	46%	23%	20%	20%	40%	24%	44%	36%	47%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 226

Q10.23 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		
Unweighted total	103	32	48	9	13	18	66	80	11	16	23	43	5	29	79	45	18	31	19	103
Weighted total	99*	31**	43*	9**	15**	18**	63*	76*	10**	12**	22**	40*	5**	29**	74*	40*	18**	30**	19**	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	42	9	20	2	9	10	24	30	5	5	12	12	3	15	37	19	11	20	3	42
42%		30%	47%	25%	59%	59%	37%	40%	52%	38%	54%	31%	63%	53%	50%	46%	60%	66%	18%	41%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20	2	13	3	1	7	9	14	2	2	9	7	-	7	20	13	7	7	1	22
21%		8%	30%	32%	9%	41%	14%	19%	21%	14%	39%	19%	-	25%	27%	33%	38%	23%	4%	21%
Don't know	15	7	5	2	-	2	11	13	2	1	2	7	-	3	6	2	-	2	7	13
15%		23%	13%	23%	-	11%	17%	17%	17%	9%	9%	17%	-	12%	8%	5%	-	6%	37%	13%
None of these	38	13	16	3	6	3	26	28	3	6	6	17	2	9	26	18	5	7	8	42
38%		42%	36%	33%	41%	16%	41%	37%	31%	53%	27%	44%	37%	32%	36%	45%	29%	24%	42%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means; Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 227

Q10.23 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	103	75	2	26	103	10	12	17	18	27	18	52	30	17	56	29	103
Weighted total	99*	71*	1**	27**	99*	9**	13**	16**	16**	25**	17**	47*	31**	16**	53*	30**	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	42	35	-	7	42	5	4	8	5	15	8	18	16	5	21	16	42
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	42%	49%	-	26%	42%	55%	27%	48%	32%	62%	44%	39%	51%	30%	39%	54%	41%
Don't know	20	17	-	3	20	1	3	2	4	9	4	10	7	3	11	6	22
None of these	21%	24%	-	13%	21%	10%	21%	13%	27%	35%	23%	21%	22%	20%	21%	20%	21%
	15	9	-	5	15	1	5	2	-	-	2	8	2	2	11	2	13
	15%	13%	-	20%	15%	6%	37%	11%	-	-	14%	18%	5%	10%	21%	6%	13%
	38	22	1	15	38	4	4	7	8	9	5	18	12	7	19	11	42
	38%	31%	100%	54%	38%	40%	30%	41%	52%	38%	32%	39%	40%	46%	36%	37%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 228

Q10.23 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	103	-	1	28	-	-	1	12	3	2	6	6	6	4	-	9	2	4	13	-	103	
Weighted total	99*	**	1**	22**	**	**	1**	16**	2**	2**	5**	10**	4**	3**	6**	**	9**	2**	7**	11**	**	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	42	-	1	9	-	-	-	5	-	1	2	5	1	3	3	2	-	4	6	-	42	
	42%	-	100%	40%	-	-	-	30%	-	44%	42%	57%	22%	84%	54%	26%	-	54%	55%	-	41%	
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20	-	1	4	-	-	-	4	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	4	-	22	
	21%	-	100%	18%	-	-	-	27%	-	-	33%	42%	-	-	-	23%	-	-	39%	-	21%	
Don't know	15	-	-	2	-	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	2	2	-	13	
	15%	-	-	9%	-	-	100%	21%	36%	-	27%	-	-	17%	-	11%	40%	30%	20%	-	13%	
None of these	38	-	-	9	-	-	-	7	1	1	4	3	1	2	-	5	1	1	2	-	42	
	38%	-	-	43%	-	-	-	42%	64%	56%	31%	43%	58%	16%	30%	55%	60%	17%	19%	-	41%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 229

Q10.24 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	103	98	1	4	5	8	5	7	9	2	22	23	9	5	1	2	5	51	49	103
Weighted total	99*	91*	1**	8**	4**	7**	5**	8**	13**	2**	26**	18**	7**	3**	1**	2**	4**	49*	47*	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	25	1	5	2	1	1	2	4	-	9	5	3	1	1	1	1	14	16	31
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	33	33	-	-	2	3	2	3	5	1	5	4	3	2	1	1	1	20	14	37
Don't know	7	7	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	6
None of these	39	36	-	3	1	3	3	1	4	-	16	8	2	1	-	-	1	17	20	41
	39%	39%	-	42%	16%	43%	58%	10%	28%	-	60%	46%	35%	30%	-	-	19%	35%	43%	40%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 230

Q10.24 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Number of sites		Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	103	15	88	15	25	18	26	5	12	35	13	33	4	11	18	57	80	22	103
Weighted total	99*	16**	84*	16**	25**	19**	22**	4**	12**	31*	14**	35**	4**	13**	18**	50*	75*	23**	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	2	28	2	9	7	4	*	7	11	6	8	2	6	6	14	25	6	31
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	31%	16%	33%	16%	36%	39%	20%	10%	57%	36%	43%	24%	46%	44%	35%	29%	33%	25%	30%
Don't know	33	8	25	4	12	6	6	1	5	15	2	11	-	1	10	22	24	9	37
	34%	53%	30%	26%	48%	31%	26%	25%	40%	48%	12%	33%	-	7%	54%	44%	32%	41%	36%
	7	-	7	-	1	2	2	-	1	-	1	3	-	1	-	2	5	2	6
	7%	-	8%	-	5%	11%	10%	-	8%	-	11%	9%	-	10%	-	4%	6%	8%	6%
None of these	39	7	32	10	5	5	11	3	3	10	5	14	2	5	6	17	27	10	41
	39%	44%	38%	65%	19%	29%	50%	75%	25%	34%	39%	41%	54%	40%	34%	35%	37%	43%	40%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 231

Q10.24 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	103	32	48	9	13	18	66	80	11	16	23	43	5	29	79	45	18	31	19	103
Weighted total	99*	31**	43*	9**	15**	18**	63*	76*	10**	12**	22**	40*	5**	29**	74*	40*	18**	30**	19**	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	11	12	1	5	6	21	23	6	1	8	15	4	6	25	14	3	13	6	31
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	31%	35%	29%	6%	36%	37%	33%	30%	58%	11%	34%	38%	76%	22%	33%	36%	19%	43%	30%	30%
Don't know	33	10	14	4	5	9	20	27	4	5	10	18	1	10	29	16	10	11	4	37
None of these	34%	31%	32%	44%	34%	54%	32%	36%	40%	40%	44%	44%	13%	34%	39%	40%	56%	38%	21%	36%
	7	1	3	2	-	1	4	5	1	1	-	-	-	2	3	2	-	-	3	6
	7%	4%	7%	23%	-	6%	6%	7%	10%	4%	-	-	-	8%	4%	5%	-	-	13%	6%
	39	12	19	3	6	4	24	29	1	6	8	14	1	13	27	15	6	9	8	41
	39%	37%	43%	33%	38%	25%	38%	38%	5%	50%	35%	35%	10%	44%	36%	38%	34%	29%	43%	40%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 232

Q10.24 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	103	75	2	26	103	10	12	17	18	27	18	52	30	17	56	29	103
Weighted total	99*	71*	1**	27**	99*	9**	13**	16**	16**	25**	17**	47*	31**	16**	53*	30**	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	26	-	4	30	-	3	7	2	15	2	15	13	-	19	11	31
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	34%	37%	-	16%	31%	-	21%	46%	13%	60%	14%	33%	41%	-	36%	38%	30%
Don't know	7	5	-	2	7	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	-	6	1	6
None of these	39	24	1	14	39	7	7	4	9	7	8	18	11	10	20	8	41
	39%	34%	100%	51%	39%	79%	53%	25%	58%	27%	48%	38%	35%	63%	38%	28%	40%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 233

Q10.24 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	103	-	1	28	-	-	1	12	3	2	6	6	6	4	-	9	2	4	13	-	103	
Weighted total	99*	-**	1**	22**	-**	-**	1**	16**	2**	2**	5**	10**	4**	3**	6**	-**	9**	2**	7**	11**	-**	103
Has done this at any site since early 2015	30	-	-	6	-	-	-	4	1	1	5	2	1	-	-	2	1	4	2	-	31	
31%	-	-	-	29%	-	-	-	24%	34%	56%	30%	57%	38%	37%	-	27%	40%	54%	18%	-	30%	
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	33	-	1	13	-	-	-	5	1	1	2	2	1	2	-	2	-	1	1	-	37	
34%	-	100%	59%	-	-	-	-	29%	71%	56%	41%	19%	42%	22%	34%	23%	-	17%	12%	-	36%	
Don't know	7	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	2	-	6	
7%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	10%	-	30%	20%	-	6%	
None of these	39	-	-	5	-	-	7	1	1	2	4	2	1	3	-	5	1	-	6	-	41	
39%	-	-	25%	-	-	-	47%	29%	44%	43%	43%	42%	41%	50%	-	55%	60%	-	56%	-	40%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 234

Q10.23-24 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category ventilation. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Summary

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to ventilation

	Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)	Addition of heat recovery
Unweighted total	103	103
Weighted total	99	99
Has done this at any site since early 2015	42 42%	30 31%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	20 21%	33 34%
Don't know	15 15%	7 7%
None of these	38 38%	39 39%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
 Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
 Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 235

Q10.25 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	165	153	2	10	3	11	17	7	15	4	34	27	14	13	5	2	11	80	83	165
Weighted total	159	138	1**	20**	2**	10**	14**	7**	16**	4**	38**	22**	12**	12**	5**	4**	11**	70*	87*	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	69	1	-	1	2	9	4	6	1	12	12	8	5	3	1	5	35	34	80
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	43%	50%	50%	-	44%	19%	62%	52%	39%	16%	31%	56%	64%	40%	66%	25%	47%	51%	39%	48%
Don't know	51	47	1	3	1	3	4	2	6	1	10	7	5	7	1	-	5	25	24	56
None of these	32%	34%	50%	17%	56%	27%	28%	29%	40%	16%	26%	33%	37%	59%	16%	-	47%	36%	28%	34%
	23	12	-	11	-	-	1	-	2	2	8	2	2	1	1	3	1	7	17	17
	15%	9%	-	56%	-	-	9%	-	15%	42%	21%	9%	13%	8%	14%	75%	8%	9%	19%	10%
	42	35	1	6	-	6	3	3	4	2	12	5	2	2	1	-	1	16	26	43
	26%	26%	50%	28%	-	59%	20%	37%	25%	42%	33%	22%	19%	20%	19%	-	9%	23%	29%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 236

Q10.25 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	165	24	141	35	30	39	39	9	13	68	10	44	4	18	27	88	126	37	165
Weighted total	159	24**	135	33*	32**	38*	35*	7**	15**	67*	10**	41*	3**	20**	31**	78*	121	36*	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	14	56	19	8	18	13	3	8	34	2	15	2	7	11	40	50	18	80
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	43%	56%	41%	59%	26%	47%	36%	45%	53%	50%	15%	37%	63%	33%	34%	51%	41%	50%	48%
Don't know	51	8	43	15	6	12	11	3	3	25	1	10	2	4	8	27	36	15	56
None of these	32%	32%	32%	45%	20%	33%	31%	52%	23%	37%	5%	24%	63%	18%	25%	34%	30%	42%	34%
	23	3	20	2	6	7	5	1	2	6	4	8	-	8	3	2	17	6	17
	78%	13%	15%	7%	20%	18%	13%	11%	14%	8%	41%	19%	-	42%	10%	3%	14%	18%	10%
	42	5	37	5	12	7	11	3	3	16	4	14	1	3	12	23	35	5	43
	26%	19%	27%	15%	38%	20%	32%	37%	23%	23%	43%	33%	37%	17%	38%	29%	29%	14%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 237

Q10.25 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	165	33	92	17	22	27	110	130	17	28	29	77	10	44	138	67	32	51	26	165
Weighted total	159	32**	82*	20**	24**	24**	103*	122	14**	23**	30**	73*	10**	39*	128	59*	29**	46*	29**	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	14	40	10	6	13	49	59	8	15	9	35	5	14	60	29	18	31	9	80
43%	44%	48%	50%	26%	55%	48%	49%	55%	65%	31%	49%	52%	35%	47%	50%	61%	67%zn	32%	48%	48%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	51	12	29	5	5	12	29	40	4	12	8	31	4	10	45	22	13	17	6	56
32%	38%	36%	27%	19%	50%	28%	33%	28%	53%	28%	42%	44%	25%	35%	38%	44%	36%	21%	21%	34%
Don't know	23	2	6	5	7	4	10	15	1	1	8	4	2	5	14	4	-	5	7	17
15%	5%	8%	28%	31%	15%	10%	12%	8%	2%	28%	6%	24%	13%	11%	7%	-	11%	24%	10%	10%
None of these	42	9	21	4	8	2	30	30	3	5	8	19	-	16	32	17	7	3	9	43
26%q	28%	26%	19%	32%	10%	29%	25%	23%	21%	27%	26%	-	41%	25%q	30%q	24%	7%	32%	26%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 238

Q10.25 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	165	113	5	47	165	15	23	12	35	44	34	87	43	31	80	50	165
Weighted total	159	113*	5**	41*	159	16**	21**	11**	33*	42*	30**	84*	44*	28**	74*	52*	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	49	3	17	69	3	11	5	14	23	12	40	18	10	35	23	80
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	51	34	2	15	51	4	9	1	8	16	16	24	11	14	22	13	56
Don't know	23	20	-	3	23	6	-	2	8	4	2	11	9	3	6	12	17
None of these	42	32	-	10	42	4	4	3	9	9	5	23	13	6	24	12	43
	26%	28%	-	24%	26%	26%	21%	26%	28%	22%	18%	27%	30%	20%	33%	22%	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 239

Q10.25 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	165	2	4	60	1	4	7	7	8	6	11	8	7	1	1	6	4	5	22	-	165
Weighted total	159	2**	4**	54*	1**	3**	5**	8**	7**	9**	14**	5**	5**	1**	2**	6**	6**	8**	19**	-**	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69	2	4	34	-	3	1	1	2	1	-	5	3	-	-	3	1	-	5	-	80
43%	100%	100%	63% ^z	-	100%	25%	11%	33%	13%	-	37%	59%	68%	-	-	58%	16%	-	25%	-	48%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	51	-	1	23	-	2	-	4	1	-	4	1	1	-	-	4	-	1	7	-	56
32%	-	17%	41%	-	69%	35%	-	64%	13%	-	30%	25%	24%	-	-	66%	-	14%	37%	-	34%
Don't know	23	-	-	1	-	1	3	1	4	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	4	6	1	-	17
15% ^c	-	-	2%	-	-	10%	37%	11%	45%	-	6%	16%	-	100%	-	18%	70%	73%	3%	-	10%
None of these	42	-	-	6	1	2	4	-	6	1	6	1	2	-	2	1	1	1	10	-	43
26% ^c	-	-	12%	100%	-	29%	52%	-	42%	100%	46%	25%	32%	-	100%	16%	14%	13%	54%	-	26%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 240

Q10.26 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	165	153	2	10	3	11	17	7	15	4	34	27	14	13	5	2	11	80	83	165
Weighted total	159	138	1**	20**	2**	10**	14**	7**	16**	4**	38**	10**	12**	12**	5**	4**	11**	70*	87*	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	103	93	1	9	1	6	12	5	10	2	22	17	9	3	3	4	7	42	59	106
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	65%	68%	50%	44%	72%	58%	87%	71%	61%	42%	59%	75%	70%	26%	66%	100%	66%	61%	68%	64%
Don't know	57	49	1	6	1	3	6	2	4	-	14	8	3	8	1	3	4	24	32	63
None of these	36%	36%	100%	31%	56%	32%	41%	23%	25%	-	38%	32%	25%	66%	16%	75%	40%	35%	37%	38%
	8	3	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1	1	-	1	-	1	2	5	7
	5%	2%	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	6%	4%	-	14%	-	8%	3%	6%	4%
	32	29	-	3	-	3	1	1	6	3	7	3	3	4	1	-	-	17	15	33
	20%	21%	-	16%	-	28%	9%	17%	39%	58%	18%	14%	21%	34%	19%	-	-	24%	17%	20%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 241

Q10.26 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	165	24	141	35	30	39	39	9	13	68	10	44	4	18	27	88	126	37	165
Weighted total	159	24**	135	33*	32**	38*	35*	7**	15**	67*	10**	41*	3**	20**	31**	78*	121	36*	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	103	11	92	18	15	28	25	5	12	42	8	25	2	11	20	54	80	22	106
	65%	47%	68%	54%	48%	73%	71%	78%	83%	62%	78%	62%	63%	56%	64%	69%	66%	61%	64%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	57	3	53	9	8	13	13	6	8	21	6	14	1	4	6	35	43	14	63
	36%	13%	40%	27%	25%	35%	36%	89%	54%	31%	56%	34%	43%	20%	18%	45%	35%	39%	38%
Don't know	8	2	6	1	5	-	2	1	-	3	1	2	-	-	2	1	5	3	7
	5%	9%	4%	2%	14%	-	5%	11%	-	5%	5%	6%	-	-	7%	2%	4%	9%	4%
None of these	32	9	23	10	9	6	6	-	-	16	1	8	1	6	6	13	23	8	33
	20%	36%	17%	30%	29%	16%	18%	-	-	24%	6%	21%	19%	32%	19%	17%	19%	21%	20%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 242

Q10.26 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	165	33	92	17	22	27	110	130	17	28	29	77	10	44	138	67	32	51	26	165
Weighted total	159	32**	82*	20**	24**	24**	103*	122	14**	23**	30**	73*	10**	39*	128	59*	29**	46*	29**	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	103	20	56	12	15	18	70	82	11	16	20	48	7	26	90	39	21	33	13	106
65%	61%	69%	60%	65%	74%	68%	67%	74%	69%	68%	66%	76%	68%	70%	67%	74%	73%	45%	45%	64%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	57	9	32	7	8	12	35	43	7	10	8	27	4	13	47	30	12	19	9	63
36%	29%	40%	36%	34%	49%	34%	35%	51%	46%	28%	37%	37%	33%	37%	50%	41%	41%	32%	32%	38%
Don't know	8	2	1	2	-	-	3	5	-	1	4	1	-	1	3	2	1	2	3	7
5%	6%	2%	12%	-	-	3%	4%	4%	-	2%	12%	1%	-	4%	2%	4%	3%	4%	10%	4%
None of these	32	6	15	3	8	4	19	23	1	4	5	18	1	8	23	10	6	6	9	33
20%	20%	18%	16%	33%	18%	19%	19%	4%	19%	16%	25%	15%	19%	18%	18%	21%	13%	30%	20%	20%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 243

Q10.26 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	165	113	5	47	165	15	23	12	35	44	34	87	43	31	80	50	165
Weighted total	159	113*	5**	41*	159	16**	21**	11**	33*	42*	30**	84*	44*	28**	74*	52*	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	103	74	4	24	103	7	9	7	24	35	16	57	30	13	50	39	106
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	57	41	1	15	57	8	4	-	12	23	12	28	17	11	23	23	63
Don't know	8	6	-	2	8	1	-	1	2	-	1	1	4	1	-	4	7
None of these	32	21	1	10	32	4	8	3	6	4	6	19	7	6	18	6	33
	20%	18%	15%	25%	20%	26%	41%	24%	17%	8%	19%	23%	16%	23%	24%	11%	20%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 244

Q10.26 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	(u)	
Unweighted total	165	2	4	60	1	4	7	7	8	6	11	8	7	1	1	6	4	5	22	-	165	
Weighted total	159	2**	4**	54*	1**	3**	5**	8**	7**	9**	1**	14**	5**	5**	1**	2**	6**	6**	8**	19**	-**	165
Has done this at any site since early 2015	103	2	3	32	1	3	1	5	2	5	1	12	3	3	1	6	4	5	14	-	106	
65%	65%	100%	78%	59%	100%	100%	28%	65%	32%	61%	100%	88%	59%	53%	100%	-	100%	64%	59%	72%	-	64%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	57	-	1	16	1	3	2	2	3	2	-	7	2	1	1	2	5	3	-	7	-	63
36%	36%	-	17%	30%	100%	100%	45%	25%	37%	27%	-	49%	40%	18%	100%	82%	48%	-	34%	-	-	38%
Don't know	8	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	7
5%	5%	-	-	3%	-	-	10%	-	11%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%	3%	-	4%
None of these	32	-	1	13	-	-	1	2	3	1	-	2	1	2	-	-	2	1	3	-	-	33
20%	20%	-	22%	25%	-	-	18%	25%	38%	13%	-	12%	26%	38%	-	-	-	36%	14%	14%	-	20%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 245

Q10.25-26 I'm now going to read out a list of more detailed measures that your business may have done or considered within the category processes. For each one, please tell me whether your business...

Summary

Base: all participants who have implemented or are considering improvements to processes

	Process re-engineering	Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps
Unweighted total	165	165
Weighted total	159	159
Has done this at any site since early 2015	69 43%	103 65%
Is planning to do this at any site in the near future	51 32%	57 36%
Don't know	23 15%	8 5%
None of these	42 26%	32 20%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
 Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
 Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 246

Q11.1 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed new more efficient boiler/burner since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	88	80	2	6	4	5	6	7	10	2	19	18	5	8	1	2	-	38	50	88
Weighted total	92*	79*	1**	12**	4**	5**	6**	7**	11**	1**	21**	17**	5**	8**	2**	4**	-**	42*	50*	88*
At one main site	28	25	-	3	2	1	1	4	1	-	8	2	2	5	-	3	-	13	16	26
	31%	32%	-	23%	52%	15%	12%	58%	6%	-	36%	10%	35%	57%	-	79%	-	30%	31%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	35	31	1	3	2	1	5	1	4	1	9	9	2	1	-	1	-	13	22	36
	38%	39%	100%	25%	48%	17%	88%	11%	37%	59%	44%	52%	33%	11%	-	21%	-	31%	44%	41%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	8	-	4	-	2	-	1	1	1	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	4	7	12
	12%	10%	-	31%	-	35%	-	9%	9%	41%	19%	33%	21%	-	-	-	-	10%	14%	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	22%	6%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	4%	3%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	10	7	-	2	-	-	-	4	-	-	3	-	-	1	2	-	-	9	1	6
	11%	9%	-	20%	-	-	-	36%	-	-	15%	-	-	10%	100%	-	-	21% <i>r</i>	2%	7%
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
	3%	3%	-	-	-	33%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	4%	3%
Don't know	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2
	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	1%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 247

Q11.1 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed new more efficient boiler/burner since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	88	-	88	7	25	24	23	5	4	35	6	23	1	14	18	48	68	20	88
Weighted total	92*	-**	92*	7**	25**	27**	25**	5**	5**	39**	8**	23**	1**	15**	18**	49*	75*	18**	88*
At one main site	28	-	28	1	7	10	9	1	1	8	7	9	-	5	5	14	22	6	26
	31%	-	31%	12%	27%	36%	37%	14%	27%	21%	85%	38%	-	32%	26%	29%	30%	35%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	35	-	35	4	10	8	8	4	1	16	-	11	1	6	9	14	28	7	36
	38%	-	38%	64%	42%	30%	34%	74%	11%	40%	-	47%	100%	44%	49%	29%	37%	41%	41%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	-	12	2	4	1	3	-	2	6	1	-	-	3	1	7	9	2	12
	12%	-	12%	24%	16%	6%	11%	-	37%	14%	8%	-	-	20%	7%	15%	12%	14%	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	-	3	-	1	-	2	1	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	3	2	1	3
	3%	-	3%	-	3%	-	6%	13%	-	2%	8%	7%	-	-	-	6%	3%	3%	3%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	10	-	10	-	2	4	2	-	1	9	-	-	-	-	2	8	10	-	6
	11%	-	11%	-	8%	16%	9%	-	25%	22%	-	-	-	-	11%	16%	13%	-	7%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	1	1	1	3
	3%	-	3%	-	5%	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	8%	-	4%	7%	1%	2%	7%	3%
Don't know	3	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	2
	3%	-	3%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	3%	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 248

Q11.1 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed new more efficient boiler/burner since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	88	10	56	12	9	9	62	71	8	15	16	37	3	28	69	29	4	10	16	88
Weighted total	92*	10**	57*	14**	11**	10**	61*	70*	10**	15**	15**	36*	2**	28**	73*	30**	3**	10**	17**	88*
At one main site	28	2	19	3	4	1	20	20	8	4	5	11	1	11	18	5	1	2	9	26
	31%	24%	33%	20%	38%	14%	32%	28%	79%	27%	33%	30%	46%	38%	25%	18%	19%	21%	54%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	35	3	24	3	4	5	22	28	1	7	7	14	-	13	29	13	3	4	5	36
	38%	30%	42%	23%	36%	53%	36%	40%	8%	46%	49%	39%	-	47%	40%	44%	81%	38%	32%	41%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	3	5	4	-	1	7	8	-	-	1	5	1	1	11	6	-	2	-	12
	12%	29%	9%	27%	-	8%	11%	11%	-	-	4%	14%	32%	5%	15%	21%	-	19%	-	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	1	1	2	-	1	2	3	-	2	2	-	-	3	2	1	-	-	1	3
	3%	6%	1%	11%	-	6%	4%	4%	-	10%	14%	-	-	10%	3%	2%	-	-	4%	3%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	10	1	6	2	1	-	7	6	1	2	-	4	-	-	10	5	-	2	-	6
	11%	12%	10%	15%	8%	-	12%	9%	13%	13%	-	12%	-	-	14%	15%	-	22%	-	7%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	1	-	-	2	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	3
	3%	-	3%	5%	-	-	4%	4%	-	4%	-	5%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	11%	3%
Don't know	3	-	1	-	2	2	1	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	2
	3%	-	1%	-	18%	19%	1%	4%	-	-	-	-	22%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 249

Q11.1 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed new more efficient boiler/burner since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	88	62	2	23	88	6	17	8	22	23	24	44	18	17	52	16	88
Weighted total	92*	63*	3**	25**	92*	9**	17**	8**	21**	26**	24**	46*	19**	17**	54*	18**	88*
At one main site	28	19	1	8	28	6	8	4	6	5	8	17	3	7	15	6	26
	31%	31%	38%	31%	31%	70%	44%	49%	27%	17%	34%	37%	15%	39%	28%	31%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	35	29	-	6	35	-	6	3	9	11	8	20	6	5	24	5	36
	38%	46%	-	24%	38%	-	34%	33%	41%	42%	34%	44%	31%	31%	45%	26%	41%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	8	2	2	12	1	2	-	3	3	4	5	3	3	6	3	12
	12%	12%	62%	8%	12%	7%	14%	-	15%	10%	16%	11%	13%	17%	11%	15%	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	2	-	1	3	-	2	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	1	-	3
	3%	3%	-	2%	3%	-	9%	-	-	5%	9%	-	3%	12%	1%	-	3%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	10	3	-	7	10	-	-	1	3	6	1	3	6	-	7	3	6
	11%	5%	-	27%	11%	-	-	18%	14%	21%	6%	6%	29%	-	12%	18%	7%
At all sites across your company	2	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	1	2	3
	3%	2%	-	5%	3%	-	-	-	3%	2%	-	1%	10%	-	1%	11%	3%
Don't know	3	-	-	1	3	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
	3%	-	-	2%	3%	23%	-	-	-	2%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 250

Q11.1 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed new more efficient boiler/burner since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	88	1	-	12	1	-	2	6	8	6	2	5	4	5	-	3	4	8	5	16	-	88
Weighted total	92*	1**	-**	12**	1**	-**	2**	5**	8**	9**	1**	8**	5**	3**	-**	5**	4**	9**	6**	13**	-**	88*
At one main site	28	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	3	2	-	5	-	1	-	-	1	5	4	2	-	26
	31%	-	-	29%	-	-	24%	32%	43%	18%	-	64%	-	19%	-	-	23%	51%	69%	18%	-	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	35	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	3	4	1	3	2	2	-	1	3	1	2	9	-	36
	38%	-	-	11%	100%	-	76%	31%	39%	46%	53%	36%	40%	46%	-	27%	63%	13%	31%	69%	-	41%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	4	-	2	-	-	-	12
	12%	100%	-	15%	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	16%	34%	-	73%	-	20%	-	4%	-	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	3
	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	5%	-	3%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	10	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	11%	-	-	28%	-	-	-	22%	11%	23%	-	-	45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
At all sites across your company	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	3
	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	5%	-	3%
Don't know	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	3%	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 251

Q11.2 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed building management system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	52	44	1	7	4	3	2	3	5	2	17	7	3	3	1	-	2	22	30	52
Weighted total	57*	44*	***	13**	4**	5**	2**	3**	6**	1**	19**	5**	3**	4**	2**	..*	3**	26**	31**	52*
At one main site	19	11	-	8	1	2	-	1	3	-	6	1	3	-	-	-	3	11	8	15
	34%	26%	-	62%	20%	40%	-	29%	53%	-	33%	21%	79%	-	-	-	100%	44%	25%	29%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	14	*	-	1	-	2	2	1	1	6	2	-	2	-	-	-	5	9	16
	25%	32%	100%	-	14%	-	100%	51%	13%	41%	32%	33%	-	35%	-	-	-	20%	30%	31%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	7	-	4	1	3	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	3	-	-	-	4	7	9
	19%	17%	-	28%	32%	60%	-	20%	-	59%	10%	12%	-	65%	-	-	-	17%	22%	17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6	5	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	3	3	5
	11%	11%	-	10%	34%	-	-	-	17%	-	6%	-	21%	-	100%	-	-	10%	11%	10%
At all sites across your company	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	4
	7%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	9%	8%
Don't know	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 252

Q11.2 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed building management system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	52	-	52	4	18	11	11	4	4	22	3	11	-	11	11	26	38	14	52
Weighted total	57*	-**	57*	4**	21**	13**	11**	4**	4**	30**	2**	10**	-**	10**	13**	30**	43*	14**	52*
At one main site	19	-	19	2	8	7	3	-	-	11	-	4	-	2	7	7	12	7	15
	34%	-	34%	39%	39%	53%	24%	-	-	39%	-	39%	-	25%	56%	22%	29%	48%	29%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	-	14	2	5	3	5	-	-	5	-	6	-	4	1	8	10	4	16
	25%	-	25%	44%	24%	22%	44%	-	-	16%	-	61%	-	45%	8%	27%	24%	29%	31%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	-	11	-	6	1	3	-	2	7	2	-	-	1	3	6	10	1	9
	19%	-	19%	-	27%	8%	23%	-	41%	25%	75%	-	-	10%	25%	20%	24%	7%	17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
	3%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	15%	19%	-	25%	-	-	-	-	5%	2%	4%	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6	-	6	1	1	2	-	2	-	4	-	-	-	1	1	4	4	2	5
	11%	-	11%	17%	5%	16%	-	58%	-	14%	-	-	-	10%	11%	13%	10%	12%	10%
At all sites across your company	4	-	4	-	-	-	1	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	4
	7%	-	7%	-	-	-	10%	27%	40%	7%	-	-	-	-	13%	9%	-	-	8%
Don't know	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	2%	-	2%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	2%	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 253

Q11.2 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed building management system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECS (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	52	5	35	9	2	6	35	42	2	7	10	21	2	17	46	23	2	9	6	52
Weighted total	57*	6**	37**	12**	1**	5**	37**	43*	2**	8**	9**	22**	5**	15**	52*	26**	2**	8**	6**	52*
At one main site	19 34%	2 31%	16 44%	1 9%	-	1 29%	10 27%	13 30%	1 39%	2 21%	-	9 40%	-	4 24%	16 31%	6 22%	-	2 29%	3 60%	15 29%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14 25%	1 9%	7 18%	6 51%	-	2 41%	12 32%	14 34%	-	3 44%	8 84%	5 21%	2 100%	7 46%	14 28%	6 25%	2 64%	3 40%	-	16 31%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11 19%	2 31%	7 20%	2 15%	-	1 18%	7 18%	7 17%	-	2 26%	1 9%	4 16%	-	2 12%	10 19%	4 17%	-	1 7%	1 22%	9 17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1 3%	1 10%	1 2%	-	-	1 13%	1 2%	1 3%	-	-	1 7%	-	-	1 4%	1 3%	1 6%	1 36%	1 10%	-	2 4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6 11%	-	2 7%	3 25%	1 57%	-	4 11%	4 10%	-	1 9%	-	4 17%	-	1 7%	6 12%	5 20%	-	-	-	5 10%
At all sites across your company	4 7%	1 19%	2 6%	-	1 43%	-	3 8%	2 4%	1 61%	-	-	2 7%	-	-	4 8%	3 11%	-	1 14%	-	4 8%
Don't know	1 2%	-	1 3%	-	-	-	1 3%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1 7%	-	-	-	-	1 17%	1 2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 254

Q11.2 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed building management system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	52	37	2	13	52	2	12	6	11	17	13	25	14	10	35	7	52
Weighted total	57*	38*	3**	17**	57*	3**	13**	6**	11**	20**	16**	25**	17**	13**	36**	9**	52*
At one main site	19	11	-	8	19	2	7	-	5	5	8	7	4	8	9	2	15
	34%	30%	-	49%	34%	76%	59%	-	41%	27%	54%	27%	25%	65%	26%	18%	29%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	13	1	1	14	1	4	3	2	3	4	8	3	3	11	1	16
	25%	34%	30%	4%	25%	24%	34%	52%	17%	17%	24%	31%	17%	20%	30%	12%	31%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	7	2	2	11	-	-	1	5	2	2	6	3	2	7	2	9
	19%	19%	70%	12%	19%	-	-	20%	41%	12%	12%	26%	17%	15%	21%	21%	17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	2
	3%	2%	-	4%	3%	-	-	-	-	7%	-	3%	4%	-	4%	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6	4	-	2	6	-	1	1	-	4	1	1	4	-	4	2	5
	11%	11%	-	12%	11%	-	8%	11%	-	22%	6%	4%	24%	-	12%	23%	10%
At all sites across your company	4	2	-	2	4	-	-	1	-	3	1	1	2	-	2	2	4
	7%	4%	-	14%	7%	-	-	17%	-	14%	3%	5%	13%	-	5%	26%	8%
Don't know	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	2%	-	-	6%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	3%	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 255

Q11.2 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed building management system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																			Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	52	2	-	6	-	-	3	-	5	3	1	5	3	-	3	5	4	4	8	-	52
Weighted total	57*	3**	-**	6**	-**	-**	2**	-**	8**	2**	1**	8**	2**	-**	5**	6**	4**	4**	6**	-**	52*
At one main site	19	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	5	2	-	5	-	-	-	3	1	-	2	-	15
	34%	-	-	31%	-	-	-	-	61%	72%	-	62%	-	-	-	47%	28%	-	39%	-	29%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	3	1	-	-	1	2	2	2	-	16
	25%	59%	-	13%	-	-	23%	-	-	-	100%	38%	35%	-	-	21%	48%	44%	31%	-	31%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	4	1	-	1	1	-	9
	19%	41%	-	10%	-	-	-	-	25%	-	-	-	34%	-	73%	16%	-	30%	14%	-	17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	3%	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	5
	11%	-	-	33%	-	-	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%	-	24%	-	17%	-	10%
At all sites across your company	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	4
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	48%	-	14%	-	-	-	32%	-	-	-	-	26%	-	-	8%
Don't know	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 256

Q11.3 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)
Unweighted total	14	11	-	3	-	2	-	4	-	4	-	1	2	-	-	1	6	8	14
Weighted total	16**	10**	-**	6**	-**	3**	-**	5**	-**	4**	-**	1**	3**	-**	-**	1**	8**	8**	14**
At one main site	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	2	5
	28%	45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44%	-	100%	39%	-	-	100%	31%	25%	36%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	7	3	-	4	-	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	5	1	5
	42%	26%	-	69%	-	-	-	79%	-	30%	-	-	61%	-	-	-	69%	17%	36%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	6%	10%	-	-	-	34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	7%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	7%
Don't know	3	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2
	18%	10%	-	31%	-	66%	-	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34%	14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 257

Q11.3 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	14	-	14	-	4	4	3	1	2	7	-	1	-	4	-	7	7	7	14
Weighted total	16**	..	16**	..	5**	5**	3**	1**	3**	10**	..	1**	..	3**	..	9**	9**	7**	14**
At one main site	5	-	5	-	1	1	3	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	3	3	2	5
	28%	-	28%	-	23%	17%	100%	-	-	21%	-	100%	-	23%	-	29%	31%	24%	36%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	7	-	7	-	-	4	-	-	3	5	-	-	-	1	-	5	5	1	5
	42%	-	42%	-	-	83%	-	-	100%	50%	-	-	-	19%	-	59%	57%	21%	36%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
	6%	-	6%	-	19%	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	29%	-	-	-	14%	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	7%	-	7%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	11%	-	7%	
Don't know	3	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	2
	18%	-	18%	-	58%	-	-	-	-	19%	-	-	-	29%	-	-	-	42%	14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 258

Q11.3 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	14	3	7	4	-	1	9	10	2	3	2	3	2	4	13	6	-	3	1	14
Weighted total	16**	4**	7**	5**	..**	***	9**	9**	2**	3**	2**	2**	2**	4**	15**	7**	..**	2**	1**	14**
At one main site	5	1	2	1	-	*	3	5	1	2	2	*	1	2	4	3	-	*	1	5
	28%	27%	29%	27%	-	100%	37%	50%	49%	79%	100%	23%	59%	50%	24%	39%	-	20%	100%	36%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	7	1	3	2	-	-	3	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	7	3	-	2	-	5
	42%	28%	43%	52%	-	-	30%	16%	51%	21%	-	30%	41%	-	44%	45%	-	80%	-	36%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1
	6%	-	13%	-	-	-	11%	11%	-	-	-	-	-	24%	6%	-	-	-	-	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1
	7%	-	14%	-	-	-	12%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	26%	7%	16%	-	-	-	7%
Don't know	3	2	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	2
	18%	45%	-	21%	-	-	11%	11%	-	-	-	47%	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 259

Q11.3 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	14	10	2	2	14	1	4	-	2	6	3	7	4	1	9	4	14
Weighted total	16**	11**	2**	3**	16**	2**	3**	**	1**	9**	4**	6**	6**	2**	10**	4**	14**
At one main site	5	3	1	-	5	-	2	-	1	2	1	3	-	-	4	*	5
	28%	30%	59%	-	28%	-	48%	-	55%	25%	30%	54%	-	-	40%	12%	36%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	7	5	1	1	7	-	1	-	1	5	-	1	6	-	3	4	5
	42%	43%	41%	39%	42%	-	23%	-	45%	63%	-	13%	100%	-	31%	88%	36%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	6%	9%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	-	10%	-	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	7%	9%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	12%	-	17%	-	-	10%	-	7%
Don't know	3	1	-	2	3	2	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	2	1	-	2
	18%	9%	-	61%	18%	100%	29%	-	-	-	70%	-	-	100%	10%	-	14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 260

Q11.3 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	14	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	4	1	-	2	-	14
Weighted total	16**	-**	-**	2**	-**	-**	-**	1**	1**	-**	**	-**	2**	-**	-**	2**	5**	1**	-**	2**	-**	14**
At one main site	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	5
	28%	-	-	52%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	26%	-	-	43%	-	36%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	5
	42%	-	-	48%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	36%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%	-	-	-	-	-	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57%	-	7%
Don't know	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	2
	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40%	100%	-	-	-	-	14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 261

Q11.4 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed local controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	92	85	1	6	4	8	6	8	8	2	21	17	7	7	1	1	1	39	53	92
Weighted total	94*	82*	***	11**	4**	9**	7**	8**	8**	1**	23**	13**	7**	8**	2**	3**	1**	39*	55*	92*
At one main site	19	19	-	-	1	1	1	3	-	-	6	1	2	2	-	-	1	10	9	21
	20%	23%	-	-	20%	9%	11%	39%	-	-	24%	11%	28%	33%	-	-	100%	26%	16%	23%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	33	25	*	8	1	1	4	2	4	1	10	3	2	3	-	3	-	13	20	29
	35%	30%	100%	67%	34%	13%	54%	22%	52%	41%	43%	20%	36%	36%	-	100%	-	34%	36%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	13	11	-	2	-	3	1	-	-	1	4	3	1	-	-	-	-	6	7	12
	14%	13%	-	17%	-	29%	18%	-	-	59%	17%	26%	13%	-	-	-	-	15%	13%	13%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	7	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	5	6
	7%	8%	-	-	32%	-	-	38%	-	-	4%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	9%	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	8	6	-	2	-	4	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	7	7
	8%	7%	-	17%	-	44%	16%	-	-	-	7%	-	-	14%	-	-	-	2%	13%	8%
At all sites across your company	13	13	-	-	1	1	-	-	3	-	1	4	2	1	2	-	-	7	6	16
	14%	16%	-	-	14%	6%	-	-	35%	-	4%	29%	23%	17%	100%	-	-	19%	11%	17%
Don't know	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 262

Q11.4 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed local controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	92	-	92	8	29	24	22	3	5	31	6	29	2	15	16	48	70	22	92
Weighted total	94*	..**	94*	8**	29**	25**	24**	3**	5**	35**	7**	28**	2**	15**	17**	47*	74*	20**	92*
At one main site	19	-	19	1	7	5	6	-	1	5	2	9	1	3	7	6	13	7	21
20%	20%	-	20%	9%	23%	21%	23%	-	10%	13%	29%	34%	52%	24%	42%	12%	17%	33%	23%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	33	-	33	3	7	10	7	2	3	15	3	8	-	5	6	15	28	5	29
35%	35%	-	35%	46%	25%	39%	31%	69%	62%	41%	40%	29%	-	32%	35%	32%	37%	27%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	13	-	13	-	6	2	5	-	-	6	-	4	-	1	2	9	11	2	12
14%	14%	-	14%	-	23%	6%	20%	-	-	17%	-	14%	-	8%	12%	19%	15%	8%	13%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	-	7	1	1	1	2	-	1	-	2	2	-	-	1	5	6	1	6
7%	7%	-	7%	12%	4%	6%	9%	-	17%	-	31%	8%	-	-	4%	11%	8%	4%	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	8	-	8	1	3	2	-	1	1	2	-	2	1	1	1	3	5	3	7
8%	8%	-	8%	13%	11%	9%	-	31%	11%	5%	-	8%	48%	7%	7%	6%	7%	14%	8%
At all sites across your company	13	-	13	2	3	5	4	-	-	8	-	2	-	3	-	10	11	3	16
14%	14%	-	14%	20%	11%	19%	17%	-	-	23%	-	7%	-	22%	-	21%	14%	13%	17%
Don't know	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
1%	1%	-	1%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	1%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 263

Q11.4 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed local controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	
Unweighted total	92	11	55	14	10	11	66	79	6	16	18	38	2	32	68	25	4	12	23
Weighted total	94*	10**	55*	15**	11**	11**	63*	75*	6**	17**	18**	38*	1**	31**	69*	27**	4**	11**	24**
At one main site	19	2	13	4	-	2	14	15	5	1	2	6	-	9	11	3	1	1	8
	20%	16%	24%	29%	-	15%	22%	19%	74%	8%	13%	15%	-	31%	16%	9%	25%	8%	33%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	33	2	17	6	7	4	19	23	-	5	3	13	1	9	24	10	-	2	9
	35%	15%	30%	39%	61%	41%	30%	31%	-	32%	16%	33%	59%	28%	35%	38%	-	15%	38%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	13	4	9	1	-	2	7	11	-	4	5	2	-	5	12	5	1	3	1
	14%	34%	16%	4%	-	18%	11%	15%	-	21%	29%	6%	-	16%	17%	20%	34%	26%	6%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	-	4	2	1	-	7	7	-	4	3	4	-	2	5	2	1	2	1
	7%	-	7%	10%	13%	-	11%	9%	-	23%	18%	12%	-	5%	8%	6%	23%	23%	5%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	8	2	5	-	1	1	5	6	-	-	2	4	-	2	6	3	-	-	2
	8%	18%	10%	-	5%	10%	8%	8%	-	-	12%	11%	-	7%	8%	10%	-	-	9%
At all sites across your company	13	2	7	3	2	2	11	13	2	3	2	9	1	3	11	5	1	3	1
	14%	17%	12%	18%	21%	15%	17%	17%	26%	16%	13%	23%	41%	10%	16%	17%	17%	28%	6%
Don't know	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	2%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 264

Q11.4 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed local controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	92	66	3	23	92	7	23	10	18	17	25	47	19	18	61	13	92
Weighted total	94*	64*	3**	26**	94*	9**	22**	11**	17**	19**	26**	49*	19**	19**	60*	15**	92*
At one main site	19	13	-	6	19	3	7	-	2	4	9	8	1	7	11	1	21
	20%	20%	-	24%	20%	32%	31%	-	13%	20%	34%	17%	8%	35%	18%	10%	23%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	33	26	1	7	33	4	7	2	8	7	7	21	6	3	25	5	29
	35%	40%	23%	25%	35%	47%	34%	19%	46%	39%	25%	42%	31%	17%	42%	31%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	13	8	2	3	13	-	2	2	3	2	4	7	1	5	7	1	12
	14%	13%	56%	10%	14%	-	8%	20%	17%	11%	17%	15%	7%	26%	11%	8%	13%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	5	1	1	7	-	2	4	-	1	2	4	1	2	4	1	6
	7%	8%	21%	3%	7%	-	10%	32%	-	5%	6%	9%	5%	8%	7%	6%	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	8	5	-	3	8	2	-	1	1	2	2	3	2	2	5	1	7
	8%	7%	-	12%	8%	21%	-	10%	6%	9%	9%	6%	13%	10%	8%	8%	8%
At all sites across your company	13	8	-	6	13	-	3	2	3	3	2	4	7	1	7	5	16
	14%	12%	-	21%	14%	-	16%	19%	18%	17%	8%	9%	36%	4%	12%	36%	17%
Don't know	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	1%	-	-	4%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	2%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 265

Q11.4 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed local controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	92	1	1	13	-	-	4	6	8	5	3	6	2	5	-	3	7	7	4	17	-	92
Weighted total	94*	1**	1**	13**	-**	-**	3**	6**	7**	8**	3**	9**	2**	3**	-**	5**	8**	9**	4**	14**	-**	92*
At one main site	19	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	3	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	3	-	21
	20%	-	100%	19%	-	-	-	-	11%	20%	41%	40%	-	58%	-	-	21%	25%	-	25%	-	23%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	33	-	-	2	-	-	1	3	2	3	1	5	2	1	-	3	3	4	-	4	-	29
	35%	-	-	12%	-	-	44%	54%	28%	38%	27%	60%	100%	22%	-	62%	34%	48%	-	26%	-	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	13	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	-	12
	14%	-	-	19%	-	-	43%	-	18%	26%	32%	-	-	-	-	38%	-	-	18%	18%	-	13%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	6
	7%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	25%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	54%	-	-	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	8	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	1	2	-	7
	8%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	20%	-	-	24%	-	28%	15%	-	8%
At all sites across your company	13	-	-	6	-	-	*	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	16
	14%	-	-	43%	-	-	14%	22%	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	10%	-	17%	-	-	17%
Don't know	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 266

Q11.1-4 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Summary

Base: all participants who have installed heating and boilers since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	New more efficient boiler or burner	Building management system	Connect to existing district heating	Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control
Unweighted total	88	52	14	92
Weighted total	92	57	16	94
At one main site	28 31%	19 34%	5 28%	19 20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	35 38%	14 25%	7 42%	33 35%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12 12%	11 19%	1 6%	13 14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3 3%	1 3%	-	7 7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	10 11%	6 11%	-	8 8%
At all sites across your company	2 3%	4 7%	1 7%	13 14%
Don't know	3 3%	1 2%	3 18%	1 1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 267

Q11.5 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed plant replacement/upgrade since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance				Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	54	53	1	-	2	1	4	3	2	2	15	13	5	2	-	1	3	32	22	54
Weighted total	51*	51*	1**	-**	2**	1**	3**	3**	2**	2**	18**	10**	4**	1**	-**	2**	4**	29**	22**	54*
At one main site	13	13	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	1	3	3	1	1	-	-	-	10	3	16
	25%	26%	-	-	61%	100%	19%	60%	-	54%	15%	26%	31%	100%	-	-	-	34%	14%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	13	13	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	4	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	10	13
	25%	25%	-	-	39%	-	16%	-	47%	46%	25%	24%	-	-	-	100%	-	8%	47%	24%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	12	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	5	4	1	-	-	-	-	7	4	11
	23%	23%	-	-	-	-	40%	-	-	-	27%	45%	31%	-	-	-	-	24%	20%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	7	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	2	6
	13%	14%	-	-	-	-	24%	40%	-	-	23%	-	-	-	-	-	28%	16%	10%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	4	-	4
	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	53%	-	-	5%	16%	-	-	-	-	49%	14%	-	7%
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	22%	-	-	-	-	3%	4%	4%
Don't know	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
	3%	2%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	23%	2%	4%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 268

Q11.5 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed plant replacement/upgrade since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	54	-	54	5	12	10	15	3	9	19	2	22	-	4	7	38	45	7	54
Weighted total	51*	-**	51*	4**	12**	9**	14**	3**	10**	20**	1**	19**	-**	4**	8**	34*	41*	8**	54*
At one main site	13	-	13	1	2	4	6	-	-	3	1	7	-	3	2	9	10	3	16
	25%	-	25%	17%	21%	49%	39%	-	-	14%	63%	36%	-	69%	21%	25%	25%	37%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	13	-	13	-	1	4	3	1	4	6	-	5	-	1	-	9	9	1	13
	25%	-	25%	-	7%	42%	21%	36%	41%	29%	-	26%	-	12%	-	26%	23%	9%	24%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	-	12	2	5	1	2	-	2	8	-	2	-	1	3	7	11	1	11
	23%	-	23%	52%	41%	9%	13%	-	21%	40%	-	12%	-	18%	35%	20%	26%	10%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	-	7	-	-	-	3	1	3	1	-	3	-	-	1	6	5	2	6
	13%	-	13%	-	-	-	24%	24%	29%	4%	-	15%	-	-	14%	17%	12%	24%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	4	-	4	1	2	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	-	2	2	4	-	4
	8%	-	8%	15%	16%	-	3%	39%	-	9%	37%	3%	-	-	31%	5%	10%	-	7%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
	3%	-	3%	-	15%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	4%	-	-	-	3%	2%	12%	4%
Don't know	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	1	2
	3%	-	3%	16%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	4%	2%	9%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q11.5 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed plant replacement/upgrade since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	54	7	31	7	9	11	40	48	6	10	10	21	3	22	42	27	6	17	12	54
Weighted total	51*	6**	31**	6**	9**	11**	38*	46*	5**	9**	9**	18**	2**	24**	40*	28**	5**	16**	11**	54*
At one main site	13	2	8	1	2	1	12	13	-	*	1	4	1	7	6	2	2	3	7	16
	25%	34%	27%	13%	20%	8%	31%	27%	-	5%	7%	20%	62%	30%	16%	9%	39%	16%	59%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	13	3	6	2	2	4	9	13	1	1	4	2	-	9	12	9	1	4	1	13
	25%	42%	19%	41%	24%	34%	24%	27%	15%	6%	49%	13%	-	39%	29%	32%	23%	23%	10%	24%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	2	7	1	2	2	8	9	2	3	2	6	-	1	9	6	1	5	2	11
	23%	25%	21%	25%	23%	15%	21%	19%	31%	39%	18%	36%	-	5%	24%	21%	13%	30%	19%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	-	5	-	2	2	5	6	2	2	1	3	1	3	7	6	-	2	-	6
	13%	-	15%	-	26%	16%	13%	13%	36%	21%	14%	18%	38%	12%	17%	22%	-	11%	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	4	-	2	1	1	1	3	4	-	2	1	2	-	2	3	3	1	2	1	4
	8%	-	7%	21%	7%	11%	7%	9%	-	19%	13%	10%	-	8%	9%	12%	25%	14%	5%	7%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	2
	3%	-	6%	-	-	8%	2%	2%	18%	10%	-	-	-	3%	2%	3%	-	-	7%	4%
Don't know	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	2
	3%	-	5%	-	-	8%	2%	3%	-	-	-	4%	-	4%	4%	-	-	5%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 270

Q11.5 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed plant replacement/upgrade since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	54	34	-	20	54	4	6	3	14	18	11	31	12	9	35	10	54
Weighted total	51*	30**	-**	21**	51*	3**	6**	3**	14**	18**	9**	31**	12**	8**	34**	10**	54*
At one main site	13	8	-	5	13	1	1	-	4	4	3	8	3	1	11	1	16
	25%	25%	-	26%	25%	48%	17%	-	26%	23%	34%	24%	22%	19%	32%	6%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	13	9	-	4	13	1	1	-	2	6	3	7	3	4	5	4	13
	25%	29%	-	18%	25%	30%	22%	-	14%	33%	33%	22%	25%	51%	14%	39%	24%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	7	-	4	12	-	3	2	4	2	1	9	2	1	9	2	11
	23%	23%	-	21%	23%	-	46%	66%	29%	12%	9%	28%	18%	10%	26%	20%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	3	-	4	7	-	-	1	1	5	-	6	1	-	7	-	6
	13%	10%	-	19%	13%	-	-	34%	8%	26%	-	19%	9%	-	20%	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	4	2	-	2	4	-	-	-	2	1	1	2	1	-	2	2	4
	8%	7%	-	9%	8%	-	-	-	17%	6%	7%	7%	10%	-	7%	17%	7%
At all sites across your company	2	1	-	1	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	2
	3%	3%	-	4%	3%	-	14%	-	7%	-	-	-	15%	-	-	17%	4%
Don't know	2	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	2
	3%	3%	-	3%	3%	22%	-	-	-	-	18%	-	-	20%	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 271

Q11.5 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed plant replacement/upgrade since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	54	1	1	14	-	1	3	5	2	3	-	4	3	4	-	4	1	-	8	-	54	
Weighted total	51*	1**	1**	13**	-**	**	2**	6**	2**	4**	-**	6**	2**	2**	-**	**	5**	1**	-**	6**	-**	54*
At one main site	13	-	-	3	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	-	16	
	25%	-	-	24%	-	100%	59%	16%	39%	-	-	35%	-	37%	-	-	-	-	64%	-	30%	
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	13	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	13	
	25%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	67%	-	27%	-	-	30%	21%	-	-	46%	100%	-	36%	24%	
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12	1	1	4	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	11	
	23%	100%	100%	29%	-	-	41%	-	61%	47%	-	-	31%	-	-	28%	-	-	-	-	20%	
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	
	13%	-	-	14%	-	-	-	17%	-	26%	-	53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	
	8%	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42%	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	7%	
At all sites across your company	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	
	3%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	
Don't know	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	
	3%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 272

Q11.6 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed control system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	51	49	-	2	1	-	3	3	3	1	13	11	6	2	-	1	5	30	21	51
Weighted total	53*	50*	-**	3**	1**	-**	3**	3**	3**	1**	17**	9**	5**	1**	-**	2**	6**	30**	23**	51*
At one main site	14	13	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	3	3	*	1	-	-	3	12	2	14
	27%	25%	-	51%	100%	-	29%	37%	37%	-	20%	35%	8%	49%	-	-	54%	41%	8%	27%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	14	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	4	3	-	1	-	2	-	-	3	10	13
	26%	28%	-	-	-	-	71%	-	100%	26%	33%	-	51%	-	100%	-	-	11%	45%	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	11	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	3	2	-	-	-	1	-	7	4	10
	21%	22%	-	-	-	48%	-	-	-	24%	32%	35%	-	-	-	16%	-	22%	20%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	7	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	4	2	6
	12%	13%	-	-	-	29%	-	29%	-	18%	-	14%	-	-	-	17%	-	14%	10%	12%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3
	4%	5%	-	-	-	23%	-	34%	-	-	-	11%	-	-	-	-	-	6%	3%	6%
At all sites across your company	3	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2
	5%	2%	-	49%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	4%
Don't know	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	3
	5%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	6%	4%	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 273

Q11.6 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed control system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	51	-	51	3	11	9	13	3	12	16	-	22	1	5	5	36	44	5	51
Weighted total	53*	-**	53*	3**	11**	12**	12**	3**	13**	19**	-**	22**	2**	7**	5**	34*	45*	6**	51*
At one main site	14	-	14	1	2	7	3	-	1	3	-	8	2	4	1	7	12	2	14
27%	-	-	27%	26%	23%	57%	27%	-	11%	18%	-	38%	100%	59%	16%	22%	28%	33%	27%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	-	14	-	3	3	3	1	4	5	-	5	-	1	1	8	10	1	13
26%	-	-	26%	-	31%	22%	23%	36%	30%	29%	-	21%	-	19%	20%	24%	24%	12%	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	-	11	1	4	1	2	-	3	6	-	4	-	-	3	7	10	1	10
21%	-	-	21%	52%	37%	7%	16%	-	23%	31%	-	18%	-	-	52%	21%	23%	11%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	-	7	-	-	-	3	1	3	2	-	3	-	-	-	7	5	2	6
12%	-	-	12%	-	-	-	25%	24%	21%	9%	-	13%	-	-	-	19%	11%	29%	12%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	2	-	3
4%	-	-	4%	22%	-	-	5%	39%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	11%	5%	5%	-	6%
At all sites across your company	3	-	3	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	2	1	2
5%	-	-	5%	-	9%	14%	-	-	-	5%	-	7%	-	22%	-	3%	4%	15%	4%
Don't know	3	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	3
5%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	4%	-	15%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	6%	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 274

Q11.6 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed control system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	51	4	29	9	9	14	32	42	6	8	9	18	3	22	39	25	8	12	11	51
Weighted total	53*	5**	32**	8**	9**	14**	34**	44*	6**	8**	10**	17**	2**	26**	40*	26**	7**	11**	11**	51*
At one main site	14	2	8	2	2	2	9	10	1	1	1	4	*	9	5	4	2	2	8	14
	27%	47%	25%	25%	23%	17%	27%	23%	24%	14%	15%	24%	23%	33%	12%	14%	25%	17%	70%	27%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	3	7	2	2	3	11	14	-	2	3	3	-	9	13	9	2	3	1	13
	26%	53%	22%	28%	22%	20%	33%	31%	-	20%	32%	16%	-	36%	33%	35%	30%	26%	6%	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	-	8	1	2	2	7	8	2	2	-	5	-	2	9	5	-	3	2	10
	21%	-	26%	10%	22%	18%	22%	18%	30%	27%	-	28%	-	7%	22%	21%	-	29%	19%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	-	4	1	1	3	4	5	2	2	1	2	1	3	7	6	1	2	-	6
	12%	-	14%	14%	13%	20%	11%	12%	30%	23%	12%	13%	77%	11%	16%	22%	11%	16%	-	12%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	1	1	1	1	1	2	-	1	2	2	-	1	2	1	1	1	1	3
	4%	-	2%	15%	7%	9%	4%	5%	-	16%	18%	10%	-	2%	4%	4%	17%	5%	5%	6%
At all sites across your company	3	-	3	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	2	3	1	-	-	-	2
	5%	-	8%	-	-	7%	-	4%	15%	-	17%	-	-	6%	6%	3%	-	-	-	4%
Don't know	3	-	1	1	1	1	1	3	-	-	1	2	-	1	3	-	1	1	-	3
	5%	-	3%	7%	13%	10%	3%	6%	-	-	6%	10%	-	3%	6%	-	17%	8%	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 275

Q11.6 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed control system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	51	36	-	15	51	2	3	3	14	18	11	29	11	9	32	10	51
Weighted total	53*	37*	-**	16**	53*	2**	4**	3**	14**	19**	11**	30**	12**	9**	33**	11**	51*
At one main site	14	11	-	4	14	1	1	-	2	6	6	7	2	4	10	1	14
	27%	28%	-	24%	27%	43%	32%	-	17%	29%	52%	22%	16%	38%	31%	6%	27%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	11	-	3	14	1	-	2	2	4	2	6	5	3	6	4	13
	26%	28%	-	20%	26%	57%	-	63%	14%	22%	22%	21%	42%	37%	20%	35%	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	7	-	4	11	-	3	1	5	1	1	8	1	1	8	1	10
	21%	18%	-	28%	21%	-	68%	37%	34%	4%	13%	28%	11%	16%	26%	11%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	3	-	4	7	-	-	-	-	7	-	7	-	-	5	1	6
	12%	8%	-	23%	12%	-	-	-	-	35%	-	21%	-	-	17%	9%	12%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	2	3
	4%	6%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	9%	6%	5%	2%	10%	-	2%	16%	6%
At all sites across your company	3	2	-	1	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	2
	5%	4%	-	6%	5%	-	-	-	19%	-	-	-	21%	-	-	23%	4%
Don't know	3	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	1	2	-	3
	5%	7%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	8%	3%	8%	6%	-	9%	5%	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 276

Q11.6 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed control system since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	51	1	1	12	-	1	3	6	3	3	-	4	2	3	1	-	5	-	-	6	-	51
Weighted total	53*	1**	1**	11**	-**	**	2**	8**	3**	4**	-**	6**	2**	3**	1**	-**	6**	-**	-**	5**	-**	51*
At one main site	14	-	1	2	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	14
	27%	-	100%	23%	-	100%	29%	21%	40%	-	-	53%	-	61%	-	-	-	-	-	43%	-	27%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	-	-	1	-	-	-	5	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	13
	26%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	70%	-	53%	-	-	44%	18%	-	-	42%	-	-	27%	-	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	1	-	3	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	10
	21%	100%	-	26%	-	-	43%	9%	37%	47%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	21%	-	-	-	-	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6
	12%	-	-	17%	-	-	-	-	23%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	-	-	12%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
	4%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%	-	-	20%	-	-	-	-	6%
At all sites across your company	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	4%
Don't know	3	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	5%	-	-	19%	-	-	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 277

Q11.7 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed replacement of air conditioning with free/evaporative cooling since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	27	22	-	5	1	4	1	2	1	-	5	5	4	1	-	-	2	14	13	27
Weighted total	31**	23**	-**	9**	1**	6**	1**	2**	1**	**	7**	5**	5**	1**	**	**	3**	17**	15**	27**
At one main site	8	6	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	2	5	2	8
	24%	26%	-	20%	-	34%	-	49%	-	-	17%	33%	100%	-	-	-	67%	32%	14%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	9	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4	8
	30%	42%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	65%	68%	-	-	-	-	-	-	35%	24%	30%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
	10%	14%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	18%	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	17%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	4%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
	5%	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	4%
At all sites across your company	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	3%	4%	-	-	-	-	51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	4%
Don't know	7	2	-	5	-	4	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	5	3	5	
	24%	9%	-	62%	-	66%	-	100%	-	-	-	34%	-	-	-	33%	28%	19%	19%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 278

Q11.7 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed replacement of air conditioning with free/evaporative cooling since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	27	-	27	2	9	6	4	1	4	10	1	10	1	3	4	14	24	3	27
Weighted total	31**	-**	31**	2**	11**	7**	4**	1**	5**	14**	1**	11**	2**	3**	5**	14**	27**	4**	27**
At one main site	8	-	8	-	4	3	1	-	-	3	1	4	2	1	2	3	8	-	8
	24%	-	24%	-	38%	37%	22%	-	-	25%	100%	33%	100%	25%	41%	21%	28%	-	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	-	9	2	2	3	-	-	3	5	-	3	-	1	2	6	7	3	8
	30%	-	30%	100%	19%	38%	-	-	56%	38%	-	31%	-	23%	43%	41%	26%	57%	30%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	3	-	3
	10%	-	10%	-	7%	-	29%	-	26%	9%	-	7%	-	-	16%	9%	12%	-	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	4%	-	4%	-	-	-	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	4%	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	1
	5%	-	5%	-	-	24%	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	52%	-	-	6%	-	4%
At all sites across your company	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	3%	-	3%	-	-	-	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	3%	-	4%
Don't know	7	-	7	-	4	-	-	1	1	4	-	2	-	-	-	2	6	2	5
	24%	-	24%	-	36%	-	-	100%	18%	28%	-	15%	-	-	-	14%	21%	43%	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 279

Q11.7 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed replacement of air conditioning with free/evaporative cooling since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	27	5	14	2	6	5	14	20	1	5	6	11	1	9	22	10	2	8	3	27
Weighted total	31**	6**	18**	2**	6**	6**	15**	22**	1**	5**	7**	11**	**	11**	25**	10**	2**	7**	3**	27**
At one main site	8	3	4	-	1	1	4	5	-	1	-	3	*	3	5	2	*	4	1	8
	24%	43%	25%	-	9%	15%	27%	22%	-	20%	-	29%	100%	32%	20%	21%	27%	49%	27%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	2	5	1	2	3	7	9	1	3	2	4	-	4	8	3	-	1	1	8
	30%	26%	29%	39%	34%	48%	46%	43%	100%	56%	38%	35%	-	33%	32%	33%	-	10%	47%	30%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	1	-	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	2	-	1	1	3
	10%	-	7%	-	36%	-	13%	9%	-	-	-	7%	-	12%	10%	24%	-	17%	25%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	4%	-	-	-	21%	-	8%	5%	-	-	18%	11%	-	-	5%	11%	-	-	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	1
	5%	-	9%	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	25%	-	-	16%	7%	-	-	-	-	4%
At all sites across your company	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	3%	-	5%	-	-	-	6%	4%	-	-	-	8%	-	-	4%	-	-	12%	-	4%
Don't know	7	2	4	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	1	1	-	1	6	1	1	1	-	5
	24%	31%	25%	61%	-	37%	-	9%	-	24%	18%	11%	-	8%	22%	11%	73%	12%	-	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 280

Q11.7 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed replacement of air conditioning with free/evaporative cooling since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	27	14	-	12	27	3	5	2	4	6	6	13	8	6	14	6	27
Weighted total	31**	15**	-**	15**	31**	3**	5**	3**	6**	7**	7**	16**	8**	7**	16**	7**	27**
At one main site	8	3	-	5	8	1	1	-	1	1	3	3	2	3	4	1	8
24%	17%	-	34%	24%	15%	20%	-	21%	13%	37%	16%	29%	37%	24%	16%	30%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	5	-	5	9	1	3	-	2	3	1	8	1	1	8	1	8
30%	32%	-	32%	30%	27%	56%	-	35%	52%	13%	47%	11%	13%	48%	12%	30%	30%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	2	-	1	3	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
10%	13%	-	9%	10%	-	24%	39%	-	-	11%	8%	15%	11%	8%	18%	11%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
4%	8%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	18%	-	7%	-	-	8%	-	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	1
5%	11%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	29%	-	-	-	20%	-	-	24%	4%	4%
At all sites across your company	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
3%	6%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	11%	-	-	13%	4%	4%
Don't know	7	2	-	4	7	2	-	2	-	1	3	4	1	3	2	1	5
24%	13%	-	26%	24%	57%	-	61%	-	17%	39%	22%	14%	39%	12%	17%	19%	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 281

Q11.7 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed replacement of air conditioning with free/evaporative cooling since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	27	1	-	4	-	1	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	-	-	3	-	-	4	1	27
Weighted total	31**	1**	-**	4**	-**	1**	3**	2**	2**	2**	3**	1**	3**	-**	-**	4**	-**	-**	4**	2**	27**
At one main site	8	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	8
	24%	-	-	28%	-	100%	-	58%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	41%	-	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	8
	30%	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	60%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%	-	30%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
	10%	-	-	51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	-	-	-	-	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1
	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41%	-	4%
At all sites across your company	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
Don't know	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	5
	24%	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	71%	-	-	-	100%	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 282

Q11.5-7 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Summary

Base: all participants who have installed cooling since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Plant replacement / upgrade	Control system	Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling
Unweighted total	54	51	27
Weighted total	51	53	31
At one main site	13 25%	14 27%	8 24%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	13 25%	14 26%	9 30%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	12 23%	11 21%	3 10%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	7 13%	7 12%	1 4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	4 8%	2 4%	2 5%
At all sites across your company	2 3%	3 5%	1 3%
Don't know	2 3%	3 5%	7 24%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 283

Q11.8 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed distribution improvements since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	27	26	1	-	1	1	1	1	2	-	9	6	1	3	-	-	2	15	12	27
Weighted total	26**	25**	1**	-**	1**	1**	1**	***	2**	-**	9**	6**	1**	4**	-**	-**	2**	14**	12**	27**
At one main site	9	9	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	1	-	2	-	-	2	5	3	9
34%	34%	34%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	30%	-	28%	21%	-	40%	-	-	100%	40%	26%	33%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	11	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	6	3	-	1	-	-	-	6	6	11
46%	45%	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	70%	-	60%	54%	-	36%	-	-	-	42%	51%	41%	
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2
5%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	23%	-	-	-	-	-	11%	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
4%	5%	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	6%	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
6%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	6%	7%
Don't know	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 284

Q11.8 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed distribution improvements since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	27	-	27	2	8	8	6	-	3	10	-	9	2	7	3	11	21	6	27
Weighted total	26**	..**	26**	1**	9**	7**	6**	..**	2**	11**	..**	9**	2**	7**	4**	9**	19**	7**	27**
At one main site	9	-	9	1	2	2	3	-	1	5	-	2	2	2	3	7	2	9	
	34%	-	34%	67%	23%	26%	48%	-	43%	44%	-	26%	100%	34%	41%	30%	36%	27%	33%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	-	12	-	6	4	2	-	1	5	-	4	-	3	2	5	9	3	11
	46%	-	46%	-	59%	54%	33%	-	25%	45%	-	51%	-	49%	59%	52%	46%	46%	41%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	5%	-	5%	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	7%	-	-	7%	-	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
	4%	-	4%	33%	-	-	-	-	31%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	6%	-	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	2
	6%	-	6%	-	18%	-	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	10%	-	11%	5%	11%	7%
Don't know	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	4%	-	4%	-	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	17%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 285

Q11.8 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed distribution improvements since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	27	5	17	1	4	2	23	23	5	3	6	11	3	11	24	9	2	9	2	27
Weighted total	26**	4**	17**	1**	4**	3**	21**	21**	6**	2**	7**	11**	3**	10**	22**	8**	1**	8**	3**	27**
At one main site	9	2	6	-	1	-	7	6	2	1	2	3	1	4	8	3	-	4	1	9
	34%	38%	36%	-	26%	-	32%	29%	25%	42%	23%	25%	33%	39%	35%	41%	-	47%	28%	33%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	2	7	1	2	1	10	10	5	1	4	5	2	4	10	4	1	2	2	11
	46%	45%	40%	100%	62%	56%	49%	47%	75%	58%	64%	48%	67%	38%	44%	45%	100%	32%	72%	41%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	2
	5%	-	8%	-	-	-	6%	6%	-	-	13%	8%	-	5%	6%	-	-	-	-	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	1	-	*	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
	4%	-	4%	-	12%	-	5%	5%	-	-	-	10%	-	-	3%	-	-	9%	-	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	2
	6%	17%	6%	-	-	-	8%	8%	-	-	-	9%	-	7%	7%	-	-	12%	-	7%
Don't know	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1
	4%	-	7%	-	-	44%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	11%	5%	14%	-	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 286

Q11.8 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed distribution improvements since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	27	19	1	7	27	-	6	2	7	6	9	15	3	8	14	5	27
Weighted total	26**	16**	1**	8**	26**	-**	6**	2**	7**	5**	9**	14**	3**	8**	13**	5**	27**
At one main site	9	7	-	2	9	-	5	1	2	1	2	7	-	2	6	1	9
	34%	43%	-	18%	34%	-	71%	50%	29%	18%	17%	51%	-	21%	45%	21%	33%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	4	1	7	12	-	1	1	3	4	6	5	1	4	6	2	11
	46%	25%	100%	82%	46%	-	22%	50%	46%	68%	66%	33%	39%	49%	46%	41%	41%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2
	5%	8%	-	-	5%	-	7%	-	-	-	5%	7%	-	6%	-	19%	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
	4%	7%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	13%	-	3%	25%	-	9%	-	-	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	2
	6%	10%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	25%	-	-	5%	36%	9%	-	20%	7%
Don't know	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	4%	7%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	15%	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 287

Q11.8 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed distribution improvements since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	27	-	-	3	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	2	4	3	-	2	2	1	5	-	27
Weighted total	26**	**	**	3**	**	1**	1**	1**	2**	**	**	2**	3**	4**	**	2**	2**	1**	4**	**	27**
At one main site	9	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	9
	34%	-	-	69%	-	-	-	-	70%	-	-	-	60%	-	-	-	-	-	88%	-	33%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	2	-	1	2	1	-	-	11
	46%	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	100%	21%	50%	-	66%	100%	100%	-	-	41%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
	6%	-	-	31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34%	-	-	-	-	7%
Don't know	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 288

Q11.9 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed point of use heaters since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	31	29	1	1	1	5	2	2	2	1	8	3	2	2	-	-	3	17	14	31
Weighted total	29**	26**	1**	2**	1**	4**	2**	3**	3**	1**	8**	3**	1**	2**	-**	-**	3**	16**	13**	31*
At one main site	8	8	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	1	4	5	8
	29%	32%	-	-	-	22%	100%	-	-	-	40%	45%	-	-	-	-	59%	23%	37%	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	9	-	2	-	1	-	2	3	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	7	4	10
	39%	35%	-	100%	-	34%	-	81%	100%	100%	42%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	44%	32%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	3	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	5
	12%	11%	100%	-	-	30%	-	-	-	-	7%	30%	-	50%	-	-	-	9%	16%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
	4%	4%	-	-	100%	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	5%	6%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	2
	6%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	50%	-	-	-	11%	-	6%
At all sites across your company	3	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	1	4
	10%	11%	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	41%	10%	10%	13%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 289

Q11.9 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed point of use heaters since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	31	-	31	3	8	8	9	-	3	12	2	8	1	6	2	18	21	10	31
Weighted total	29**	-**	29**	2**	9**	7**	8**	-**	2**	14**	2**	6**	1**	7**	2**	15**	18**	10**	31*
At one main site	8	-	8	2	4	1	2	-	-	5	1	2	1	3	-	4	4	5	8
	29%	-	29%	78%	42%	11%	26%	-	-	39%	35%	27%	100%	48%	-	27%	21%	44%	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	-	11	-	3	4	4	-	1	5	1	1	-	3	2	4	8	3	10
	39%	-	39%	-	33%	48%	51%	-	27%	35%	65%	11%	-	43%	100%	30%	45%	26%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	3	-	1	2	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	2	3	-	5
	12%	-	12%	-	8%	27%	8%	-	-	4%	-	28%	-	-	-	17%	18%	-	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
	4%	-	4%	22%	-	-	-	-	33%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	6%	-	6%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	2	2
	6%	-	6%	-	10%	-	-	-	40%	6%	-	14%	-	-	-	11%	-	17%	6%
At all sites across your company	3	-	3	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	2	2	1	4
	10%	-	10%	-	7%	14%	15%	-	-	12%	-	20%	-	10%	-	11%	9%	12%	13%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 290

Q11.9 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed point of use heaters since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	31	4	16	4	7	4	23	25	4	3	8	11	3	10	25	11	2	7	5	31
Weighted total	29**	4**	14**	3**	7**	3**	21**	22**	5**	3**	8**	11**	3**	9**	23**	9**	1**	6**	5**	31*
At one main site	8	2	5	2	-	1	5	7	2	1	1	5	-	2	6	3	-	3	3	8
	29%	47%	33%	60%	-	29%	24%	30%	44%	44%	15%	44%	-	22%	24%	35%	-	46%	55%	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	1	4	1	5	-	9	7	3	-	4	1	1	5	10	3	1	1	1	10
	39%	34%	28%	40%	61%	-	42%	29%	56%	-	43%	13%	54%	60%	43%	27%	40%	10%	23%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	2	-	1	1	3	3	-	1	2	1	1	-	3	1	-	-	1	5
	12%	-	14%	-	18%	21%	13%	15%	-	20%	20%	8%	46%	-	12%	13%	-	-	11%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
	4%	-	5%	-	6%	-	5%	5%	-	-	-	11%	-	-	3%	-	-	12%	-	6%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	1	-	1	2	2	1	1	-	2
	6%	-	12%	-	-	29%	4%	8%	-	-	21%	8%	-	10%	7%	19%	60%	14%	-	6%
At all sites across your company	3	1	1	-	1	1	2	3	-	1	-	2	-	1	2	1	-	1	1	4
	10%	19%	8%	-	14%	21%	11%	13%	-	36%	-	15%	-	8%	10%	6%	-	18%	11%	13%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 291

Q11.9 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed point of use heaters since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	31	21	-	10	31	2	5	3	7	9	8	18	4	8	19	4	31
Weighted total	29**	18**	-**	11**	29**	1**	5**	3**	9**	7**	8**	17**	3**	8**	17**	3**	31*
At one main site	8	6	-	2	8	1	2	2	3	1	4	4	1	3	4	2	8
	29%	36%	-	19%	29%	59%	34%	68%	32%	18%	50%	22%	25%	34%	24%	49%	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	4	-	7	11	-	2	-	5	2	2	9	-	3	8	-	10
	39%	23%	-	65%	39%	-	46%	-	60%	27%	21%	55%	-	36%	48%	-	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	2	-	2	3	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	2	1	5
	12%	9%	-	16%	12%	41%	-	-	-	17%	16%	9%	-	9%	10%	27%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
	4%	6%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	10%	-	3%	24%	-	7%	-	6%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
	6%	10%	-	-	6%	-	-	32%	-	12%	-	5%	30%	-	5%	24%	6%
At all sites across your company	3	3	-	-	3	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	-	4
	10%	16%	-	-	10%	-	21%	-	8%	16%	13%	7%	21%	21%	7%	-	13%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 292

Q11.9 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed point of use heaters since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	31	-	-	5	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	2	2	6	3	-	3	1	-	5	-	31
Weighted total	29**	-**	-**	4**	-**	-**	1**	-**	2**	1**	-**	2**	3**	4**	4**	-**	3**	1**	-**	4**	-**	31*
At one main site	8	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	8
	29%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%	-	41%	52%	-	38%	-	-	19%	-	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	3	-	10
	39%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	46%	-	-	79%	13%	24%	-	41%	100%	-	68%	-	-	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	12%	-	-	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%	19%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54%	-	-	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
At all sites across your company	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	4
	10%	-	-	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	21%	-	-	13%	-	13%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 293

Q11.8-9 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Summary

Base: all participants who have installed hot water since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Distribution improvements	Point of use heaters
Unweighted total	27	31
Weighted total	26	29
At one main site	9 34%	8 29%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12 46%	11 39%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	1 5%	3 12%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1 4%	1 4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	2 6%
At all sites across your company	2 6%	3 10%
Don't know	1 4%	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 294

Q11.10 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	186	170	5	11	7	13	9	13	11	4	44	32	20	15	3	3	11	92	91	186
Weighted total	183	159	3**	21**	5**	13**	8**	14**	11**	4**	46*	28**	18**	15**	4**	5**	11**	89*	91*	186
At one main site	39	32	1	6	2	4	1	2	4	2	9	3	7	-	-	-	4	25	12	40
	22%	20%	43%	27%	34%	29%	8%	14%	40%	20%	12%	39%	-	-	-	34%	28% ^r	13%	13%	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	39	36	-	3	2	1	3	6	1	*	13	8	1	2	1	-	1	20	19	41
	22%	23%	-	16%	43%	11%	36%	44%	9%	10%	27%	29%	4%	12%	30%	-	13%	22%	21%	22%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	39	29	1	9	*	2	2	2	2	1	8	5	6	4	-	4	1	13	25	38
	21%	19%	17%	41%	10%	19%	21%	18%	21%	29%	17%	19%	33%	29%	-	66%	11%	15%	28%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	21	-	-	-	1	1	3	2	-	7	3	-	3	-	2	1	10	11	20
	12%	13%	-	-	-	5%	8%	24%	19%	-	15%	10%	-	18%	-	34%	8%	11%	13%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	10	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	3	1	1	2	1	-	2	5	7	13
	7%	7%	-	9%	-	15%	14%	-	-	-	7%	4%	5%	11%	17%	-	15%	6%	8%	7%
At all sites across your company	25	22	1	2	1	3	-	-	1	1	3	6	2	5	2	-	1	10	15	27
	14%	14%	40%	8%	13%	21%	-	-	12%	21%	6%	23%	12%	30%	53%	-	12%	11%	16%	15%
Don't know	7	7	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	1	6	1	7
	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	-	6%	3%	7%	-	-	-	7%	7%	1%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 295

Q11.10 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	186	-	186	30	36	49	46	9	14	57	14	58	4	26	17	107	133	52	186
Weighted total	183	-**	183	30**	33*	53*	42*	7**	15**	57*	15**	57*	4**	24**	19**	105*	132	50*	186
At one main site	39	-	39	9	11	11	4	1	1	12	4	14	-	7	7	21	28	11	40
	22%	-	22%	32%	34%f	20%	9%	11%	8%	20%	30%	24%	-	31%	38%	20%	21%	23%	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	39	-	39	6	4	12	10	4	3	10	5	10	1	3	2	24	32	6	41
	22%	-	22%	22%	13%	22%	25%	55%	17%	18%	36%	17%	18%	11%	9%	23%	24%	12%	22%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	39	-	39	6	5	10	13	-	5	13	-	13	1	7	4	21	27	12	38
	21%	-	21%	20%	15%	18%	31%	-	32%	22%	-	23%	16%	31%	19%	20%	20%	24%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	-	21	-	5	8	4	1	3	6	1	8	1	1	4	14	17	5	20
	12%	-	12%	-	16%	15%	10%	11%	20%	10%	4%	14%	22%	2%	19%	14%	13%	9%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	-	12	4	1	2	2	1	3	1	2	5	2	1	-	8	8	4	13
	7%	-	7%	12%	3%	4%	4%	11%	18%	3%	13%	8%	45%	5%	-	8%	6%	9%	7%
At all sites across your company	25	-	25	3	6	10	5	1	-	11	3	5	-	4	3	11	17	8	27
	14%	-	14%	10%	18%	19%	12%	-	-	19%	18%	10%	-	17%	15%	11%	13%	15%	15%
Don't know	7	-	7	1	-	1	4	-	1	4	-	2	-	1	-	5	3	4	7
	4%	-	4%	4%	-	2%	9%	-	5%	8%	-	4%	-	3%	-	5%	2%	7%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 296

Q11.10 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	186	35	102	20	26	36	117	154	24	31	33	80	12	51	142	56	21	35	40	186
Weighted total	183	35**	98*	20**	24**	34*	111*	150	21**	27**	35**	80*	9**	45*	137	52*	19**	29*	43*	186
At one main site	39	7	25	3	4	4	26	30	2	6	6	16	2	10	32	4	6	8	7	40
	22% ^o	20%	26%	13%	17%	13%	23%	20%	8%	21%	18%	20%	20%	21%	23% ^o	9%	32%	28% ^o	16%	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	39	9	18	4	6	8	25	34	2	4	4	14	3	10	25	11	3	4	13	41
	22%	26%	18%	20%	24%	23%	22%	22%	11%	13%	13%	18%	35%	22%	18%	22%	13%	14%	30%	22%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	39	8	21	3	5	8	21	32	9	4	11	19	1	10	30	13	2	4	8	38
	21%	22%	22%	13%	20%	24%	18%	21%	43%	16%	31%	24%	11%	21%	22%	24%	8%	13%	19%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	4	9	4	4	6	13	20	2	4	4	12	1	5	19	7	5	4	3	20
	12%	12%	9%	21%	16%	18%	12%	14%	11%	16%	11%	15%	16%	10%	14%	14%	25%	14%	6%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	2	8	1	1	1	8	9	1	1	4	8	1	1	8	5	1	1	4	13
	7%	5%	8%	5%	5%	3%	7%	6%	6%	4%	10%	9%	7%	1%	6%	10%	4%	5%	9%	7%
At all sites across your company	25	5	12	6	3	3	15	20	4	7	6	10	1	9	18	8	2	6	7	27
	14%	13%	12%	27%	12%	10%	14%	14%	17%	27%	17%	13%	12%	19%	13%	16%	9%	20%	15%	15%
Don't know	7	1	5	-	2	3	3	5	1	1	-	2	-	2	5	3	2	2	2	7
	4%	2%	5%	-	6%	9%	3%	4%	4%	3%	-	2%	-	6%	4%	5%	8%	6%	4%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 297

Q11.10 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	186	129	7	48	186	18	49	24	33	25	50	86	45	42	100	39	186
Weighted total	183	125	8**	46*	183	16**	51*	22**	30**	27**	49*	83*	44*	42*	97*	36*	186
At one main site	39	24	1	12	39	8	14	4	2	4	9	18	11	8	21	8	40
	22%	19%	15%	27%	22%	50%	27%	17%	7%	16%	18%	22%	26%	19%	22%	23%	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	39	26	2	10	39	4	12	7	6	4	16	15	5	17	16	4	41
	22%	20%	22%	22%	22%	25%	23%	32%	19%	14%	33% <i>f</i>	18%	11%	40% <i>zno</i>	17%	10%	22%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	39	31	4	4	39	2	12	3	12	4	9	17	10	5	25	7	38
	21%	24% <i>c</i>	48%	9%	21%	10%	24%	13%	39%	14%	18%	21%	24%	12%	25%	19%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	17	-	5	21	1	4	2	1	10	3	15	3	3	15	4	20
	12%	13%	-	10%	12%	6%	8%	11%	5%	37%	6%	18%	7%	6%	15%	10%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	8	-	4	12	-	4	1	2	1	3	7	3	4	7	2	13
	7%	6%	-	9%	7%	-	9%	5%	6%	5%	5%	8%	6%	9%	7%	5%	7%
At all sites across your company	25	14	1	10	25	1	4	4	6	3	6	9	9	3	10	11	27
	14%	11%	14%	21%	14%	4%	8%	20%	20%	11%	13%	10%	21%	7%	10%	31% <i>zmn</i>	15%
Don't know	7	6	-	1	7	1	-	1	1	1	4	2	2	3	3	1	7
	4%	5%	-	2%	4%	5%	-	3%	3%	3%	8%	2%	3%	7%	3%	2%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 298

Q11.10 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	186	4	1	33	4	2	6	21	13	2	11	7	9	15	5	1	9	9	7	26	1	186
Weighted total	183	5**	1**	27**	3**	1**	4**	27**	11**	2**	11**	8**	8**	10**	7**	2**	10**	8**	12**	25**	2**	186
At one main site	39	-	-	5	1	*	6	1	1	4	1	4	4	4	-	-	1	1	2	7	-	40
	22%	-	-	19%	47%	34%	12%	21%	7%	55%	39%	17%	45%	35%	-	-	12%	11%	17%	29%	-	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	39	3	-	4	-	-	4	4	3	-	2	1	2	4	4	-	3	3	-	6	-	41
	22%	60%	-	16%	-	-	12%	15%	27%	-	16%	12%	28%	38%	56%	-	30%	35%	-	24%	-	22%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	39	-	1	4	1	-	2	8	3	-	1	1	1	2	-	2	2	1	6	4	2	38
	21%	-	100%	13%	34%	-	41%	28%	23%	-	12%	17%	8%	21%	-	100%	17%	15%	48%	16%	100%	20%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	1	-	4	-	1	-	3	2	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	3	-	20
	12%	18%	-	15%	-	66%	-	13%	17%	45%	-	33%	-	-	-	-	-	21%	17%	12%	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	1	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	-	13
	7%	22%	-	10%	-	-	15%	-	-	-	7%	21%	8%	-	28%	-	13%	-	9%	4%	-	7%
At all sites across your company	25	-	-	5	-	-	-	4	3	-	3	-	1	1	-	-	3	1	1	4	-	27
	14%	-	-	20%	-	-	-	13%	26%	-	24%	-	11%	6%	-	-	28%	18%	8%	15%	-	15%
Don't know	7	-	-	2	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	4%	-	-	7%	19%	-	21%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 299

Q11.11 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	111	102	2	7	5	9	6	11	7	1	24	23	11	8	1	1	3	59	51	111
Weighted total	112*	98*	1**	12**	4**	7**	5**	11**	8**	1**	27**	23**	12**	8**	1**	1**	3**	57*	53*	111
At one main site	21	17	1	3	2	2	2	-	2	-	3	3	4	1	-	-	-	14	6	21
	18%	17%	55%	27%	35%	29%	46%	-	26%	-	12%	12%	32%	10%	-	-	-	25%	12%	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	26	-	4	1	2	-	3	3	-	9	8	3	-	1	-	1	19	10	28
	27%	26%	-	31%	16%	37%	-	25%	32%	-	32%	34%	25%	-	100%	-	27%	34%	18%	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	14	14	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	4	3	1	3	-	1	-	4	10	18
	13%	14%	45%	-	-	-	34%	13%	-	-	13%	15%	5%	38%	-	100%	-	8%	18%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	9	-	2	2	1	-	1	1	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	9	9
	9%	9%	-	14%	39%	10%	-	8%	16%	-	15%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	17%q	8%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6	6	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	4	6
	5%	6%	-	-	10%	-	-	14%	-	-	7%	-	14%	-	-	-	-	3%	7%	5%
At all sites across your company	21	17	-	3	-	2	-	1	2	1	4	4	2	4	-	-	1	9	12	20
	19%	18%	-	28%	-	24%	-	8%	27%	100%	13%	19%	19%	51%	-	-	41%	16%	22%	18%
Don't know	10	10	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	2	3	1	-	-	-	1	7	4	9
	9%	10%	-	-	-	-	20%	32%	-	-	7%	12%	5%	-	-	-	32%	12%	7%	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 300

Q11.11 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	111	-	111	23	23	34	21	2	6	34	4	33	2	13	14	63	84	26	111
Weighted total	112*	-**	112*	21**	23**	37**	20**	1**	7**	34*	4**	33**	2**	14**	15**	62*	84*	27**	111
At one main site	21	-	21	7	3	7	2	-	1	8	-	8	-	2	2	13	15	6	21
18%	18%	-	18%	30%	13%	18%	8%	-	18%	25%	-	24%	-	17%	13%	21%	17%	23%	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	-	30	5	4	12	7	1	1	6	3	9	1	3	5	18	26	3	28
27%	27%	-	27%	22%	19%	32%	33%	60%	11%	17%	67%	28%	42%	21%	34%	30%	31%	12%	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	14	-	14	2	2	4	5	1	1	2	1	1	-	3	3	7	11	3	18
13%	13%	-	13%	10%	8%	11%	24%	40%	16%	7%	13%	4%	-	20%	18%	11%	13%	12%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	-	10	2	3	1	3	-	2	3	-	3	1	-	1	5	6	4	9
9%	9%	-	9%	8%	12%	3%	15%	-	24%	10%	-	10%	58%	-	8%	9%	7%	17%	8%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6	-	6	3	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	5	4	2	6
5%	5%	-	5%	13%	-	4%	-	-	18%	5%	-	5%	-	-	-	8%	4%	7%	5%
At all sites across your company	21	-	21	3	8	8	1	-	-	8	1	6	-	3	4	6	16	4	20
19%	19%	-	19%	13%	37%	22%	7%	-	-	23%	20%	19%	-	20%	27%	10%	19%	15%	18%
Don't know	10	-	10	1	3	4	2	-	1	5	-	3	-	3	-	7	7	4	9
9%	9%	-	9%	3%	11%	10%	12%	-	12%	14%	-	10%	-	22%	-	12%	8%	14%	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 301

Q11.11 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	111	27	58	10	16	25	70	95	15	17	25	47	7	30	81	25	10	20	27	111
Weighted total	112*	27**	58*	9**	18**	26**	65*	93*	13**	16**	25**	46*	6**	28**	78*	23**	10**	17**	30**	111
At one main site	21	7	13	1	-	5	11	16	-	3	3	7	1	7	17	3	3	5	4	21
	18%	25%	23%	9%	-	20%	16%	17%	-	21%	11%	16%	11%	25%	21%	14%	27%	33%	13%	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	7	18	*	4	7	18	25	3	2	6	14	2	5	17	4	-	2	12	28
	27%	27%	30%	5%	24%	27%	28%	26%	24%	10%	25%	30%	26%	18%	21%	19%	-	12%	38%	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	14	2	8	3	1	6	8	13	3	1	4	8	2	4	11	3	1	2	4	18
	13%	8%	13%	40%	6%	22%	12%	14%	25%	4%	14%	17%	30%	14%	14%	12%	11%	14%	12%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	3	4	2	1	1	6	9	2	2	2	5	-	3	6	5	2	1	4	9
	9%	10%	8%	28%	5%	6%	9%	9%	17%	14%	8%	11%	-	11%	8%	20%	23%	9%	13%	8%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6	*	2	-	3	*	3	4	*	4	-	4	-	-	5	2	-	-	1	6
	5%	2%	3%	-	19%	2%	5%	4%	4%	25%	-	9%	-	-	6%	10%	-	-	3%	5%
At all sites across your company	21	6	9	-	6	2	14	18	3	4	10	7	2	5	17	4	1	4	4	20
	19%	22%	15%	-	34%	9%	22%	19%	25%	26%	42%	15%	33%	20%	22%	15%	11%	22%	13%	18%
Don't know	10	2	5	1	2	4	5	10	1	-	-	1	-	3	6	2	3	2	3	9
	9%	7%	8%	17%	11%	15%	8%	10%	5%	-	-	2%	-	12%	8%	8%	29%	11%	9%	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 302

Q11.11 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	111	73	4	32	111	11	33	17	18	7	29	53	24	28	60	20	111
Weighted total	112*	71*	6**	31**	112*	12**	34**	17**	17**	6**	30**	55*	21**	28**	61*	17**	111
At one main site	21	9	1	9	21	1	10	2	1	1	7	9	3	7	8	4	21
	18%	13%	21%	28%	18%	5%	30%	10%	4%	17%	25%	16%	14%	26%	13%	21%	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	21	2	7	30	5	11	5	4	1	8	19	3	8	20	1	28
	27%	30%	35%	21%	27%	39%	32%	29%	25%	8%	26%	34%	16%	29%	33%	8%	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	14	13	-	1	14	1	3	3	4	1	4	7	3	3	10	1	18
	13%	19%	-	4%	13%	8%	8%	20%	26%	9%	13%	13%	16%	9%	17%	8%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	8	-	3	10	3	1	1	1	3	3	4	3	3	5	2	9
	9%	11%	-	9%	9%	22%	4%	5%	7%	54%	11%	8%	13%	12%	7%	14%	8%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6	4	-	2	6	-	1	2	1	-	-	4	2	-	4	1	6
	5%	6%	-	5%	5%	-	2%	13%	5%	-	-	6%	10%	-	7%	8%	5%
At all sites across your company	21	11	2	8	21	1	8	4	4	-	4	9	5	4	11	7	20
	19%	15%	44%	24%	19%	9%	24%	23%	23%	-	15%	17%	26%	12%	17%	38%	18%
Don't know	10	6	-	3	10	2	-	-	2	1	3	4	1	3	4	1	9
	9%	8%	-	9%	9%	17%	-	-	9%	13%	10%	6%	4%	11%	6%	5%	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 303

Q11.11 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	111	5	1	26	3	-	3	12	7	1	4	4	4	6	1	-	6	5	5	18	-	111
Weighted total	112*	6**	1**	23**	2**	-**	2**	14**	6**	1**	4**	4**	3**	5**	2**	-**	7**	6**	8**	18**	-**	111
At one main site	21	1	-	6	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	7	-	21
	18%	16%	-	24%	27%	-	-	9%	-	-	40%	37%	18%	-	-	-	-	-	27%	36%	-	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	4	-	2	-	-	-	6	2	-	1	-	3	2	-	1	-	-	2	5	-	28
	27%	65%	-	10%	-	-	24%	45%	33%	-	16%	-	63%	100%	-	13%	-	-	26%	27%	-	25%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	14	1	1	3	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	18
	13%	19%	100%	12%	46%	-	31%	10%	-	-	-	32%	25%	-	-	-	19%	18%	12%	12%	-	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	9
	9%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	20%	100%	-	63%	-	-	-	-	-	67%	-	-	-	8%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	6
	5%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	16%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	-	5%	-	5%
At all sites across your company	21	-	-	5	-	-	1	1	3	-	2	-	1	-	-	5	-	2	2	2	-	20
	19%	-	-	23%	-	-	44%	7%	39%	-	44%	-	13%	-	-	69%	-	29%	9%	9%	-	18%
Don't know	10	-	-	5	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	9
	9%	-	-	21%	26%	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	11%	-	-	8%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 304

Q11.12 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	224	209	4	11	9	19	15	16	15	8	46	42	17	17	3	4	12	110	110	224
Weighted total	225	201	2**	22**	7**	19**	12**	18**	17**	8**	52*	37*	15**	17**	4**	7**	11**	110*	110*	224
At one main site	39	36	1	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	10	5	3	1	-	-	6	25	11	40
	17%	18%	25%	10%	24%	11%	12%	14%	16%	33%	19%	13%	19%	7%	-	-	48%	23% <i>r</i>	10%	18%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	52	48	*	4	*	4	5	7	7	*	11	12	2	2	1	-	1	24	26	54
	23%	24%	20%	18%	7%	20%	39%	40%	41%	6%	21%	32%	16%	11%	30%	-	6%	22%	23%	24%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	54	47	1	6	2	4	4	4	1	3	13	6	2	6	2	5	1	26	27	52
	24%	23%	25%	29%	36%	22%	32%	24%	7%	37%	24%	15%	16%	37%	53%	73%	9%	24%	25%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	19	-	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	5	2	3	-	-	-	1	8	13	21
	9%	10%	-	8%	26%	17%	4%	10%	12%	12%	10%	5%	19%	-	-	-	7%	7%	12%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	18	16	-	2	-	4	2	-	-	-	5	4	2	1	-	-	1	9	9	17
	8%	8%	-	9%	-	20%	13%	-	-	-	10%	10%	11%	5%	-	-	10%	8%	8%	8%
At all sites across your company	33	26	1	6	-	2	-	1	4	1	4	9	2	7	1	2	-	12	21	32
	15%	13%	31%	26%	-	10%	-	7%	24%	12%	8%	26% <i>j</i>	15%	40%	17%	27%	-	11%	19%	14%
Don't know	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	5	-	1	-	-	-	2	5	3	8
	4%	4%	-	-	7%	-	-	5%	-	-	9%	-	4%	-	-	-	20%	5%	3%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 305

Q11.12 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	224	-	224	37	47	60	53	12	14	78	16	67	6	30	29	123	167	55	224
Weighted total	225	-**	225	39*	45*	66*	49*	10**	14**	80*	18**	67*	6**	29**	34**	120	167	56*	224
At one main site	39	-	39	9	11	13	1	2	2	17	5	10	-	5	11	20	28	11	40
	17% ^f	-	17%	24% ^f	24% ^f	20% ^f	2%	19%	14%	21%	30%	15%	-	16%	33%	17%	17%	19%	18%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	52	-	52	8	7	16	17	3	2	14	4	14	2	4	3	33	41	10	54
	23%	-	23%	20%	15%	24%	35% ^d	26%	12%	17%	19%	21%	31%	16%	9%	27%	24%	19%	24%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	54	-	54	9	10	14	12	1	7	18	1	18	1	6	8	35	46	8	52
	24%	-	24%	24%	23%	22%	25%	5%	49%	23%	7%	26%	22%	21%	22%	29%	27%	14%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	-	21	2	6	3	6	2	3	8	2	5	1	4	2	10	13	8	21
	9%	-	9%	4%	12%	4%	13%	16%	19%	10%	12%	8%	15%	16%	5%	8%	8%	14%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	18	-	18	7	2	6	2	1	-	4	5	6	2	3	3	7	12	6	17
	8%	-	8%	18%	6%	8%	4%	7%	-	5%	25%	8%	32%	10%	9%	5%	7%	10%	8%
At all sites across your company	33	-	33	3	9	14	4	3	-	16	1	9	-	4	7	13	21	11	32
	15%	-	15%	9%	20%	21%	8%	27%	-	20%	7%	14%	-	16%	22%	10%	12%	20%	14%
Don't know	9	-	9	1	-	1	6	-	1	3	-	6	-	2	-	3	7	2	8
	4%	-	4%	2%	-	1%	13% ^{zde}	-	6%	3%	-	8%	-	6%	-	2%	4%	3%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 306

Q11.12 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	224	51	117	22	31	40	149	189	29	34	40	98	11	56	171	71	22	41	50	224
Weighted total	225	53*	115*	22**	29**	39*	144	187	25**	30*	40*	99*	10**	50*	168	66*	20**	35*	55*	224
At one main site	39	11	20	2	5	7	26	33	2	5	5	21	3	5	33	10	5	10	5	40
	17%	21%	18%	8%	18%	18%	18%	18%	6%	15%	12%	21%	28%	10%	20%	16%	26%	27% ^r	10%	18%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	52	12	23	5	8	10	36	48	6	3	11	19	5	14	31	14	2	3	21	54
	23% ^q	22%	20%	24%	28%	27%	25%	25%	24%	10%	28%	19%	50%	28%	18%	22%	9%	8%	37% ^{nq}	24%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	54	12	29	7	7	11	27	41	9	7	8	29	1	12	45	19	6	9	8	52
	24%	22%	25%	32%	22%	29%	19%	22%	36%	24%	19%	29%	11%	23%	27%	28%	31%	24%	14%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	3	15	1	2	3	15	18	3	5	4	10	-	7	15	10	3	3	5	21
	9%	5%	13%	5%	8%	8%	10%	10%	13%	17%	9%	10%	-	13%	9%	15%	12%	7%	10%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	18	5	9	2	2	1	13	14	2	5	4	10	-	1	13	4	1	5	5	17
	8%	10%	8%	11%	5%	3%	9%	8%	7%	15%	10%	10%	-	3%	8%	6%	6%	13%	8%	8%
At all sites across your company	33	10	15	4	4	3	21	24	3	5	9	10	1	9	25	7	1	5	8	32
	15%	19%	13%	17%	13%	7%	14%	13%	13%	18%	23%	10%	12%	19%	15%	11%	5%	14%	14%	14%
Don't know	9	1	4	1	2	3	6	9	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	2	2	2	4	8
	4%	1%	4%	4%	5%	8%	4%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	5% ^k	3%	2%	10%	6%	8%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 307

Q11.12 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	224	149	9	65	224	20	64	33	35	28	59	104	53	56	117	45	224
Weighted total	225	149	10**	64*	225	20**	67*	31**	32*	29**	58*	105*	51*	57*	120*	41*	224
At one main site	39	27	2	10	39	6	15	2	3	2	13	16	9	13	16	9	40
	17%	18%	19%	15%	17%	30%	22%	8%	9%	5%	22%	15%	18%	23%	14%	23%	18%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	52	39	1	13	52	6	13	10	8	4	14	26	8	15	30	3	54
	23% ^o	26%	9%	20%	23%	32%	19%	33%	26%	15%	23%	25%	16%	27% ^o	25% ^o	9%	24%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	54	37	3	14	54	3	22	10	7	7	12	27	15	10	29	14	52
	24%	25%	26%	22%	24%	16%	32%	32%	21%	25%	20%	26%	29%	17%	24%	35%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	14	2	5	21	3	4	-	5	6	4	15	2	4	15	1	21
	9%	9%	19%	8%	9%	17%	6%	-	17%	19%	7%	14%	4%	7%	13%	4%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	18	9	-	7	18	-	8	4	2	4	2	9	5	2	9	5	17
	8%	6%	-	12%	8%	-	12%	13%	7%	13%	3%	8%	11%	3%	8%	12%	8%
At all sites across your company	33	19	2	11	33	1	6	4	6	6	7	12	11	7	19	7	32
	15%	13%	23%	17%	15%	5%	9%	13%	20%	21%	13%	11%	22%	11%	16%	17%	14%
Don't know	9	4	*	4	9	-	-	-	-	1	6	1	1	6	1	1	8
	4%	3%	4%	6%	4%	-	-	1%	-	3%	11% ^{zk}	1%	2%	11% ^{zn}	*	2%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 308

Q11.12 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	224	5	1	49	4	2	6	28	13	3	13	5	9	14	6	1	11	12	9	32	1	224
Weighted total	225	6**	1**	44*	3**	1**	4**	35**	11**	4**	12**	6**	8**	10**	8**	2**	11**	12**	15**	31**	2**	224
At one main site	39	-	-	12	1	*	4	1	2	2	2	1	1	3	-	-	1	-	2	8	-	40
	17%	-	-	27%	47%	34%	12%	12%	5%	48%	20%	15%	9%	32%	-	-	9%	-	13%	25%	-	18%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	52	5	-	6	-	-	-	10	3	-	2	1	3	4	4	-	2	2	4	7	-	54
	23%	84%	-	13%	-	-	12%	28%	25%	-	17%	16%	35%	42%	47%	-	20%	13%	29%	22%	-	24%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	54	-	1	12	1	-	2	12	4	-	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	4	2	52
	24%	-	100%	27%	34%	-	56%	34%	33%	-	11%	28%	10%	20%	16%	100%	26%	18%	23%	12%	100%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21	1	-	3	-	1	-	2	1	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	4	2	3	3	-	21
	9%	16%	-	7%	-	66%	-	19%	24%	12%	41%	7%	-	-	-	-	35%	13%	9%	9%	-	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	18	-	-	5	-	-	-	3	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	4	-	17
	8%	-	-	12%	-	-	-	7%	8%	-	6%	-	-	23%	-	-	8%	13%	11%	-	-	8%
At all sites across your company	33	-	-	4	-	-	1	5	1	1	3	-	3	1	-	-	5	2	1	6	-	32
	15%	-	-	9%	-	-	21%	13%	11%	28%	22%	-	39%	6%	-	-	46%	20%	9%	20%	-	14%
Don't know	9	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	*	-	8
	4%	-	-	5%	19%	-	-	5%	-	-	12%	-	-	-	14%	-	-	7%	-	1%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 309

Q11.13 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	160	150	3	7	5	13	11	12	11	7	30	30	14	13	2	3	8	75	84	160
Weighted total	157	143	2**	13**	4**	12**	9**	13**	10**	7**	32**	27**	14**	14**	3**	4**	7**	73*	83*	160
At one main site	31	29	-	2	1	1	2	2	4	2	4	4	4	1	-	-	3	21	8	31
	19%	20%	-	13%	30%	7%	20%	19%	41%	24%	13%	15%	29%	6%	-	-	47%	29%	10%	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	26	*	4	*	3	2	3	3	1	8	7	2	1	-	-	1	12	18	31
	19%	18%	26%	31%	11%	25%	16%	25%	25%	12%	23%	26%	15%	11%	-	-	10%	16%	22%	19%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	41	39	1	2	-	3	3	3	-	2	11	4	3	5	2	4	1	22	20	39
	26%	27%	33%	14%	-	25%	32%	23%	-	27%	16%	20%	40%	75%	100%	20%	30%	24%	24%	24%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	11	-	2	2	-	1	1	3	1	3	-	1	1	-	-	1	3	9	15
	8%	7%	-	14%	58%	-	6%	7%	27%	13%	8%	-	6%	8%	-	-	8%	4%	11%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	7	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	1	3	5	9
	5%	5%	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	-	2%	9%	6%	6%	-	-	16%	4%	6%	6%
At all sites across your company	28	24	1	3	-	4	-	3	1	2	3	9	3	4	1	-	-	10	18	28
	18%	17%	41%	28%	-	35%	-	20%	7%	24%	10%	33%	19%	28%	25%	-	-	14%	22%	18%
Don't know	7	7	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	4	7
	4%	5%	-	-	-	7%	9%	6%	-	-	10%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	3%	5%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 310

Q11.13 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	160	-	160	25	38	40	40	6	11	53	11	52	6	24	22	85	115	45	160
Weighted total	157	-**	157	25**	35*	44*	36*	5**	11**	51*	10**	54*	5**	23**	23**	81*	112*	45*	160
At one main site	31	-	31	8	9	9	3	-	2	15	1	9	1	4	5	19	23	8	31
19%	-	-	19%	31%	25%	19%	9%	-	18%	30%	10%	17%	19%	18%	20%	23%	20%	18%	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	-	30	4	6	6	11	2	2	8	3	10	2	2	3	19	22	8	31
19%	-	-	19%	17%	16%	13%	32%	32%	16%	16%	30%	19%	37%	10%	14%	24%	20%	18%	19%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	41	-	41	6	8	13	8	1	6	9	3	18	1	6	9	21	30	11	39
26%	-	-	26%	22%	23%	29%	23%	17%	49%	18%	24%	33%	26%	26%	38%	26%	27%	25%	24%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	-	12	2	2	2	4	-	2	6	2	2	1	1	-	9	7	5	15
8%	-	-	8%	9%	6%	4%	12%	-	17%	11%	15%	4%	18%	5%	-	10%	6%	12%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	-	7	2	1	2	2	1	-	2	1	1	-	2	-	4	5	2	9
5%	-	-	5%	7%	4%	4%	5%	16%	-	5%	9%	2%	-	8%	-	5%	5%	5%	6%
At all sites across your company	28	-	28	3	9	11	3	2	-	10	1	9	-	7	6	8	21	8	28
18%	-	-	18%	11%	26%	26%	9%	35%	-	19%	12%	16%	-	29%	25%	10%	18%	17%	18%
Don't know	7	-	7	1	-	3	3	-	-	1	-	5	-	1	1	1	4	3	7
4%	-	-	4%	2%	-	6%	9%	-	-	2%	-	9%	-	4%	4%	2%	3%	6%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 311

Q11.13 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	160	33	89	17	19	30	106	136	18	21	30	73	7	46	119	49	18	30	39	160
Weighted total	157	33**	84*	16**	20**	30**	100*	132	14**	18**	32**	74*	5**	42*	114	45*	17**	27**	41*	160
At one main site	31	9	15	2	5	3	22	27	-	3	6	18	1	6	25	7	5	9	5	31
	19%	28%	17%	11%	24%	11%	23%	20%	-	19%	17%	25%	23%	14%	22%	16%	29%	34%	13%	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	8	14	2	4	9	16	26	4	3	6	10	1	9	15	8	1	1	14	31
	19%	23%	16%	11%	20%	30%	16%	19%	29%	14%	19%	14%	16%	21%	13%	19%	4%	5%	34%	19%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	41	6	26	5	5	10	25	34	4	3	9	25	2	8	33	12	6	6	8	39
	26%	19%	31%	29%	23%	35%	25%	26%	29%	14%	29%	34%	50%	19%	29%	27%	36%	23%	20%	24%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	2	7	3	-	1	8	10	2	1	-	3	1	4	9	7	2	1	4	15
	8%	7%	9%	18%	-	4%	8%	8%	12%	6%	-	5%	12%	11%	7%	15%	13%	5%	9%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	-	6	*	1	1	5	6	2	2	4	6	-	1	7	3	1	4	-	9
	5%	-	7%	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%	13%	11%	12%	8%	-	3%	7%	7%	8%	13%	-	6%
At all sites across your company	28	6	14	4	4	4	18	23	2	7	6	10	-	10	21	5	1	6	7	28
	18%	19%	17%	23%	21%	13%	18%	17%	17%	37%	20%	13%	-	25%	18%	12%	6%	21%	18%	18%
Don't know	7	1	3	1	2	1	5	7	-	-	1	2	-	3	3	2	1	-	2	7
	4%	4%	3%	5%	8%	4%	5%	5%	-	-	3%	2%	-	8%	3%	4%	4%	-	6%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 312

Q11.13 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	160	106	6	48	160	14	44	27	27	21	44	71	41	42	81	32	160
Weighted total	157	104*	7**	47*	157	14**	45*	27**	24**	21**	43*	70*	39*	41*	82*	29**	160
At one main site	31	16	2	12	31	5	13	5	4	1	11	10	10	11	11	9	31
	19%	15%	38%	26%	19%	38%	30%	18%	16%	5%	25%	14%	27%	26%	14%	30%	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	24	1	6	30	3	6	7	4	4	12	9	7	10	13	4	31
	19%	23%	12%	12%	19%	21%	13%	26%	19%	19%	28%	12%	19%	26%	15%	15%	19%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	41	27	2	12	41	3	14	7	7	7	7	24	10	7	29	6	39
	26%	26%	30%	26%	26%	23%	32%	27%	27%	34%	16%	34%	27%	17%	35%	20%	24%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	10	-	2	12	3	-	-	2	6	2	8	3	2	8	3	15
	8%	10%	-	4%	8%	18%	-	-	9%	29%	4%	11%	7%	4%	10%	9%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	3	-	4	7	-	1	2	2	2	-	4	4	-	4	4	9
	5%	3%	-	9%	5%	-	3%	7%	9%	9%	-	6%	9%	-	5%	13%	6%
At all sites across your company	28	19	1	8	28	-	9	6	4	1	8	14	4	6	18	4	28
	18%	18%	20%	18%	18%	-	20%	21%	16%	4%	18%	20%	11%	16%	21%	13%	18%
Don't know	7	4	-	2	7	-	1	-	1	-	4	2	-	4	1	-	7
	4%	4%	-	5%	4%	-	1%	-	4%	-	8%	3%	-	11% <i>n</i>	1%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 313

Q11.13 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	(u)
Unweighted total	160	3	1	34	3	2	4	20	8	2	10	3	5	8	5	-	11	11	8	21	1	160
Weighted total	157	4**	1**	31*	3**	1**	3**	25**	6**	2**	8**	3**	4**	5**	6**	**	11**	10**	13**	20**	2**	160
At one main site	31	-	-	10	1	-	-	5	-	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	2	5	-	31
	19%	-	-	34%	34%	34%	-	22%	-	55%	19%	-	-	39%	-	-	9%	8%	15%	24%	-	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	30	2	-	1	-	-	1	7	3	-	1	1	2	1	4	-	-	2	2	3	-	31
	19%	45%	-	5%	-	-	27%	30%	58%	-	15%	27%	59%	13%	61%	-	-	4%	16%	18%	13%	19%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	41	-	1	9	1	-	1	7	1	-	2	2	1	2	1	-	2	1	5	4	2	39
	26%	-	100%	29%	42%	-	45%	28%	10%	-	24%	48%	23%	35%	21%	-	18%	11%	41%	21%	100%	24%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	1	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	3	-	2	-	15
	8%	30%	-	7%	-	66%	-	-	18%	45%	-	-	17%	-	-	-	6%	33%	-	8%	-	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	9
	5%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	14%	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	15%	4%	-	6%
At all sites across your company	28	1	-	3	-	-	1	5	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	7	1	1	6	-	28
	18%	25%	-	11%	-	-	27%	20%	-	-	33%	-	-	-	-	-	63%	14%	10%	30%	-	18%
Don't know	7	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	7
	4%	-	-	8%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	25%	-	-	13%	18%	-	-	8%	-	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 314

Q11.14 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	143	135	1	7	6	14	12	13	10	6	18	28	13	11	3	3	6	74	67	143
Weighted total	140	125	***	14**	3**	14**	10**	13**	12**	6**	18**	26**	12**	11**	4**	5**	5**	72*	65*	143
At one main site	30	30	-	-	2	3	3	4	4	1	3	4	4	1	2	-	1	19	9	32
	21%	24%	-	-	53%	20%	29%	31%	31%	15%	15%	13%	31%	8%	53%	-	20%	26%	14%	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	24	22	-	2	-	2	2	3	3	1	2	7	1	-	1	2	1	12	12	25
	17%	18%	-	11%	-	12%	16%	26%	27%	13%	13%	27%	5%	-	30%	34%	11%	16%	19%	17%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	33	26	*	6	2	4	2	-	1	2	6	5	2	5	-	4	1	17	16	33
	24%	21%	100%	46%	47%	29%	22%	-	13%	39%	31%	18%	16%	43%	-	66%	13%	24%	24%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	6	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	4	7
	4%	5%	-	-	-	5%	18%	-	-	17%	-	3%	7%	-	-	-	-	2%	7%	5%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	11	-	2	-	3	2	1	-	-	2	1	2	2	-	-	1	4	9	14
	9%	9%	-	14%	-	19%	17%	7%	-	-	12%	5%	13%	17%	-	-	16%	5%	14%	10%
At all sites across your company	29	25	-	4	-	2	-	2	4	1	4	7	3	4	1	-	1	16	13	28
	21%	20%	-	29%	-	16%	-	18%	30%	17%	24%	26%	27%	32%	17%	-	24%	22%	21%	20%
Don't know	5	5	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	4	1	4
	3%	4%	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	6%	8%	-	-	-	-	16%	6%	1%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 315

Q11.14 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	143	-	143	20	31	40	33	7	11	60	10	28	4	17	16	87	107	36	143
Weighted total	140	-**	140	22**	30**	43*	28**	6**	11**	60*	10**	26**	4**	18**	17**	85*	105*	34*	143
At one main site	30	-	30	5	9	9	5	-	1	17	2	4	-	2	6	19	25	4	32
	21%	-	21%	22%	29%	22%	18%	-	11%	29%	17%	16%	-	11%	38%	22%	24%	13%	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	24	-	24	4	5	4	5	4	2	10	1	4	1	2	3	16	20	4	25
	17%	-	17%	17%	18%	8%	16%	70%	22%	16%	12%	17%	24%	9%	18%	19%	19%	12%	17%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	33	-	33	6	4	9	9	-	4	12	-	9	1	5	2	22	25	8	33
	24%	-	24%	28%	13%	21%	34%	-	41%	20%	-	36%	28%	27%	13%	26%	24%	23%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	-	6	1	-	1	3	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	1	6	4	2	7
	4%	-	4%	2%	-	3%	12%	-	8%	4%	16%	-	-	-	3%	7%	4%	5%	5%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	-	13	4	1	4	1	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	1	6	7	6	14
	9%	-	9%	20%	4%	9%	3%	30%	11%	6%	29%	7%	49%	11%	3%	7%	7%	17%	10%
At all sites across your company	29	-	29	2	11	13	4	-	-	14	3	5	-	7	4	13	22	7	28
	21%	-	21%	10%	36%	29%	13%	-	-	23%	26%	20%	-	38%	24%	16%	21%	22%	20%
Don't know	5	-	5	-	-	3	1	-	1	2	-	1	-	1	-	3	2	3	4
	3%	-	3%	-	-	7%	4%	-	7%	3%	-	4%	-	5%	-	3%	2%	8%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 316

Q11.14 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	143	30	86	12	14	33	87	120	20	23	27	67	7	36	116	53	15	33	24	143
Weighted total	140	29**	83*	12**	14**	32**	81*	115	19**	20**	27**	67*	6**	33*	114*	48*	13**	28*	23**	143
At one main site	30	8	18	2	2	5	21	28	2	3	6	18	3	4	25	8	5	10	3	32
	21%	27%	22%	17%	12%	14%	26%	24%	10%	15%	20%	27%	54%	13%	22%	17%	42%	35%	14%	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	24	4	16	1	2	5	17	20	3	4	5	11	-	8	17	11	1	2	6	25
	17%	15%	19%	9%	11%	14%	21%	18%	16%	18%	17%	16%	-	25%	15%	22%	10%	9%	28%	17%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	33	7	21	4	1	10	16	25	6	1	7	17	-	9	28	13	3	4	5	33
	24%	24%	26%	35%	4%	30%	20%	22%	33%	6%	25%	25%	-	27%	24%	27%	26%	15%	24%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	2	3	-	1	1	4	5	1	1	-	3	1	1	4	3	-	-	2	7
	4%	6%	4%	-	10%	2%	5%	5%	5%	8%	-	4%	14%	4%	4%	6%	-	-	9%	5%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	2	8	*	3	4	6	9	1	3	3	7	1	-	10	5	1	3	3	14
	9%	7%	9%	4%	19%	12%	7%	8%	3%	17%	9%	10%	14%	-	9%	10%	7%	9%	12%	10%
At all sites across your company	29	6	15	4	4	6	16	23	6	7	8	11	1	9	25	8	1	7	3	28
	21%	21%	17%	35%	29%	18%	20%	20%	34%	37%	29%	16%	18%	28%	22%	16%	8%	26%	15%	20%
Don't know	5	-	3	-	2	3	2	5	-	-	-	1	-	1	5	1	1	2	-	4
	3%	-	3%	-	14%	10%	2%	4%	-	-	-	1%	-	3%	4%	2%	8%	6%	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 317

Q11.14 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	143	86	9	47	143	7	43	25	29	20	31	72	39	28	79	34	143
Weighted total	140	83*	10**	44*	140	8**	45*	23**	26**	20**	30**	69*	39*	28**	76*	33**	143
At one main site	30	12	4	14	30	2	14	5	4	4	8	12	9	8	11	9	32
	21%	15%	37%	31% ^a	21%	23%	31%	20%	14%	21%	28%	18%	24%	30%	15%	29%	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	24	14	-	9	24	3	6	4	3	6	6	13	5	4	17	3	25
	17%	17%	-	21%	17%	44%	12%	17%	13%	31%	19%	18%	14%	15%	22%	8%	17%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	33	22	4	7	33	-	12	5	8	4	4	21	8	7	20	6	33
	24%	27%	37%	16%	24%	-	27%	20%	29%	20%	15%	30%	21%	24%	26%	20%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	5	1	1	6	1	-	1	2	1	1	5	-	1	5	-	7
	4%	6%	8%	1%	4%	8%	-	6%	7%	4%	3%	8%	-	3%	7%	-	5%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	10	-	3	13	-	5	3	3	1	3	6	4	3	8	2	14
	9%	12%	-	8%	9%	-	10%	12%	11%	4%	9%	9%	11%	10%	10%	7%	10%
At all sites across your company	29	17	2	10	29	-	9	6	6	3	7	11	11	4	14	11	28
	21%	21%	18%	23%	21%	-	19%	25%	23%	15%	23%	16%	28%	14%	19%	34%	20%
Don't know	5	3	-	-	5	2	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4
	3%	3%	-	-	3%	26%	-	-	4%	4%	4%	1%	2%	4%	1%	2%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 318

Q11.14 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	143	4	1	39	1	2	4	16	16	2	6	1	5	5	3	1	8	5	6	17	1	143
Weighted total	140	5**	1**	35*	1**	1**	3**	19**	14**	2**	5**	1**	5**	4**	4**	2**	7**	5**	9**	15**	2**	143
At one main site	30	-	-	13	-	-	-	4	3	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	3	-	32
	21%	-	-	36%	-	-	-	23%	22%	-	33%	-	-	34%	-	-	13%	18%	15%	21%	-	22%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	24	3	-	3	-	-	1	4	2	2	1	-	2	2	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	25
	17%	60%	-	8%	-	-	29%	20%	18%	100%	12%	100%	-	50%	26%	-	-	46%	-	16%	-	17%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	33	-	1	5	1	1	1	6	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	1	1	5	2	2	33
	24%	-	100%	14%	100%	66%	52%	33%	10%	-	25%	-	39%	-	-	100%	14%	20%	62%	12%	100%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	-	-	3	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	7
	4%	-	-	7%	-	-	20%	8%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	5%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	1	-	3	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	2	2	-	14
	9%	22%	-	8%	-	-	-	8%	6%	-	-	-	-	47%	-	16%	-	-	23%	11%	-	10%
At all sites across your company	29	1	-	6	-	-	-	2	5	-	2	-	3	1	-	-	4	1	-	5	-	28
	21%	18%	-	16%	-	-	-	8%	39%	-	31%	-	61%	16%	-	-	56%	17%	-	34%	-	20%
Don't know	5	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	3%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 319

Q11.10-14 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Summary

Base: all participants who have installed lighting since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls	Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent	Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED	Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED	Replace external lighting with LED
Unweighted total	186	111	224	160	143
Weighted total	183	112	225	157	140
At one main site	39 22%	21 18%	39 17%	31 19%	30 21%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	39 22%	30 27%	52 23%	30 19%	24 17%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	39 21%	14 13%	54 24%	41 26%	33 24%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	21 12%	10 9%	21 9%	12 8%	6 4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12 7%	6 5%	18 8%	7 5%	13 9%
At all sites across your company	25 14%	21 19%	33 15%	28 18%	29 21%
Don't know	7 4%	10 9%	9 4%	7 4%	5 3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 320

Q11.15 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed PC power management since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	67	62	2	3	2	3	4	5	3	2	22	13	3	6	-	1	3	35	31	67
Weighted total	66*	60*	1**	5**	2**	3**	3**	7**	4**	1**	23**	10**	4**	6**	**	1**	2**	34**	32**	67*
At one main site	4	4	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	4	1	4
	6%	7%	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	5%	14%	-	-	-	100%	-	11%	2%	6%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	9	-	-	-	-	2	1	*	3	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	8	1	9
	13%	15%	-	-	-	-	24%	35%	33%	14%	16%	-	10%	-	-	-	-	23%	3%	13%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	3
	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	-	8%	4%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3
	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	8	-	4	1	2	-	-	-	5	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	5	7	10
	18%	13%	-	69%	69%	68%	-	-	-	21%	23%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	14%	21%	15%
At all sites across your company	29	28	1	-	1	1	3	3	3	1	8	5	2	3	-	-	1	13	16	33
	44%	47%	100%	-	31%	32%	85%	43%	65%	67%	35%	47%	37%	54%	-	-	47%	37%	50%	49%
Don't know	7	6	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	2	2	2	-	-	1	3	5	5
	11%	10%	-	31%	-	-	-	20%	-	9%	-	37%	36%	-	-	22%	7%	16%	7%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 321

Q11.15 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed PC power management since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	67	-	67	10	8	20	18	7	4	20	7	25	3	4	12	34	47	20	67
Weighted total	66*	-**	66*	8**	10**	22**	16**	7**	3**	22**	9**	24**	3**	5**	13**	29**	46*	20**	67*
At one main site	4	-	4	1	1	-	1	1	-	3	1	-	-	1	1	-	3	1	4
	6%	-	6%	6%	12%	-	9%	18%	-	13%	16%	-	-	25%	4%	-	7%	6%	6%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	-	9	-	1	5	2	1	-	2	-	6	-	-	1	4	7	2	9
	13%	-	13%	-	12%	22%	12%	9%	-	9%	-	27%	-	-	9%	14%	15%	9%	13%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	3	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	3
	4%	-	4%	-	-	-	11%	-	22%	-	-	2%	-	-	9%	5%	4%	3%	4%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	-	3	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	3	3	-	3
	4%	-	4%	-	-	4%	-	24%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	9%	6%	6%	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	-	12	4	2	3	-	3	-	2	6	3	1	-	2	4	10	2	10
	18%	-	18%	49%	24%	13%	-	38%	-	9%	65%	14%	33%	-	16%	15%	21%	8%	15%
At all sites across your company	29	-	29	4	2	10	11	1	3	9	2	13	2	1	6	16	16	13	33
	44%	-	44%	45%	17%	44%	65%	10%	78%	40%	20%	53%	67%	31%	48%	57%	35%	64%	49%
Don't know	7	-	7	-	3	4	1	-	-	6	-	-	-	2	2	-	5	2	5
	11%	-	11%	-	34%	16%	3%	-	-	29%	-	-	-	43%	15%	-	12%	10%	7%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 322

Q11.15 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed PC power management since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	67	17	35	6	9	8	50	55	13	12	12	29	6	15	46	24	6	9	20	67
Weighted total	66*	20**	33**	5**	9**	6**	49*	54*	12**	11**	12**	27**	5**	16**	44*	22**	6**	11**	21**	67*
At one main site	4	4	1	-	-	-	4	4	1	-	-	1	-	3	4	1	1	2	1	4
	6%	19%	2%	-	-	-	9%	8%	12%	-	-	4%	-	20%	9%	5%	21%	23%	2%	6%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	1	5	*	2	-	8	5	3	1	4	1	2	3	8	6	2	2	1	9
	13%	7%	15%	9%	21%	-	16%	10%	24%	9%	34%	5%	52%	21%	19%	27%	38%	15%	3%	13%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	3	-	-	-	2	3	2	2	2	3	-	-	3	3	1	1	-	3
	4%	-	8%	-	-	-	4%	5%	16%	19%	16%	9%	-	-	6%	12%	13%	7%	-	4%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	-	3	-	-	2	1	3	1	1	-	1	-	1	3	2	-	-	-	3
	4%	-	8%	-	-	27%	2%	5%	8%	9%	-	4%	-	5%	6%	7%	-	-	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	6	5	-	-	2	6	8	*	-	2	1	1	2	7	2	-	2	4	10
	18%	32%	16%	-	-	37%	11%	14%	4%	-	17%	5%	12%	14%	15%	8%	-	22%	18%	15%
At all sites across your company	29	9	13	3	5	2	23	25	3	7	4	16	2	4	16	6	1	3	13	33
	44%	42%	38%	64%	56%	36%	47%	47%	21%	64%	33%	60%	35%	24%	37%	29%	20%	28%	61%	49%
Don't know	7	-	4	1	2	-	6	6	2	-	-	3	-	3	4	3	1	1	3	5
	11%	-	13%	27%	23%	-	12%	11%	16%	-	-	12%	-	16%	9%	11%	9%	5%	16%	7%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 323

Q11.15 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed PC power management since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	67	47	1	18	67	4	19	6	10	8	17	33	15	14	40	12	67
Weighted total	66*	46*	1**	18**	66*	5**	16**	7**	10**	6**	17**	30**	17**	14**	37*	14**	67*
At one main site	4	4	-	1	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	3	1	4
6%	6%	8%	-	3%	6%	-	7%	-	-	-	-	10%	7%	-	9%	9%	6%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	5	1	3	9	-	2	3	-	2	2	5	2	3	4	2	9
13%	13%	11%	100%	17%	13%	-	15%	48%	-	31%	12%	17%	10%	21%	11%	12%	13%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	1	-	2	3	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	2	1	1	1	3
4%	4%	1%	-	11%	4%	-	-	19%	12%	3%	-	12%	4%	3%	6%	6%	4%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	2	-	1	3	-	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	3
4%	4%	4%	-	4%	4%	-	-	17%	-	-	-	8%	-	-	7%	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	7	-	2	12	-	4	1	-	2	-	4	6	-	7	3	10
18%	18%	16%	-	13%	18%	-	26%	19%	-	38%	-	13%	35%	-	18%	23%	15%
At all sites across your company	29	24	-	5	29	5	8	2	4	1	11	12	5	9	15	5	33
44%	44%	52%	-	29%	44%	100%	52%	24%	44%	18%	62%	41%	33%	61%	42%	37%	49%
Don't know	7	4	-	4	7	-	1	2	-	-	4	3	1	2	4	2	5
11%	11%	8%	-	22%	11%	-	-	8%	21%	-	23%	10%	3%	14%	10%	13%	7%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 324

Q11.15 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed PC power management since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	67	1	-	9	1	1	5	-	2	2	5	6	3	8	5	1	2	3	-	13	-	67
Weighted total	66*	1**	-**	7**	1**	1**	3**	-**	1**	3**	4**	9**	3**	5**	8**	1**	3**	3**	-**	13**	-**	67*
At one main site	4	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	6%	-	-	17%	-	-	16%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	5	-	9
	13%	-	-	-	-	100%	43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	53%	-	-	-	37%	-	13%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	-	11%	-	-	39%	-	-	-	-	4%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	4%	-	-	14%	100%	-	-	-	60%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	*	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	10
	18%	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	40%	-	21%	26%	23%	9%	16%	100%	-	-	-	21%	-	15%
At all sites across your company	29	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	1	3	6	1	4	1	-	1	2	-	6	-	33
	44%	-	-	43%	-	-	41%	-	-	53%	61%	74%	27%	72%	13%	-	47%	61%	-	42%	-	49%
Don't know	7	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	11%	100%	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%	-	53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 325

Q11.16 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	99	90	4	5	5	6	4	6	4	3	29	15	6	6	-	4	8	55	43	99
Weighted total	99*	86*	2**	11**	4**	7**	3**	6**	6**	2**	31**	12**	6**	4**	**	6**	8**	55*	43*	99*
At one main site	11	11	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	4	1	2	-	-	1	1	8	2	9
	11%	12%	-	-	21%	-	15%	-	-	-	15%	12%	29%	-	-	19%	7%	15%	5%	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	11	-	-	-	1	-	2	3	*	3	1	1	-	-	-	1	8	3	12
	12%	13%	-	-	-	15%	-	30%	54%	22%	9%	5%	14%	-	-	-	13%	15%	8%	12%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	10	9	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	1	1	-	-	-	2	5	4	11
	10%	10%	28%	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	14%	6%	21%	-	-	-	32%	10%	10%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	7	1	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	1	-	1	-	3	1	4	6	9
	10%	8%	23%	26%	-	-	14%	-	-	-	12%	7%	-	15%	-	45%	14%	7%	14%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	8	-	6	2	3	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	1	-	-	-	6	7	13
	13%	9%	-	52%	47%	43%	-	-	-	-	14%	19%	-	31%	-	-	-	10%	17%	13%
At all sites across your company	38	38	*	-	1	2	3	3	3	2	10	6	2	2	-	2	2	22	16	40
	39%	44%	21%	-	32%	28%	85%	44%	46%	78%	31%	51%	36%	55%	-	35%	21%	39%	37%	40%
Don't know	6	3	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	4	5
	6%	3%	28%	22%	-	-	-	11%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	14%	4%	8%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 326

Q11.16 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	99	-	99	18	13	24	29	7	8	31	13	36	7	9	13	54	69	30	99
Weighted total	99*	-**	99*	21**	11**	26**	25**	8**	8**	32**	14**	36**	7**	9**	14**	52*	66*	33**	99*
At one main site	11	-	11	3	1	2	3	1	-	4	3	4	-	1	2	5	5	5	9
	11%	-	11%	16%	11%	6%	13%	16%	-	12%	20%	12%	-	12%	15%	9%	8%	16%	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	-	11	-	1	4	3	3	-	4	-	5	1	-	-	7	11	*	12
	12%	-	12%	-	7%	17%	13%	40%	-	11%	-	15%	10%	-	-	14%	17%	1%	12%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	10	-	10	1	-	1	4	1	3	1	1	4	1	-	1	6	7	2	11
	10%	-	10%	4%	-	5%	14%	15%	31%	2%	5%	11%	13%	-	9%	12%	11%	7%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	-	10	3	1	1	3	1	1	6	-	1	2	1	-	7	10	-	9
	10%	-	10%	13%	9%	4%	14%	10%	14%	18%	-	3%	25%	9%	-	13%	15%	-	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	-	13	3	3	4	1	1	1	2	6	4	2	-	2	6	8	5	13
	13%	-	13%	15%	31%	14%	2%	18%	15%	6%	47%	10%	26%	-	15%	12%	12%	15%	13%
At all sites across your company	38	-	38	9	4	14	10	-	2	13	4	17	2	4	9	19	23	16	40
	39%	-	39%	41%	36%	54%	38%	-	27%	40%	29%	46%	26%	47%	61%	37%	34%	48%	40%
Don't know	6	-	6	2	1	-	2	-	1	4	-	1	-	3	-	2	2	4	5
	6%	-	6%	11%	6%	-	7%	-	13%	11%	-	3%	-	31%	-	3%	3%	12%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 327

Q11.16 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	99	24	50	6	19	13	67	79	16	19	19	47	3	25	72	35	10	18	26	99
Weighted total	99*	30**	47*	5**	17**	12**	65*	77*	19**	16**	18**	44*	3**	24**	71*	33**	10**	19**	27**	99*
At one main site	11	4	3	-	3	1	10	9	3	1	-	4	-	5	5	1	1	2	5	9
	11%	15%	6%	-	19%	7%	15%	12%	14%	5%	-	9%	-	19%	7%	4%	12%	12%	20%	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	1	8	-	2	2	10	10	2	-	3	4	2	3	10	8	2	3	2	12
	12%	3%	17%	-	13%	14%	15%	12%	10%	-	19%	8%	66%	14%	14%	25%	23%	13%	6%	12%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	10	1	6	1	2	3	5	10	4	3	3	5	-	4	7	5	3	3	1	11
	10%	3%	13%	15%	11%	28%	8%	12%	21%	17%	16%	12%	-	18%	11%	16%	32%	16%	4%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	-	8	1	1	3	4	9	5	3	3	7	-	3	9	3	1	1	1	9
	10%	-	17%	20%	7%	22%	5%	12%	26%	16%	16%	16%	-	13%	12%	9%	12%	6%	5%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	7	3	1	2	1	4	5	*	3	2	3	-	-	10	4	-	2	3	13
	13%	24%	7%	28%	10%	10%	6%	6%	2%	18%	10%	8%	-	-	14%	11%	-	12%	13%	13%
At all sites across your company	38	14	16	2	7	2	30	32	3	6	7	18	1	8	25	10	1	6	14	40
	39%	48%	33%	38%	38%	20%	47%	42%	14%	39%	36%	41%	34%	35%	35%	31%	13%	29%	50%	40%
Don't know	6	2	3	-	1	-	2	3	2	1	1	3	-	-	5	2	1	2	1	5
	6%	8%	6%	-	4%	-	3%	4%	12%	4%	4%	6%	-	-	7%	5%	7%	12%	2%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 328

Q11.16 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	99	66	3	30	99	10	26	10	16	10	25	50	23	27	51	20	99
Weighted total	99*	68*	2**	29**	99*	9**	25**	11**	14**	10**	24**	50*	25**	26**	49*	23**	99*
At one main site	11	6	-	4	11	-	2	2	1	-	2	7	2	2	7	2	9
	11%	9%	-	15%	11%	-	7%	18%	9%	-	7%	15%	7%	6%	15%	7%	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	7	1	4	11	1	1	3	2	4	3	6	2	3	7	2	12
	12%	10%	29%	14%	12%	8%	6%	23%	14%	35%	14%	12%	9%	13%	13%	7%	12%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	10	6	-	3	10	-	2	1	4	2	3	2	4	3	5	1	11
	10%	9%	-	11%	10%	-	8%	5%	26%	18%	13%	4%	18%	11%	11%	6%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	7	-	3	10	2	3	-	2	1	2	4	4	2	3	5	9
	10%	11%	-	10%	10%	20%	13%	-	14%	11%	10%	8%	15%	7%	7%	21%	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	8	1	4	13	1	3	1	-	2	3	6	5	3	7	3	13
	13%	12%	36%	14%	13%	13%	13%	11%	-	17%	11%	12%	18%	10%	15%	14%	13%
At all sites across your company	38	28	1	10	38	6	13	5	4	1	11	20	7	14	15	10	40
	39%	41%	35%	34%	39%	59%	53%	43%	29%	13%	45%	41%	29%	52%	31%	42%	40%
Don't know	6	5	-	1	6	-	-	-	1	1	-	4	1	-	4	1	5
	6%	7%	-	2%	6%	-	-	-	7%	7%	-	9%	3%	-	9%	3%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 329

Q11.16 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	99	-	-	19	1	1	6	4	2	3	5	13	2	11	7	1	5	3	1	15	-	99
Weighted total	99*	-**	-**	17**	1**	1**	4**	7**	1**	4**	4**	17**	2**	7**	9**	1**	7**	3**	2**	13**	-**	99*
At one main site	11	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	4	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	9
	11%	-	-	12%	-	-	14%	-	-	35%	-	21%	-	-	31%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	3	-	12
	12%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	39%	57%	-	-	-	-	13%	9%	-	20%	-	-	25%	-	12%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	10	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	11
	10%	-	-	3%	-	-	21%	-	-	-	20%	10%	-	17%	26%	-	-	39%	-	7%	-	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	10	-	-	3	1	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	9
	10%	-	-	19%	100%	-	-	39%	-	26%	-	-	55%	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	-	9%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	13	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	13
	13%	-	-	11%	-	-	29%	-	43%	-	24%	13%	45%	16%	22%	100%	18%	-	-	-	-	13%
At all sites across your company	38	-	-	6	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	9	-	4	1	-	2	2	2	6	-	40
	39%	-	-	38%	-	-	36%	22%	-	39%	56%	49%	-	54%	11%	-	29%	61%	100%	48%	-	40%
Don't know	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	5
	6%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	34%	-	-	5%	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 330

Q11.17 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	80	74	3	3	3	3	4	5	4	1	27	14	4	5	-	2	5	44	34	80
Weighted total	80*	73*	2**	6**	3**	4**	3**	5**	5**	1**	26**	12**	4**	5**	**	3**	6**	45*	34**	80*
At one main site	16	15	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	1	6	3	-	1	-	-	-	11	5	17
	20%	20%	-	24%	51%	26%	25%	-	49%	100%	24%	23%	-	15%	-	-	-	24%	16%	21%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	2	1	-	-	-	2	8	2	9
	12%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	40%	-	-	8%	17%	28%	-	-	-	38%	18%	4%	11%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	5	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	4	6
	6%	6%	36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	54%	33%	2%	12%	8%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	4	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	5
	5%	6%	-	-	23%	-	-	16%	-	-	9%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	4%	6%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2
	3%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	3%
At all sites across your company	36	33	1	2	1	3	3	2	3	-	9	6	3	2	-	1	2	16	18	36
	44%	45%	64%	34%	27%	74%	75%	43%	51%	-	36%	49%	72%	44%	-	46%	29%	36%	54%	45%
Don't know	7	5	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	3	5
	9%	7%	-	41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	-	-	42%	-	-	-	7%	10%	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 331

Q11.17 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	80	-	80	14	10	20	22	7	7	27	10	31	3	8	13	44	56	24	80
Weighted total	80*	-**	80*	15**	8**	23**	20**	7**	7**	27**	10**	31**	4**	9**	13**	42*	53*	27**	80*
At one main site	16	-	16	2	2	4	3	5	-	6	2	4	-	1	4	7	11	5	17
20%	20%	-	20%	13%	28%	16%	16%	65%	-	22%	21%	12%	-	17%	30%	16%	20%	19%	21%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	-	9	-	1	2	4	2	1	2	1	4	1	-	-	5	9	-	9
12%	12%	-	12%	-	12%	7%	19%	24%	15%	9%	14%	12%	24%	-	-	13%	18%	-	11%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	5	-	5	-	1	2	2	-	1	3	-	1	-	1	-	5	3	2	6
6%	6%	-	6%	-	9%	9%	8%	-	11%	11%	-	4%	-	8%	-	11%	6%	7%	8%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	-	4	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	3	-	-	-	4	3	1	5
5%	5%	-	5%	3%	8%	-	-	11%	33%	4%	-	8%	-	-	-	10%	6%	4%	6%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	3	-	3	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	1	2	2
3%	3%	-	3%	13%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	7%	1%	7%	3%
At all sites across your company	36	-	36	8	3	12	10	-	2	10	6	16	3	4	7	17	23	13	36
44%	44%	-	44%	55%	44%	51%	52%	-	27%	38%	57%	51%	76%	50%	55%	39%	43%	47%	45%
Don't know	7	-	7	2	-	3	1	-	1	4	1	1	-	2	2	2	3	4	5
9%	9%	-	9%	15%	-	12%	5%	-	15%	16%	8%	3%	-	26%	15%	4%	6%	15%	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 332

Q11.17 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	80	22	34	6	18	6	59	64	13	8	12	37	3	20	55	25	7	12	23	80
Weighted total	80*	26**	32*	4**	18**	6**	58*	64*	13**	7**	10**	34*	2**	22**	52*	25**	7**	13**	26**	80*
At one main site	16	5	6	*	5	2	12	14	-	1	2	8	-	6	11	6	1	2	4	17
	20%	18%	19%	12%	25%	26%	21%	22%	-	10%	15%	23%	-	28%	20%	22%	18%	15%	17%	21%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	1	7	*	-	1	8	8	2	-	2	2	1	5	7	4	2	3	1	9
	12%	5%	23%	11%	-	18%	14%	13%	19%	-	16%	6%	51%	24%	14%	15%	33%	20%	4%	11%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	5	1	2	1	1	1	2	4	2	2	3	5	-	-	3	2	1	2	2	6
	6%	5%	7%	19%	4%	22%	3%	6%	15%	27%	24%	13%	-	-	6%	10%	11%	14%	8%	8%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	-	2	-	2	*	3	3	*	1	*	2	-	1	4	2	1	-	1	5
	5%	-	6%	-	13%	7%	4%	4%	3%	18%	4%	5%	-	3%	7%	10%	17%	-	2%	6%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	3	1	-	-	2	-	3	3	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	2
	3%	3%	-	-	11%	-	5%	4%	6%	-	-	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	8%	3%
At all sites across your company	36	15	12	2	7	1	26	27	3	2	3	16	1	7	20	7	1	4	16	36
	44%	56%	37%	58%	37%	12%	46%	43%	24%	33%	33%	48%	49%	31%	38%	27%	20%	34%	61%	45%
Don't know	7	3	2	-	2	1	4	5	4	1	1	1	-	3	7	4	-	2	-	5
	9%	12%	6%	-	11%	16%	7%	8%	33%	12%	8%	3%	-	14%	14%	16%	-	17%	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 333

Q11.17 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	80	52	3	25	80	10	20	8	12	8	24	38	16	24	42	13	80
Weighted total	80*	54*	2**	25**	80*	10**	20**	9**	10**	8**	25**	38*	15**	24**	42*	13**	80*
At one main site	16	10	1	5	16	3	2	2	3	3	7	5	4	5	8	2	17
	20%	18%	35%	22%	20%	29%	10%	26%	26%	39%	26%	13%	28%	23%	19%	18%	21%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	7	1	2	9	1	3	2	-	1	1	5	3	1	6	3	9
	12%	13%	29%	8%	12%	9%	13%	17%	-	8%	4%	14%	18%	5%	13%	19%	11%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	5	3	1	2	5	1	-	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	-	2	6
	6%	5%	36%	8%	6%	7%	-	15%	6%	24%	5%	4%	12%	11%	-	14%	8%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	3	-	2	4	-	-	-	3	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	5
	5%	5%	-	7%	5%	-	-	-	26%	6%	-	11%	-	-	10%	-	6%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	3	1	-	2	3	-	1	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	3	-	2
	3%	1%	-	8%	3%	-	4%	21%	-	-	3%	5%	-	-	7%	-	3%
At all sites across your company	36	26	-	10	36	6	14	2	3	1	13	16	6	14	15	6	36
	44%	49%	-	39%	44%	54%	73%	21%	32%	9%	50%	41%	41%	57%	36%	49%	45%
Don't know	7	5	-	2	7	-	-	-	1	1	3	4	-	1	6	-	5
	9%	10%	-	8%	9%	-	-	-	10%	14%	12%	11%	-	4%	14%	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 334

Q11.17 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	80	-	-	14	-	1	7	5	2	2	10	1	9	6	1	5	2	1	12	-	80	
Weighted total	80*	-**	-**	12**	-**	1**	4**	7**	2**	2**	12**	1**	7**	9**	1**	6**	2**	2**	11**	-**	80*	
At one main site	16	-	-	1	-	-	17%	41%	49%	57%	-	24%	-	11%	-	100%	14%	-	-	31%	-	17
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	9
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	5
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
At all sites across your company	36	-	-	5	-	3	56%	42%	-	50%	51%	100%	3	36%	-	31%	100%	100%	49%	-	36	
Don't know	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	5
	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	13%	35%	-	36%	-	-	-	-	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 335

Q11.15-17 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Summary

Base: all participants who have installed computers and IT solutions since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	PC power management	Upgrade to more efficient screens	Energy efficient file storage or server replacement
Unweighted total	67	99	80
Weighted total	66	99	80
At one main site	4 6%	11 11%	16 20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9 13%	11 12%	9 12%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3 4%	10 10%	5 6%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3 4%	10 10%	4 5%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	12 18%	13 13%	3 3%
At all sites across your company	29 44%	38 39%	36 44%
Don't know	7 11%	6 6%	7 9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 336

Q11.18 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed wall insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	21	18	2	1	-	5	-	1	-	-	7	2	1	2	-	1	-	9	12	21
Weighted total	20**	17**	1**	2**	**	4**	**	***	**	**	5**	2**	1**	4**	**	2**	**	8**	13**	21**
At one main site	3	3	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	4
	16%	19%	-	-	-	43%	-	-	-	-	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%	15%	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	6	6	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	*	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	6
	30%	36%	-	-	-	36%	-	-	-	10%	71%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	13%	41%	29%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
	16%	4%	50%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	29%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	-	9%	20%	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3
	9%	11%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	15%	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	5%	14%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	5%
At all sites across your company	3	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	2	2
	13%	16%	-	-	-	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	12%	14%	10%
Don't know	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	1	2
	13%	12%	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	53%	-	-	-	-	26%	5%	10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 337

Q11.18 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed wall insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	21	-	21	2	3	9	4	-	3	12	2	2	1	2	5	11	16	4	21
Weighted total	20**	-**	20**	1**	3**	10**	3**	-**	3**	11**	2**	2**	1**	2**	7**	9**	15**	4**	21**
At one main site	3	-	3	-	2	1	*	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	*	3	-	4
16%	-	-	16%	-	75%	8%	16%	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	29%	5%	21%	-	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	6	-	6	-	-	4	2	-	-	2	2	2	-	2	1	3	4	*	6
30%	-	-	30%	-	-	40%	-	-	-	18%	73%	100%	-	73%	15%	37%	28%	13%	29%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	3	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	2	2	1	3
16%	-	-	16%	59%	-	6%	-	-	56%	6%	27%	-	100%	-	-	27%	16%	19%	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	3
9%	-	-	9%	41%	-	-	-	-	44%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	15%	12%	-	14%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
3%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	4%	-	5%
At all sites across your company	3	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	2	2
13%	-	-	13%	-	-	26%	-	-	-	24%	-	-	-	-	26%	10%	6%	50%	10%
Don't know	3	-	3	-	1	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	2	-	2	1	2
13%	-	-	13%	-	25%	19%	-	-	-	24%	-	-	-	27%	30%	-	13%	18%	10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 338

Q11.18 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed wall insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	21	4	6	4	7	2	15	18	2	3	6	9	1	7	17	9	3	6	3	21
Weighted total	20**	4**	6**	3**	7**	1**	16**	17**	2**	2**	5**	8**	1**	7**	17**	8**	2**	4**	3**	21**
At one main site	3	-	1	*	2	-	3	3	-	*	1	1	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	4
	16%	-	13%	15%	29%	-	21%	19%	-	28%	26%	16%	-	-	20%	16%	-	-	-	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	6	1	3	1	1	-	6	6	2	*	-	3	-	3	4	1	*	1	2	6
	30%	24%	44%	45%	14%	-	36%	33%	72%	28%	-	39%	-	42%	22%	12%	25%	25%	78%	29%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	1	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	2	1	1	-	3
	16%	17%	28%	22%	-	-	4%	8%	-	-	-	-	100%	9%	19%	30%	36%	17%	-	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	2	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	*	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	3
	9%	16%	-	-	17%	56%	8%	7%	28%	44%	14%	6%	-	20%	8%	17%	39%	35%	-	14%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	3%	-	-	18%	-	44%	-	3%	-	-	11%	7%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	5%
At all sites across your company	3	2	1	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	2	3	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	2
	13%	43%	14%	-	-	-	17%	16%	-	-	36%	33%	-	-	16%	-	-	23%	-	10%
Don't know	3	-	-	-	3	-	2	3	-	-	1	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	1	2
	13%	-	-	-	39%	-	13%	15%	-	-	13%	-	-	29%	12%	24%	-	-	22%	10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 339

Q11.18 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed wall insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	21	16	1	4	21	1	2	3	2	8	7	11	2	6	13	1	21
Weighted total	20**	14**	***	6**	20**	1**	3**	3**	2**	7**	8**	10**	2**	5**	13**	1**	21**
At one main site	3	2	*	1	3	1	-	-	1	*	2	1	-	2	1	-	4
	16%	13%	100%	17%	16%	100%	-	-	38%	7%	26%	14%	-	34%	11%	-	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	6	5	-	1	6	-	2	2	1	1	2	4	-	2	3	1	6
	30%	36%	-	17%	30%	-	66%	74%	62%	15%	26%	43%	-	37%	22%	100%	29%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	3	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	2	1	2	1	1	2	-	3
	16%	22%	-	-	16%	-	-	26%	-	26%	9%	19%	28%	12%	19%	-	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	3
	9%	13%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	20%	-	19%	-	-	14%	-	14%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	3%	4%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	8%	-	6%	-	-	4%	-	5%
At all sites across your company	3	1	-	2	3	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	2	-	2
	13%	6%	-	31%	13%	-	34%	-	-	26%	12%	-	72%	17%	14%	-	10%
Don't know	3	1	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	2
	13%	5%	-	35%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	27%	-	-	-	15%	-	10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 340

Q11.18 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed wall insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	21	-	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	2	1	-	1	-	1	5	1	21
Weighted total	20**	-**	-**	4**	-**	-**	1**	-**	-**	-**	-**	1**	2**	1**	2**	-**	1**	-**	2**	5**	2**	21**
At one main site	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4
	16%	-	-	41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%	-	19%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	6
	30%	-	-	43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	19%	-	29%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	14%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34%	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3
	9%	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	14%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	3%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
At all sites across your company	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66%	-	-	-	-	-	35%	-	10%
Don't know	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	10%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 341

Q11.19 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	34	31	1	2	1	5	1	3	3	-	7	3	3	3	-	2	1	15	19	34
Weighted total	35**	30**	1**	4**	1**	4**	1**	3**	4**	**	5**	3**	3**	5**	**	3**	1**	16**	19**	34*
At one main site	10	10	-	-	-	2	1	1	3	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	5	5	9
	28%	32%	-	-	-	48%	100%	26%	72%	-	17%	27%	-	17%	-	-	-	28%	27%	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	12	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	1	2	2	-	-	2	-	1	11	12
	33%	38%	-	-	100%	52%	-	-	28%	-	31%	52%	-	-	-	70%	-	6%	57%	35%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	4
	7%	6%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38%	-	-	-	-	30%	-	12%	4%	12%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	2	-	4	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	3	2	5
	16%	6%	-	100%	-	-	-	74%	-	-	14%	21%	48%	-	-	-	-	20%	12%	15%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	3%
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1
	6%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41%	-	-	-	12%	-	3%
Don't know	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	3	-	2
	8%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41%	-	-	100%	18%	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 342

Q11.19 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	34	-	34	5	5	11	10	1	2	18	2	3	1	3	8	17	27	6	34
Weighted total	35**	-**	35**	4**	6**	13**	9**	1**	1**	17**	2**	4**	1**	5**	10**	14**	25**	8**	34*
At one main site	10	-	10	1	3	2	4	-	-	5	-	-	-	1	3	4	8	1	9
28%	-	-	28%	20%	50%	12%	45%	-	-	27%	-	-	-	25%	31%	31%	33%	16%	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	-	12	*	1	7	2	1	-	6	2	2	-	2	5	5	8	2	12
33%	-	-	33%	11%	16%	53%	26%	100%	-	34%	73%	54%	-	34%	49%	34%	32%	28%	35%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	3	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	4
7%	-	-	7%	17%	-	5%	13%	-	-	4%	27%	-	100%	-	-	8%	7%	9%	12%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	-	6	2	2	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	2	-	1	2	4	5
16%	-	-	16%	52%	34%	-	-	-	100%	19%	-	-	-	40%	-	10%	7%	47%	15%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	2%	-	3%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	1
6%	-	-	6%	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	-	46%	-	-	-	14%	8%	-	3%
Don't know	3	-	3	-	-	2	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	-	2
8%	-	-	8%	-	-	15%	9%	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	20%	-	11%	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 343

Q11.19 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	34	6	9	6	12	6	23	29	3	4	8	17	2	10	26	14	3	6	7	34
Weighted total	35**	6**	10**	5**	13**	6**	22**	28**	4**	4**	6**	17**	1**	10**	27**	12**	2**	4**	7**	34*
At one main site	10	1	3	2	4	1	7	8	1	2	2	6	-	3	7	5	-	1	3	9
	28%	15%	26%	35%	33%	19%	30%	28%	33%	54%	28%	36%	-	24%	25%	39%	-	22%	41%	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	3	3	2	4	2	9	11	2	*	3	7	-	3	8	2	*	1	4	12
	33%	61%	29%	34%	27%	29%	43%	40%	48%	13%	46%	43%	-	28%	30%	17%	25%	25%	48%	35%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	1	1	1	-	-	2	3	-	*	*	*	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	4
	7%	12%	8%	21%	-	-	9%	9%	-	13%	7%	3%	100%	6%	7%	9%	36%	18%	10%	12%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	1	2	-	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	*	-	1	5	1	1	1	-	5
	16%	12%	17%	-	25%	11%	5%	4%	18%	20%	11%	3%	-	14%	19%	11%	39%	35%	-	15%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	10%	-	9%	-	2%	-	-	9%	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	3%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1
	6%	-	21%	-	-	32%	-	7%	21%	-	-	12%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	3%
Don't know	3	-	-	-	2	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	3	-	-	-	2
	8%	-	-	-	15%	-	13%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	27%	10%	23%	-	-	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 344

Q11.19 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	34	23	1	10	34	1	6	6	8	7	10	17	7	10	20	4	34
Weighted total	35**	21**	***	13**	35**	1**	8**	6**	9**	5**	11**	16**	8**	10**	22**	4**	34*
At one main site	10	5	-	5	10	1	3	1	5	-	2	4	4	3	5	2	9
	28%	22%	-	38%	28%	100%	32%	22%	52%	-	20%	24%	47%	32%	22%	48%	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	8	-	3	12	-	2	4	2	3	3	5	3	3	7	2	12
	33%	40%	-	25%	33%	-	22%	66%	26%	54%	27%	33%	44%	27%	33%	52%	35%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	2	*	-	3	-	-	1	-	*	1	*	1	1	1	-	4
	7%	10%	100%	-	7%	-	-	13%	-	9%	13%	3%	9%	15%	5%	-	12%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	4	-	2	6	-	2	-	2	1	2	4	-	2	4	-	5
	16%	17%	-	16%	16%	-	21%	-	22%	27%	15%	25%	-	17%	18%	-	15%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	2%	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	10%	-	3%	-	-	2%	-	3%
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	1
	6%	9%	-	-	6%	-	25%	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	9%	-	3%
Don't know	3	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	2	-	2
	8%	-	-	21%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	25%	-	-	8%	9%	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 345

Q11.19 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	34	-	-	8	1	-	2	1	1	1	-	1	5	1	1	-	4	1	2	5	-	34
Weighted total	35**	-**	-**	7**	1**	-**	1**	2**	1**	1**	-**	1**	4**	**	2**	-**	4**	1**	4**	5**	-**	34*
At one main site	10	-	-	4	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	9
	28%	-	-	53%	-	-	61%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%	100%	-	-	-	26%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	12	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	4	-	12
	33%	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	39%	-	47%	86%	-	35%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	7%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	*	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	5
	16%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%	100%	-	-	40%	-	-	-	14%	-	15%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	-	39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
At all sites across your company	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53%	-	-	3%
Don't know	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	8%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 346

Q11.20 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed draught-proofing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	24	22	1	1	2	6	-	3	1	1	4	1	1	2	-	1	-	11	13	24
Weighted total	24**	22**	1**	2**	2**	5**	**	3**	2**	1**	3**	1**	1**	4**	**	2**	**	11**	13**	24**
At one main site	3	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2
	12%	13%	-	-	-	21%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26%	-	8%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	12	-	2	1	3	-	2	-	1	1	1	1	2	-	2	-	2	11	13
	56%	54%	-	100%	35%	60%	-	53%	-	100%	42%	100%	100%	47%	-	100%	-	22%	85%	54%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	4
	12%	11%	100%	-	65%	-	-	-	-	-	58%	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	9%	17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	4%
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
	7%	8%	-	-	-	19%	-	31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	7%	8%
Don't know	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1
	8%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53%	-	-	-	18%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 347

Q11.20 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed draught-proofing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	24	-	24	3	3	9	7	1	1	11	1	4	1	-	5	15	19	4	24
Weighted total	24**	-**	24**	2**	3**	10**	8**	1**	2**	10**	1**	4**	1**	-**	7**	14**	19**	4**	24**
At one main site	3	-	3	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	3	-	2
12%	-	-	12%	-	35%	-	25%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	15%	13%	15%	-	8%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	-	14	*	2	5	4	1	2	4	-	4	-	-	4	8	9	3	13
56%	-	-	56%	28%	65%	47%	57%	100%	100%	44%	-	100%	-	-	55%	55%	49%	73%	54%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	3	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	2	2	1	4
12%	-	-	12%	43%	-	24%	-	-	-	12%	100%	-	100%	-	-	16%	10%	27%	17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	1
2%	-	-	2%	29%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	3%	-	4%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
7%	-	-	7%	-	-	9%	11%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	12%	10%	-	8%
Don't know	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	1
8%	-	-	8%	-	-	20%	-	-	-	20%	-	-	-	-	30%	-	11%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 348

Q11.20 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed draught-proofing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	24	4	10	6	4	2	18	21	-	3	6	12	1	8	19	9	2	5	4	24
Weighted total	24**	4**	9**	6**	4**	1**	18**	20**	**	4**	6**	11**	1**	9**	20**	9**	1**	3**	4**	24**
At one main site	3	-	-	2	1	-	1	1	-	2	-	2	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	2
	12%	-	-	30%	22%	-	5%	5%	-	49%	-	17%	-	-	15%	20%	-	-	-	8%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	3	6	3	1	1	11	12	-	2	6	6	-	5	11	4	-	1	3	13
	56%	83%	63%	52%	22%	54%	61%	59%	-	39%	91%	54%	-	58%	54%	46%	-	16%	71%	54%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	1	2	1	-	-	2	3	-	*	-	*	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	4
	12%	17%	18%	10%	-	-	10%	13%	18%	12%	-	4%	100%	20%	9%	12%	100%	33%	29%	17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	11%	-	3%	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	8%	-	46%	-	3%	-	-	9%	5%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	4%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	2
	7%	-	19%	-	-	-	10%	9%	-	-	-	16%	-	-	9%	-	-	51%	-	8%
Don't know	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	-	1
	8%	-	-	-	45%	-	11%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	22%	10%	21%	-	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 349

Q11.20 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed draught-proofing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	24	16	-	8	24	1	2	4	8	5	9	11	4	10	12	2	24
Weighted total	24**	14**	-**	10**	24**	1**	2**	3**	9**	5**	10**	9**	5**	9**	13**	2**	24**
At one main site	3	-	-	3	3	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	2	1	2	-	2
12%	-	-	-	29%	12%	100%	-	-	22%	-	10%	-	36%	10%	15%	-	8%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	10	-	4	14	-	2	2	5	4	5	7	2	7	5	1	13
56%	68%	-	38%	56%	-	62%	78%	54%	81%	54%	71%	34%	73%	43%	61%	-	54%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	2	-	1	3	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	1	1	2	-	4
12%	12%	-	12%	12%	-	-	22%	14%	9%	7%	18%	13%	7%	18%	-	-	17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
2%	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	4%	-	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
2%	4%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	10%	-	6%	-	-	4%	-	-	4%
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	2
7%	12%	-	-	7%	-	38%	-	10%	-	9%	-	17%	10%	-	39%	-	8%
Don't know	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1
8%	-	-	20%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	20%	-	-	-	16%	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 350

Q11.20 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed draught-proofing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	24	-	-	5	-	2	1	1	1	-	1	3	2	2	-	2	1	-	2	1	24
Weighted total	24**	-**	-**	5**	-**	1**	2**	1**	1**	-**	1**	2**	1**	3**	-**	2**	2**	-**	3**	2**	24**
At one main site	3	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	12%	-	-	20%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	3	2	13
	56%	-	-	56%	-	50%	-	-	100%	-	-	28%	-	31%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	54%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	12%	-	-	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	72%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	-	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
At all sites across your company	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	66%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%
Don't know	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 351

Q11.21 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	35	30	3	2	2	5	1	3	2	1	9	3	3	1	-	2	1	12	23	35
Weighted total	31**	25**	2**	4**	1**	4**	1**	3**	2**	1**	7**	2**	3**	2**	**	3**	1**	10**	21**	35*
At one main site	6	6	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	7
19%	19%	23%	-	-	-	61%	100%	-	50%	-	12%	38%	-	-	-	-	-	17%	20%	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	12	*	2	1	1	-	-	1	1	3	1	3	2	-	-	-	3	11	15
46%	46%	48%	25%	46%	100%	25%	-	50%	100%	51%	41%	100%	100%	-	-	-	27%	56%	43%	
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	2	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	3
6%	6%	5%	38%	-	-	14%	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	14%	3%	9%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	2	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	1	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	4
12%	12%	6%	-	54%	-	-	74%	-	-	10%	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	6%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
5%	5%	6%	-	-	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	4%	6%
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	*	2	2
7%	7%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	70%	-	4%	9%	6%
Don't know	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
5%	5%	3%	38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	8%	3%	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 352

Q11.21 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	35	-	35	4	7	11	11	-	2	19	1	4	2	3	9	16	27	7	35
Weighted total	31**	-**	31**	3**	8**	10**	8**	-**	2**	17**	1**	3**	1**	4**	10**	12**	22**	8**	35*
At one main site	6	-	6	1	3	1	1	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	3	2	6	-	7
	19%	-	19%	28%	38%	15%	7%	-	-	22%	-	16%	-	-	31%	16%	27%	-	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	-	14	1	2	6	3	-	2	6	-	2	*	1	5	7	10	3	15
	46%	-	46%	32%	28%	56%	41%	-	100%	37%	-	69%	38%	26%	51%	55%	47%	34%	43%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	3
	6%	-	6%	-	-	7%	17%	-	-	3%	100%	-	-	-	-	10%	9%	-	9%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	-	4	1	2	*	-	-	-	3	-	*	1	2	-	*	1	3	4
	12%	-	12%	40%	26%	5%	-	-	-	19%	-	14%	62%	56%	-	4%	4%	35%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
	5%	-	5%	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	6%	-	6%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	-	2	*	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	*	*	2	2
	7%	-	7%	-	-	18%	6%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	18%	4%	2%	23%	6%
Don't know	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	2
	5%	-	5%	-	8%	-	11%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	18%	-	-	4%	8%	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 353

Q11.21 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECS (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	35	6	11	4	13	5	25	31	2	2	11	15	2	11	24	11	2	6	10	35
Weighted total	31**	6**	9**	3**	12**	5**	21**	26**	2**	1**	9**	13**	1**	10**	22**	9**	1**	4**	9**	35*
At one main site	6	1	2	-	3	1	5	6	1	-	2	4	-	1	4	3	-	1	2	7
	19%	11%	24%	-	25%	26%	23%	23%	64%	-	20%	29%	-	13%	16%	29%	-	15%	27%	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	3	5	1	6	3	9	11	1	*	3	5	-	6	9	4	*	1	5	15
	46%	46%	52%	45%	45%	62%	44%	44%	36%	50%	34%	38%	-	61%	43%	43%	41%	29%	57%	43%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	2	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
	6%	-	14%	22%	-	-	6%	8%	-	-	-	-	52%	13%	6%	6%	59%	15%	9%	9%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	1	-	-	3	-	2	2	-	-	*	*	1	*	3	1	-	1	-	4
	12%	12%	-	-	25%	-	8%	6%	-	-	6%	4%	48%	5%	15%	8%	-	18%	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
	5%	-	9%	18%	-	12%	4%	5%	-	-	6%	11%	-	-	6%	-	-	23%	-	6%
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	*	-	-	2	2	-	*	2	2	-	-	2	*	-	-	-	2
	7%	31%	-	15%	-	-	11%	9%	-	50%	26%	18%	-	-	10%	5%	-	-	-	6%
Don't know	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	2
	5%	-	-	-	5%	-	4%	6%	-	-	8%	-	-	9%	4%	9%	-	-	8%	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 354

Q11.21 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	35	25	1	9	35	1	2	7	9	8	11	17	6	10	20	4	35
Weighted total	31**	20**	***	10**	31**	1**	2**	6**	9**	7**	10**	15**	6**	9**	18**	3**	35*
At one main site	6	2	-	4	6	1	2	2	1	-	2	3	1	2	4	1	7
19%	11%	-	36%	19%	100%	100%	30%	15%	-	-	22%	21%	10%	21%	19%	17%	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	12	-	2	14	-	-	4	5	3	5	7	2	4	8	2	15
46%	61%	-	19%	46%	-	-	59%	53%	43%	-	52%	51%	30%	48%	45%	56%	43%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	3
6%	10%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	14%	4%	-	16%	3%	-	9%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	2	-	2	4	-	-	1	2	-	-	3	1	-	3	-	4
12%	8%	-	20%	12%	-	-	11%	22%	7%	-	5%	17%	12%	6%	18%	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
5%	7%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	9%	8%	-	4%	16%	-	3%	27%	-	6%
At all sites across your company	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	2
7%	-	100%	17%	7%	-	-	-	-	33%	-	3%	32%	-	12%	-	-	6%
Don't know	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
5%	3%	-	8%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 355

Q11.21 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	35	-	-	9	1	-	1	1	3	-	1	5	1	1	-	3	1	-	6	1	35
Weighted total	31**	-**	-**	8**	1**	-**	1**	1**	3**	-**	1**	5**	**	1**	-**	2**	1**	-**	6**	2**	35*
At one main site	6	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	7
	19%	-	-	58%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39%	-	-	-	-	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	14	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	3	2	15
	46%	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	30%	-	100%	-	61%	100%	-	56%	100%	43%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	6%	-	-	7%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	4	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	12%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	5%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
At all sites across your company	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	6%
Don't know	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	5%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 356

Q11.22 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed automatic/revolving doors since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	20	19	-	1	1	2	2	2	1	-	1	7	3	-	-	-	1	9	11	20
Weighted total	19**	16**	-**	2**	1**	1**	2**	3**	1**	**	***	7**	3**	**	-**	-**	1**	9**	9**	20**
At one main site	6	6	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	3	6
31%	31%	35%	-	-	100%	-	70%	-	100%	-	-	23%	27%	-	-	-	-	25%	37%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	10	8	-	2	-	1	1	2	-	*	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	5	10
52%	52%	46%	-	100%	-	100%	30%	81%	-	100%	48%	73%	-	-	-	-	-	46%	58%	50%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	2
5%	5%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	19%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	5%	10%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
8%	8%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	5%
At all sites across your company	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
4%	4%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	9%	-	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 357

Q11.22 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed automatic/revolving doors since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	20	-	20	3	5	4	7	-	1	13	-	6	-	3	4	11	14	5	20
Weighted total	19**	..**	19**	2**	6**	3**	7**	..**	1**	12**	..**	5**	..**	4**	4**	9**	12**	5**	20**
At one main site	6	-	6	-	2	1	2	-	1	4	-	1	-	1	3	2	4	1	6
	31%	-	31%	-	32%	31%	30%	-	100%	31%	-	13%	-	32%	74%	17%	38%	24%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	10	-	10	1	3	1	4	-	-	5	-	4	-	3	1	6	4	4	10
	52%	-	52%	74%	45%	51%	59%	-	-	46%	-	78%	-	68%	26%	62%	35%	76%	50%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	5%	-	5%	26%	-	18%	-	-	-	4%	-	9%	-	-	-	5%	8%	-	10%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	8%	-	8%	-	24%	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	16%	13%	-	5%
At all sites across your company	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	4%	-	4%	-	-	-	12%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 358

Q11.22 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed automatic/revolving doors since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	20	4	7	2	6	2	13	17	2	3	5	9	-	8	14	9	1	6	5	20
Weighted total	19**	4**	5**	2**	6**	2**	11**	15**	2**	3**	4**	7**	**	7**	13**	7**	***	5**	5**	20**
At one main site	6	2	2	-	3	2	3	5	2	1	1	2	-	3	3	2	-	2	3	6
	31%	41%	28%	-	39%	100%	26%	32%	100%	28%	16%	35%	-	45%	22%	27%	-	34%	56%	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	10	1	4	2	3	-	5	7	-	2	3	4	-	3	7	4	*	3	2	10
	52%	23%	72%	100%	47%	-	44%	46%	-	72%	73%	58%	-	38%	57%	62%	100%	66%	44%	50%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	2
	5%	-	-	-	15%	-	9%	6%	-	-	11%	7%	-	6%	4%	-	-	-	-	10%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	8%	36%	-	-	-	-	14%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	5%
At all sites across your company	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1
	4%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	11%	6%	11%	-	-	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 359

Q11.22 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed automatic/revolving doors since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	20	10	2	8	20	-	2	4	8	3	7	12	1	7	11	2	20
Weighted total	19**	8**	2**	9**	19**	**	2**	4**	9**	1**	6**	12**	1**	6**	11**	2**	20**
At one main site	6	2	2	2	6	-	2	1	3	-	4	2	-	4	2	-	6
	31%	25%	100%	24%	31%	-	100%	31%	31%	-	62%	17%	-	63%	18%	-	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	10	5	-	4	10	-	-	3	5	1	1	8	1	1	7	2	10
	52%	64%	-	49%	52%	-	-	69%	53%	68%	16%	67%	100%	16%	63%	100%	50%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	2
	5%	11%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	32%	8%	4%	-	8%	4%	-	10%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	8%	-	-	17%	8%	-	-	-	16%	-	-	12%	-	-	14%	-	5%
At all sites across your company	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	4%	-	-	10%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	13%	-	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 360

Q11.22 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed automatic/revolving doors since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	20	-	-	9	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	20
Weighted total	19**	-**	-**	8**	-**	-**	2**	1**	1**	-**	-**	4**	**	-**	-**	-**	1**	1**	-**	-**	20**
At one main site	6	-	-	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	6
	31%	-	-	44%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	30%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	10	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
	52%	-	-	41%	-	-	27%	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	50%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	1	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	5%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	8%	-	-	-	-	-	73%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
At all sites across your company	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	4%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 361

Q11.18-22 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Summary

Base: all participants who have installed building fabric, including windows since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Wall insulation	Roof / loft insulation	Draught-proofing	Replacement with double/triple glazing	Automatic / revolving doors
Unweighted total	21	34	24	35	20
Weighted total	20	35	24	31	19
At one main site	3	10	3	6	6
	16%	28%	12%	19%	31%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	6	12	14	14	10
	30%	33%	56%	46%	52%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	3	3	3	2	-
	16%	7%	12%	6%	-
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	2	6	*	4	1
	9%	16%	2%	12%	5%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	1	1	1	1	1
	3%	2%	2%	5%	8%
At all sites across your company	3	2	2	2	-
	13%	6%	7%	7%	-
Don't know	3	3	2	1	1
	13%	8%	8%	5%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 362

Q11.23 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	
Unweighted total	35	33	-	2	2	2	2	1	-	11	10	3	-	-	-	2	21	14	35
Weighted total	34**	30**	-**	5**	2**	2**	1**	2**	2**	-**	15**	7**	3**	-**	-**	1**	21**	13**	35*
At one main site	6	6	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	4	1	7
	16%	19%	-	-	-	64%	62%	-	-	5%	30%	46%	-	-	-	-	21%	9%	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	11	-	-	*	-	-	1	-	9	1	-	-	-	-	-	9	3	9
	33%	39%	-	-	26%	-	-	54%	-	60%	15%	-	-	-	-	-	40%	22%	26%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	8	6	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	5	1	-	-	-	-	1	5	3	8
	25%	21%	-	49%	-	-	-	46%	-	36%	21%	-	-	-	-	59%	24%	26%	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	5	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	4
	14%	8%	-	51%	74%	-	-	-	100%	-	9%	-	-	-	-	41%	5%	28%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3
	5%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	9%
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	-	1	*	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	4
	7%	8%	-	-	-	36%	38%	-	-	-	-	54%	-	-	-	-	3%	14%	11%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 363

Q11.23 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	35	-	35	4	8	5	7	2	9	11	5	17	2	3	5	21	29	5	35
Weighted total	34**	-**	34**	4**	8**	6**	5**	2**	9**	8**	5**	19**	2**	4**	6**	18**	28**	5**	35*
At one main site	6	-	6	1	2	-	2	1	-	1	1	4	-	-	1	3	4	2	7
16%	-	-	16%	27%	20%	-	34%	73%	-	13%	13%	20%	-	-	18%	17%	13%	42%	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	-	11	3	-	3	-	*	5	2	-	8	1	-	4	5	7	3	9
33%	-	-	33%	73%	-	43%	-	27%	58%	31%	-	41%	50%	-	71%	28%	26%	58%	26%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	8	-	8	-	4	-	2	-	3	1	2	4	1	-	-	5	8	-	8
25%	-	-	25%	-	49%	-	32%	-	30%	17%	43%	21%	50%	-	-	30%	30%	-	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	5	-	5	-	1	2	-	-	1	1	2	2	-	2	-	2	5	-	4
14%	-	-	14%	-	15%	40%	-	-	12%	7%	36%	12%	-	65%	-	14%	17%	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	*	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	3
5%	-	-	5%	-	-	10%	22%	-	-	15%	8%	-	-	-	11%	6%	6%	-	9%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	1	*	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	-	4
7%	-	-	7%	-	16%	7%	12%	-	-	18%	-	5%	-	35%	-	6%	8%	-	11%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 364

Q11.23 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	35	6	20	3	5	6	22	27	3	6	8	10	2	12	30	18	6	14	4	35
Weighted total	34**	7**	18**	2**	6**	7**	21**	26**	3**	4**	9**	7**	3**	13**	30**	16**	7**	15**	3**	35*
At one main site	6	2	3	-	1	1	4	6	-	-	1	1	-	3	4	1	-	1	-	7
	16%	24%	17%	-	15%	18%	18%	22%	-	-	8%	16%	-	21%	13%	4%	-	4%	13%	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	2	8	-	1	2	7	9	-	-	2	2	1	5	10	8	4	5	1	9
	33%	23%	45%	-	15%	27%	35%	35%	-	-	18%	27%	28%	38%	35%	52%	55%	31%	27%	26%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	8	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	5	1	-	4	8	4	2	4	-	8
	25%	44%	9%	76%	34%	46%	12%	13%	100%	61%	49%	10%	-	31%	29%	27%	37%	26%	-	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	5	1	1	1	2	1	4	5	-	-	2	2	2	1	4	1	1	3	1	4
	14%	9%	7%	24%	37%	9%	20%	19%	-	-	26%	25%	72%	5%	12%	3%	8%	20%	36%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	3
	5%	-	9%	-	-	-	5%	4%	-	26%	-	8%	-	-	5%	6%	-	11%	-	9%
At all sites across your company	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	1	1	4
	7%	-	13%	-	-	-	9%	7%	-	14%	-	14%	-	4%	5%	7%	-	8%	24%	11%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 365

Q11.23 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	35	29	-	6	35	3	3	6	4	14	7	16	12	6	17	12	35
Weighted total	34**	28**	-**	6**	34**	3**	4**	6**	3**	14**	6**	14**	14**	5**	17**	13**	35*
At one main site	6	5	-	1	6	2	2	-	1	-	2	2	2	2	3	1	7
16%	16%	-	17%	16%	64%	45%	-	27%	-	-	34%	11%	13%	44%	17%	5%	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	8	-	3	11	-	2	2	1	7	1	7	4	1	8	3	9
33%	30%	-	51%	33%	-	55%	28%	35%	48%	15%	49%	26%	20%	46%	22%	26%	
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	8	8	-	1	8	1	-	1	-	3	3	1	4	2	3	4	8
25%	27%	-	13%	25%	36%	-	17%	-	24%	50%	9%	29%	36%	16%	32%	23%	
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	5	4	-	1	5	-	-	2	-	3	-	2	3	-	2	3	4
14%	13%	-	19%	14%	-	-	32%	-	20%	-	13%	21%	-	11%	23%	11%	
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	3
5%	6%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	21%	4%	-	7%	4%	-	6%	4%	9%	
At all sites across your company	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	*	1	-	1	1	-	1	2	4
7%	8%	-	-	7%	-	-	23%	16%	4%	-	10%	7%	-	3%	14%	11%	
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 366

Q11.23 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	35	-	1	8	-	-	3	-	1	3	3	1	4	1	-	2	-	2	6	-	35
Weighted total	34**	-**	1**	6**	-**	-**	5**	-**	1**	2**	5**	1**	2**	1**	-**	1**	-**	4**	5**	-**	35*
At one main site	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	7
	16%	-	-	31%	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	-	18%	100%	-	67%	-	-	13%	-	20%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	9
	33%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	32%	100%	-	-	-	33%	-	-	49%	-	26%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	8	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	8
	25%	-	100%	18%	-	-	-	-	-	38%	68%	-	31%	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	23%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
	14%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	5%	-	-	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%
At all sites across your company	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	4
	7%	-	-	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	11%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 367

Q11.24 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance				Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)
Unweighted total	28	25	1	2	2	2	2	3	-	7	4	2	1	-	1	2	14	14	28
Weighted total	28**	23**	1**	5**	2**	1**	1**	2**	4**	**	9**	4**	2**	1**	**	1**	14**	14**	28**
At one main site	10	10	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	6	4	11
	37%	45%	-	-	74%	100%	62%	-	-	27%	57%	-	-	-	100%	-	42%	32%	39%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	9	-	-	*	-	-	2	1	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	5	4	9
	33%	40%	-	-	26%	-	-	100%	14%	39%	43%	54%	-	-	-	-	35%	31%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	4	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	1	3
	13%	3%	100%	49%	-	-	-	-	-	34%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	20%	5%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	2
	11%	3%	-	51%	-	-	-	-	57%	-	-	-	-	-	-	59%	-	23%	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
	5%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46%	-	-	-	41%	4%	6%	7%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 368

Q11.24 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	28	-	28	3	5	6	6	1	7	11	4	7	2	5	3	17	24	4	28
Weighted total	28**	-**	28**	2**	7**	7**	4**	***	7**	9**	6**	8**	2**	6**	4**	14**	24**	4**	28**
At one main site	10	-	10	1	3	2	2	-	2	3	1	4	1	1	1	7	10	1	11
	37%	-	37%	31%	53%	24%	44%	-	35%	37%	21%	46%	58%	20%	30%	49%	40%	18%	39%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	-	9	1	-	3	2	*	3	4	2	2	-	1	3	5	6	3	9
	33%	-	33%	41%	-	37%	44%	100%	45%	40%	40%	21%	-	16%	70%	38%	27%	66%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	4	-	4	1	2	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	1	3	1	3
	13%	-	13%	28%	35%	-	12%	-	-	8%	38%	-	42%	-	-	4%	12%	16%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	1	3	-	2
	11%	-	11%	-	-	32%	-	-	11%	-	-	28%	-	41%	-	5%	13%	-	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	2
	5%	-	5%	-	12%	-	-	-	8%	15%	-	-	-	14%	-	4%	6%	-	7%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	2%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	8%	-	-	2%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 369

Q11.24 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	28	9	14	1	3	5	20	22	6	2	6	13	3	7	23	15	3	11	5	28
Weighted total	28**	10**	11**	1**	5**	6**	19**	21**	5**	1**	7**	12**	4**	6**	22**	13**	2**	12**	6**	28**
At one main site	10	3	5	-	3	3	7	8	2	1	3	5	1	3	7	4	1	4	3	11
	37%	26%	45%	-	52%	43%	38%	39%	38%	43%	42%	40%	24%	43%	32%	34%	45%	37%	55%	39%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	4	4	-	-	3	5	7	2	-	1	6	-	3	7	6	-	1	2	9
	33%	44%	33%	-	-	57%	29%	32%	38%	-	10%	46%	-	48%	34%	51%	-	6%	31%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	4	3	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	4	1	-	3	-	3
	13%	30%	5%	-	-	-	7%	6%	10%	-	-	-	17%	9%	16%	5%	-	26%	-	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	-	1	-	2	-	3	3	1	1	3	1	2	-	3	1	1	3	-	2
	11%	-	7%	-	48%	-	17%	15%	14%	57%	47%	6%	59%	-	14%	6%	33%	27%	-	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	2
	5%	-	7%	100%	-	-	7%	6%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	2%	4%	23%	5%	14%	7%
Don't know	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	4%	-	-	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 370

Q11.24 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	28	25	-	3	28	-	3	6	3	14	2	14	12	-	17	11	28
Weighted total	28**	25**	-**	3**	28**	-**	3**	6**	2**	14**	2**	13**	13**	-**	16**	11**	28**
At one main site	10	10	-	-	10	-	2	2	1	4	1	5	4	-	9	2	11
	37%	41%	-	-	37%	-	66%	39%	75%	28%	60%	41%	29%	-	52%	15%	39%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	7	-	2	9	-	1	2	-	6	1	7	1	-	7	2	9
	33%	30%	-	58%	33%	-	34%	28%	-	46%	40%	53%	11%	-	44%	17%	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	4	4	-	-	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	-	1	3	3
	13%	14%	-	-	13%	-	-	20%	-	-	-	-	28%	-	4%	25%	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	2	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	3	2
	11%	10%	-	25%	11%	-	-	-	-	22%	-	-	25%	-	-	27%	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	2
	5%	3%	-	17%	5%	-	-	13%	-	4%	-	6%	4%	-	-	12%	7%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	25%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	4%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 371

Q11.24 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	28	-	-	7	-	-	3	1	1	2	3	2	1	-	-	2	1	2	3	-	28
Weighted total	28**	-**	-**	5**	-**	-**	4**	1**	1**	1**	5**	2**	1**	-**	-**	1**	1**	4**	2**	-**	28**
At one main site	10	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	11
	37%	-	-	79%	-	-	-	-	100%	46%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	35%	46%	-	39%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	9	-	-	1	-	-	3	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	9
	33%	-	-	11%	-	-	86%	100%	-	-	32%	59%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	33%	-	32%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	13%	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	42%	41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65%	-	7%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At all sites across your company	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	5%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
Don't know	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 372

Q11.23-24 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Summary

Base: all participants who have installed ventilation since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)	Addition of heat recovery
Unweighted total	35	28
Weighted total	34	28
At one main site	6 16%	10 37%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11 33%	9 33%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	8 25%	4 13%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	5 14%	3 11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	2 5%	-
At all sites across your company	2 7%	1 5%
Don't know	-	-
	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 373

Q11.25 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed process re-engineering since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	65	64	1	-	1	2	8	3	5	1	11	14	8	4	1	-	6	33	32	65
Weighted total	56*	55*	1**	-**	1**	1**	6**	3**	5**	1**	11**	11**	8**	3**	1**	-**	5**	28*	27**	65*
At one main site	5	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	6
	9%	9%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	16%	100%	18%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	12%	5%	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	11	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	3	8	13
	21%	21%	-	-	-	-	15%	23%	42%	-	22%	17%	45%	-	-	-	35%	12%	29%	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	9	9	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	4	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	6	12
	17%	16%	100%	-	-	45%	34%	-	-	34%	12%	10%	25%	-	-	-	-	10%	24%	18%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	6	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	5	1	7
	11%	11%	-	-	-	-	30%	34%	17%	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	21%	16%	5%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	5	5	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	4	1	6
	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	24%	-	10%	7%	10%	-	-	-	10%	15%	2%	9%
At all sites across your company	18	18	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	4	4	5	1	1	-	-	1	10	8	20
	33%	33%	-	-	-	55%	11%	44%	-	38%	39%	63%	30%	100%	-	-	17%	35%	31%	31%
Don't know	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	3%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 374

Q11.25 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed process re-engineering since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	65	-	65	10	7	21	15	4	8	31	1	13	1	4	6	42	50	14	65
Weighted total	56*	-**	56*	8**	7**	17**	13**	3**	8**	26**	1**	12**	1**	4**	6**	36*	42*	13**	65*
At one main site	5	-	5	1	1	1	1	-	1	2	-	2	-	1	1	2	4	1	6
	9%	-	9%	8%	19%	9%	5%	-	9%	8%	-	17%	-	35%	13%	6%	10%	5%	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	-	11	1	-	1	5	1	3	6	-	2	1	-	-	9	9	1	13
	21%	-	21%	17%	-	6%	42%	19%	40%	23%	-	18%	100%	-	-	26%	23%	5%	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	9	-	9	1	-	4	2	-	2	3	-	1	-	-	2	6	7	2	12
	17%	-	17%	17%	-	23%	14%	-	27%	10%	-	11%	-	-	26%	17%	18%	14%	18%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	-	6	-	-	3	2	1	1	4	-	1	-	-	-	6	6	-	7
	11%	-	11%	-	-	15%	14%	24%	13%	16%	-	8%	-	-	-	17%	15%	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	5	-	5	-	1	2	2	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	4	3	2	6
	9%	-	9%	-	8%	9%	13%	38%	-	-	100%	15%	-	-	-	11%	7%	14%	9%
At all sites across your company	18	-	18	5	5	7	2	1	-	10	-	4	-	2	4	8	11	7	20
	33%	-	33%	58%	73%	39%	12%	18%	-	40%	-	30%	-	42%	61%	23%	27%	55%	31%
Don't know	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	10%	3%	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	6%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 375

Q11.25 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed process re-engineering since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	65	11	37	10	7	15	44	54	9	14	8	30	6	16	60	31	20	32	5	65
Weighted total	56*	10**	30*	10**	6**	13**	38*	47*	7**	12**	8**	27**	4**	13**	51*	26**	17**	27**	5**	65*
At one main site	5	1	1	1	1	-	4	4	-	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	1	3	1	6
	9%	15%	2%	13%	23%	-	11%	9%	-	12%	15%	5%	16%	11%	8%	8%	8%	10%	15%	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	1	7	3	1	3	8	10	1	-	1	4	1	6	10	7	1	2	1	13
	21%	6%	23%	32%	15%	21%	20%	21%	9%	-	13%	14%	14%	49%	20%	28%	7%	6%	27%	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	9	-	6	1	3	2	7	6	2	3	1	5	1	1	9	6	4	5	-	12
	17%	-	20%	8%	42%	12%	17%	13%	28%	21%	14%	19%	32%	11%	18%	25%	23%	20%	-	18%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	2	4	-	-	2	3	4	3	3	1	3	2	1	6	3	2	4	-	7
	11%	18%	14%	-	-	18%	8%	9%	38%	25%	14%	12%	38%	7%	12%	11%	12%	14%	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	5	-	2	2	1	1	4	5	-	1	2	3	-	1	4	3	1	1	1	6
	9%	-	8%	20%	8%	9%	10%	10%	-	10%	21%	11%	-	9%	9%	11%	7%	5%	10%	9%
At all sites across your company	18	6	9	3	1	5	12	17	2	4	2	10	-	2	16	5	7	11	2	20
	33%	61%	30%	27%	11%	40%	31%	36%	25%	33%	22%	39%	-	14%	31%	17%	43%	41%	48%	31%
Don't know	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	1%	-	3%	-	-	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	3%	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 376

Q11.25 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed process re-engineering since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	65	46	1	18	65	2	6	4	15	24	13	36	16	11	30	22	65
Weighted total	56*	41*	1**	14**	56*	2**	5**	3**	13**	21**	10**	31*	14**	9**	25**	20**	65*
At one main site	5	3	-	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	6
	9%	8%	-	10%	9%	58%	15%	23%	11%	3%	13%	6%	10%	15%	8%	7%	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	9	1	2	11	1	1	-	3	5	2	6	3	2	3	6	13
	21%	22%	100%	14%	21%	42%	20%	-	22%	24%	18%	20%	24%	21%	12%	29%	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	9	7	-	2	9	-	-	1	2	5	1	7	1	1	6	2	12
	17%	18%	-	13%	17%	-	-	18%	12%	24%	13%	23%	5%	8%	25%	8%	18%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	3	-	3	6	-	1	-	1	4	-	6	-	-	5	1	7
	11%	8%	-	20%	11%	-	31%	-	7%	18%	-	20%	-	-	20%	6%	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	5	5	-	-	5	-	-	-	2	2	1	3	1	1	3	1	6
	9%	12%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	19%	10%	5%	10%	8%	6%	13%	6%	9%
At all sites across your company	18	12	-	6	18	-	2	2	4	4	5	7	6	5	6	8	20
	33%	30%	-	43%	33%	-	35%	59%	29%	17%	51%	21%	46%	51%	23%	40%	31%
Don't know	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
	1%	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	6%	-	-	4%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 377

Q11.25 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed process re-engineering since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	65	2	3	29	-	4	2	1	2	1	-	4	5	3	-	3	1	-	5	-	65
Weighted total	56*	2**	2**	24**	-**	3**	1**	1**	1**	-**	5**	3**	3**	-**	-**	3**	1**	-**	5**	-**	65*
At one main site	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	6
	9%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	60%	-	-	-	24%	-	-	-	-	-	40%	-	9%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11	-	-	4	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	13
	21%	-	-	18%	-	74%	-	100%	-	100%	-	23%	-	-	-	32%	100%	-	-	-	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	9	1	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	12
	17%	47%	28%	9%	-	-	56%	-	-	-	24%	56%	47%	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	18%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6	1	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	11%	53%	-	16%	-	26%	-	-	-	-	-	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6
	9%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	40%	-	20%	-	-	-	-	36%	-	-	-	-	9%
At all sites across your company	18	-	2	9	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	20
	33%	-	72%	39%	-	-	44%	-	-	-	56%	-	28%	-	-	32%	-	-	45%	-	31%
Don't know	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	1%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 378

Q11.26 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	94	89	1	4	2	5	12	5	7	1	21	18	8	4	1	1	7	41	52	94
Weighted total	92*	82*	1**	9**	1**	5**	10**	5**	8**	2**	21**	15**	9**	3**	1**	3**	7**	36*	54*	94*
At one main site	14	10	-	4	1	-	1	-	2	2	4	1	2	-	-	-	1	6	8	12
	16%	13%	-	43%	61%	-	12%	-	22%	100%	19%	8%	28%	-	-	-	14%	17%	15%	13%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	21	18	-	3	*	-	1	2	1	-	2	2	1	1	-	3	3	5	14	19
	22%	22%	-	31%	39%	-	13%	42%	12%	-	11%	16%	16%	46%	-	100%	47%	13%	27%	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	11	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	2	4	-	1	-	-	-	6	6	15
	13%	14%	-	-	-	22%	20%	21%	-	-	11%	27%	-	30%	-	-	-	16%	11%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	9	1	2	-	1	2	-	3	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	9	12
	13%	11%	100%	26%	-	12%	25%	-	39%	-	16%	15%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	17%	13%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	7	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	4	3	8
	8%	9%	-	-	-	26%	-	11%	14%	-	5%	11%	9%	25%	-	-	-	12%	5%	9%
At all sites across your company	24	24	-	-	-	2	3	1	1	-	7	3	4	-	1	-	1	12	12	25
	26%	29%	-	-	-	40%	30%	25%	12%	-	35%	22%	48%	-	100%	-	15%	32%	22%	27%
Don't know	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	3
	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	24%	2%	3%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 379

Q11.26 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	94	-	94	11	12	27	26	7	11	38	4	24	1	9	11	56	74	19	94
Weighted total	92*	-**	92*	11**	12**	27**	24**	5**	12**	34*	6**	25**	1**	11**	14**	50*	72*	18**	94*
At one main site	14	-	14	5	2	3	5	-	-	3	-	5	-	3	4	4	12	2	12
	16%	-	16%	43%	15%	11%	20%	-	-	10%	-	19%	-	32%	32%	8%	17%	10%	13%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	21	-	21	1	1	4	8	*	6	7	3	5	1	-	1	14	17	2	19
	22%	-	22%	6%	10%	16%	33%	8%	49%	22%	48%	19%	100%	-	7%	27%	24%	12%	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	-	11	1	1	4	3	3	-	4	-	4	-	1	1	6	7	4	15
	13%	-	13%	6%	9%	14%	13%	55%	-	12%	-	14%	-	13%	8%	11%	10%	24%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	-	12	-	-	6	3	1	2	5	-	4	-	2	1	9	10	2	12
	13%	-	13%	-	-	23%	11%	14%	19%	13%	-	16%	-	22%	6%	17%	14%	9%	13%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	-	7	-	1	2	3	1	-	1	2	2	-	-	2	4	5	2	8
	8%	-	8%	-	7%	9%	12%	22%	-	2%	37%	7%	-	-	16%	8%	8%	10%	9%
At all sites across your company	24	-	24	5	7	8	3	-	2	13	1	5	-	3	4	13	18	6	25
	26%	-	26%	45%	53%	28%	11%	-	18%	38%	15%	21%	-	25%	31%	25%	25%	31%	27%
Don't know	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	1	-	2	2	1	3
	3%	-	3%	-	7%	-	-	-	14%	2%	-	3%	-	8%	-	3%	2%	4%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 380

Q11.26 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	94	16	54	11	13	19	63	76	11	15	17	45	7	26	86	41	22	34	8	94
Weighted total	92*	16**	49*	12**	15**	18**	60*	72*	10**	13**	18**	43*	7**	24**	81*	37*	19**	30**	10**	94*
At one main site	14	3	8	2	1	1	5	6	-	1	-	6	1	2	13	3	1	1	1	12
	16%	18%	17%	15%	8%	5%	9%	9%	-	5%	-	13%	22%	8%	16%	8%	3%	5%	10%	13%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	21	3	5	4	8	3	14	15	3	1	3	6	1	9	16	11	4	5	4	19
	22%	20%	11%	35%	52%	16%	23%	21%	32%	7%	19%	13%	13%	40%	20%	29%	21%	17%	40%	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	1	7	3	*	4	6	9	1	2	4	7	1	3	11	6	2	4	-	15
	13%	4%	15%	28%	3%	22%	11%	13%	13%	13%	24%	16%	9%	14%	14%	17%	12%	12%	-	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	1	7	-	4	3	8	10	1	2	4	4	4	3	12	6	3	5	-	12
	13%	6%	14%	-	28%	18%	13%	14%	14%	15%	20%	10%	55%	14%	15%	17%	16%	16%	-	13%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	2	3	2	-	1	6	7	-	1	2	4	-	3	7	4	2	2	-	8
	8%	12%	7%	17%	-	7%	10%	10%	-	9%	13%	9%	-	12%	9%	12%	10%	5%	-	9%
At all sites across your company	24	6	16	1	1	5	19	22	4	7	4	16	-	2	19	6	7	12	4	25
	26%	35%	33%	5%	9%	28%	32%	30%	41%	51%	24%	38%	-	9%	24%	17%	37%	40%	43%	27%
Don't know	2	1	2	-	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	2	1	3
	3%	5%	3%	-	-	5%	3%	3%	-	-	-	2%	-	4%	2%	-	-	5%	8%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 381

Q11.26 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	94	67	2	25	94	3	7	5	25	33	18	50	26	15	44	34	94
Weighted total	92*	68*	1**	22**	92*	5**	7**	5**	22**	32**	16**	49*	26**	13**	42*	36**	94*
At one main site	14	11	-	3	14	2	1	2	5	-	3	9	3	2	9	4	12
	16%	17%	-	13%	16%	33%	13%	49%	22%	-	16%	18%	11%	12%	21%	11%	13%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	21	17	1	2	21	4	-	1	4	9	4	11	6	2	8	10	19
	22%	25%	60%	11%	22%	67%	-	21%	16%	29%	24%	21%	23%	18%	18%	29%	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	7	1	4	11	-	-	1	6	3	2	7	3	1	6	3	15
	13%	11%	40%	17%	13%	-	-	13%	27%	8%	10%	15%	10%	8%	15%	10%	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	11	-	1	12	-	2	-	-	9	1	9	2	1	9	2	12
	13%	16%	-	5%	13%	-	36%	-	-	27%	6%	17%	9%	7%	20%	7%	13%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	6	-	1	7	-	1	-	2	3	2	4	1	3	3	2	8
	8%	9%	-	6%	8%	-	19%	-	8%	10%	10%	9%	4%	22%	6%	5%	9%
At all sites across your company	24	13	-	11	24	-	2	1	6	7	4	9	10	4	7	13	25
	26%	19%	-	48%	26%	-	32%	17%	26%	23%	27%	18%	40%	27%	17%	37%	27%
Don't know	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
	3%	4%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	3%	5%	2%	3%	6%	2%	2%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 382

Q11.26 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Sector																				Unwtd total
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	94	2	2	32	1	4	2	4	1	4	10	5	3	1	-	6	2	3	11	-	94
Weighted total	92*	2**	1**	27**	1**	3**	1**	5**	1**	5**	12**	3**	3**	1**	**	6**	4**	5**	11**	**	94*
At one main site	14	1	-	3	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	12
	16%	47%	-	10%	-	-	-	34%	-	31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	35%	-	13%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	21	-	-	4	-	1	2	1	-	1	3	1	1	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	19
	22%	-	-	17%	-	24%	60%	44%	100%	21%	21%	23%	52%	-	-	44%	74%	-	-	-	20%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	11	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	15
	13%	-	47%	11%	100%	19%	-	-	-	-	8%	16%	17%	100%	-	-	-	29%	22%	-	16%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	12	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	12
	13%	53%	-	8%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	23%	61%	-	-	-	-	26%	49%	-	-	13%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	7	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	8
	8%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	37%	-	-	12%	-	9%
At all sites across your company	24	-	1	10	-	1	1	-	3	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	25
	26%	-	53%	37%	-	31%	40%	23%	49%	-	20%	-	31%	-	-	19%	-	-	31%	-	27%
Don't know	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	3%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 383

Q11.25-26 And which of the following best describes how many sites across your business this measure has been installed or upgraded in the last 18 months?

Summary

Base: all participants who have installed processes since early 2015 and operate from multiple sites

	Process re-engineering	Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps
Unweighted total	65	94
Weighted total	56	92
At one main site	5 9%	14 16%
At a few sites (less than a quarter)	11 21%	21 22%
At some sites (between a quarter and a half)	9 17%	11 13%
At many sites (between a half and three quarters)	6 11%	12 13%
At nearly all sites (more than three quarters but not all)	5 9%	7 8%
At all sites across your company	18 33%	24 26%
Don't know	1 1%	2 3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 384

Q12. Again, thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, what was your company's actual capital spend on energy efficiency measures for your accounting period ending in 2015? If you can, please tell me the capital spend overall across the whole organisation, or your best estimate. We are interested in actual, rather than committed, spend.

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
£0 - no investment	66	52	1	14	1	8	4	6	2	-	29	6	3	1	2	-	3	33	33	59
	8%	7%	9%	14%	6%	11% <i>m</i>	9%	10%	4%	-	13% <i>zkm</i>	4%	6%	1%	10%	-	7%	8%	8%	7%
Less than £10,000	120	92	3	26	3	16	7	9	8	7	33	13	6	5	2	3	6	55	64	110
	14%	12%	22%	26% <i>za</i>	11%	21% <i>k</i>	15%	15%	12%	41%	14%	9%	9%	9%	11%	16%	12%	13%	15%	13%
£10,000 - £24,999	105	96	1	8	1	12	4	4	10	4	23	17	8	13	-	1	5	53	51	102
	12%	13%	9%	8%	6%	16%	8%	8%	15%	23%	10%	12%	13%	23% <i>zfgjk</i>	-	7%	12%	12%	12%	12%
£25,000 - £49,999	63	56	-	8	2	6	5	3	4	2	13	15	5	3	-	3	2	28	34	68
	7%	7%	-	8%	9%	8%	11%	5%	5%	11%	6%	11%	9%	6%	-	16%	4%	7%	8%	8%
£50,000 - £99,999	88	84	3	2	4	9	7	8	7	1	13	17	4	4	5	4	3	46	42	92
	10%	11% <i>c</i>	23%	2%	19%	12%	16% <i>j</i>	14%	10%	5%	6%	12%	7%	7%	28%	21%	7%	11%	10%	11%
£100,000 - £499,999	130	122	*	8	6	4	12	10	13	1	34	22	16	6	3	-	4	70	60	140
	15% <i>e</i>	16%	4%	8%	27%	5%	26% <i>e</i>	16% <i>e</i>	20% <i>e</i>	5%	15% <i>e</i>	15% <i>e</i>	26% <i>zejp</i>	12%	14%	-	10%	16%	14%	16%
£500,000 - £999,999	39	35	-	4	*	3	-	3	6	-	12	6	2	3	-	-	2	20	19	39
	4%	5%	-	4%	2%	4%	-	5%	10% <i>f</i>	-	5%	4%	3%	6%	-	-	4%	5%	4%	4%
£1,000,000 or more	78	70	1	7	2	6	3	5	7	-	22	9	4	6	6	2	7	42	35	82
	9%	9%	5%	8%	9%	8%	7%	8%	10%	-	10%	6%	6%	11%	32%	10%	16% <i>k</i>	10%	8%	9%
Don't know	180	155	3	22	3	10	5	12	8	3	50	40	12	14	1	5	13	86	89	179
	21%	20%	26%	22%	11%	14%	10%	20%	13%	15%	22%	27% <i>efh</i>	20%	26%	6%	31%	29% <i>f</i>	20%	21%	21%
Mean (£1000)	902.58	993.14	109.17	267.33	365.47	287.78	156.86	447.65	438.39	22.20	2242.56	428.27	218.15	402.12	1066.56	178.58	1536.91	1184.95	624.54	869.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 385

Q12. Again, thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, what was your company's actual capital spend on energy efficiency measures for your accounting period ending in 2015? If you can, please tell me the capital spend overall across the whole organisation, or your best estimate. We are interested in actual, rather than committed, spend.

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
£0 - no investment	66	25	41	30	11	10	13	3	-	17	13	33	15	11	10	24	36	30	59
	8%h	15%zb	6%	15%zdefh	5%	5%	7%	8%h	-	6%	12%i	12%z	36%	9%	7%	6%	6%	13%zp	7%
Less than £10,000	120	32	88	50	28	26	12	3	1	22	31	42	15	23	25	36	77	41	110
	14%fhio	19%b	13%	25%zdefgh	13%fh	13%h	7%	8%	2%	7%	30%zik	15%i	35%	19%o	17%o	9%	12%	17%	13%
£10,000 - £24,999	105	16	89	23	29	27	22	2	3	38	12	33	2	21	17	51	85	20	102
	12%	10%	13%	11%	14%	14%	12%	5%	5%	13%	12%	12%	5%	17%	12%	12%	14%	8%	12%
£25,000 - £49,999	63	14	49	16	18	14	12	2	2	23	3	23	4	5	12	32	47	17	68
	7%	8%	7%	8%	9%	7%	7%	5%	3%	8%	3%	8%	10%	4%	8%	8%	7%	7%	8%
£50,000 - £99,999	88	16	73	16	22	25	20	3	2	39	12	20	1	6	19	52	66	22	92
	10%	9%	10%	8%	11%	13%	11%	10%	4%	13%k	12%	7%	3%	5%	13%	13%lm	11%	9%	11%
£100,000 - £499,999	130	19	111	12	41	27	38	2	10	54	8	36	3	21	22	73	95	35	140
	15%c	12%	16%	6%	20%c	14%c	21%zc	7%	19%c	18%j	8%	13%	7%	17%	15%	18%	15%	15%	16%
£500,000 - £999,999	39	4	35	1	4	9	12	5	8	20	1	8	-	1	4	30	34	3	39
	4%c	3%	5%	1%	2%	5%c	7%ccd	14%zcde	15%zcde	7%jk	1%	3%	-	1%	3%	7%zmn	5%q	1%	4%
£1,000,000 or more	78	4	74	6	8	15	18	11	20	34	1	27	1	6	11	56	59	18	82
	9%acdj	3%	10%a	3%	4%	8%	10%ccd	34%zcdef	37%zcdef	11%j	1%	10%j	2%	5%	8%	14%zmn	9%	7%	9%
Don't know	180	36	144	45	47	39	33	3	8	57	23	56	1	29	26	55	128	51	179
	21%cd	22%	20%	22%	23%	20%	18%	10%	15%	19%	22%	20%	2%	24%o	18%	13%	20%	21%	21%
Mean (£1000)	902.58	103.69	1089.04	77.10	170.42	280.02c	355.84cd	1621.20	9472.77zdef	573.82	59.36	720.01	45.33	126.30	245.44	1604.70	972.43	721.83	869.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 386

Q12. Again, thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, what was your company's actual capital spend on energy efficiency measures for your accounting period ending in 2015? If you can, please tell me the capital spend overall across the whole organisation, or your best estimate. We are interested in actual, rather than committed, spend.

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
£0 - no investment	66	21	19	7	19	1	47	47	2	1	5	22	-	15	23	8	2	3	40	59
		8% <i>beinopq</i>	11% <i>b</i>	4%	8%	1%	8% <i>e</i>	7% <i>ji</i>	2%	1%	4%	6%	-	7%	4%	3%	2%	2%	16% <i>znopq</i>	7%
Less than £10,000	120	29	51	13	28	11	73	81	12	4	13	37	4	21	65	14	5	11	54	110
		14% <i>iopq</i>	15%	12%	14%	9%	13%	12% <i>ji</i>	16% <i>i</i>	4%	9%	11%	14%	9%	11% <i>o</i>	6%	5%	7%	22% <i>znopq</i>	13%
£10,000 - £24,999	105	26	58	4	16	17	73	90	8	10	17	50	3	31	69	16	7	19	36	102
		12% <i>o</i>	13% <i>c</i>	14% <i>c</i>	5%	11%	13%	13%	10%	10%	12%	14%	11%	14%	12% <i>o</i>	7%	8%	12%	14% <i>o</i>	12%
£25,000 - £49,999	63	17	33	6	7	11	38	53	7	8	11	27	11	12	39	10	3	6	23	68
		7%	8%	8%	6%	5%	9%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	19% <i>zkm</i>	5%	6%	4%	4%	4%	9% <i>oq</i>	8%
£50,000 - £99,999	88	18	49	6	15	10	60	73	6	20	22	44	4	25	67	37	12	25	20	92
		10%	9%	12%	6%	10%	9%	11%	7%	20% <i>zgh</i>	16%	13%	13%	11%	11%	15% <i>zr</i>	13%	16% <i>zr</i>	8%	11%
£100,000 - £499,999	130	20	65	19	27	20	92	106	15	18	17	71	3	37	107	49	18	26	21	140
		15% <i>r</i>	10%	15%	21% <i>a</i>	18%	17%	15%	19%	18%	12%	20% <i>z</i>	10%	17%	18% <i>r</i>	19% <i>r</i>	19% <i>r</i>	17% <i>r</i>	8%	16%
£500,000 - £999,999	39	4	23	6	5	7	24	27	6	7	7	15	2	12	38	27	7	10	1	39
		4% <i>r</i>	2%	5%	7%	4%	6%	4%	7%	7%	5%	4%	6%	5%	6% <i>r</i>	11% <i>znr</i>	8% <i>r</i>	6% <i>r</i>	-	4%
£1,000,000 or more	78	14	44	9	9	15	52	64	10	16	22	34	7	20	73	52	20	30	6	82
		9% <i>r</i>	7%	10%	10%	13%	9%	9%	12%	17% <i>zg</i>	16% <i>zg</i>	10%	21% <i>zm</i>	9%	12% <i>r</i>	21% <i>znr</i>	22% <i>znr</i>	19% <i>znr</i>	2%	9%
Don't know	180	46	81	20	23	24	119	148	14	15	25	51	2	49	117	38	16	28	48	179
		21% <i>k</i>	24%	19%	23%	15%	20%	21%	17%	15%	18%	15%	6%	22% <i>kl</i>	20%	15%	18%	18%	20%	21%
Mean (£1000)	902.58	1913.84	679.10	854.02	363.80	657.80	1134.22	599.49	4267.14z	812.55	372.84	760.74	472.02	420.19	1253.82	2564.83	2730.68r	2832.39	99.87	869.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 387

Q12. Again, thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, what was your company's actual capital spend on energy efficiency measures for your accounting period ending in 2015? If you can, please tell me the capital spend overall across the whole organisation, or your best estimate. We are interested in actual, rather than committed, spend.

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
£0 - no investment	66	24	4	39	66	-	-	-	-	-	42	18	6	40	22	4	59
	8% <i>aefghiklo</i>	5%	12%	12% <i>za</i>	8% <i>efghi</i>	-	-	-	-	-	17% <i>zkl</i>	4%	3%	18% <i>zno</i>	5%	2%	7%
Less than £10,000	120	64	5	50	120	120	-	-	-	-	54	48	16	49	49	21	110
	14% <i>fghi</i>	12%	16%	16%	14% <i>fghi</i>	100% <i>zdfghi</i>	-	-	-	-	22% <i>zkl</i>	12%	9%	22% <i>zno</i>	11%	12%	13%
£10,000 - £24,999	105	63	6	34	105	-	105	-	-	-	34	55	15	31	62	10	102
	12% <i>eghio</i>	12%	19%	11%	12% <i>eghi</i>	-	62% <i>zdeghi</i>	-	-	-	14%	13%	8%	14% <i>o</i>	14% <i>o</i>	6%	12%
£25,000 - £49,999	63	43	3	17	63	-	63	-	-	-	17	26	18	17	29	16	68
	7% <i>eghi</i>	8%	9%	6%	7% <i>eghi</i>	-	38% <i>zdeghi</i>	-	-	-	7%	6%	9%	8%	6%	10%	8%
£50,000 - £99,999	88	61	1	26	88	-	-	88	-	-	13	50	24	12	57	19	92
	10% <i>efhijm</i>	12%	4%	8%	10% <i>efhi</i>	-	-	100% <i>zdefhi</i>	-	-	5%	12% <i>jl</i>	13% <i>jl</i>	5%	12% <i>m</i>	11%	11%
£100,000 - £499,999	130	77	5	49	130	-	-	-	130	-	24	66	40	25	74	32	140
	15% <i>efgi</i>	15%	17%	16%	15% <i>efgi</i>	-	-	-	100% <i>zdefgi</i>	-	10%	16% <i>jl</i>	21% <i>zj</i>	11%	16%	19%	16%
£500,000 - £999,999	39	26	1	12	39	-	-	-	-	39	4	28	6	3	30	6	39
	4% <i>efhm</i>	5%	3%	4%	4% <i>efh</i>	-	-	-	-	33% <i>zdefgh</i>	2%	7% <i>jl</i>	3%	1%	7% <i>m</i>	3%	4%
£1,000,000 or more	78	46	4	27	78	-	-	-	-	78	10	33	35	6	40	32	82
	9% <i>efghjm</i>	9%	15%	9%	9% <i>efgh</i>	-	-	-	-	67% <i>zdefgh</i>	4%	8%	19% <i>zjk</i>	3%	5% <i>m</i>	19% <i>zmm</i>	9%
Don't know	180	118	1	59	180	-	-	-	-	-	46	88	28	36	95	33	179
	21% <i>efghi</i>	23%	5%	19%	21% <i>efghi</i>	-	-	-	-	-	19%	21%	15%	17%	21%	19%	21%
Mean (£1000)	902.58	622.87	355.58	1423.45	902.58	4.69	23.66e	69.73ef	215.57efg	4997.37zdefh	142.60	699.41	2312.75	131.13	664.00	2586.32	869.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 388

Q12. Again, thinking about your own organisation, rather than any subsidiaries or other group members, what was your company's actual capital spend on energy efficiency measures for your accounting period ending in 2015? If you can, please tell me the capital spend overall across the whole organisation, or your best estimate. We are interested in actual, rather than committed, spend.

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871	
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	36**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871	
£0 - no investment	66	-	-	6	-	-	3	4	1	1	2	15	-	5	2	2	11	-	13	-	59	
	8%	-	-	3%	-	-	11% <i>c</i>	5%	1%	3%	7%	20% <i>zcghp</i>	-	10% <i>c</i>	6%	38%	4%	23% <i>zcghps</i>	-	9% <i>c</i>	-	
Less than £10,000	120	2	-	19	3	1	4	11	2	5	3	10	1	11	6	-	5	10	-	25	2	
	14%	21%	-	11%	30%	13%	14%	14%	5%	13%	9%	14%	5%	24% <i>zch</i>	17%	-	12%	20%	-	18%	28%	
£10,000 - £24,999	105	2	-	19	-	-	5	7	3	4	5	6	4	7	6	4	3	8	20	-	102	
	12%	21%	-	11%	-	-	16%	9%	9%	11%	18%	8%	14%	15%	17%	-	10%	7%	29%	15%	12%	
£25,000 - £49,999	63	-	-	9	-	-	4	8	5	1	3	4	1	5	5	-	6	2	1	10	-	
	7%	-	-	5%	-	-	13%	10%	15% <i>c</i>	3%	5%	4%	5%	10%	15%	-	12%	5%	4%	8%	8%	
£50,000 - £99,999	88	2	1	27	2	-	1	9	8	5	3	5	2	1	8	-	4	1	6	9	2	
	10% <i>m</i>	21%	13%	16% <i>zfmqs</i>	23%	-	4%	11%	22% <i>zfmqs</i>	12%	11%	6%	8%	2%	-	-	8%	2%	21%	7%	23%	
£100,000 - £499,999	130	2	1	31	2	2	4	16	4	13	2	8	5	4	7	-	4	9	3	13	-	
	15%	17%	15%	18% <i>s</i>	20%	34%	14%	20%	12%	33%	6%	10%	18%	10%	19%	-	9%	19%	11%	10%	16%	
£500,000 - £999,999	39	-	-	6	-	1	1	4	4	1	3	4	3	3	-	-	6	-	-	3	2	
	4%	-	-	4%	-	18%	5%	5%	11% <i>qs</i>	3%	-	4%	13%	7%	-	-	13% <i>zqqs</i>	-	-	2%	22%	
£1,000,000 or more	78	-	3	18	1	1	1	9	4	4	11	5	2	1	3	1	1	2	7	-	82	
	9%	-	53%	11%	8%	26%	3%	11%	11%	10%	15%	14%	17%	4%	3%	62%	3%	2%	8%	5%	9%	
Don't know	180	2	1	36	2	*	6	12	5	5	8	15	6	8	7	-	13	10	8	35	2	
	21%	20%	19%	21%	20%	8%	20%	14%	14%	13%	28%	20%	21%	18%	22%	-	28%	20%	26%	26%	26%	
Mean (£1000)	902.58	60.53	750.03	767.59	146.86	1860.15	273.22	4075.23	370.28	428.97	472.33	1998.84	383.66	162.62	103.27	1471.46	208.13	143.96	166.05	172.19	220.51	869.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 389

Q13. And is that the capital spend on energy efficiency across all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's capital spend on energy efficiency

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	144	133	4	7	6	13	11	8	6	6	38	24	8	6	1	2	13	92	52	144
Weighted total	138	123	2**	13**	5**	12**	10**	7**	7**	5**	38*	23**	6**	6**	1**	2**	13**	86*	52*	144
For all sites	48	40	1	7	1	3	4	2	3	1	12	12	3	2	-	1	1	21	27	50
	34%	32%	45%	54%	25%	28%	40%	32%	37%	21%	31%	53%	57%	28%	-	39%	6%	24%	51% <i>q</i>	35%
For sites I'm responsible for	90	83	1	6	4	9	6	5	5	4	25	11	3	4	1	1	12	64	25	93
	65%	67%	55%	46%	75%	72%	60%	68%	63%	79%	66%	47%	43%	72%	100%	61%	94%	74% <i>r</i>	49%	65%
Don't know / Refused	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 390

Q13. And is that the capital spend on energy efficiency across all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's capital spend on energy efficiency

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	144	-	144	28	30	36	29	5	16	54	18	42	6	17	21	79	105	39	144
Weighted total	138	-**	138	28**	31**	34*	26**	5**	15**	56*	18**	34*	6**	15**	21**	76*	99*	39*	144
For all sites	48	-	48	9	9	15	8	1	5	16	4	14	1	7	9	26	36	12	50
	34%	-	34%	32%	30%	45%	31%	15%	37%	29%	22%	41%	15%	47%	44%	35%	36%	31%	35%
For sites I'm responsible for	90	-	90	18	21	19	18	4	9	40	13	20	5	8	12	50	63	27	93
	65%	-	65%	64%	70%	55%	69%	85%	63%	71%	72%	59%	85%	53%	56%	65%	63%	69%	65%
Don't know / Refused	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	1%	-	1%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 391

Q13. And is that the capital spend on energy efficiency across all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's capital spend on energy efficiency

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	144	31	74	12	26	15	111	131	8	21	26	68	8	45	102	43	20	39	40	144
Weighted total	138	30**	72*	9**	26**	15**	106*	125	7**	20**	25**	63*	8**	41*	95*	37*	19**	37*	41*	144
For all sites	48	13	20	2	10	3	37	42	4	6	10	19	2	15	30	9	6	13	17	50
	34%	44%	28%	25%	40%	22%	35%	33%	51%	29%	41%	30%	23%	37%	31%	23%	31%	36%	42%	35%
For sites I'm responsible for	90	17	52	7	14	12	68	82	4	14	15	44	6	26	65	29	13	24	23	93
	65%	56%	72%	75%	55%	78%	64%	66%	49%	71%	59%	70%	77%	63%	69%	77%	69%	64%	55%	65%
Don't know / Refused	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	1%	-	-	-	5%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 392

Q13. And is that the capital spend on energy efficiency across all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's capital spend on energy efficiency

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (a)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	144	92	8	42	144	27	36	18	28	24	50	65	26	45	66	29	144
Weighted total	138	86*	7**	42*	138	28**	34*	17**	26**	21**	44*	65*	24**	40*	65*	26**	144
For all sites	48	28	-	17	48	11	12	5	6	8	21	18	6	18	16	9	50
	34%	33%	-	41%	34%	40%	36%	29%	25%	40%	47% <i>k</i>	27%	24%	44% <i>n</i>	25%	36%	35%
For sites I'm responsible for	90	56	7	25	90	17	22	12	19	12	23	46	18	22	48	17	93
	65%	66%	100%	59%	65%	60%	64%	71%	75%	60%	53%	71%	76%	56%	74%	64%	65%
Don't know / Refused	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	2%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 393

Q13. And is that the capital spend on energy efficiency across all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's capital spend on energy efficiency

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	144	3	1	34	3	1	4	8	7	6	6	7	6	15	3	-	4	6	-	28	2	144
Weighted total	138	3**	1**	32*	2**	1**	3**	10**	7**	8**	5**	8**	4**	10**	4**	-**	5**	7**	-**	25**	4**	144
For all sites	48	3	1	9	1	-	2	4	-	-	1	3	1	3	-	-	3	6	-	10	2	50
	34%	100%	100%	27%	31%	-	69%	41%	-	-	14%	35%	24%	28%	-	-	57%	78%	-	41%	54%	35%
For sites I'm responsible for	90	-	-	23	2	1	1	6	7	8	3	5	3	7	4	-	2	2	-	15	2	93
	65%	-	-	73%	69%	100%	31%	59%	100%	100%	64%	65%	76%	72%	100%	-	43%	22%	-	59%	46%	65%
Don't know / Refused	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 394

Q14. And did your accounting period in 2015 end in April or December or at some other time?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
April	294	250	4	40	9	28	13	22	27	6	73	40	15	26	10	10	13	139	153	298
	34%	33%	38%	41%	40%	37%	27%	37%	40%	37%	32%	27%	25%	48%z/f/k/l	53%	56%	28%	32%	36%	34%
December	313	286	3	24	7	21	21	18	21	7	87	57	17	16	8	2	28	199	107	318
	36%r	38%	28%	24%	28%	27%	46%e	30%	32%	39%	38%	39%	29%	29%	41%	14%	60%z/eg/h/j/k/l/m	46%zr	25%	37%
Other	264	226	4	34	7	27	12	19	18	4	68	48	27	13	1	5	6	95	167	255
	30%pq	30%	34%	35%	32%	35%p	27%	32%p	27%	24%	30%p	33%p	46%z/j/m/p	23%	6%	30%	12%	22%	39%zq	29%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 395

Q14. And did your accounting period in 2015 end in April or December or at some other time?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
April	294	52	242	59	77	72	63	11	12	102	39	86	13	37	52	128	212	80	298
	34%	31%	34%	29%	37% <i>h</i>	38% <i>h</i>	35%	35%	22%	34%	38%	31%	31%	31%	35%	31%	34%	34%	34%
December	313	63	250	74	63	63	70	12	27	103	35	113	18	40	48	158	226	85	318
	36%	38%	35%	37%	31%	33%	39%	38%	50% <i>zde</i>	34%	34%	40%	43%	33%	33%	39%	36%	36%	37%
Other	264	52	212	67	66	56	48	9	16	98	30	80	11	45	47	122	189	70	255
	30%	31%	30%	33%	32%	29%	27%	28%	28%	32%	29%	29%	26%	37%	32%	30%	30%	30%	29%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 396

Q14. And did your accounting period in 2015 end in April or December or at some other time?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
April	294	69	138	32	49	40	188	232	25	41	47	110	15	74	202	79	34	45	83	298
	34%	35%	33%	35%	33%	35%	33%	34%	31%	41%	34%	31%	50% <i>k</i>	33%	34%	32%	38%	28%	34%	34%
December	313	59	162	35	54	43	205	246	23	35	47	144	6	75	217	106	42	72	88	318
	36%	30%	38%	39%	37%	37%	35%	36%	28%	35%	33%	41% <i>l</i>	20%	34%	36%	42%	47% <i>z</i>	45% <i>zn</i>	35%	37%
Other	264	68	123	23	45	32	185	210	32	23	46	98	9	72	179	65	13	42	76	255
	30% <i>p</i>	35%	29%	25%	31%	28%	32%	31%	40% <i>l</i>	23%	33%	28%	30%	33%	30% <i>p</i>	26% <i>p</i>	15%	26% <i>p</i>	31% <i>p</i>	29%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 397

Q14. And did your accounting period in 2015 end in April or December or at some other time?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
April	294	188	11	96	294	36	66	35	45	29	79	134	73	71	153	63	298
	34%	36%	35%	31%	34%	30%	39% <i>i</i>	39% <i>i</i>	34%	25%	32%	33%	39%	33%	33%	36%	34%
December	313	170	8	133	313	44	50	30	56	55	85	153	66	75	167	66	318
	36%	32%	28%	43% <i>a</i>	36%	36%	30%	34%	43% <i>f</i>	47% <i>zdf</i>	35%	37%	35%	34%	37%	38%	37%
Other	264	165	11	84	264	40	53	23	29	33	80	124	48	72	137	44	255
	30%	32%	37%	27%	30%	34%	31%	27%	22%	28%	33%	30%	26%	33%	30%	25%	29%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 398

Q14. And did your accounting period in 2015 end in April or December or at some other time?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
April	294	3	3	45	3	4	12	18	14	15	9	11	19	20	8	5	4	27	15	54	6	298
	34%kp	28%	59%	26%p	28%	81%	38%kp	22%	38%kp	40%	34%	15%	63%	44%cgkp	23%	100%	8%	58%zcgkp	50%	40%cgkp	72%	34%
December	313	6	2	87	5	-	8	26	16	8	15	46	8	15	13	-	6	7	8	37	2	318
	36%pq	56%	41%	51%zfgmpqs	47%	-	26%	32%p	43%pq	21%	54%	61%zfgmpqs	26%	33%p	37%	-	12%	15%	26%	27%	28%	37%
Other	264	2	-	39	3	1	11	38	7	15	3	18	3	11	13	-	36	13	7	45	-	255
	30%	16%	-	23%	25%	19%	36%	46%zchkm	19%	39%	12%	25%	11%	24%	40%	-	79%zcfghkms	27%	23%	33%	-	29%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 399

Q15a. Edited kWh for known sites

Base: all participants in kilowatts

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
1-10000	24	22	-	2	3	2	1	1	1	-	8	1	1	2	-	-	3	12	10	22
	3%	3%	-	2%	13%	2%	2%	2%	1%	-	3%	1%	1%	4%	-	-	6%	3%	2%	3%
10001-20000	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	1	4
	*	*	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	7%	-	1%	*	*
20001-40000	5	3	-	2	-	2	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	5
	1%	*	-	2%	-	3%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1%	1%
40001-50000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
50001-100000	11	11	-	-	-	1	2	3	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	6	9
	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	3%k	5%zk	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
100001-500000	49	46	1	2	-	2	3	5	5	4	11	9	4	3	2	-	1	25	24	49
	6%	6%	10%	2%	-	3%	7%	9%	8%	22%	5%	6%	7%	5%	11%	-	2%	6%	6%	6%
500001-1000000	35	32	1	2	-	4	1	3	3	1	4	11	3	4	-	-	-	19	16	37
	4%	4%	9%	2%	-	5%	2%	5%	4%	3%	2%	7%j	5%	7%	-	-	-	4%	4%	4%
1000001-2000000	43	38	-	5	2	3	-	3	3	3	10	9	4	*	-	-	1	24	18	45
	5%	5%	-	5%	10%	4%	-	5%	4%	15%	4%	6%	7%	1%	-	-	2%	6%	4%	5%
More than 2000000	381	354	2	25	10	36	22	25	37	3	96	53	29	28	11	4	24	197	182	400
	44%c	46%c	20%	25%	44%	48%	47%	43%	56%k	16%	42%	36%	48%	51%	59%	25%	52%	45%	43%	46%
Don't know	319	251	7	61	8	26	17	18	15	8	92	60	19	17	6	12	18	147	165	299
	37%	33%	61%	63%za	33%	34%	36%	30%	23%	44%	40%h	41%h	31%	31%	30%	69%	39%	34%	39%	34%
Mean (£000)	632683.1	681311.4	24745.3	29616.8	19900.4	192627.4	43474.3	48845.8	2276490.3	7604.5	165853.4	2153107.0	112749.0	67151.7	24948.0	14420.2	236886.4	726312.6	531073.8	619396.5
Median (£000)	6285.3	6954.5	2481.0	3804.2	5856.2	5500.0	6000.0	3535.0	7100.0	1058.6	6500.0	4465.9	5500.0	13232.1	11000.0	3904.1	17568.4	7500.0	5634.0	7031.9
First Quartile	748.3	750.0z	151.0	585.6	1654.0	1000.0	165.4z	330.8	744.3	218.3	976.0	748.3	1096.2	594.3	8270.1	15.0	2811.8	748.3	850.0	850.0z
Second Quartile	3721.5	3904.1	1000.0	2398.3	3374.2	4100.0	4669.0	2315.6	4135.0	619.5	3142.6	2497.9	4000.0	7063.7	10000.0	3110.0	15382.9	3300.0	3804.2	3969.6
Third Quartile	11578.1	13000.0	2481.0	4862.1	14000.0	11578.1	14000.0	4962.1	20179.0	1058.6	11500.0	11908.9	8270.1	15000.0	11000.0	3904.1	21600.0	14886.2	9900.0	13232.1
Fourth Quartile	46000.0	48000.0	26000.0	11578.1	30042.4	35000.0	42000.0	19848.2	99241.1	6616.1	58000.0	48000.0	22448.8	47000.0	50000.0	5856.2	68322.6	48801.8	43921.6	51000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 400

Q15a. Edited kWh for known sites

Base: all participants in kilowatts

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)	
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
1-10000	24	2	21	5	6	5	4	1	2	12	4	4	-	3	5	13	14	10	22
	3%	1%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	4%	4%	4%	2%	-	2%	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%
10001-20000	3	1	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	2	-	1	3	1	4
	*	1%	*	1%	1%	-	*	-	-	*	1%	*	2%	1%	-	*	*	*	*
20001-40000	5	4	2	4	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	3	3	-	-	1	2	4	5
	1%	2% b	*	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	*	-	1%	8%	-	-	*	*	2% p	1%
40001-50000	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
50001-100000	11	5	6	5	2	3	1	-	-	2	2	4	1	4	2	2	7	4	9
	1%	3% b	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	2%	3% o	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%
100001-500000	49	15	35	24	6	6	10	1	1	9	7	25	4	9	9	19	37	13	49
	6%	9%	5%	12% zdeh	3%	3%	6%	4%	2%	3%	6%	9% l	9%	8%	6%	5%	6%	5%	6%
500001-1000000	35	11	24	13	8	8	4	-	2	9	7	18	1	11	6	14	21	14	37
	4%	6%	3%	6%	4%	4%	2%	-	4%	3%	7%	6%	3%	9% zo	4%	3%	3%	6%	4%
1000001-2000000	43	5	37	8	19	11	2	-	2	10	5	15	1	9	9	20	35	8	45
	5% f	3%	5%	4%	9% zf	6% f	1%	-	4%	3%	5%	5%	3%	7%	6%	5%	6%	4%	5%
More than 2000000	381	56	325	37	95	94	96	24	35	162	21	105	3	44	68	221	293	82	400
	44% acjq	33%	46% a	19%	46% c	49% c	53% zc	72% zode	63% zcd	54% zjk	21%	37% f	7%	36%	47%	54% zm	47% sq	35%	46%
Don't know	319	67	252	101	69	64	60	7	12	96	56	105	27	41	47	117	217	101	299
	37% ho	40%	36%	51% zdefgh	33%	34%	33%	21%	22%	32%	54% zik	37%	66%	33%	32%	29%	35%	43% p	34%
Mean (£000)	632683.1	173325.6	733323.9	175039.5	1237835.8	100647.7	971909.0	326741.2	545623.7e	1424567.5	64189.8	70650.6	5275.3	17310.8	171561.8	1103000.3	797066.8	156784.1	619396.5
Median (£000)	6285.3	3141.3	7063.7	879.6	4000.0	6616.1	15500.0	55000.0	73400.0	10000.0	1500.0	3142.6	413.5	3308.0	4669.0	12405.1	8000.0	3804.2	7031.9
First Quartile	748.3c	248.1z	1058.6	151.7	1405.9	1100.0	1964.8	11000.0	5000.0	1786.3	268.0	377.0z	24.8	300.0	790.0	1438.2	1000.0	248.1z	850.0z
Second Quartile	3721.5	1323.2	4168.1	446.6	3060.0	4000.0	8000.0	37000.0	21899.2	5856.2	911.5	2000.0	165.4	1405.9	3142.6	6000.0	4300.4	2067.5	3969.6
Third Quartile	11578.1	5210.9	13664.5	1468.4	5500.0	11578.1	21000.0	99241.1	198482.2	15616.6	4100.0	6616.1	482.0	4300.4	7000.0	21600.0	14886.2	4962.1	13232.1
Fourth Quartile	46000.0	19520.7	54000.0	16540.2	17568.7	24862.8	68322.6	198000.0	488018.3	62000.0	16540.2	21600.0	1394.2	11578.1	21472.8	92625.0	50000.0	29772.3	51000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 401

Q15a. Edited kWh for known sites

Base: all participants in kilowatts

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
1-10000	24	3	17	-	4	-	19	20	3	3	2	11	2	6	17	8	4	8	6	22
	3%	2%	4%	-	2%	-	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	3%	8%	2%	3%	3%	4%	5%	3%	3%
10001-20000	3	3	1	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	2	3	-	-	3	1	1	1	1	4
	*	1%	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	*	*	1%	1%	*	*
20001-40000	5	-	3	-	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	2	1	-	3	5
	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	2%	-	*	1%	1%	-	1%	1%
40001-50000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	*
50001-100000	11	3	3	2	3	-	10	9	1	-	1	8	-	1	3	1	-	2	6	9
	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	-	*	1%	*	-	1%	2%	1%
100001-500000	49	10	24	6	10	3	37	39	4	4	12	18	3	11	26	7	4	6	22	49
	6%	5%	6%	7%	7%	3%	6%	6%	5%	4%	8%	5%	11%	5%	4%	3%	4%	4%	9%	6%
500001-1000000	35	10	16	4	5	4	28	30	6	1	6	20	-	8	24	7	3	3	11	37
	4%	5%	4%	5%	3%	3%	5%	4%	7%	1%	4%	6%	-	4%	4%	3%	3%	2%	5%	4%
1000001-2000000	43	11	21	5	6	4	32	36	6	5	8	22	-	8	31	4	1	7	12	45
	5%	6%	5%	6%	4%	4%	6%	5%	8%	5%	6%	6%	-	4%	5%	2%	1%	5%	5%	5%
More than 2000000	381	79	191	42	62	74	254	316	33	52	56	164	21	109	323	171	52	100	54	400
	44%	41%	45%	47%	42%	64%	44%	46%	42%	52%	40%	47%	66%	49%	54%	68%	58%	63%	22%	46%
Don't know	319	76	147	30	58	31	192	233	27	34	53	104	3	78	169	49	26	31	131	299
	37%	39%	35%	34%	39%	27%	33%	34%	33%	35%	38%	30%	11%	35%	28%	20%	29%	20%	53%	34%
Mean (£000)	632683.1	71916.2	1197651.6	58696.1	60696.8	145360.3	858210.0	746021.6	99075.6	348617.0	56466.8	1237791.9	53172.6	142329.2	767851.8	1518966.4	505260.0	1533073.0	170038.9	619396.5
Median (£000)	6285.3	4332.6	7000.0	4962.1	7248.2	24862.8	5000.0	6500.0	5000.0	15000.0	8328.5	5500.0	7100.0	9097.1	10000.0	23424.9	74000.0	19848.2	1784.7	7031.9
First Quartile	748.3	850.0	626.3	1000.0	523.9	3110.0	594.3z	790.0z	959.3	2000.0	526.0	744.3	391.6	1075.1	1405.9	3907.0	3060.0	1700.0	218.3	850.0z
Second Quartile	3721.5	3110.0	4525.5	3142.6	3374.2	11000.0	3109.6	3721.5	2418.9	9575.9	4100.0	3141.3	6832.3	4100.0	5500.0	17568.7	27000.0	10000.0	976.0	3969.6
Third Quartile	11578.1	7808.3	14876.1	11483.5	11000.0	39245.2	9924.1	11578.1	10000.0	29751.4	16700.0	11250.0	10150.8	17568.7	18675.4	39041.5	144000.0	29751.4	3000.0	13232.1
Fourth Quartile	46000.0	40000.0	51000.0	50000.0	29500.0	101507.8	33757.2	41350.5	74430.8	97603.7	61000.0	43921.6	48801.8	73400.0	65000.0	136645.1	292811.0	114000.0	7808.3	51000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 402

Q15a. Edited kWh for known sites

Base: all participants in kilowatts

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
1-10000	24	13	1	10	24	2	5	5	6	2	7	10	5	7	11	5	22
	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	5%	5%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%
10001-20000	3	3	-	1	3	1	2	-	1	-	1	2	1	1	2	1	4
	*	1%	-	*	*	1%	1%	-	1%	-	*	*	1%	*	*	1%	*
20001-40000	5	1	-	5	5	3	1	-	-	-	3	1	2	3	-	2	5
	1%	*	-	2%e	1%	2%	*	-	-	-	1%	*	1%	1% <i>n</i>	-	1% <i>n</i>	1%
40001-50000	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*
50001-100000	11	6	-	5	11	4	2	-	-	1	4	6	1	4	4	3	9
	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	3%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%
100001-500000	49	32	2	15	49	19	12	3	4	-	12	26	11	11	29	10	49
	6% <i>l</i>	6%	5%	5%	6% <i>l</i>	15% <i>zdfghi</i>	7% <i>l</i>	3%	3%	-	5%	6%	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%
500001-1000000	35	25	3	7	35	8	14	3	1	1	13	15	6	12	18	5	37
	4%	5%	10%	2%	4%	7% <i>hi</i>	8% <i>zghi</i>	4%	1%	1%	5%	4%	3%	6%	4%	3%	4%
1000001-2000000	43	33	1	9	43	8	14	2	3	2	13	26	4	12	25	6	45
	5%	6%	2%	3%	5%	6%	8% <i>hi</i>	2%	2%	2%	5%	6%	2%	6%	5%	3%	5%
More than 2000000	381	226	16	139	381	29	68	49	88	82	104	190	84	93	209	77	400
	44% <i>e</i>	43%	54%	44%	44% <i>e</i>	25%	41% <i>e</i>	56% <i>zdef</i>	67% <i>zdef</i>	70% <i>zdefg</i>	43%	46%	45%	43%	46%	45%	46%
Don't know	319	184	8	122	319	47	51	26	27	28	88	135	72	75	159	63	299
	37% <i>hi</i>	35%	27%	39%	37% <i>hi</i>	39% <i>hi</i>	30%	29%	21%	24%	36%	33%	39%	35%	35%	36%	34%
Mean (£000)	632683.1	587975.1	97759.6	774117.1	632683.1	6353.1	62987.7	2581152.8	204000.6	1712468.1	66794.2	738543.1	1171981.4	49595.9	692032.6	1245047.0	619396.5
Median (£000)	6285.3	5856.2	11578.1	8000.0	6285.3	1058.6	2680.0	14250.1	12405.1	74000.0	4700.0	6285.3	8270.1	3804.2	7000.0	9575.9	7031.9
First Quartile	748.3	879.6	744.3	585.6	748.3	183.0z	679.7	1654.0	4000.0	11000.0	750.0	959.3	595.4	619.5	959.3	526.0	850.0z
Second Quartile	3721.5	3300.0	10000.0	3969.6	3721.5	585.6	1984.8	7808.3	8270.1	39041.5	2656.4	3800.0	5000.0	2481.0	3907.0	5000.0	3969.6
Third Quartile	11578.1	10150.8	19520.7	13051.5	11578.1	2067.5	3308.0	21472.8	17568.7	115781.3	10000.0	13000.0	14876.1	6616.1	14886.2	18492.5	13232.1
Fourth Quartile	46000.0	42000.0	132321.5	41759.1	46000.0	5856.2	11000.0	57000.0	48000.0	413504.7	33000.0	51000.0	50000.0	21502.2	52000.0	66499.6	51000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 403

Q15a. Edited kWh for known sites

Base: all participants in kilowatts

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
1-10000	24	-	-	5	-	-	-	6	-	3	-	2	-	1	2	-	2	2	-	2	-	22
	3%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	7%	-	7%	-	3%	-	2%	6%	-	4%	3%	-	2%	-	3%
10001-20000	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*
20001-40000	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1%
40001-50000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
50001-100000	11	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	9
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%z	-	3%	-	-	-	4%	-	1%	-	1%
100001-500000	49	1	-	5	-	-	2	4	1	-	1	3	1	3	6	-	2	6	-	14	-	49
	6%	12%	-	3%	-	-	7%	5%	4%	-	3%	4%	3%	6%	17%	-	4%	12% c	-	10% zc	-	6%
500001-1000000	35	-	-	5	2	-	4	1	-	2	4	4	1	4	-	-	2	1	4	6	-	37
	4%	-	-	3%	21%	-	13% zcghq	1%	-	5%	2%	5%	2%	9%	-	-	4%	1%	13%	5%	-	4%
1000001-2000000	43	1	-	6	4	-	3	3	-	1	4	4	1	6	1	-	3	2	1	5	2	45
	5%	8%	-	4%	-	-	12% cs	4%	8%	-	4%	5%	5%	12% zcs	2%	-	7%	4%	4%	3%	28%	5%
More than 2000000	381	5	4	97	3	5	10	44	19	17	9	23	17	14	12	2	25	10	12	49	2	400
	44% g	46%	81%	57% zfkms	35%	87%	33%	54% fkms	54% kmq	46%	33%	31%	56%	31%	35%	38%	55% kmqs	21%	41%	36%	22%	46%
Don't know	319	4	1	47	4	1	11	23	12	18	13	33	10	16	13	3	12	26	12	56	4	299
	37% c	34%	19%	27%	44%	13%	35%	29%	34%	47%	48%	44% c	33%	35%	39%	62%	26%	54% zcgp	42%	41% c	51%	34%
Mean (£000)	632683.1	49929.8	142252.3	1562798.6	774215.6	26542242.0	38327.0	105602.5s	33143.0	173063.8	40160.8	133726.8	77515.0	18140.1	21398.8	132321.5	41463.0	4003.3	14661.4	25426.3	168046.1	619396.5
Median (£000)	6285.3	7063.7	114000.0	15382.9	4700.0	900000.0	3800.0	15033.2	9924.1	9097.1	4962.1	2150.2	8000.0	1819.4	3000.0	132321.5	3804.2	1654.0	14886.2	3721.5	1075.1	7031.9
First Quartile	748.3	1700.0	10000.0	1896.0	585.6	73000.0	750.0	1058.6	2481.0	6285.3	571.2	151.0z	2163.9	523.9	218.3	132321.5	1405.9	244.5	1000.9	286.4	1075.1	850.0z
Second Quartile	3721.5	5000.0	10000.0	7100.0	4700.0	900000.0	1500.0	4600.0	5500.0	8270.1	4000.0	1654.0	4962.1	1500.0	1500.0	132321.5	3700.0	377.0	9924.1	2183.3	1075.1	3969.6
Third Quartile	11578.1	7063.7	114000.0	26633.7	5856.2	1300000.0	8000.0	19848.2	14000.0	12405.1	6616.1	3109.6	21899.2	4300.4	4000.0	132321.5	8270.1	2150.2	16700.0	6285.3	380424.3	13232.1
Fourth Quartile	46000.0	47000.0	292811.0	79000.0	61000.0*****		54432.0	55000.0	36000.0	127359.4	28382.0	40000.0	90971.0	12670.3	19798.6	132321.5	74430.8	4962.1	19848.2	16540.2	380424.3	51000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 404

Q15a. Edited kWh re-scaled to full organisation size

Base: all participants in kilowatts

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
1-10000	24	22	-	2	3	2	1	1	1	-	8	1	1	2	-	-	3	12	10	22
	3%	3%	-	2%	13%	2%	2%	2%	1%	-	3%	1%	1%	4%	-	-	6%	3%	2%	3%
10001-20000	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	1	4
	*	*	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	7%	-	1%	*	*
20001-40000	5	3	-	2	-	2	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	5
	1%	*	-	2%	-	3%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1%	1%
40001-50000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
50001-100000	11	11	-	-	-	1	2	3	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	6	9
	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	3%k	5%zk	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
100001-500000	44	41	1	2	-	2	2	5	5	4	10	8	4	2	2	10	1	22	21	44
	5%	5%	10%	2%	-	3%	5%	9%	8%	22%	4%	5%	7%	3%	11%	-	2%	5%	5%	5%
500001-1000000	32	30	1	2	-	2	1	2	2	1	3	11	3	4	-	-	-	16	16	33
	4%	4%	4%	2%	-	3%	2%	4%	2%	3%	1%	8%zj	5%	4%j	-	-	-	4%	4%	4%
1000001-2000000	45	42	1	2	2	4	1	4	3	3	12	10	4	*	-	-	1	27	18	49
	5%	6%	5%	2%	10%	5%	2%	6%	4%	15%	5%	7%	7%	1%	-	-	2%	6%	4%	6%
More than 2000000	386	357	2	27	10	37	22	25	38	3	96	54	29	29	11	4	24	199	185	405
	44%c	47%c	20%	28%	44%	49%	47%	43%	58%k	16%	42%	37%	48%	53%k	59%	25%	52%	46%	43%	46%
Don't know	319	251	7	61	8	26	17	18	15	8	92	60	19	17	6	12	18	147	165	299
	37%	33%	61%	63%za	33%	34%	36%	30%	23%	44%	40%h	41%h	31%	31%	30%	69%	39%	34%	39%	34%
Mean (£000)	752702.9	810979.1	24794.9	29908.6	22398.3	201949.6	84802.1	49210.9	2277934.8	8414.9	179426.5	2852305.5	112985.1	68940.8	24948.0	14421.3	329480.9	948157.3	541547.1	730061.4
Median (£000)	7000.0	7900.0	2481.0	4669.0	5856.2	5500.0	6000.0	3535.0	7443.1	1058.6	7000.0	5209.3	5500.0	13232.1	11000.0	3904.1	27000.0	8270.1	5856.2	8270.1
First Quartile	911.5	911.5	201.3	585.6	1654.0	1133.3	626.3	330.8	1488.6	218.3	1000.0	750.0	1096.2	827.0	8270.1	20.0	5000.0	1000.0	911.5	992.4
Second Quartile	3969.6	4000.0	1333.3	3308.0	3374.2	4100.0	4669.0	2315.6	4490.1	619.5	3170.0	2497.9	4000.0	7063.7	10000.0	3110.0	15616.6	4000.0	3804.2	4300.4
Third Quartile	12405.1	14000.0	2481.0	5856.2	14000.0	11578.1	14000.0	4962.1	20179.0	1058.6	13000.0	11908.9	8328.5	15000.0	11000.0	3904.1	41759.1	15033.2	9924.1	14876.1
Fourth Quartile	54000.0	57000.0	26000.0	11578.1	40056.5	39245.2	78082.9	21472.8	99241.1	6616.1	80000.0	48000.0	22448.8	51000.0	50000.0	5856.2	216000.0	66499.6	48000.0	61000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 405

Q15a. Edited kWh re-scaled to full organisation size

Base: all participants in kilowatts

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
1-10000	24	2	21	5	6	5	4	1	2	12	4	4	-	3	5	13	14	10	22
	3%	1%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	4%	4%	4%	2%	-	2%	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%
10001-20000	3	1	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	2	-	1	3	1	4
	*	1%	*	1%	1%	-	*	-	-	*	1%	*	2%	1%	-	*	*	*	*
20001-40000	5	4	2	4	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	3	3	-	-	1	2	4	5
	1%	2% b	*	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	*	-	1%	8%	-	-	*	*	2% p	1%
40001-50000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
50001-100000	11	5	6	5	2	3	1	-	-	2	2	4	1	4	2	2	7	4	9
	1%	3% b	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	2%	3% o	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%
100001-500000	44	15	30	22	6	6	8	1	1	8	4	24	2	9	8	17	34	10	44
	5%	9% b	4%	11% zdef	3%	3%	5%	4%	2%	3%	4%	9% z	6%	8%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%
500001-1000000	32	11	21	13	8	7	2	-	1	8	8	15	2	11	5	12	18	14	33
	4%	6%	3%	7% f	4%	4%	1%	-	1%	3%	7%	6%	6%	9% zo	3%	3%	3%	6%	4%
1000001-2000000	45	5	40	6	20	12	6	-	2	9	6	17	*	6	11	24	38	7	49
	5%	3%	6%	3%	9% zcf	6%	3%	-	3%	3%	6%	6%	1%	5%	7%	6%	6%	3%	6%
More than 2000000	386	56	331	41	95	94	96	24	36	166	22	106	4	47	68	222	296	85	405
	44% acjq	33%	47% a	21%	46% c	49% c	53% zc	72% zcde	66% zcde	55% zjk	21%	38% fj	9%	38%	47%	54% zm	47% sq	36%	46%
Don't know	319	67	252	101	69	64	60	7	12	96	56	105	27	41	47	117	217	101	299
	37% ho	40%	36%	51% zdefgh	33%	34%	33%	21%	22%	32%	54% zik	37%	66%	33%	32%	29%	35%	43% p	34%
Mean (£000)	752702.9	173325.6	879638.8	187657.7	1627589.1	120852.9	975694.3	329805.9	735863.4e	1703268.0	199091.3	80697.6	5768.8	23803.2	175993.7	1321620.6	947504.8	189473.7	730061.4
Median (£000)	7000.0	3141.3	8270.1	976.0	4000.0	6954.5	16540.2	55000.0	115761.3	10142.8	1654.0	4000.0	482.0	3308.0	4669.0	14876.1	8328.5	3969.6	8270.1
First Quartile	911.5	248.1	1333.3	218.3	1405.9	1438.2	1964.8	11000.0	8000.0	2067.5	300.0	400.0	24.8	300.0	1000.0	1629.0	1125.8	248.1	992.4
Second Quartile	3969.6	1323.2	4631.3	571.2	3060.0	4168.1	9000.0	37000.0	29500.0	6000.0	959.3	2150.2	165.4	1654.0	3142.6	7063.7	4700.0	2130.2	4300.4
Third Quartile	12405.1	5210.9	15033.2	2130.2	5500.0	11578.1	21405.0	99241.1	216000.0	18000.0	4300.4	8270.1	626.3	4300.4	7000.0	28000.0	15000.0	5856.2	14876.1
Fourth Quartile	54000.0	19520.7	73400.0	16540.2	21472.8	28000.0	68580.6	220535.8	578906.5	90219.2	16540.2	27000.0	9294.8	11578.1	28412.6	99241.1	57890.7	41759.1	61000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 406

Q15a. Edited kWh re-scaled to full organisation size

Base: all participants in kilowatts

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
1-10000	24	3	17	-	4	-	19	20	3	3	2	11	2	6	17	8	4	8	6	22
	3%	2%	4%	-	2%	-	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	3%	8%	2%	3%	3%	4%	5%	3%	3%
10001-20000	3	3	1	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	2	3	-	-	3	1	1	1	1	4
	*	1%	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	*	*	1%	1%	-	*
20001-40000	5	-	3	-	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	2	1	-	3	5
	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	2%	-	*	1%	1%	-	1%	1%
40001-50000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	*
50001-100000	11	3	3	2	3	-	10	9	1	-	1	8	-	1	3	1	-	2	6	9
	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	-	*	1%	*	-	1%	2%	1%
100001-500000	44	9	21	6	8	2	33	34	3	4	10	17	1	10	24	7	4	5	19	44
	5%	4%	5%	7%	6%	2%	6%	5%	3%	4%	7%	5%	4%	5%	4%	3%	4%	3%	8%	5%
500001-1000000	32	9	14	3	6	3	25	27	5	1	5	17	-	8	21	6	2	2	11	33
	4%	5%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	6%	1%	4%	5%	-	3%	4%	3%	2%	1%	4%	4%
1000001-2000000	45	11	23	6	6	4	37	40	6	5	9	25	2	8	31	4	1	5	14	49
	5%	6%	5%	6%	4%	4%	6%	6%	7%	5%	7%	7%	7%	4%	5%	2%	1%	3%	6%	6%
More than 2000000	386	82	193	43	62	75	256	319	36	52	58	165	21	110	327	171	53	104	56	405
	44%	42%	46%	48%	42%	65%	44%	46%	45%	52%	41%	47%	66%	50%	55%	68%	59%	65%	23%	46%
Don't know	319	76	147	30	58	31	192	233	27	34	53	104	3	78	169	49	26	31	131	299
	37%	39%	35%	34%	39%	27%	33%	34%	33%	35%	38%	30%	11%	35%	28%	20%	29%	20%	53%	34%
Mean (£000)	752702.9	80041.0	1425382.3	94830.5	61880.5	158570.0	1006439.3	874217.4	100390.6	460038.6	66289.5	1493405.4	53319.5	151824.8	907169.3	1808991.5	572614.0	1987783.9	225772.8	730061.4
Median (£000)	7000.0	4465.9	7808.3	5634.0	8000.0	24862.8	5500.0	7063.7	5000.0	15000.0	11578.1	6500.0	7100.0	10000.0	10994.6	29500.0	78082.9	23200.0	1958.2	8270.1
First Quartile	911.5	976.0	744.3	1058.6	679.7	3161.1	626.3	976.0	959.3	2214.0	626.3	750.0	1958.2	1597.9	1488.6	4525.5	3109.6	2130.2	237.8	992.4
Second Quartile	3969.6	3141.3	4962.1	3142.6	3374.2	11000.0	3300.0	3969.6	2418.9	9664.3	4300.4	3308.0	6832.3	4962.1	6000.0	18492.5	27329.0	13051.5	1096.2	4300.4
Third Quartile	12405.1	9097.1	14886.2	11483.5	11363.6	41350.5	10142.8	13000.0	10000.0	29751.4	19848.2	13051.5	10150.8	18000.0	19848.2	48000.0	144000.0	39041.5	3308.0	14876.1
Fourth Quartile	54000.0	40000.0	79000.0	50000.0	29500.0	165401.9	41350.5	50000.0	74430.8	136645.1	74430.8	50000.0	48801.8	114000.0	80000.0	181942.0	350000.0	181942.0	10000.0	61000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 407

Q15a. Edited kWh re-scaled to full organisation size

Base: all participants in kilowatts

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
1-10000	24	13	1	10	24	2	5	5	6	2	7	10	5	7	11	5	22
	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	5%	5%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%
10001-20000	3	3	-	1	3	1	2	-	1	-	1	2	1	1	2	1	4
	*	1%	-	*	*	1%	1%	-	1%	-	*	*	1%	*	*	1%	*
20001-40000	5	1	-	5	5	3	1	-	-	-	3	1	2	3	-	2	5
	1%	*	-	2%e	1%	2%	*	-	-	-	1%	*	1%	1% <i>n</i>	-	1% <i>n</i>	1%
40001-50000	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*
50001-100000	11	6	-	5	11	4	2	-	-	1	4	6	1	4	4	3	9
	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	3%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%
100001-500000	44	29	2	14	44	16	11	2	4	-	10	24	10	10	26	9	44
	5% <i>l</i>	5%	5%	5%	5% <i>l</i>	14% <i>zdghi</i>	6% <i>l</i>	2%	3%	-	4%	6%	6%	5%	6%	5%	5%
500001-1000000	32	24	2	7	32	8	13	4	1	1	12	15	5	11	16	5	33
	4%	5%	6%	2%	4%	7% <i>hi</i>	8% <i>zdhi</i>	5%	1%	1%	5%	4%	3%	5%	4%	3%	4%
1000001-2000000	45	34	1	10	45	9	15	2	4	2	15	25	5	14	25	6	49
	5%	7%	2%	3%	5%	8% <i>l</i>	9% <i>ghi</i>	2%	3%	1%	6%	6%	3%	6%	6%	3%	6%
More than 2000000	386	230	18	139	386	30	69	49	88	83	105	194	85	94	213	78	405
	44% <i>e</i>	44%	58%	45%	44% <i>e</i>	25%	41% <i>e</i>	56% <i>ef</i>	67% <i>zdef</i>	71% <i>zdefg</i>	43%	47%	45%	43%	47%	45%	46%
Don't know	319	184	8	122	319	47	51	26	27	28	88	135	72	75	159	63	299
	37% <i>hi</i>	35%	27%	39%	37% <i>hi</i>	39% <i>hi</i>	30%	29%	21%	24%	36%	33%	39%	35%	35%	36%	34%
Mean (£000)	752702.9	775784.3	101630.5	788026.0	752702.9	9313.0	118223.6	3432820.3	216724.0	1754559.5	70668.1	972327.1	1184630.5	52899.9	907961.8	1257884.0	730061.4
Median (£000)	7000.0	6285.3	16700.0	8270.1	7000.0	1333.3	2911.1	15616.6	12405.1	92625.0	4962.1	7000.0	9900.0	3969.6	7267.7	9924.1	8270.1
First Quartile	911.5	959.3	1543.8	595.4	911.5	218.3	750.0	1654.0	4000.0	12405.1	827.0	992.4	595.4	780.8	1000.0	526.0	992.4
Second Quartile	3969.6	3535.0	10000.0	4100.0	3969.6	619.5	1984.8	8270.1	8270.1	47339.8	2700.0	4100.0	5210.9	2497.9	4300.4	5210.9	4300.4
Third Quartile	12405.1	11578.1	19520.7	13232.1	12405.1	2067.5	3800.0	23424.9	19520.7	127359.4	10994.6	13664.5	16540.2	6832.3	14886.2	19848.2	14876.1
Fourth Quartile	54000.0	54000.0	132321.5	50000.0	54000.0	8270.1	11578.1	78082.9	49620.6	430000.0	34044.2	65000.0	66499.6	23424.9	62000.0	80000.0	61000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 408

Q15a. Edited kWh re-scaled to full organisation size

Base: all participants in kilowatts

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
1-10000	24	-	-	5	-	-	-	6	-	3	-	2	-	1	2	-	2	2	-	2	-	22
	3%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	7%	-	7%	-	3%	-	2%	6%	-	4%	3%	-	2%	-	3%
10001-20000	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*
20001-40000	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
40001-50000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
50001-100000	11	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	9
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%z	-	-	3%	-	-	-	4%	-	1%	-	1%
100001-500000	44	1	-	4	-	-	2	4	1	-	1	3	1	3	5	-	2	5	-	12	-	44
	5%	12%	-	2%	-	-	7%	5%	4%	-	3%	4%	3%	6%	14%	-	4%	11% c	-	9% c	-	5%
500001-1000000	32	-	-	6	2	-	4	-	-	2	4	1	3	1	-	-	2	1	4	4	-	33
	4%	-	-	4%	21%	-	13% zcghqs	-	-	5%	5%	2%	7% g	4%	-	-	4%	1%	13%	3%	-	4%
1000001-2000000	45	1	-	6	-	-	4	3	3	-	1	4	1	6	1	-	3	1	4	9	2	49
	5%	8%	-	4%	-	-	12% cp	4%	8%	-	4%	5%	5%	13% zcgp	2%	-	6%	4%	7%	28%	-	6%
More than 2000000	386	5	4	97	3	5	10	45	19	17	9	23	17	15	12	2	28	10	12	50	2	405
	44% g	46%	81%	57% zfkms	35%	87%	33%	56% fkms	54% kmq	46%	33%	31%	56%	33%	35%	38%	62% zfkms	21%	41%	37%	22%	46%
Don't know	319	4	1	47	4	1	11	23	12	18	13	33	10	16	13	3	12	26	12	56	4	299
	37% c	34%	19%	27%	44%	13%	35%	29%	34%	47%	48%	44% c	33%	35%	39%	62%	26%	54% zcgp	42%	41% c	51%	34%
Mean (£000)	752702.9	49929.8	165868.0	2009336.8	789040.1	26542242.0	38338.4	105895.7	38767.6	515776.8	40166.2	155064.7	167665.6	18665.8	21423.1	132321.5	43837.8	4043.2	14661.4	34915.6	168356.1	730061.4
Median (£000)	7000.0	7063.7	114000.0	18000.0	4700.0	900000.0	3800.0	15033.2	9924.1	9097.1	4962.1	2150.2	21899.2	2700.0	3000.0	132321.5	4669.0	1654.0	14886.2	4100.0	1629.0	8270.1
First Quartile	911.5	1700.0	10000.0	1896.0	585.6	73000.0	750.0	1902.1	2481.0	6285.3	571.2	151.7	2163.9	523.9	218.3	132321.5	2130.2	244.5	1000.9	482.0	1629.0	992.4
Second Quartile	3989.6	5000.0	10000.0	7500.0	4700.0	900000.0	1500.0	6000.0	5500.0	8270.1	4000.0	1654.0	4962.1	1595.9	1500.0	132321.5	3700.0	612.0	9924.1	2214.0	1629.0	4300.4
Third Quartile	12405.1	7063.7	114000.0	33913.1	5856.2	1300000.0	8000.0	19848.2	14000.0	12405.1	6616.1	7267.7	54000.0	4332.6	4000.0	132321.5	9097.1	2150.2	16700.0	6616.1	380424.3	14876.1
Fourth Quartile	54000.0	47000.0	292811.0	97603.7	130138.2*****		54432.0	55000.0	42000.0	165401.9	28382.0	73400.0	161942.0	15500.0	19796.6	132321.5	74430.8	4962.1	19848.2	18000.0	380424.3	61000.0

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 409

Q15a. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in value (raw data)

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	541	478	17	46	20	49	32	37	32	13	124	106	38	38	8	9	27	252	281	541
Weighted total	564	464	10**	90*	18**	50*	28**	41*	43**	14**	146	95*	35*	36*	9**	14**	26**	257	298	541
1-10000	14	11	1	2	-	3	4	2	1	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	10	13
	2%	2%	7%	2%	-	6% <i>k</i>	13%	4%	2%	-	3%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	2%	3%	2%
10001-20000	9	7	-	2	-	1	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	3	6
	2%	1%	-	2%	-	2%	-	4%	3%	15%	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	1%	1%
20001-40000	10	8	1	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	4	3	1	-	-	-	-	4	6	10
	2%	2%	5%	2%	-	-	4%	3%	-	-	4% <i>j</i>	8% <i>zj</i>	4% <i>j</i>	-	-	-	-	2%	2%	2%
40001-50000	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%
50001-100000	21	17	-	5	1	2	-	1	2	6	4	1	*	-	-	-	-	9	12	19
	4%	4%	-	5%	7%	5%	-	2%	2%	13%	4%	4%	2%	1%	-	-	-	3%	4%	4%
100001-500000	70	58	1	11	3	8	2	7	8	2	17	9	6	3	2	1	1	27	43	67
	12%	12%	12%	12%	18%	16%	7%	17%	19%	16%	12%	10%	17%	9%	17%	11%	2%	10%	15%	12%
500001-1000000	32	30	-	2	1	4	-	2	1	-	3	7	3	6	1	-	5	15	16	32
	6%	6%	-	2%	5%	7%	-	5%	1%	-	2%	7%	7%	17% <i>zj</i>	12%	-	18%	6%	5%	6%
1000001-2000000	29	27	-	2	2	1	4	6	-	3	3	2	3	-	-	-	2	20	10	29
	5%	6%	-	3%	11%	3%	4%	11% <i>j</i>	14%	-	2%	3%	6%	8%	-	-	6%	8% <i>r</i>	3%	5%
More than 2000000	57	52	1	4	2	4	4	5	8	-	18	6	1	5	1	-	1	26	31	63
	10%	11%	6%	4%	14%	8%	14%	12%	20%	-	12%	6%	4%	14%	11%	-	5%	10%	10%	12%
Don't know	319	251	7	61	8	26	17	18	15	8	92	60	19	17	6	12	18	147	165	299
	57%	54%	71%	68%	44%	52%	58%	43%	36%	56%	63% <i>g</i>	63% <i>g</i>	53%	47%	60%	89%	68%	57%	55%	55%
Mean (£000)	3494.62	3683.99	2017.51	2231.47	1491.84	1793.69	3269.80	5027.97	3320.66	114.25	5645.33	3367.68	792.98	4435.58	1783.40	249.13	2660.03	3529.28	3482.70	3652.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 410

Q15a. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in value (raw data)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	541	100	441	122	134	121	113	17	29	186	64	176	29	83	84	242	382	155	541
Weighted total	564	111*	452	140	136	128*	110*	16**	28**	197	77*	178	37**	92*	94*	228	390	170	541
1-10000	14	6	8	6	1	2	5	-	-	2	1	7	5	3	1	3	8	6	13
	2%	6% b	2%	4%	1%	1%	4%	-	-	1%	2%	4%	13%	4%	1%	1%	2%	4%	2%
10001-20000	9	6	3	5	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	8	-	3	3	3	4	5	6
	2%	5% zb	1%	3%	1%	-	1%	9%	-	1%	-	4% zi	-	3%	3%	1%	1%	3%	1%
20001-40000	10	5	5	8	1	1	1	-	-	3	4	3	2	4	1	2	5	6	10
	2%	4% b	1%	6% zdef	*	1%	1%	-	-	1%	5%	2%	7%	4%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%
40001-50000	3	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	2	1	3
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	4%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
50001-100000	21	2	19	4	10	6	1	-	-	5	5	5	*	9	2	8	15	6	19
	4%	2%	4%	3%	7% f	5%	*	-	-	2%	6%	3%	1%	9% z	2%	4%	4%	3%	4%
100001-500000	70	11	59	9	31	22	8	-	-	33	5	21	-	22	18	19	46	23	67
	12%	10%	13%	6%	22% zcf	17% cf	8%	-	-	17%	6%	12%	-	24% zo	19% o	8%	12%	13%	12%
500001-1000000	32	5	26	3	9	14	5	1	-	18	3	7	1	5	10	15	26	5	32
	6%	5%	6%	2%	7%	11% c	5%	5%	-	9%	3%	4%	2%	6%	10%	6%	7%	3%	6%
1000001-2000000	29	3	26	1	7	9	11	-	1	11	1	10	1	3	7	16	24	5	29
	5% c	2%	6%	1%	5%	7% c	10% c	-	4%	6%	2%	6%	3%	4%	8%	7%	6%	3%	5%
More than 2000000	57	5	52	1	7	10	18	7	14	27	2	12	-	1	4	46	43	12	63
	10% cm	4%	12% aa	1%	5%	8% c	16% cd	43%	48%	14% j	2%	7%	-	1%	4%	20% zmmn	11%	7%	12%
Don't know	319	67	252	101	69	64	60	7	12	96	56	105	27	41	47	117	217	101	299
	57%	61%	56%	72% zdef	51%	50%	55%	43%	44%	49%	73% zi	59%	75%	44%	50%	51%	56%	59%	55%
Mean (£000)	3494.62dmn	1175.68	4001.05	880.30	1061.47	2197.32	3431.77d	6983.43	23582.87	3384.28	1118.27	3525.33	248.39	383.76	743.93	6577.66zmn	3424.31	3524.66	3652.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 411

Q15a. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in value (raw data)

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	541	129	259	56	86	65	366	435	51	70	94	206	18	147	354	134	55	79	169	541
Weighted total	564	131	263	60*	99*	64*	361	431	51*	61*	91*	200	18**	145	355	123	52*	78*	189	541
1-10000	14	-	8	2	4	1	9	8	3	-	1	4	2	1	6	-	-	1	8	13
	2%	-	3%	4%	4%	1%	3%	2%	6%	-	1%	2%	9%	-	2%	-	-	1%	4%	2%
10001-20000	9	1	2	2	3	-	7	7	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	7	6
	2%	1%	1%	3%	3%	-	2%	2%	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	4%	1%
20001-40000	10	2	6	1	2	-	8	8	1	-	3	3	-	2	6	-	-	-	4	10
	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%	2%	-	3%	2%	-	1%	2%	-	-	-	2%	2%
40001-50000	3	1	2	-	-	1	2	3	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	1	1	1	3
	1%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	1%	1%
50001-100000	21	6	8	4	2	2	14	16	6	2	4	11	-	6	18	1	-	5	3	19
	4%	5%	3%	7%	2%	2%	4%	4%	11% zg	3%	5%	6%	-	4%	5% o	1%	-	6% o	2%	4%
100001-500000	70	18	33	7	10	4	51	57	4	6	7	27	4	15	49	8	2	5	21	67
	12%	14%	13%	12%	10%	7%	14%	13%	7%	10%	7%	14%	23%	11%	14% op	6%	3%	7%	11%	12%
500001-1000000	32	7	15	4	6	4	25	31	*	3	3	13	3	10	24	9	3	8	7	32
	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%	7%	1%	5%	3%	7%	19%	7%	7%	7%	7%	11% r	4%	6%
1000001-2000000	29	5	15	2	6	5	22	25	1	3	6	10	3	13	25	14	1	8	4	29
	5%	4%	6%	4%	7%	8%	6%	6%	3%	5%	7%	5%	17%	9%	7% r	12% zpr	1%	11% pr	2%	5%
More than 2000000	57	15	26	7	8	17	31	43	9	12	12	23	3	18	55	42	20	17	1	63
	70% r	11%	10%	12%	8%	26% zf	9%	10%	18%	20% zg	13%	11%	14%	13%	16% zr	34% znr	38% znr	22% zr	1%	12%
Don't know	319	76	147	30	58	31	192	233	27	34	53	104	3	78	169	49	26	31	131	299
	57% noq	58%	56%	50%	58%	48%	53%	54%	53%	56%	58%	52%	19%	54%	48%	40%	49%	41%	70% znopq	55%
Mean (£000)	3494.62r	2365.67	4358.87	3525.51	2663.00	6832.05f	3039.64	3489.68	3277.90	4942.83	4676.14	3990.59	1559.06	3833.88	4497.43r	8914.66znr	13150.83	5655.36r	363.91	3652.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 412

Q15a. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in value (raw data)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	541	321	22	195	541	78	91	59	69	68	153	252	114	140	282	100	541
Weighted total	564	329	20**	209	564	90*	94*	58*	67*	67*	160	258	121*	147	288	106*	541
1-10000	14	3	1	10	14	9	-	1	-	-	5	6	3	4	7	3	13
2%	2%	1%	6%	5% ^a	2%	10% ^{zdfhi}	-	2%	-	-	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%
10001-20000	9	6	-	3	9	6	-	-	-	-	3	6	-	3	4	2	6
2%	2%	-	1%	2%	7% ^{zdf}	-	-	-	-	-	2%	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%
20001-40000	10	3	1	7	10	4	2	2	-	-	5	3	3	5	5	-	10
2%	1%	5%	3%	2%	4%	2%	3%	-	-	-	3%	1%	2%	3%	2%	-	2%
40001-50000	3	2	1	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
1%	1%	6%	-	1%	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%
50001-100000	21	18	1	3	21	6	7	2	-	-	4	14	3	4	14	3	19
4%	5% ^c	2%	1%	4%	7%	7% ^{hi}	3%	-	-	-	2%	6%	2%	3%	5%	3%	4%
100001-500000	70	44	1	25	70	14	19	7	12	4	26	34	10	25	38	6	67
12%	13%	6%	12%	12%	16%	21% ^l	12%	18% ^l	6%	6%	16%	13%	8%	17% ^o	13%	6%	12%
500001-1000000	32	18	1	13	32	1	7	7	9	2	8	17	5	9	17	6	32
6%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%	1%	8% ^e	13% ^{zdel}	13% ^{zdel}	3%	5%	7%	5%	6%	6%	5%	6%
1000001-2000000	29	18	-	11	29	3	2	6	7	5	10	10	9	10	12	7	29
5%	6%	-	5%	5%	4%	2%	11% ^f	11% ^f	8%	8%	7%	4%	7%	7%	4%	6%	5%
More than 2000000	57	33	6	18	57	-	3	7	11	28	10	32	14	11	30	16	63
10% ^e	10%	29%	8%	10% ^e	-	4%	12% ^e	17% ^{ef}	42% ^{zdefgh}	6%	6%	12%	11%	7%	10%	15%	12%
Don't know	319	184	8	122	319	47	51	26	27	28	88	135	72	75	159	63	299
57% ^{hi}	56%	39%	58%	57% ^{hi}	52%	54%	44%	41%	42%	42%	55%	52%	60%	51%	55%	59%	55%
Mean (£000)	3494.62e	3772.12	6275.43	2642.08	3494.62e	214.45	982.33	3580.27	2555.07e	13103.82zdefh	1704.52	4289.65	4183.97	1886.32	3553.55	6054.86m	3652.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 413

Q15a. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in value (raw data)

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	541	5	2	99	9	1	27	43	26	23	20	40	18	30	16	3	33	34	15	93	4	541
Weighted total	564	6**	2**	93*	8**	1**	19**	54*	22**	32**	21**	53*	17**	23**	22**	5**	34**	39**	22**	85*	8**	541
1-10000	14	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	3	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	13
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	9%	6%	-	5%	-	-	-	4%	-	3%	-	2%
10001-20000	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	4	-	6
	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	9%	-	-	4%	-	4%	-	1%
20001-40000	10	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	3	-	10
	2%	-	-	1%	22%	-	4%	-	5%	-	-	3%	-	-	6%	-	-	1%	-	3%	-	2%
40001-50000	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	1%
50001-100000	21	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	1	2	-	-	-	2	3	1	2	19
	4%	-	-	1%	-	-	13%	3%	-	-	-	6%	4%	7%	-	-	7%	5%	14%	1%	28%	4%
100001-500000	70	-	-	11	1	-	1	9	3	5	3	6	3	3	-	-	8	6	1	10	-	67
	12%	-	-	12%	10%	-	6%	17%	13%	17%	16%	11%	15%	11%	-	-	24%	14%	3%	12%	-	12%
500001-1000000	32	2	-	7	1	-	-	4	3	2	-	-	4	-	2	-	4	1	3	5	-	32
	6%	26%	-	7%	10%	-	-	7%	12%	7%	-	-	-	-	7%	-	10%	3%	15%	6%	-	6%
1000001-2000000	29	-	-	10	-	-	1	7	1	1	-	1	*	2	-	1	1	2	2	2	-	29
	5%	-	-	10%ks	-	-	5%	12%ks	4%	4%	-	4%	-	2%	-	3%	3%	3%	11%	3%	-	5%
More than 2000000	57	1	1	14	-	-	3	7	2	5	2	4	3	1	2	2	7	-	-	2	2	63
	10%ks	12%	41%	15%ks	-	-	14%	13%ks	8%	15%	10%	8%	19%	4%	9%	38%	20%	-	-	3%	22%	12%
Don't know	319	4	1	47	4	1	11	23	12	18	13	33	10	16	13	3	12	26	12	56	4	299
	57%	62%	59%	50%	58%	100%	58%	43%	58%	57%	65%	63%	58%	70%	57%	62%	34%	65%	57%	66%cg	51%	55%
Mean (£000)	3494.62	10579.11	15000.00	2841.60	326.33	-	4973.88	3824.68	2584.35	5531.66	3288.84	8041.08	4452.79	3200.38	2529.64	8000.00	3587.12	268.14	638.13	968.12	10159.87	3652.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 414

Q15b. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in kilowatts (raw data)

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	557	508	14	35	15	51	33	30	29	13	135	116	40	35	9	11	34	291	257	557
Weighted total	560	483	8**	69*	13**	47*	31**	33**	32**	11**	159	99	36*	31*	11**	16**	32**	282	268	557
1-500	8 1%	8 2%	-	-	2 17%	-	-	-	1 2%	-	3 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	5 2%	3 1%	8 1%
501-1000	3 *	3 1%	-	-	1 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%	-	2 *
1001-2000	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *
2001-5000	5 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	1 4%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	1 2%	1 *	3 1%	5 1%
5001-10000	7 1%	5 1%	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	1 1%	1 2%	2 6%z	-	-	-	3 1%	4 1%	5 1%
10001-50000	6 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	1 4%	-	1 3%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	1 7%	-	4 1%	2 1%	8 1%
50001-100000	6 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	1 2%	1 3%	1 4%	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	4 2%	5 1%
100001-500000	31 6%	30 6%	* 6%	-	-	1 2%	4 12%	3 11%	2 16%	7 5%	6 6%	3 7%	2 5%	2 18%	-	1 3%	19 7%	12 4%	32 6%	
More than 500000	175 31% ^c	168 35% ^c	1 7%	6 9%	2 18%	18 39%	11 37%	9 28%	12 36%	2 17%	48 30%	29 29%	14 40%	10 32%	3 18%	3 34%	11 35%	75 28%	192 34%	
Don't know	319 57%	251 52%	7 87%	61 88% ^{za}	8 59%	26 56%	17 53%	18 53%	15 48%	8 67%	92 58%	60 61%	19 52%	17 55%	6 51%	12 75%	18 55%	147 52%	165 62% ^q	299 54%
Mean (£000)	12389.43	12749.97	591.57	3586.83	7570.03	13625.94	11039.71	2421.39	13972.60	16919.43	16214.64	11749.80	8341.04	7655.73	14474.76	15855.68	15810.80	12942.58	11895.46	12766.98

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 415

Q15b. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in kilowatts (raw data)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	557	109	448	147	126	112	119	16	32	176	73	187	26	67	83	267	406	146	557
Weighted total	560	114*	446	154	124	115*	117	14**	31**	175	80*	188	31**	70*	93*	246	400	154	557
1-500	8	1	7	4	1	1	-	-	2	2	1	4	-	-	3	5	5	3	8
	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	-	-	8%	1%	1%	2%	-	-	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%
501-1000	3	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	2	2
	*	-	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	1%	*
1001-2000	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	5%	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
2001-5000	5	-	5	1	3	-	1	-	-	4	1	1	-	1	2	3	3	2	5
	1%	-	1%	*	2%	-	1%	-	-	2%	1%	*	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
5001-10000	7	1	5	1	3	2	1	-	-	3	2	-	-	2	1	1	4	3	5
	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	-	-	1%	3%k	-	-	3%o	1%	*	1%	2%	1%
10001-50000	6	2	4	2	1	-	3	-	-	2	1	1	1	2	-	3	5	1	8
	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	-	-	1%	2%	*	3%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%
50001-100000	6	3	3	3	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	2	2	2	4	2	5
	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
100001-500000	31	7	24	16	5	6	5	-	-	6	5	14	2	4	4	13	26	4	32
	6%	6%	5%	10%	4%	5%	4%	-	-	4%	6%	7%	5%	6%	4%	5%	7%	3%	6%
More than 500000	175	32	144	27	42	39	45	7	16	57	13	62	1	18	35	101	136	35	192
	31%cf	28%	32%	17%	34%c	34%c	39%c	46%	52%	33%j	17%	33%j	5%	26%	38%	41%zm	34%q	23%	34%
Don't know	319	67	252	101	69	64	60	7	12	96	56	105	27	41	47	117	217	101	299
	57%o	59%	56%	66%f	56%	56%	52%	49%	40%	55%	70%	56%	87%	59%	50%	47%	54%	66%p	54%
Mean (£000)	12389.43	12264.63	12419.04	10311.27	7469.65	9487.62	17954.20d	24969.93	19133.52	15680.47k	10790.80	9293.52	7407.71	7308.71	10915.80	15240.81	12993.71	8480.04	12766.98

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 416

Q15b. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in kilowatts (raw data)

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	557	126	277	52	91	66	387	456	49	72	99	232	18	144	364	149	50	97	173	557
Weighted total	560	128	275	51*	94*	64*	371	440	46*	59*	98*	220	14**	137	353	136	48*	88*	184	557
1-500	8	1	4	-	3	-	7	7	-	1	-	2	2	2	6	3	1	2	2	8
	1%	1%	1%	-	3%	-	2%	2%	-	1%	-	1%	12%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%
501-1000	3	-	2	-	1	-	2	3	-	1	1	3	-	-	3	3	1	1	-	2
	*	-	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	*
1001-2000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	2%	1%	-	-	5%	-	*	-	-	1%	-	*
2001-5000	5	-	5	-	-	-	4	4	-	1	-	2	-	2	3	1	2	3	2	5
	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	2%	1%	*	4%z	3%	1%	1%
5001-10000	7	2	4	-	-	-	5	5	2	-	1	4	-	1	4	2	-	2	3	5
	1%	2%	2%	-	-	-	1%	1%	4%	-	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	1%
10001-50000	6	3	3	-	1	-	5	5	-	-	2	4	1	1	6	4	2	1	1	8
	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	2%	2%	5%	1%	2%	3%	3%	1%	*	1%
50001-100000	6	3	2	-	1	-	6	6	-	-	1	6	-	-	3	1	-	2	1	5
	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	1%	3%	-	-	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%
100001-500000	31	8	17	3	3	2	24	26	2	3	8	13	2	10	18	6	4	5	13	32
	6%	6%	6%	5%	4%	4%	6%	6%	4%	6%	8%	6%	13%	7%	5%	4%	8%	6%	7%	6%
More than 500000	175	35	91	18	27	31	127	152	15	19	32	83	6	42	141	68	13	40	32	192
	31%r	27%	33%	36%	29%	48%z	34%	35%	33%	32%	33%	38%	40%	31%	40%zr	50%zpr	28%	45%zr	17%	34%
Don't know	319	76	147	30	58	31	192	233	27	34	53	104	3	78	169	49	26	31	131	299
	57%knoq	59%	53%	59%	62%	48%	52%	53%	57%	58%	54%	47%	25%	57%	48%oq	36%	54%o	36%	71%znopq	54%
Mean (£000)	12389.43ar	6195.93	13525.07a	13230.47	15082.48a	24410.72zf	10442.21	12586.10	10016.81	15119.24	15447.95	12174.08	17038.64	11202.27	14449.68r	18253.18zr	13384.02	18367.62r	6074.83	12766.98

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 417

Q15b. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in kilowatts (raw data)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	557	350	17	187	557	72	114	51	79	58	154	261	120	129	296	113	557
Weighted total	560	344	17**	193	560	75*	114*	50*	74*	55*	157	256	120*	135	290	112*	557
1-500	8 1%	2 *	1 4%	5 3% a	8 1%	2 2%	-	3 6% zdf	2 3%	1 1%	3 2%	4 1%	1 1%	3 2%	4 1%	1 1%	8 1%
501-1000	3 *	3 1%	-	-	3 *	-	2 2%	1 1%	-	-	1 *	2 1%	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	2 *
1001-2000	1 *	1 *	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 *	-	-	1 *	-	1 *
2001-5000	5 1%	5 1%	-	-	5 1%	-	3 2%	-	-	-	2 1%	1 *	3 2%	2 1%	1 *	3 2%	5 1%
5001-10000	7 1%	3 1%	-	4 2%	7 1%	-	-	4 5% zdf	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	3 2%	2 1%	1 1%	5 1%
10001-50000	6 1%	3 1%	-	3 1%	6 1%	2 2%	2 2%	1 1%	1 1%	-	2 1%	3 1%	1 1%	2 2%	2 1%	2 2%	8 1%
50001-100000	6 1%	5 2%	-	1 1%	6 1%	1 2%	2 2%	-	-	1 2%	2 1%	4 2%	-	2 2%	2 1%	2 2%	5 1%
100001-500000	31 6%	23 7%	*	8 4%	31 6%	7 10% i	11 10% i	3 6%	4 5%	-	6 4%	16 6%	10 8%	5 4%	18 6%	8 7%	32 6%
More than 500000	175 31%	116 34%	8 47%	51 26%	175 31%	16 22%	43 38% e	17 34%	36 49% zde	23 43% e	52 33%	90 35%	32 27%	44 32%	98 34%	33 29%	192 34%
Don't know	319 57% fh	184 53%	8 46%	122 63%	319 57% fh	47 62% fh	51 45%	26 52%	27 37%	28 52%	88 56%	135 53%	72 60%	75 56%	159 55%	63 56%	299 54%
Mean (£000)	12389.43f	12666.96	14941.25	11435.45	12389.43f	9040.81	5991.06	17781.55	16932.63f	21250.49	12964.09	12630.43	11495.25	8281.68	14600.83	11597.92	12766.98

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 418

Q15b. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in kilowatts (raw data)

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	557	7	2	114	9	1	30	32	27	17	20	38	22	50	15	2	21	27	14	107	2	557
Weighted total	560	7**	3**	103*	6**	1**	22**	43**	22**	24**	19**	51*	21**	38*	20**	3**	21**	33**	20**	98*	4**	557
1-500	8	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	8
	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	3%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
501-1000	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
1001-2000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
2001-5000	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	5
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	5%	-	1%	-	1%
5001-10000	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	5
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	9%	-	-	1%	-	1%
10001-50000	6	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	8
	1%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%
50001-100000	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%z	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
100001-500000	31	1	-	4	-	-	1	4	1	1	1	1	2	2	-	*	4	-	8	-	32	
	6%	17%	-	4%	-	-	6%	9%	2%	-	5%	4%	6%	9%	-	2%	13%	-	8%	-	6%	
More than 500000	175	3	2	43	2	-	10	11	9	3	5	11	10	17	3	-	7	2	8	29	-	192
	31%	34%	68%	42%zk	28%	-	43%	27%	41%	14%	22%	47%	46%k	14%	-	34%	6%	38%	30%	-	34%	
Don't know	319	4	1	47	4	1	11	23	12	18	13	33	10	16	13	3	12	26	12	56	4	299
	57% ^c	48%	32%	45%	72%	100%	50%	54%	57%	75%	69%	65%	46%	42%	67%	100%	55%	76%	62%	57%	100%	54%
Mean (£000)	12389.43	7538.53	10000.00	15993.77	18017.06	-	11366.22	19466.29	14215.60	15407.11	12775.92	14605.72	16859.30	7983.91	1532.35	-	3251.59	3260.71	19725.29	8215.17	-	12766.98

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 419

Q15c. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in gigawatts (raw data)

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	371	327	13	31	8	33	22	18	16	8	87	82	30	26	7	7	23	183	180	371
Weighted total	385	317	7**	61**	8**	31**	20**	21**	21**	8**	108*	72*	26**	22**	10**	12**	24**	187	190	371
1-10	10 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	3	2	1	-	-	-	1	9	2	10
11-20	3 1%	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	2	1	3
21-40	9 2%	8	1	-	*	2	1	-	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	5	3	10
41-60	6 2%	6	-	-	5%	6%	-	4%	-	-	2%	2%	4%	2%	-	-	-	3%	2%	3%
61-80	1 *	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	2	-	-	4	2	6
81-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	1%	1%	3%	5%	21%	-	-	2%	1%	2%
101-500	13 3%	13	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	3	3	-	2	-	-	2	5	8	17
501-1000	4 1%	4	-	-	-	3%	7%	-	3%	-	3%	5%	-	10%	-	-	7%	3%	4%	5%
More than 1000	20 5%	20	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	4
Don't know	319 83%	251 79%	7 93%	61 100%	8 95%	26 84%	17 83%	18 90%	15 71%	8 100%	92 85%	60 83%	19 72%	17 80%	6 58%	12 100%	18 76%	147 79%	165 87%	299 81%
Mean (£000)	370.31	373.33	0.03	-	0.03	1170.70	727.06	0.02	18.43	-	503.86	15.20	1074.94	0.25	0.03	-	1.08	327.05	462.20	316.50

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 420

Q15c. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in gigawatts (raw data)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	371	66	305	96	83	73	75	16	22	118	49	119	21	42	45	173	264	105	371
Weighted total	385	77*	309	108*	85*	76*	74*	16**	21**	123*	58*	122	28**	42*	52*	167	270	113*	371
1-10	10	2	8	*	3	2	4	-	1	4	-	5	-	-	1	9	6	4	10
	3%	3%	3%	*	3%	3%	6% <i>c</i>	-	4%	3%	-	4%	2%	-	-	5%	2%	4%	3%
11-20	3	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	2	3	-	3
	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	12%	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%
21-40	9	2	7	2	-	2	4	1	-	3	-	2	-	4	2	7	8	1	10
	2%	3%	2%	2%	-	3%	5% <i>d</i>	4%	-	3%	-	2%	-	-	3%	4%	3%	1%	3%
41-60	6	1	6	1	1	3	-	2	-	4	1	1	-	-	2	-	6	-	6
	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	-	12%	-	3%	1%	1%	-	-	-	4%	2%	-	2%
61-80	1	-	1	-	*	-	1	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
	*	-	*	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	-	1%
81-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
101-500	13	-	13	2	2	3	2	2	2	7	1	1	-	1	1	9	9	4	17
	3%	-	4%	2%	3%	4%	3%	10%	10%	6% <i>k</i>	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	5%	3%	4%	5%
501-1000	4	-	4	-	-	1	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	4	-	4
	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	2%	10%	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	2%	1%	-	1%
More than 1000	20	3	16	2	9	1	1	1	5	6	1	7	-	-	3	13	17	3	20
	5%	4%	5%	2%	11% <i>ccef</i>	1%	1%	9%	27%	5%	1%	6%	-	-	5%	8%	6%	3%	5%
Don't know	319	67	252	101	69	64	60	7	12	96	56	105	27	41	47	117	217	101	299
	83% <i>o</i>	88%	81%	94% <i>zdf</i>	81%	85%	81%	43%	60%	78%	96% <i>zi</i>	85%	98%	96% <i>zo</i>	90% <i>o</i>	70%	80%	89%	81%
Mean (£000)	370.31	620.41	330.40	2.47	1492.78	0.86	8.05	0.78	43.49	294.93	0.97	791.14	0.01	0.55	1118.76	258.16	451.56	28.30	316.50

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 421

Q15c. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in gigawatts (raw data)

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	371	87	180	35	60	48	234	286	38	56	59	143	8	99	232	99	47	61	123	371
Weighted total	385	89*	179	38**	70*	50*	228	282	36*	48**	57*	139	6**	95*	229	91*	41*	56*	138	371
1-10	10	1	3	1	6	7	3	7	3	1	1	4	-	3	8	6	1	3	2	10
	3%	1%	1%	3%	9% <i>zab</i>	14% <i>zf</i>	1%	3%	8%	2%	1%	3%	-	3%	4%	6%	3%	6%	1%	3%
11-20	3	1	1	-	2	2	1	3	-	3	-	3	-	-	3	3	-	1	-	3
	1%	1%	*	-	3%	4% <i>f</i>	*	1%	-	6% <i>zg</i>	-	2%	-	-	1%	4% <i>zr</i>	-	1%	-	1%
21-40	9	4	4	-	1	2	5	6	2	1	-	5	1	1	9	6	1	2	-	10
	2%	4%	2%	-	1%	4%	2%	2%	6%	2%	-	4%	14%	1%	4% <i>r</i>	6% <i>zr</i>	2%	3%	-	3%
41-60	6	1	3	2	-	1	4	5	1	1	-	5	-	1	6	5	-	1	-	6
	2%	1%	1%	5%	-	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	-	3%	-	1%	3%	5% <i>r</i>	-	1%	-	2%
61-80	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	*	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	*	-	2
	*	-	1%	-	-	-	*	*	-	1%	-	-	20%	-	1%	1%	3% <i>z</i>	1%	-	1%
81-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
101-500	13	3	7	2	1	3	6	9	2	4	2	6	-	6	13	7	8	9	-	17
	3%	4%	4%	6%	1%	6%	3%	3%	6%	7%	4%	5%	-	6%	6% <i>r</i>	7% <i>r</i>	19% <i>znr</i>	16% <i>znr</i>	-	5%
501-1000	4	-	3	1	-	2	1	4	-	-	-	1	-	2	4	2	1	1	-	4
	1%	-	2%	2%	-	5% <i>zf</i>	1%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	-	3%	2%	3%	3% <i>r</i>	1%	-	1%
More than 1000	20	4	11	2	3	2	15	15	2	4	1	11	1	4	16	12	3	8	4	20
	5%	5%	6%	5%	4%	3%	7%	5%	5%	9%	1%	8%	10%	4%	7%	13% <i>zr</i>	8%	15% <i>zr</i>	3%	5%
Don't know	319	76	147	30	58	31	192	233	27	34	53	104	3	78	169	49	26	31	131	299
	83% <i>enopq</i>	85%	82%	79%	83%	62%	84% <i>e</i>	82%	74%	72%	92% <i>hi</i>	75%	56%	82%	74% <i>oq</i>	55%	62%	56%	96% <i>znopq</i>	81%
Mean (£000)	370.31	252.52	540.10	448.30	28.27	240.59	468.07	438.03	0.40	206.82	267.26	619.27	0.34	143.03	334.18	342.81	1.67	508.72	727.50	316.50

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 422

Q15c. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in gigawatts (raw data)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	371	211	9	148	371	44	57	34	48	51	98	163	89	78	196	78	371
Weighted total	385	217	9**	154	385	48*	62*	32*	44*	52*	104*	167	91*	86*	197	79*	371
1-10	10	5	-	5	10	-	3	-	7	-	4	2	4	3	3	4	10
3%	3%	2%	-	3%	3%	-	5%	-	16% <i>zdegl</i>	-	4%	1%	5%	3%	2%	5%	3%
11-20	3	3	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	3	-	3
1%	1%	2%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	4%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	1%
21-40	9	4	-	5	9	2	1	1	2	2	3	4	2	2	5	2	10
2%	2%	-	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	5%	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%
41-60	6	3	-	3	6	-	-	1	2	3	-	3	3	-	4	3	6
2%	2%	1%	-	2%	2%	-	-	3%	5%	6%	-	2%	3%	-	2%	3%	2%
61-80	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	*	-	1	-	2
*	-	-	-	1%	*	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*	*	-	1%	-	1%
81-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
101-500	13	7	-	6	13	-	-	3	3	6	4	7	3	2	9	2	17
3%	3%	-	4%	3%	-	-	-	9% <i>f</i>	6%	12% <i>zdef</i>	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%	5%
501-1000	4	3	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	3	1	2	1	1	2	1	4
1%	1%	2%	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	6% <i>zd</i>	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
More than 1000	20	8	1	11	20	-	6	2	2	7	4	10	5	3	11	5	20
5%	5%	4%	7%	7%	5%	-	9%	7%	5%	13% <i>zde</i>	4%	6%	6%	3%	6%	7%	5%
Don't know	319	184	8	122	319	47	51	26	27	28	88	135	72	75	159	63	299
	83% <i>hi</i>	85%	93%	79%	83% <i>hi</i>	97% <i>zdghi</i>	83% <i>hi</i>	80% <i>i</i>	62%	54%	85%	81%	80%	88%	80%	79%	81%
Mean (£000)	370.31	213.95	1.30	538.67	370.31	0.03	1371.44	403.19	386.05	6.06	206.60	341.85	571.19	305.65	277.81	644.07	316.50

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 423

Q15c. Thinking about this same accounting period, what was the total energy consumption by your organisation (excluding transport fuel)?

Base: all participants in gigawatts (raw data)

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	371	4	3	72	7	8	18	23	21	13	15	28	11	20	11	2	13	21	9	70	2	371
Weighted total	385	5**	2**	68*	5**	5**	12**	31**	18**	19**	15**	38**	12**	17**	17**	3**	13**	26**	12**	64*	4**	371
1-10	10	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	1	-	10
	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	6%	3%	-	6%	23%	-	-	-	-	2%	-	3%
11-20	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
21-40	9	-	-	4	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10
	2%	-	-	5%	-	-	6%	7%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	3%
41-60	6	1	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	2%	23%	-	4%	-	12%	-	3%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%
61-80	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	*	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
81-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
101-500	13	-	1	5	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	17
	3%	-	59%	8%	-	14%	-	3%	-	4%	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	5%
501-1000	4	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	1%	-	-	1%	-	16%	-	5%	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
More than 1000	20	-	-	8	1	2	-	3	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	20
	5%	-	-	11%	15%	37%	-	9%	7%	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	3%	-	5%
Don't know	319	4	1	47	4	1	11	23	12	18	13	33	10	16	13	3	12	26	12	56	4	299
	83% ^c	77%	41%	69%	85%	13%	88%	76%	70%	96%	90%	88%	85%	94%	77%	100%	91%	100%	100%	87% ^c	100%	81%
Mean (£000)	370.31	0.05	0.26	340.89	5.48	26.54	0.02	443.93	1248.87	3.20	0.08	0.59	0.49	0.01	*	-	286.00	-	-	854.44	-	316.50

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 424

Q16. And is that the energy consumption for all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's total energy consumption

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	126	119	3	4	5	14	9	6	5	3	33	19	5	8	-	3	13	80	46	126
Weighted total	114	105	2**	8**	4**	13**	8**	5**	7**	2**	29**	14**	4**	8**	**	3**	13**	69*	45*	126
For all sites	37	36	1	-	-	6	4	2	4	1	5	6	3	2	-	1	3	25	12	45
	32%	35%	29%	-	-	46%	53%	32%	64%	35%	16%	40%	69%	22%	-	56%	21%	37%	26%	36%
For sites I'm responsible for	75	65	1	8	4	7	4	2	2	1	23	8	1	6	-	1	11	44	31	79
	65%	62%	71%	100%	100%	54%	47%	43%	36%	65%	78%	60%	31%	78%	-	44%	79%	63%	68%	63%
Don't know	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2
	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	25%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6% ^q	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 425

Q16. And is that the energy consumption for all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's total energy consumption

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	126	-	126	24	26	31	28	4	12	49	13	38	2	13	19	68	88	38	126
Weighted total	114	-**	114	22**	25**	29**	22**	4**	11**	49*	11**	31*	2**	13**	18**	61*	78*	36*	126
For all sites	37	-	37	6	9	9	7	2	3	16	1	11	-	6	8	18	28	9	45
	32%	-	32%	28%	36%	32%	30%	53%	30%	32%	10%	37%	-	48%	41%	30%	36%	25%	36%
For sites I'm responsible for	75	-	75	16	13	20	15	2	8	32	10	19	2	7	9	43	49	26	79
	65%	-	65%	72%	52%	68%	70%	47%	70%	65%	90%	63%	100%	52%	50%	70%	63%	71%	63%
Don't know	3	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	2	2
	3%	-	3%	-	11%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	2%	4%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 426

Q16. And is that the energy consumption for all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's total energy consumption

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	126	29	62	14	19	17	96	115	7	16	24	63	6	36	97	48	16	39	28	126
Weighted total	114	28**	58*	11**	16**	16**	85*	103	7**	13**	22**	57*	5**	32*	87*	42*	15**	38*	27**	126
For all sites	37	9	17	3	7	5	31	36	3	4	6	19	1	11	27	11	3	8	10	45
	32%	32%	29%	26%	42%	30%	37%	34%	37%	35%	30%	34%	15%	35%	31%	27%	22%	22%	36%	36%
For sites I'm responsible for	75	19	40	7	9	11	51	65	5	8	15	36	5	19	60	30	11	29	14	79
	65%	68%	68%	62%	58%	70%	60%	63%	63%	65%	70%	64%	85%	60%	69%	73%	78%	78%	54%	63%
Don't know	3	-	2	1	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	2
	3%	-	3%	12%	-	-	3%	3%	-	-	-	2%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	11%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 427

Q16. And is that the energy consumption for all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's total energy consumption

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (a)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	126	89	6	31	126	18	25	13	22	19	43	57	23	40	57	27	126
Weighted total	114	81*	5**	28**	114	18**	22**	11**	18**	16**	36*	54*	21**	34*	54*	25**	126
For all sites	37	25	1	11	37	7	9	3	6	5	19	16	1	18	13	5	45
	32%	31%	20%	39%	32%	40%	39%	28%	30%	32%	53% zk	30%	4%	54% zn	24%	18%	36%
For sites I'm responsible for	75	53	4	17	75	11	13	8	13	11	15	36	21	14	41	19	79
	65% m	66%	80%	61%	65%	60%	61%	72%	70%	68%	43%	67% j	96%	41%	76% m	77%	63%
Don't know	3	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	1	2
	3%	4%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	2%	-	5%	-	5%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 428

Q16. And is that the energy consumption for all your organisation's sites or just for the sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who know their organisation's total energy consumption

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	126	2	1	31	2	1	4	5	5	5	3	5	8	15	2	-	5	4	-	27	1	126
Weighted total	114	2**	1**	28**	1**	1**	3**	5**	4**	6**	2**	7**	6**	10**	2**	**	7**	4**	**	23**	2**	126
For all sites	37	1	-	11	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	-	4	1	-	-	-	1	-	8	-	45
	32%	38%	-	40%	49%	100%	77%	37%	35%	22%	57%	24%	-	40%	43%	-	-	39%	-	33%	-	36%
For sites I'm responsible for	75	-	1	17	1	-	1	3	3	5	1	5	6	6	1	-	7	1	-	15	2	79
	65%	-	100%	60%	51%	-	23%	63%	65%	78%	43%	76%	100%	60%	57%	-	100%	20%	-	67%	100%	63%
Don't know	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2
	3%	62%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42%	-	-	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 429

Q17. As far as you are aware, does your company own or lease vehicles which are used, at least some of the time, for commercial use?

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871	
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871	
Yes (and this is not all through subcontractors)	628	558	7	62	22	59	36	53	48	11	129	115	36	43	15	14	33	321	299	640	
	72%j	73%	63%	63%	93%	78%j	78%j	90%zhjlp	74%j	64%	56%	79%j	72%j	82%j	79%	78%	70%	74%	70%	73%	
No	235	195	4	36	2	17	10	6	15	6	96	30	16	10	4	4	14	109	122	224	
	27%g	26%	37%	37%	7%	22%	22%	10%	23%	36%	42%zefghklm	21%	22%	26%g	18%	21%	22%	30%g	25%	29%	26%
Don't know	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	4	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	5	7	
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	2%	*	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 430

Q17. As far as you are aware, does your company own or lease vehicles which are used, at least some of the time, for commercial use?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes (and this is not all through subcontractors)	628	97	530	102	154	153	143	27	44	226	66	173	16	74	109	329	628	-	640
	72%ackmq	58%	75%a	51%	75%c	80%zc	79%c	82%c	80%c	75%k	64%	62%	39%	61%	75%m	81%zm	100%zq	-	73%
No	235	69	167	97	52	36	35	5	9	75	36	104	25	35	37	73	-	235	224
	27%efop	41%zb	24%	49%zdefgh	25%	19%	19%	15%	17%	25%	35%	37%zi	61%	39%zno	25%	18%	-	100%zp	26%
Don't know	8	1	7	-	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	-	-	-	6	-	-	7
	1%p	*	1%	-	*	1%	1%	3%c	3%c	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 431

Q17. As far as you are aware, does your company own or lease vehicles which are used, at least some of the time, for commercial use?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes (and this is not all through subcontractors)	628 72% ^r	126 64%	327 77% ^{ad}	67 75%	98 67%	98 85% ^{zf}	411 71%	501 73%	60 76%	75 76%	99 70%	264 75%	26 83%	163 74%	450 75% ^r	193 77% ^r	65 72%	125 78% ^r	160 65%	640 73%
No	235 27% ^e	67 34% ^b	94 22%	21 24%	48 33% ^b	18 15%	160 28% ^e	179 26%	19 24%	24 24%	40 29%	87 25%	5 17%	55 25%	143 24%	54 22%	24 27%	33 21%	86 35% ^{znoq}	224 26%
Don't know	8 1%	3 1%	2 1%	1 2%	1 1%	- -	7 1%	8 1%	- -	- -	1 1%	1 -	3 -	3 1%	6 1%	4 2%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	7 1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 432

Q17. As far as you are aware, does your company own or lease vehicles which are used, at least some of the time, for commercial use?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes (and this is not all through subcontractors)	628	382	24	216	628	77	132	66	95	94	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
	72% <i>m</i>	73%	79%	69%	72%	64%	78% <i>e</i>	75%	73%	80% <i>e</i>	67%	75% <i>j</i>	74%	64% <i>e</i>	76% <i>m</i>	74%	73%
No	235	134	6	95	235	41	36	22	35	21	81	97	48	77	108	42	224
	27% <i>l</i>	26%	21%	30%	27% <i>l</i>	34% <i>l</i>	22%	25%	26%	18%	33% <i>k</i>	24%	26%	35% <i>zno</i>	24%	25%	26%
Don't know	8	6	-	2	8	2	-	-	1	3	-	6	1	1	4	2	7
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	-	-	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 433

Q17. As far as you are aware, does your company own or lease vehicles which are used, at least some of the time, for commercial use?

Base: all participants

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	(u)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes (and this is not all through subcontractors)	628	11	3	147	7	5	27	73	34	27	15	32	17	27	21	5	23	35	19	94	6	640
	72% <i>kmp</i>	100%	68%	86% <i>zkmps</i>	71%	92%	87% <i>zkmps</i>	90% <i>zkmps</i>	93% <i>zkmpqs</i>	70%	55%	43%	57%	59%	62%	100%	50%	75% <i>kp</i>	64%	69% <i>kp</i>	72%	73%
No	235	-	2	21	3	*	4	6	2	11	13	43	13	19	13	-	21	12	11	40	2	224
	27% <i>cfgh</i>	-	32%	12%	29%	8%	13%	7%	7%	30%	45%	57% <i>zcfghqs</i>	43%	41% <i>zcfgh</i>	38%	-	48% <i>zcfghqs</i>	25% <i>gh</i>	36%	30% <i>cfgh</i>	28%	26%
Don't know	8	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	7
	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 434

Q18a. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Cars

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
0	65	52	1	12	2	6	3	4	5	3	16	8	7	6	3	1	3	27	39	63
	10%	9%	13%	19%	9%	10%	8%	8%	11%	28%	12%	7%	16%	13%	19%	6%	9%	8%	13%	10%
1	16	16	-	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	3	5	2	-	-	-	1	6	9	17
	2%	3%	-	-	-	5%	-	4%	-	-	2%	4%	5%	-	-	-	2%	2%	3%	3%
2-10	141	119	2	20	8	7	9	6	8	2	32	21	15	12	5	4	11	62	78	132
	22%	21%	28%	32%	36%	12%	24%	11%	16%	18%	25%	18%	36%zegk	27%	31%	31%	33%	19%	26%	21%
11-19	57	50	2	5	1	8	3	8	4	2	9	7	4	4	1	6	1	29	27	56
	9%	9%	29%	8%	7%	13%	7%	15%	8%	16%	7%	6%	9%	10%	8%	41%	2%	9%	9%	9%
20-49	114	105	1	8	7	10	12	13	10	1	19	23	7	4	-	3	2	59	51	117
	18%	19%	15%	13%	33%	17%	33%zjm	24%	21%	8%	15%	20%	17%	8%	-	22%	6%	18%	17%	18%
50-99	60	56	-	4	-	6	2	7	2	1	11	17	-	8	4	-	3	39	22	64
	10%/	10%	-	6%	-	10%/	5%	13%/	4%	9%	9%	15%/	-	17%/	30%	-	9%	12%	7%	10%
100+	118	116	1	2	3	12	6	10	15	2	30	23	2	6	-	-	8	69	49	135
	19%cl	21%cl	7%	3%	13%	20%/	16%	18%	31%/	20%	24%/	20%/	5%	12%	-	-	25%	21%	16%	21%
Don't know	56	44	*	11	1	8	3	4	4	-	9	11	5	6	2	-	5	30	25	56
	9%	8%	7%	18%	3%	13%	7%	8%	8%	-	7%	9%	12%	13%	12%	-	14%	9%	8%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 435

Q18a. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Cars

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	-**	640
0	65	11	54	9	25	15	11	4	3	16	6	30	4	16	12	17	65	-	63
	10%o	11%	10%	8%	16%f	10%	7%	13%	6%	7%	9%	17%zi	28%	22%zo	11%	5%	10%	-	10%
1	16	7	9	7	5	2	2	-	-	5	1	9	4	1	2	7	16	-	17
	2%	7%zb	2%	6%zf	3%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	5%	22%	1%	2%	2%	2%	-	3%
2-10	141	33	108	33	43	43	19	1	2	55	27	33	7	29	31	52	141	-	132
	22%fho	34%zb	20%	32%fj	28%fj	28%fj	13%	4%	4%	24%	41%zik	19%	45%	38%zo	28%o	16%	22%	-	21%
11-19	57	16	41	19	16	13	8	-	-	23	8	17	-	9	18	19	57	-	56
	9%h	17%zb	8%	19%zefh	10%h	9%	6%	-	-	10%	11%	10%	-	12%	16%zo	6%	9%	-	9%
20-49	114	16	98	24	29	28	24	3	4	50	7	25	-	13	25	64	114	-	117
	18%	16%	19%	24%h	19%	18%	17%	13%	9%	22%	10%	14%	-	18%	23%	19%	18%	-	18%
50-99	60	5	55	2	18	19	17	3	-	28	2	12	-	2	10	40	60	-	64
	10%c	5%	10%	2%	12%ch	12%ch	12%ch	13%	1%	12%	3%	7%	-	2%	9%	12%em	10%	-	10%
100+	118	2	116	4	12	22	45	9	25	28	12	35	1	5	10	93	118	-	135
	19%acdimm	2%	22%a	4%	8%	14%c	32%zcde	35%	57%zcdef	13%	18%	20%	6%	6%	9%	28%zmn	19%	-	21%
Don't know	56	7	49	5	6	11	17	6	10	20	4	11	-	-	2	36	56	-	56
	9%dmn	7%	9%	4%	4%	7%	12%d	21%	23%zcde	9%	6%	6%	-	-	2%	11%mn	9%	-	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 436

Q18a. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Cars

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
0	65	11	38	8	8	10	39	53	1	12	17	24	4	17	48	13	3	11	13	63
	10%h	9%	12%	12%	9%	10%	10%	10%h	2%	15%h	18%zh	9%	15%	10%	11%	7%	5%	9%	8%	10%
1	16	3	9	1	3	2	12	16	-	2	2	7	1	3	8	3	1	2	8	17
	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	-	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	5%rn	3%
2-10	141	30	67	15	27	18	86	105	12	12	17	53	6	37	88	24	13	24	50	132
	22%o	24%	20%	23%	27%	18%	21%	21%	20%	16%	17%	20%	24%	23%	20%o	13%	19%	20%	31%znoq	21%
11-19	57	12	32	7	5	13	36	49	7	5	11	29	2	17	45	12	7	13	12	56
	9%	9%	10%	11%	5%	13%	9%	10%	12%	7%	11%	11%	8%	11%	10%	6%	11%	10%	8%	9%
20-49	114	25	63	10	14	14	84	96	10	15	22	53	7	25	78	33	12	32	30	117
	18%	20%	19%	15%	14%	14%	20%	19%	16%	20%	22%	20%	27%	16%	17%	17%	19%	26%	19%	18%
50-99	60	15	23	9	14	7	50	55	7	5	10	31	1	15	47	25	9	12	11	64
	10%	12%	7%	13%	14%	7%	12%	11%	12%	7%	10%	12%	4%	9%	10%	13%	14%	10%	7%	10%
100+	118	17	66	14	19	27	76	93	16	19	15	50	5	36	89	55	14	22	29	135
	19%	14%	20%	21%	20%	27%	18%	19%	26%	25%	15%	19%	18%	22%	20%	28%znqr	22%	18%	18%	21%
Don't know	56	13	30	3	8	7	29	35	7	6	4	17	*	12	47	28	6	8	6	56
	9%	10%	9%	4%	8%	8%	7%	7%	12%	8%	4%	6%	2%	8%	10%r	14%zqr	9%	7%	4%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 437

Q18a. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Cars

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
0	65	47	1	18	65	7	10	3	15	7	16	31	16	12	37	15	63
	10%	12%	4%	8%	10%	9%	7%	5%	16%g	7%	10%	10%	11%	9%	11%	12%	10%
1	16	8	3	5	16	4	4	2	1	-	4	8	2	4	8	3	17
	2%	2%	12%	2%	2%	5%f	3%	2%	1%	-	3%	3%	1%	3%	2%	3%	3%
2-10	141	93	5	41	141	27	34	15	18	13	41	73	23	32	82	25	132
	22%	24%	20%	19%	22%	35%zdhi	26%	22%	19%	14%	25%	24%	17%	23%	24%	19%	21%
11-19	57	42	-	14	57	7	15	10	4	5	11	34	12	10	35	12	56
	9%	11%	-	7%	9%	9%	11%	15%hi	4%	5%	7%	11%	9%	7%	10%	9%	9%
20-49	114	69	5	40	114	15	30	12	19	15	29	49	33	26	60	28	117
	18%	18%	19%	19%	18%	20%	23%	18%	20%	17%	18%	16%	24%	19%	18%	22%	18%
50-99	60	31	1	27	60	7	11	3	8	12	20	25	14	14	31	14	64
	10%	8%	6%	13%	10%	9%	8%	4%	9%	13%	12%	8%	10%	10%	9%	11%	10%
100+	118	65	7	47	118	7	25	14	26	30	34	55	28	31	63	23	135
	19%	17%	28%	22%	19%	9%	19%	21%	27%e	32%zdef	21%	18%	20%	22%	18%	18%	21%
Don't know	56	27	3	23	56	4	3	8	5	11	9	30	10	11	29	8	56
	9%g	7%	11%	11%	9%g	5%	2%	12%f	5%	12%f	6%	10%	7%	8%	8%	6%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 438

Q18a. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Cars

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	21**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
0	65	-	-	5	1	-	1	3	1	6	1	7	3	3	3	-	8	3	5	15	-	63
	10% c	-	-	4%	17%	-	3%	4%	3%	21%	5%	21%	18%	13% c	14%	-	36%	7%	26%	16% cgh	-	10%
1	16	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	1	1	-	1	2	2	-	-	2	1	1	2	-	17
	2%	-	-	1%	12%	-	-	2%	2%	3%	-	4%	5%	6%	-	-	7%	4%	7%	2%	-	3%
2-10	141	3	3	36	2	1	2	14	7	3	5	3	6	4	-	-	8	17	6	18	2	132
	22% f	29%	80%	24% f	21%	15%	8%	19%	21%	12%	14%	16%	18%	24%	17%	-	33%	49%	34%	19%	38%	21%
11-19	57	-	-	19	-	-	-	7	3	6	1	-	-	4	1	-	1	1	2	12	-	56
	9%	-	-	13% f	-	-	-	9%	8%	22%	7%	-	-	16% f	4%	-	6%	3%	11%	13% f	-	9%
20-49	114	4	-	40	-	1	4	14	7	2	1	1	3	2	3	-	*	7	2	19	-	117
	18%	36%	-	27% z	-	13%	16%	19%	20%	8%	13%	4%	6%	11%	11%	62%	2%	21%	11%	21%	-	18%
50-99	60	2	-	18	1	-	4	8	5	1	6	4	*	3	-	-	1	-	-	6	-	64
	10%	18%	-	12%	9%	-	15%	11%	14%	4%	5%	19%	21%	2%	16%	-	5%	-	-	7%	-	10%
100+	118	2	1	13	2	3	14	19	9	6	7	9	2	6	4	-	1	4	-	15	-	135
	19% c	17%	20%	9%	33%	64%	52% zcghms	26% c	26% c	24%	45%	28%	12%	22% c	20%	-	4%	11%	-	16%	-	21%
Don't know	56	-	-	13	1	*	1	7	2	2	3	4	2	2	4	2	1	2	2	5	4	56
	9%	-	-	9%	8%	9%	5%	10%	5%	7%	11%	9%	21%	6%	17%	38%	6%	6%	11%	6%	62%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 439

Q18b. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

LGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
0	282	260	4	17	9	21	17	21	20	6	69	54	18	17	7	6	16	157	122	283
	45%	47% c	62%	27%	43%	35%	47%	39%	41%	54%	54% e	47%	41%	37%	47%	45%	49%	49%	41%	44%
1	45	35	-	10	-	2	1	1	1	*	10	13	5	4	1	-	6	25	20	45
	7%	6%	-	15%	-	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	8%	11%	13%	9%	6%	-	19%	8%	7%	7%
2-10	130	113	1	16	3	13	9	11	5	3	25	23	12	12	5	7	4	51	78	129
	21%	20%	15%	26%	14%	21%	24%	21%	11%	25%	19%	20%	28%	27%	35%	49%	11%	16%	26% q	20%
11-19	16	16	-	-	*	5	1	3	-	-	1	4	1	1	-	-	-	10	4	16
	2%	3%	-	-	2%	8% zj	3%	5%	-	-	1%	3%	2%	3%	-	-	-	3%	1%	3%
20-49	26	26	1	-	4	3	4	2	2	1	5	1	-	1	-	-	-	12	15	29
	4%	5%	8%	-	18%	5%	10% kl	4%	5%	8%	4%	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	4%	5%	5%
50-99	26	24	-	2	1	7	-	5	3	-	1	3	2	4	-	-	-	8	18	29
	4%	4%	-	3%	5%	12% zflj	-	9% j	7% j	-	1%	2%	4%	9% j	-	-	-	3%	6% q	5%
100+	59	53	1	5	2	3	2	7	15	1	10	12	2	2	-	1	2	35	23	63
	9%	9%	7%	9%	10%	5%	6%	12%	31% zefklm	9%	8%	10%	4%	5%	-	6%	6%	11%	8%	10%
Don't know	44	32	1	12	2	6	3	3	1	-	8	7	4	4	2	-	5	24	20	46
	7%	6%	8%	19% za	9%	11%	7%	7%	2%	-	6%	6%	9%	8%	12%	-	14%	7%	7%	7%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 440

Q18b. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

LGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	-**	640
0	282	57	225	55	78	66	59	10	13	100	32	90	8	39	47	146	282	-	283
	45%	58% zb	42%	54% h	50% h	43%	41%	36%	31%	44%	48%	52%	52%	53%	43%	44%	45%	-	44%
1	45	12	33	17	12	10	3	-	2	16	7	16	2	10	13	11	45	-	45
	7% fo	12% b	6%	17% zdef	8% f	7%	2%	-	5%	7%	11%	9%	16%	14% o	12% o	3%	7%	-	7%
2-10	130	16	115	20	39	39	23	5	4	54	12	29	3	20	25	60	130	-	129
	21% h	16%	22%	19%	25% h	25% h	16%	17%	8%	24%	18%	17%	18%	26%	23%	18%	21%	-	20%
11-19	16	2	13	2	4	1	6	-	1	4	2	5	-	1	4	8	16	-	16
	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	1%	4%	-	3%	2%	3%	3%	-	2%	4%	2%	2%	-	3%
20-49	26	3	23	2	7	8	4	3	2	9	4	4	1	3	5	15	26	-	29
	4%	3%	4%	2%	4%	5%	3%	12%	4%	4%	5%	2%	8%	4%	5%	5%	4%	-	5%
50-99	26	3	23	1	6	8	6	2	2	7	1	7	-	1	6	18	26	-	29
	4%	3%	4%	1%	4%	5%	4%	9%	5%	3%	1%	4%	-	1%	6%	5%	4%	-	5%
100+	59	-	59	1	5	18	22	3	10	19	4	13	-	1	5	46	59	-	63
	9% acdm	-	11% a	1%	3%	12% cd	16% zcd	11%	23% zcd	8%	7%	8%	-	1%	5%	14% zmn	9%	-	10%
Don't know	44	4	40	4	4	2	19	4	9	17	5	8	1	-	4	24	44	-	46
	7% em	4%	8%	4%	3%	1%	13% zcde	15%	21% zcde	8%	7%	5%	6%	-	4%	7% m	7%	-	7%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 441

Q18b. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

LGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
0	282	46	137	36	62	42	198	239	18	28	41	121	7	78	196	88	32	62	84	283
	45%h	36%	42%	54%a	63%zab	43%	48%	48%h	30%	38%	41%	46%	27%	48%	44%	45%	50%	50%	53%	44%
1	45	15	23	4	3	1	30	32	1	9	7	18	1	10	29	6	1	10	11	45
	7%e	12%d	7%	6%	3%	1%	7%e	6%	1%	12%h	7%	7%	2%	6%	6%	3%	2%	8%	7%	7%
2-10	130	29	75	9	15	27	81	108	15	9	25	55	11	35	89	31	6	25	36	129
	21%p	23%	23%	14%	15%	27%	20%	22%i	25%i	12%	25%i	21%	41%	21%	20%p	16%	9%	20%p	23%p	20%
11-19	16	4	9	-	2	3	9	15	4	3	4	8	2	3	12	5	6	4	2	16
	2%	3%	3%	-	2%	3%	2%	3%	6%	3%	4%	3%	7%	2%	3%	3%	9%znor	4%	1%	3%
20-49	26	4	15	4	4	7	17	21	6	6	7	12	2	9	23	9	2	2	3	29
	4%	3%	4%	6%	4%	7%	4%	4%	9%	8%	7%	5%	6%	5%	5%	5%	4%	1%	2%	5%
50-99	26	6	15	2	3	4	17	20	1	7	6	13	-	8	21	9	1	2	5	29
	4%	5%	5%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	2%	9%	6%	5%	-	5%	5%	5%	2%	1%	3%	5%
100+	59	11	30	10	6	13	37	42	9	9	5	22	2	14	44	24	9	10	12	63
	9%	8%	9%	16%	6%	13%	9%	8%	15%j	12%	5%	8%	7%	8%	10%	12%	14%	8%	8%	10%
Don't know	44	11	22	2	4	2	23	25	7	4	4	15	2	6	35	20	8	10	7	46
	7%	9%	7%	3%	4%	2%	6%	5%	12%g	6%	4%	6%	9%	4%	8%	11%r	12%r	8%	4%	7%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 442

Q18b. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

LGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
0	282	165	9	104	282	42	59	32	39	35	83	133	57	64	157	54	283
	45%	43%	36%	48%	45%	54%	45%	48%	41%	37%	51%	43%	41%	46%	46%	43%	44%
1	45	30	-	15	45	7	11	4	6	1	14	23	8	13	24	8	45
	7% <i>f</i>	8%	-	7%	7% <i>f</i>	9% <i>f</i>	9% <i>f</i>	6%	7%	1%	9%	7%	6%	9%	7%	7%	7%
2-10	130	84	4	43	130	14	37	10	21	18	35	59	32	32	65	31	129
	21%	22%	16%	20%	21%	18%	28% <i>g</i>	15%	22%	20%	21%	19%	23%	23%	19%	25%	20%
11-19	16	12	1	2	16	3	2	2	2	3	1	10	4	-	11	4	16
	2%	3%	4%	1%	2%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%	1%	3%	3%	-	3% <i>m</i>	3% <i>m</i>	3%
20-49	26	17	3	7	26	5	3	5	3	7	8	14	5	9	13	4	29
	4%	4%	11%	3%	4%	7%	3%	7%	4%	8%	5%	4%	3%	6%	4%	3%	5%
50-99	26	16	2	8	26	2	7	2	3	8	4	12	10	4	14	8	29
	4%	4%	7%	4%	4%	3%	5%	3%	3%	9%	3%	4%	7%	3%	4%	6%	5%
100+	59	37	3	18	59	2	10	5	16	12	11	31	15	10	37	10	63
	9%	10%	14%	8%	9%	3%	8%	8%	17% <i>szdef</i>	13% <i>e</i>	7%	10%	11%	7%	11%	8%	10%
Don't know	44	22	3	18	44	2	2	6	5	9	7	26	8	8	25	6	46
	7% <i>f</i>	6%	11%	8%	7% <i>f</i>	2%	1%	9% <i>f</i>	5%	10% <i>f</i>	4%	8%	6%	6%	7%	5%	7%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 443

Q18b. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

LGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	21**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
0	282	5	1	79	2	1	7	24	9	9	7	19	6	14	11	2	9	24	10	41	2	283
	45% <i>fh</i>	46%	22%	54% <i>fgh</i>	31%	15%	26%	34%	26%	33%	46%	60%	37%	51% <i>fh</i>	52%	35%	39%	67%	53%	44%	38%	44%
1	45	-	-	16	-	-	1	3	1	2	-	4	1	7	1	-	-	2	-	8	-	45
	7%	-	-	11%	-	-	4%	4%	2%	7%	3%	11%	5%	26% <i>zcfghs</i>	4%	-	-	5%	-	9%	-	7%
2-10	130	4	2	25	1	-	5	18	13	8	3	4	1	3	3	-	12	6	7	16	-	129
	21%	40%	59%	17%	11%	-	20%	25%	37% <i>zcms</i>	31%	20%	12%	5%	13%	12%	-	52%	18%	36%	17%	-	20%
11-19	16	-	-	5	-	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	-	16
	2%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	2%	8% <i>z</i>	-	4%	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	3%
20-49	26	1	-	4	-	1	2	2	3	4	1	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	-	7	-	29
	4%	6%	-	3%	-	13%	8%	3%	8%	3%	-	5%	3%	-	11%	-	10%	-	-	7%	-	5%
50-99	26	1	-	3	-	-	3	6	3	5	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	29
	4%	8%	-	2%	6%	-	10% <i>c</i>	9% <i>c</i>	10% <i>c</i>	19%	-	3%	5%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	5%
100+	59	-	1	6	3	3	7	13	3	-	1	-	6	2	1	-	-	1	-	11	-	63
	9% <i>c</i>	-	20%	4%	44%	64%	27% <i>zchms</i>	18% <i>c</i>	8%	-	6%	-	38%	6%	6%	-	-	4%	-	12% <i>c</i>	-	10%
Don't know	44	-	-	10	1	*	1	5	-	2	3	3	1	*	2	3	-	2	2	5	4	46
	7%	-	-	6%	8%	9%	5%	7%	-	7%	20%	9%	7%	2%	8%	65%	-	6%	11%	5%	62%	7%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 444

Q18c. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

HGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
0	453	400	7	46	15	39	27	34	29	7	112	82	31	31	12	5	24	240	210	459
		72%	100%	74%	69%	67%	75%	64%	61%	67%	87% <i>z</i>	71%	73%	70%	83%	36%	74%	75%	70%	72%
1	21	18	-	3	-	4	-	3	4	2	1	3	2	1	-	3	11	8	20	
	3%	3%	-	5%	-	6% <i>j</i>	-	5%	8% <i>j</i>	16%	1%	2%	4%	2%	-	9%	4%	3%	3%	
2-10	51	51	-	-	1	6	3	4	7	-	4	9	4	7	1	3	4	22	29	
	8%	9%	-	-	6%	10%	9%	7%	14% <i>j</i>	-	3%	8%	9%	16% <i>j</i>	5%	22%	-	7%	10%	
11-19	11	11	-	-	1	1	-	3	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	4	6	12	
	2%	2%	-	-	6%	1%	-	5%	-	9%	1%	2%	-	3%	-	-	1%	2%	2%	
20-49	16	16	-	-	1	1	3	2	4	-	1	3	-	1	-	1	7	10	19	
	3%	3%	-	-	6%	1%	8% <i>j</i>	3%	8% <i>j</i>	-	1%	2%	-	2%	-	6%	3%	2%	3%	
50-99	17	12	-	4	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	8	1	-	4	-	4	12	14	
	3%	2%	-	7%	-	2%	3%	-	2%	-	1%	7% <i>zj</i>	2%	-	30%	-	1%	4% <i>q</i>	2%	
100+	25	25	-	-	1	3	2	6	3	1	2	4	1	1	-	1	1	15	11	
	4%	5%	-	-	3%	5%	5%	11% <i>zj</i>	6%	8%	2%	3%	3%	3%	-	6%	2%	5%	4%	
Don't know	33	25	-	8	2	4	-	3	-	-	7	4	4	2	2	-	4	18	14	
	5%	4%	-	13% <i>a</i>	9%	7%	-	5%	-	-	6%	4%	9%	5%	12%	-	13%	6%	5%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 445

Q18c. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

HGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	**	640
0	453	83	371	83	122	114	93	15	26	149	54	136	14	65	86	209	453	-	459
	72%o	85%zb	70%	81%fh	79%fh	75%	65%	56%	59%	66%	81%l	79%l	85%	88%zo	79%o	64%	72%	-	72%
1	21	3	18	6	4	9	2	-	-	7	1	8	2	3	4	9	21	-	20
	3%	3%	3%	6%	3%	6%	2%	-	-	3%	2%	4%	15%	4%	4%	3%	3%	-	3%
2-10	51	5	46	2	15	14	16	2	1	24	7	11	-	4	9	34	51	-	51
	8%c	6%	9%	2%	10%c	9%c	11%c	7%	3%	11%	11%	7%	-	6%	8%	10%	8%	-	8%
11-19	11	-	11	1	4	4	1	-	-	8	-	2	-	-	3	8	11	-	12
	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	-	-	3%	-	1%	-	-	3%	2%	2%	-	2%
20-49	16	2	15	4	-	4	3	5	1	8	-	2	-	2	1	12	16	-	19
	3%	2%	3%	4% <i>d</i>	-	2%	2%	17%	2%	4%	-	1%	-	2%	1%	4%	3%	-	3%
50-99	17	1	16	5	6	2	3	-	-	10	1	-	-	-	2	15	17	-	14
	3% <i>k</i>	1%	3%	5%	4%	2%	2%	-	-	5% <i>k</i>	2%	-	-	-	2%	5%	3%	-	2%
100+	25	1	24	-	2	4	10	2	2	8	3	7	-	-	2	20	25	-	31
	4%	1%	5%	-	1%	3%	7% <i>cd</i>	6%	18% <i>zcd</i>	3%	4%	4%	-	-	2%	6% <i>m</i>	4%	-	5%
Don't know	33	2	30	1	*	1	16	4	8	13	1	7	-	-	3	22	33	-	34
	5% <i>d</i>	3%	6%	1%	*	1%	11% <i>zcd</i>	15%	18% <i>zcd</i>	6%	1%	4%	-	-	3%	7% <i>m</i>	5%	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 446

Q18c. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

HGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
0	453	76	240	47	84	78	291	361	41	55	72	185	17	117	319	123	39	78	119	459
	72% <i>saopq</i>	61%	73% <i>a</i>	70%	86% <i>zabc</i>	79%	71%	72%	68%	73%	73%	70%	67%	72%	71%	64%	60%	62%	75% <i>opq</i>	72%
1	21	6	6	6	3	2	15	16	2	2	1	7	-	9	12	4	2	3	7	20
	3%	5%	2%	9% <i>b</i>	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%	1%	3%	-	5%	3%	2%	2%	3%	4%	3%
2-10	51	17	22	8	5	4	41	46	3	9	13	29	3	14	36	22	7	13	14	51
	8%	13% <i>b</i>	7%	12%	5%	4%	10%	9%	4%	12%	13%	11%	12%	9%	8%	11%	10%	10%	9%	8%
11-19	11	5	4	1	2	1	8	9	1	2	5	6	1	3	9	3	3	5	2	12
	2%	4%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	5%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	5%	4%	1%	2%
20-49	16	-	14	2	-	5	11	15	1	1	1	5	1	8	11	7	1	4	5	19
	3%	-	4% <i>a</i>	3%	-	5%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	5%	5%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%
50-99	17	8	9	-	-	2	10	15	4	-	1	10	1	1	13	3	2	6	3	14
	3%	6% <i>d</i>	3%	-	-	3%	2%	3%	6% <i>f</i>	-	1%	4%	3%	1%	3%	2%	4%	5%	2%	2%
100+	16	6	16	2	-	4	18	20	4	3	2	12	1	5	19	15	4	9	6	31
	4%	5% <i>d</i>	5% <i>d</i>	4%	-	4%	4%	4%	6%	4%	2%	5%	3%	3%	4%	8% <i>z</i>	6%	7%	4%	5%
Don't know	33	7	17	1	4	1	17	19	5	3	4	11	1	6	29	17	6	8	4	34
	5%	6%	5%	2%	4%	2%	4%	4%	8%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	6%	9% <i>r</i>	10% <i>r</i>	6%	2%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 447

Q18c. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

HGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
0	453	277	17	156	453	65	99	42	69	58	123	222	96	101	253	89	459
	72%	72%	70%	72%	72%	84%z dgi	75%i	64%	73%	62%	75%	72%	69%	72%	73%	70%	72%
1	21	10	1	11	21	2	5	3	3	-	10	5	4	8	9	4	20
	3%	3%	3%	5%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	-	6%k	2%	3%	6%	3%	3%	3%
2-10	51	35	1	15	51	7	12	11	5	10	11	25	14	12	29	11	51
	8%	9%	4%	7%	8%	8%	9%	16%z dh	5%	11%	7%	8%	10%	8%	8%	8%	8%
11-19	11	6	-	5	11	1	3	1	1	3	2	4	5	1	5	5	12
	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	4%	2%
20-49	16	12	1	3	16	-	5	1	1	5	2	13	1	2	13	1	19
	3%	3%	5%	1%	3%	-	4%	2%	1%	5%	1%	4%	1%	2%	4%	1%	3%
50-99	17	13	-	3	17	2	4	1	6	2	3	6	7	4	6	7	14
	3%	4%	-	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	7%z d	2%	2%	2%	5%	3%	2%	5%	2%
100+	25	12	2	12	25	1	3	2	5	9	6	13	7	6	12	8	31
	4%	3%	6%	5%	4%	1%	2%	3%	5%	10%z def	4%	4%	5%	4%	3%	6%	5%
Don't know	33	17	3	12	33	-	1	4	5	7	6	19	5	6	19	3	34
	5% f	4%	11%	5%	5% f	-	*	6% e f	5% f	7% e f	4%	6%	4%	4%	6%	2%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 448

Q18c. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

HGVs

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	21**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
0	453	4	3	102	4	2	15	34	20	21	12	30	16	21	19	2	21	33	15	75	4	459
	72% <i>g</i>	38%	80%	70% <i>g</i>	61%	50%	57%	46%	58%	79%	76%	91%	93%	77% <i>g</i>	92%	35%	95%	94%	78%	80% <i>fgh</i>	70%	72%
1	21	1	-	7	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	2	5	-	20
	3%	6%	-	5%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	11% <i>zh</i>	8%	-	-	-	11%	5%	-	3%
2-10	51	2	-	15	1	1	5	12	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	1	8	-	51
	8%	14%	-	10%	9%	13%	20% <i>zh</i>	17% <i>zh</i>	2%	5%	4%	-	-	12%	-	-	5%	-	5%	9%	-	8%
11-19	11	-	-	3	-	-	1	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	12
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	4%	6% <i>z</i>	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%
20-49	16	2	-	2	1	1	2	4	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	19
	3%	20%	-	2%	11%	29%	6%	6%	6%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	3%
50-99	17	2	-	5	-	-	1	6	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
	3%	22%	-	3%	-	-	3%	8% <i>zs</i>	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%
100+	25	-	1	5	1	-	2	6	9	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	31
	4%	-	20%	3%	11%	-	8%	9% <i>s</i>	26% <i>zcfqms</i>	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	5%
Don't know	33	-	-	7	1	*	1	4	2	3	3	1	-	-	-	3	-	2	1	2	2	34
	5%	-	-	5%	8%	9%	2%	6%	-	7%	20%	9%	7%	-	-	65%	-	6%	6%	3%	30%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 449

Q18d. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Minibuses

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
0	483	426	6	51	17	43	33	41	41	8	99	93	30	32	8	11	25	260	215	491
	77%	76%	80%	82%	76%	72%	90% <i>elm</i>	77%	85%	77%	77%	81%	71%	71%	52%	80%	75%	81% <i>r</i>	72%	77%
1	27	27	-	-	1	5	1	*	1	-	5	3	1	4	3	-	2	17	10	30
	4%	5%	-	-	4%	9%	3%	1%	3%	-	4%	3%	2%	10%	18%	-	5%	5%	3%	5%
2-10	60	56	1	3	2	6	1	6	6	3	8	11	4	7	3	3	1	18	42	60
	10%	10%	14%	4%	9%	10%	2%	12%	12%	23%	6%	10%	9%	15%	18%	20%	4%	6%	14% <i>q</i>	9%
11-19	10	10	*	-	*	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	4	-	-	-	-	3	7	11
	2%	2%	6%	-	2%	2%	3%	2%	-	-	1%	1%	8% <i>zjk</i>	-	-	-	-	1%	2%	2%
20-49	9	9	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	4	2	*	-	-	-	-	3	6	9
	1%	2%	-	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	2%	1%
50-99	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	*	*	*
100+	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	*
Don't know	34	26	-	8	1	3	1	3	-	-	10	4	4	2	2	-	5	17	17	34
	5%	5%	-	13% <i>a</i>	6%	5%	3%	7%	-	-	7%	3%	9%	4%	12%	-	15%	5%	6%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 450

Q18d. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Minibuses

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	-**	640
0	483	78	405	89	124	120	99	20	29	159	58	149	16	54	83	254	483	-	491
	77%	80%	76%	87% <i>zfh</i>	80% <i>f</i>	78%	69%	74%	66%	70%	87% <i>fi</i>	86% <i>zi</i>	97%	73%	76%	77%	77%	-	77%
1	27	6	21	6	7	6	8	-	-	17	1	4	-	5	3	14	27	-	30
	4%	6%	4%	6%	5%	4%	6%	-	-	7% <i>k</i>	2%	2%	-	6%	3%	4%	4%	-	5%
2-10	60	10	51	5	19	19	14	3	1	27	6	10	-	11	17	23	60	-	60
	10%	10%	10%	5%	12% <i>h</i>	13% <i>h</i>	9%	11%	1%	12%	9%	6%	-	15% <i>o</i>	16% <i>o</i>	7%	10%	-	9%
11-19	10	2	8	1	2	6	*	-	1	5	-	-	-	2	2	4	10	-	11
	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	4%	*	-	3%	2%	-	-	3%	3%	2%	1%	2%	-	2%
20-49	9	-	9	*	1	1	5	-	1	2	1	1	-	1	1	6	9	-	9
	1%	-	2%	*	1%	1%	4%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%
50-99	2	-	2	-	*	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	3
	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	4% <i>zef</i>	*	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	*	-	*
100+	3	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	2
	*	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	-	*
Don't know	34	2	33	1	*	2	15	4	11	14	-	7	-	1	3	23	34	-	34
	5% <i>de</i>	2%	6%	1%	*	1%	10% <i>zcde</i>	15%	25% <i>zcdelf</i>	6%	-	4%	-	1%	3%	7%	5%	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 451

Q18d. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Minibuses

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
0	483	102	253	48	75	76	316	388	45	53	70	205	20	122	335	144	48	100	129	491
	77%	81%	77%	72%	76%	78%	77%	77%	74%	71%	71%	78%	78%	75%	75%	75%	74%	80%	81%	77%
1	27	6	12	5	4	5	17	24	3	5	4	11	3	4	23	9	4	9	4	30
	4%	5%	4%	8%	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%	7%	4%	4%	10%	3%	5%	4%	7%	7%	3%	5%
2-10	60	8	32	11	10	7	45	51	4	10	16	26	2	21	42	18	5	5	18	60
	10%g	6%	10%	16%a	10%	7%	11%	10%	7%	14%	17%z	10%	9%	13%	9%	9%	8%	4%	17%g	9%
11-19	10	1	6	-	3	1	8	9	-	-	-	5	-	4	9	3	-	-	1	11
	2%	1%	2%	-	3%	1%	2%	2%	-	-	-	2%	-	2%	2%	2%	-	-	1%	2%
20-49	9	3	-	1	3	1	7	7	1	3	5	1	-	4	7	1	-	2	1	9
	1%b	3%b	-	2%b	3%b	1%	2%	1%	2%	4%	5%zg	*	-	3%	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%
50-99	2	*	2	-	-	2	*	*	2	1	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	3
	*	*	*	-	-	2% <i>f</i>	*	*	3% <i>zg</i>	1%	-	1%	-	-	*	1%	-	-	-	*
100+	3	-	3	-	-	2	1	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	2
	*	-	1%	-	-	2%	*	1%	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	1%	1%	*
Don't know	34	5	20	1	4	4	17	19	6	3	3	14	*	8	30	17	8	8	4	34
	5%	4%	6%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%	9%	4%	4%	5%	2%	5%	7%	9% <i>r</i>	12% <i>zr</i>	7%	2%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 452

Q18d. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Minibuses

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
0	483	295	15	169	483	65	102	48	71	73	127	239	103	112	267	96	491
	77%	77%	61%	78%	77%	85%	77%	72%	75%	78%	78%	78%	75%	80%	77%	75%	77%
1	27	17	4	6	27	3	7	4	3	4	4	16	7	4	16	7	30
	4%	4%	17%	3%	4%	4%	6%	6%	3%	4%	3%	5%	5%	3%	5%	6%	5%
2-10	60	36	3	21	60	7	14	8	11	7	16	25	18	7	35	17	60
	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	9%	11%	12%	11%	7%	10%	8%	13%	5%	10%	13% ^m	9%
11-19	10	8	-	2	10	-	5	1	2	2	5	4	2	4	4	2	11
	2%	2%	-	1%	2%	-	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
20-49	9	5	-	4	9	1	4	-	3	1	1	5	1	3	3	1	9
	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	2%	3%	-	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
50-99	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	+	-	2	-	3
	+	1%	-	-	+	-	-	-	2% ^{zd}	-	-	1%	+	-	+	-	+
100+	3	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	2	-	1	2
	+	1%	-	-	+	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1% ^m	-	1%	+
Don't know	34	17	3	13	34	-	1	5	3	7	8	17	6	8	18	2	34
	5% ^f	4%	11%	6%	5% ^f	-	+	8% ^{ef}	3%	8% ^{ef}	5%	5%	4%	6%	5%	2%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 453

Q18d. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Minibuses

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	34*	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
0	483	8	1	128	5	5	21	60	25	20	12	28	16	24	18	2	9	16	11	72	4	491
	77%	71%	41%	87%zs	66%	91%	76%	82%	75%	75%	80%	86%	93%	88%	86%	35%	38%	45%	62%	76%	70%	77%
1	27	2	2	8	1	-	1	1	2	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	6	-	30
	4%	22%	59%	5%	11%	-	4%	1%	6%	-	-	3%	-	10%g	-	-	-	3%	-	7%	-	5%
2-10	60	1	-	5	-	-	2	6	5	4	-	-	-	1	2	-	12	12	5	7	-	60
	10%c	7%	-	3%	-	-	9%	8%	13%c	14%	-	-	-	2%	9%	-	52%	34%	27%	7%	-	9%
11-19	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	3	-	11
	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	4%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	10%	3%	-	3%c	-	2%
20-49	9	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	5	-	9
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	4%c	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	5%zc	-	1%
50-99	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	*	-	-	-	-	-	7%zcgs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
100+	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%c	3%c	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Don't know	34	-	-	7	2	*	-	3	-	2	3	3	1	3	1	3	-	3	2	2	2	34
	5%	-	-	5%	23%	9%	-	5%	-	7%	20%	9%	7%	-	5%	65%	-	9%	11%	2%	30%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 454

Q18e. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Coaches

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
0	586	523	7	55	20	52	35	50	48	11	118	111	39	43	12	14	28	300	279	596
		93%	100%	89%	91%	88%	96%	95%	100% ^e	100%	92%	96% ^e	91%	94%	83%	100%	85%	93%	93%	93%
1	4	4	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	2	5
	1%	1%	-	-	3%	4% ^{zjk}	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
2-10	4	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	2	4
	1%	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	5%	-	-	1%	1%	1%
11-19	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	*	*	-	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	32	25	-	7	-	3	1	3	-	-	8	4	4	2	2	-	5	16	15	32
	5%	4%	-	11%	-	5%	3%	5%	-	-	7%	4%	9%	4%	12%	-	15%	5%	5%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 455

Q18e. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Coaches

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	**	640
0	586	92	494	100	149	151	127	23	34	209	66	165	16	73	106	302	586	-	596
	93%h	95%	93%	98%fh	97%fh	98%zfh	88%	85%	78%	92%	99%	96%	100%	99%	97%	92%	93%	-	93%
1	4	2	2	1	1	2	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	2	4	-	5
	1%	2%	*	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	1%
2-10	4	1	3	-	2	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	4	-	4
	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	3%	-	*	-	-	-	1%	1%	*	1%	-	1%
11-19	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	1%b	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	-	1	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
	*	-	*	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	32	2	30	1	1	1	15	3	10	12	1	7	-	-	2	22	32	-	32
	5%de	2%	6%	1%	1%	*	10%zcde	10%	22%zdef	5%	1%	4%	-	-	2%	7%rn	5%	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 456

Q18e. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Coaches

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
0	586	118	304	65	92	92	386	471	55	72	91	248	25	151	411	170	57	116	156	596
	93%o	94%	93%	97%	94%	94%	94%	94%	91%	95%	92%	94%	98%	93%	91%	88%	87%	93%	96%nop	93%
1	4	2	1	-	1	1	3	4	-	-	2	3	-	-	4	4	1	1	-	5
	1%	1%	*	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	1%
2-10	4	-	3	-	1	-	4	4	-	-	1	-	-	3	4	2	-	1	-	4
	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	2%k	1%	1%	-	1%	-	1%
11-19	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	1%	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	*	1	-	-	1	-	1	*	*	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	2
	*	*	*	-	-	1% ^f	-	*	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	*	1%	2%	-	-	*
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	32	5	17	2	4	3	18	20	5	3	4	12	*	8	28	15	7	7	4	32
	5%	4%	5%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	9%	4%	4%	5%	2%	5%	6%	8% ^r	10% ^r	6%	2%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 457

Q18e. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Coaches

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
0	586	361	20	201	586	77	131	58	89	86	155	287	127	131	324	120	596
	93%	94%	85%	93%	93%	100%zdghi	99%zdgi	87%	94%	92%	95%	93%	92%	94%	94%	94%	93%
1	4	3	-	1	4	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	2	1	2	2	5
	1%	1%	-	*	1%	-	-	3%	2%	-	-	*	2%	*	*	1%	1%
2-10	4	2	-	2	4	-	1	1	1	1	-	3	1	-	3	1	4
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%
11-19	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*	-	*
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	-	1	*	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	2
	*	-	4%	*	*	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	*
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	32	15	3	12	32	-	1	5	3	5	8	16	5	8	16	3	32
	5% <i>f</i>	4%	11%	6%	5% <i>f</i>	-	*	8% <i>ef</i>	3%	6% <i>f</i>	5%	5%	4%	6%	5%	3%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 458

Q18e. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Coaches

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	34**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
0	586	10	3	140	6	5	27	69	31	24	12	30	16	27	20	3	22	33	15	88	4	596
	93%	93%	100%	95%	83%	91%	100%	95%	91%	90%	80%	91%	93%	100%	95%	62%	97%	94%	83%	94%	70%	93%
1	4	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	5
	1%	7%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	6%	-	-	1%
2-10	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	4
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%zc	-	1%
11-19	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%zcs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	32	-	-	7	1	*	-	3	2	3	3	1	-	1	2	-	2	2	2	2	2	32
	5%	-	-	5%	8%	9%	-	5%	-	7%	20%	9%	7%	-	5%	38%	-	6%	11%	3%	30%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 459

Q18f. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Agricultural Vehicle/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (g)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	28	28	-	-	2	5	1	-	3	1	5	2	3	4	1	-	-	14	14	28
Weighted total	26**	26**	**	**	2**	4**	1**	**	3**	1**	5**	2**	3**	4**	1**	**	**	13**	12**	28**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	16	16	-	-	2	2	-	-	2	1	3	2	2	3	-	-	-	8	7	17
	62%	62%	-	-	100%	36%	-	-	70%	100%	57%	100%	65%	82%	-	-	-	62%	61%	61%
11-19	6	6	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	3	3	6
	23%	23%	-	-	-	26%	-	-	100%	-	28%	-	35%	18%	-	-	-	20%	25%	21%
20-49	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	3
	9%	9%	-	-	-	38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	11%	8%	11%
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
	6%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	6%	7%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 460

Q18f. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Agricultural Vehicle/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	28	5	23	3	8	10	2	3	2	17	1	2	-	3	7	14	28	-	28
Weighted total	26**	4**	22**	3**	8**	8**	2**	2**	2**	15**	1**	2**	**	3**	7**	13**	26**	**	28**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	16	2	14	1	7	3	2	2	1	8	1	1	-	3	3	9	16	-	17
	62%	56%	63%	29%	88%	38%	100%	69%	63%	53%	100%	50%	-	100%	43%	66%	62%	-	61%
11-19	6	1	5	2	-	4	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	2	3	6	-	6
	23%	18%	23%	71%	-	43%	-	-	-	31%	-	-	-	-	29%	23%	23%	-	21%
20-49	2	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	3
	9%	25%	7%	-	12%	8%	-	31%	-	11%	-	-	-	-	14%	5%	9%	-	11%
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	2
	6%	-	7%	-	-	11%	-	-	37%	4%	-	50%	-	-	13%	5%	6%	-	7%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 461

Q18f. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Agricultural Vehicle/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	28	5	14	5	4	8	19	26	2	1	7	14	1	7	24	10	5	7	3	28
Weighted total	26**	5**	12**	5**	4**	7**	18**	24**	1**	1**	6**	13**	2**	6**	22**	8**	5**	6**	3**	28**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	16	2	8	4	2	5	10	15	1	1	4	8	2	5	13	3	4	3	2	17
	62%	38%	68%	82%	51%	72%	57%	63%	55%	100%	60%	63%	100%	74%	60%	40%	75%	51%	71%	61%
11-19	6	1	2	-	2	1	4	6	-	-	1	3	-	1	6	2	1	-	-	6
	23%	28%	20%	-	49%	18%	25%	24%	-	-	18%	24%	-	16%	26%	30%	12%	-	-	21%
20-49	2	1	1	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	2	2	1	2	-	3
	9%	20%	12%	-	-	13%	10%	10%	-	-	12%	13%	-	-	11%	21%	13%	38%	-	11%
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	2	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	2
	6%	14%	-	18%	-	9%	5%	4%	45%	-	11%	-	-	11%	3%	8%	-	11%	29%	7%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 462

Q18f. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Agricultural Vehicle/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	28	20	-	8	28	-	6	7	5	6	4	16	7	2	20	6	28
Weighted total	26**	18**	-**	7**	26**	-**	6**	7**	5**	5**	4**	14**	6**	2**	18**	5**	28**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	16	14	-	2	16	-	4	3	3	4	2	10	4	-	13	3	17
	62%	76%	-	26%	62%	-	61%	49%	60%	72%	50%	70%	57%	-	71%	54%	61%
11-19	6	3	-	3	6	-	2	3	-	-	2	2	1	2	2	2	6
	23%	15%	-	41%	23%	-	39%	40%	-	-	50%	14%	17%	100%	11%	32%	21%
20-49	2	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	2	-	2	1	3
	9%	5%	-	20%	9%	-	-	11%	21%	14%	-	5%	26%	-	9%	14%	11%
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	2	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	2
	6%	4%	-	13%	6%	-	-	-	19%	14%	-	11%	-	-	9%	-	7%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 463

Q18f. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Agricultural Vehicle/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	28	3	-	4	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	7	-	2	7	-	28
Weighted total	26**	3**	**	4**	1**	**	1**	1**	1**	**	**	**	1**	**	**	6**	**	2**	6**	**	28**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	16	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	4	-	1	4	-	17
	62%	77%	-	49%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	68%	-	53%	73%	-	61%
11-19	6	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	6
	23%	23%	-	33%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	47%	-	-	21%
20-49	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	9%	-	-	17%	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%	-	7%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 464

Q18g. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

ATVs / Golf Buggies

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	6	6
Weighted total	6**	6**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	1**	2**	1**	1**	**	**	**	**	6**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3
	47%	47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	47%	50%
11-19	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	3
	53%	53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	53%	50%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 465

Q18g. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

ATVs / Golf Buggies

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites			Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	6	2	4	-	3	2	1	-	-	4	-	1	-	2	3	1	6	-	6
Weighted total	6**	2**	4**	**	3**	2**	1**	**	**	4**	**	1**	**	2**	3**	1**	6**	**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	1	2	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	-	3
	47%	54%	44%	-	30%	39%	100%	-	-	55%	-	-	-	-	61%	100%	47%	-	50%
11-19	3	1	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	2	1	-	3	-	3
	53%	46%	56%	-	70%	61%	-	-	-	45%	-	100%	-	100%	39%	-	53%	-	50%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 466

Q18g. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

ATVs / Golf Buggies

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	6	-	2	1	3	2	4	6	-	1	1	-	-	5	6	1	-	-	-	6
Weighted total	6**	..**	2**	1**	2**	2**	4**	6**	..**	1**	1**	..**	..**	5**	6**	1**	..**	..**	..**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	-	1	1	1	1	2	3	-	1	1	-	-	2	3	1	-	-	-	3
	47%	-	39%	100%	26%	31%	55%	47%	-	100%	100%	-	-	41%	47%	100%	-	-	-	50%
11-19	3	-	1	-	2	1	2	3	-	2	3	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	3
	53%	-	61%	-	74%	69%	45%	53%	-	-	-	-	-	59%	53%	-	-	-	-	50%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 467

Q18g. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

ATVs / Golf Buggies

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	(p)
Unweighted total	6	4	-	2	6	1	1	1	-	1	4	1	-	2	3	-	6
Weighted total	6**	4**	-**	2**	6**	1**	1**	1**	-**	1**	4**	1**	-**	2**	3**	-**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	3	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	3
	47%	74%	-	-	47%	100%	-	-	-	100%	29%	100%	-	-	57%	-	50%
11-19	3	1	-	2	3	-	1	1	-	-	3	-	-	2	1	-	3
	53%	26%	-	100%	53%	-	100%	100%	-	-	71%	-	-	100%	43%	-	50%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 468

Q18g. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

ATVs / Golf Buggies

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	6	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	6
Weighted total	6**	1**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	4**	**	1**	**	**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	3
	47%	100%															55%					50%
11-19	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	3
	53%																45%		100%			50%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 469

Q18h. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Non-road mobile machinery (other)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (g)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	18	17	-	1	-	3	2	-	1	-	5	4	1	-	1	-	-	8	10	18
Weighted total	17**	14**	**	2**	**	3**	1**	**	1**	**	6**	3**	1**	**	1**	**	**	7**	10**	18**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	2
	12%	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	15%	11%	11%
2-10	5	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	5
	30%	19%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	53%	39%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	20%	37%	28%
11-19	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
	10%	12%	-	-	-	54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	10%	11%
20-49	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	6%	7%	-	-	-	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	6%
50-99	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	5%	6%	-	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	6%
100+	6	6	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	7
	37%	43%	-	-	-	42%	46%	100%	-	47%	23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	41%	34%	39%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 470

Q18h. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Non-road mobile machinery (other)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	18	2	16	2	2	6	7	-	1	6	3	1	-	1	5	10	18	-	18
Weighted total	17**	2**	15**	1**	2**	6**	6**	**	1**	5**	4**	1**	**	1**	6**	8**	17**	**	18**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	2
	12%	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	21%	30%	-	-	-	-	12%	12%	-	11%
2-10	5	-	5	1	-	3	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	2	5	-	5
	30%	-	34%	100%	-	45%	12%	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	47%	19%	30%	-	28%
11-19	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	2
	10%	-	11%	-	-	27%	-	-	-	21%	-	-	-	100%	17%	-	10%	-	11%
20-49	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	6%	-	7%	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	6%	-	6%
50-99	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	5%	-	6%	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	5%	-	6%
100+	6	-	6	-	-	1	5	-	1	2	3	1	-	-	2	4	6	-	7
	37%	-	42%	-	-	15%	72%	-	100%	45%	70%	100%	-	-	37%	47%	37%	-	39%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 471

Q18h. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Non-road mobile machinery (other)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	18	3	8	3	3	3	11	13	3	2	2	6	1	5	14	6	7	2	4	18
Weighted total	17**	3**	8**	2**	3**	2**	10**	11**	3**	2**	2**	5**	1**	5**	13**	4**	5**	1**	3**	18**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	2
	12%	-	13%	-	-	-	11%	10%	-	61%	-	18%	-	-	16%	-	18%	-	-	11%
2-10	5	-	4	1	1	-	3	3	-	-	-	1	1	-	4	1	2	-	-	5
	30%	-	46%	28%	28%	-	28%	25%	-	-	-	16%	100%	-	34%	32%	29%	-	14%	28%
11-19	2	-	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	1	1	-	2
	10%	-	9%	-	32%	29%	10%	15%	-	-	-	13%	-	22%	13%	-	13%	51%	-	11%
20-49	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	1
	6%	-	13%	-	-	42%	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	22%	7%	23%	18%	-	-	6%
50-99	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	5%	-	11%	-	-	-	-	7%	29%	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	6%
100+	6	3	1	2	1	1	5	4	2	1	2	2	-	3	4	2	1	1	2	7
	37%	100%	8%	72%	41%	29%	51%	33%	71%	39%	100%	38%	-	56%	30%	45%	22%	49%	63%	39%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 472

Q18h. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Non-road mobile machinery (other)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	18	11	1	6	18	1	3	1	4	4	6	11	1	4	11	3	18
Weighted total	17**	10**	1**	6**	17**	1**	3**	1**	4**	3**	4**	11**	1**	3**	11**	2**	18**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	2
	12%	10%	-	18%	12%	-	-	-	26%	-	-	18%	-	-	19%	-	11%
2-10	5	4	-	1	5	1	-	-	1	-	1	4	-	1	4	-	5
	30%	43%	-	13%	30%	100%	-	-	25%	-	25%	34%	-	32%	35%	-	28%
11-19	2	1	-	1	2	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	2
	10%	10%	-	12%	10%	-	-	100%	18%	-	38%	-	-	29%	-	30%	11%
20-49	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
	6%	-	100%	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	43%	6%
50-99	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
	5%	8%	-	-	5%	-	30%	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-	7%	-	6%
100+	6	3	-	3	6	-	2	-	2	1	1	5	-	1	4	1	7
	37%	28%	-	58%	37%	-	70%	-	56%	43%	18%	47%	-	38%	39%	26%	39%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 473

Q18h. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Non-road mobile machinery (other)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)
Unweighted total	18	-	2	1	1	-	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	7	-	18
Weighted total	17**	**	1**	1**	1**	**	1**	**	3**	**	**	**	**	1**	**	1**	**	**	7**	**	18**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	12%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	11%
2-10	5	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	5
	30%	-	-	-	100%	-	42%	-	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38%	-	28%
11-19	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
	10%	-	52%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	11%
20-49	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
50-99	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
100+	6	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	7
	37%	-	48%	-	-	58%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	47%	-	39%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 474

Q18i. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Digger / Excavator

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (g)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	10	10	-	-	-	1	2	-	2	-	3	1	-	1	-	-	-	5	5	10
Weighted total	8**	8**	..*	..*	..*	1**	2**	..*	2**	..*	2**	1**	..*	***	..*	..*	..*	4**	4**	10**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	4
	40%	40%	-	-	-	-	64%	-	47%	-	34%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	32%	47%	40%
11-19	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	-	10%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	10%	10%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%	10%
100+	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	4
	41%	41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	53%	-	66%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	50%	34%	40%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 475

Q18i. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Digger / Excavator

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	10	-	10	-	3	5	1	-	1	6	-	2	-	1	2	7	10	-	10
Weighted total	8**	..*	8**	..*	2**	4**	1**	..*	1**	5**	..*	2**	..*	1**	2**	6**	8**	..*	10**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	-	3	-	2	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	2	3	-	4
	40%	-	40%	-	100%	19%	-	-	-	69%	-	-	-	-	47%	43%	40%	-	40%
11-19	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	9%	-	9%	-	-	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	9%	-	10%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	10%	-	10%	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	10%	-	10%
100+	3	-	3	-	-	2	1	-	1	1	-	2	-	1	2	3	3	-	4
	41%	-	41%	-	-	45%	100%	100%	31%	-	100%	-	-	53%	43%	41%	41%	-	40%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 476

Q18i. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Digger / Excavator

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	10	4	5	1	-	2	6	8	2	2	1	4	-	4	7	1	3	3	3	10
Weighted total	8**	3**	4**	1**	**	1**	5**	6**	1**	2**	1**	3**	**	3**	6**	1**	3**	3**	3**	10**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	*	3	-	-	-	3	3	-	1	-	-	-	3	2	-	2	1	1	4
	40%	15%	65%	-	-	66%	50%	-	45%	-	-	-	-	81%	44%	-	74%	48%	32%	40%
11-19	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1
	9%	-	16%	-	-	51%	11%	-	-	-	-	21%	-	12%	-	26%	26%	-	-	10%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	10%	-	19%	-	-	-	12%	54%	-	-	-	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	10%
100+	3	2	-	1	-	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	-	1	2	1	-	1	1	4
	41%	85%	-	100%	-	49%	34%	26%	46%	55%	100%	54%	-	19%	44%	100%	-	26%	36%	40%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 477

Q18i. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Digger / Excavator

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	10	7	-	3	10	-	3	-	3	3	3	4	3	1	5	4	10
Weighted total	8**	6**	-**	2**	8**	-**	3**	-**	2**	3**	2**	3**	2**	1**	4**	3**	10**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	2	-	1	3	-	1	-	2	2	-	1	2	-	1	2	4
	40%	43%	-	32%	40%	-	31%	-	75%	75%	-	24%	100%	-	20%	78%	40%
11-19	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
	9%	-	-	29%	9%	-	-	-	34%	-	30%	-	-	-	-	22%	10%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
	10%	14%	-	-	10%	-	31%	-	-	-	35%	-	-	-	20%	-	10%
100+	3	2	-	1	3	-	1	-	1	1	1	3	-	1	2	-	4
	41%	43%	-	38%	41%	-	38%	-	44%	25%	35%	76%	-	100%	60%	-	40%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 478

Q18i. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Digger / Excavator

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)
Unweighted total	10	-	1	-	1	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	10
Weighted total	8**	**	1**	**	1**	**	2**	**	2**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	2**	**	10**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4
	40%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	61%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34%	-	40%
11-19	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	9%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
100+	3	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	4
	41%	-	-	-	-	80%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66%	-	40%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 479

Q18j. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Forklift/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)		
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (g)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)	
Unweighted total	50	50	-	-	-	5	3	6	2	2	5	13	4	5	2	1	2	25	25	50	
Weighted total	47*	47*	**	**	**	4**	2**	6**	2**	2**	6**	12**	3**	5**	3**	1**	1**	25**	23**	50*	
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	
4%	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	4%	4%	
2-10	17	17	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	2	5	2	2	-	-	1	10	8	18	
37%	37%	37%	-	-	-	30%	-	51%	-	-	35%	44%	73%	54%	-	-	100%	39%	34%	36%	
11-19	8	8	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	3	1	-	1	-	-	-	3	5	9	
17%	17%	17%	-	-	-	15%	69%	-	-	52%	47%	5%	-	29%	-	-	-	12%	22%	18%	
20-49	14	14	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	3	1	-	3	1	-	-	7	7	14	
29%	29%	29%	-	-	-	37%	31%	-	100%	48%	-	28%	27%	-	100%	100%	-	29%	29%	28%	
50-99	3	3	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	
6%	6%	6%	-	-	-	19%	-	36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	4%	6%	
100+	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	2	4	
8%	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	17%	-	17%	-	-	-	-	9%	7%	8%	
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 480

Q18j. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Forklift/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	50	13	37	10	13	14	7	1	5	24	4	11	2	2	12	30	50	-	50
Weighted total	47*	11**	37*	9**	12**	14**	6**	1**	5**	23**	3**	9**	2**	2**	10**	30**	47*	**	50*
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	2
	4%	10%	2%	-	7%	-	16%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	10%	3%	4%	-	4%
2-10	17	6	12	6	6	3	1	-	1	5	3	5	2	1	4	8	17	-	18
	37%	55%	31%	70%	47%	23%	14%	-	22%	20%	100%	56%	100%	61%	43%	27%	37%	-	36%
11-19	8	2	6	2	2	2	-	-	1	5	-	1	-	1	2	6	8	-	9
	17%	22%	15%	22%	19%	16%	-	-	26%	20%	-	13%	-	39%	16%	19%	17%	-	18%
20-49	14	1	12	1	2	7	3	1	1	9	-	2	-	-	3	9	14	-	14
	29%	14%	34%	8%	14%	49%	48%	100%	14%	40%	-	22%	-	-	30%	30%	29%	-	28%
50-99	3	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	3
	6%	-	8%	-	-	12%	-	-	23%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	9%	6%	-	6%
100+	4	-	4	-	1	-	1	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	4	4	-	4
	8%	-	10%	-	13%	-	22%	-	15%	12%	-	8%	-	-	-	12%	8%	-	8%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 481

Q18j. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Forklift/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	50	18	24	3	5	8	33	41	3	8	8	28	3	10	39	19	12	15	11	50
Weighted total	47*	17**	19**	4**	6**	8**	32**	41*	2**	6**	6**	26**	3**	8**	38*	17**	11**	13**	10**	50*
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	2	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	2
	4%	10%	-	-	-	10%	3%	4%	-	-	13%	3%	-	13%	5%	-	-	6%	-	4%
2-10	17	7	5	2	4	3	13	15	-	2	3	10	2	3	13	3	6	4	4	18
	37%	40%	25%	37%	63%	32%	39%	38%	-	36%	51%	39%	78%	36%	35%	18%	53%	34%	44%	36%
11-19	8	1	4	-	2	2	5	7	-	1	1	4	1	2	6	3	3	3	2	9
	17%	8%	22%	-	37%	24%	16%	18%	-	11%	10%	16%	22%	20%	17%	20%	27%	24%	17%	18%
20-49	14	5	7	2	-	3	9	11	1	2	2	9	-	2	11	7	2	4	3	14
	29%	29%	35%	48%	-	35%	28%	28%	65%	28%	26%	33%	-	20%	29%	43%	14%	29%	31%	28%
50-99	3	-	3	-	-	2	2	3	1	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	1	3
	6%	-	15%	-	-	6%	7%	7%	35%	-	-	3%	-	11%	5%	7%	-	-	8%	6%
100+	4	2	1	1	-	2	2	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	4	2	1	1	-	4
	8%	13%	4%	15%	-	-	7%	6%	-	25%	-	6%	-	-	10%	13%	6%	6%	-	8%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 482

Q18j. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Forklift/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	50	29	3	17	50	4	9	13	6	10	8	31	10	6	31	12	50
Weighted total	47*	25**	3**	18**	47*	4**	8**	12**	6**	10**	7**	29**	10**	5**	29**	12**	50*
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
	4%	7%	-	-	4%	-	-	15%	-	-	-	4%	8%	-	4%	7%	4%
2-10	17	12	-	3	17	4	3	3	1	2	1	10	5	-	11	5	18
	37%	49%	-	17%	37%	100%	39%	22%	20%	18%	14%	34%	47%	-	37%	39%	36%
11-19	8	4	1	3	8	-	3	1	2	1	1	7	-	1	6	1	9
	17%	17%	39%	15%	17%	-	39%	11%	41%	14%	19%	23%	-	24%	21%	6%	18%
20-49	14	5	-	9	14	-	1	6	1	3	3	7	4	3	7	4	14
	29%	21%	-	49%	29%	-	12%	46%	13%	34%	44%	25%	37%	60%	25%	31%	28%
50-99	3	1	-	2	3	-	1	1	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	1	3
	6%	3%	-	11%	6%	-	10%	7%	-	12%	11%	7%	-	-	6%	10%	6%
100+	4	1	2	1	4	-	-	-	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	4
	8%	2%	61%	8%	8%	-	-	-	26%	22%	11%	7%	8%	15%	7%	7%	8%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 463

Q18j. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Forklift/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	50	2	2	25	1	-	2	5	4	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	50
Weighted total	47*	2**	1**	25**	1**	-**	1**	5**	3**	1**	-**	-**	5**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	4**	-**	50*
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	4%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	-	4%
2-10	17	2	-	9	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	18
	37%	68%	-	37%	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	52%	-	-	-	-	-	75%	-	36%
11-19	8	1	1	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
	17%	32%	52%	17%	-	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	48%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%
20-49	14	-	-	11	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
	29%	-	-	43%	-	-	100%	-	51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%
50-99	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	39%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
100+	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	8%	-	48%	-	-	-	-	43%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 484

Q18k. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Grass Cutter/s / Lawnmower/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	11	11	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	3	-	2	1	-	-	-	3	8	11
Weighted total	11**	11**	..*	..*	***	..*	..*	..*	2**	1**	3**	..*	2**	1**	..*	..*	..*	3**	8**	11**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	5	5	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	5	6
	48%	48%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	47%	-	-	-	-	-	69%	55%
11-19	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	2	4
	43%	43%	-	-	-	-	-	60%	-	-	-	-	53%	100%	-	-	-	72%	31%	36%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	9%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 485

Q18k. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Grass Cutter/s / Lawnmower/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	11	2	9	-	5	4	-	1	1	6	-	3	-	2	4	1	11	-	11
Weighted total	11**	2**	9**	**	5**	4**	**	***	1**	6**	**	3**	**	2**	4**	***	11**	**	11**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	5	2	4	-	4	-	-	*	1	2	-	1	-	1	*	5	-	6	
	48%	100%	39%	-	71%	-	-	100%	100%	40%	-	27%	-	36%	26%	100%	48%	-	55%
11-19	5	-	5	-	1	3	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	1	2	-	5	-	4
	43%	-	51%	-	29%	78%	-	-	-	60%	-	44%	-	64%	51%	-	43%	-	36%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	8%	-	10%	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	-	23%	-	8%	-	9%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 486

Q18k. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Grass Cutter/s / Lawnmower/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	11	-	5	2	4	2	7	8	1	1	3	1	1	4	9	3	-	-	2	11
Weighted total	11**	..**	4**	2**	5**	2**	7**	8**	1**	1**	3**	1**	1**	4**	9**	3**	..**	..**	2**	11**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	5	-	2	1	2	1	3	4	-	1	2	1	-	2	4	2	-	-	1	6
	48%	-	47%	49%	49%	38%	39%	45%	-	100%	56%	100%	-	41%	49%	56%	-	-	47%	55%
11-19	5	-	2	-	2	1	3	3	1	-	1	-	1	2	5	1	-	-	-	4
	43%	-	53%	-	51%	62%	48%	43%	100%	-	44%	-	100%	59%	51%	44%	-	-	-	36%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	8%	-	-	51%	-	-	13%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53%	9%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 487

Q18k. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Grass Cutter/s / Lawnmower/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	11	5	-	6	11	-	4	1	2	3	5	4	2	3	7	1	11
Weighted total	11**	4**	-**	7**	11**	-**	4**	1**	2**	3**	5**	4**	2**	3**	7**	1**	11**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	5	3	-	2	5	-	2	-	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	6
	48%	76%	-	31%	48%	-	46%	-	49%	49%	36%	37%	100%	31%	46%	100%	55%
11-19	5	1	-	4	5	-	2	1	-	1	3	1	-	2	3	-	4
	43%	24%	-	56%	43%	-	54%	100%	-	51%	64%	38%	-	69%	41%	-	36%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	8%	-	-	14%	8%	-	-	-	51%	-	-	26%	-	-	13%	-	9%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 488

Q18k. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Grass Cutter/s / Lawnmower/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)
Unweighted total	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	6	-	1	3	-	11
Weighted total	11**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	1**	**	**	**	6**	**	1**	3**	**	11**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	6
	48%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	43%	-	-	67%	-	55%
11-19	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	4
	43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57%	-	100%	-	-	36%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%	-	9%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 489

Q18l. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Pick-Up Truck/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	3
Weighted total	2**	2**	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	1**	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	2**	..*	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	2
	68%	68%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	68%	-	67%
11-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	32%	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	33%
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 490

Q181. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Pick-Up Truck/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	3	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	2	3	-	3
Weighted total	2**	1**	2**	**	1**	**	**	**	1**	2**	**	1**	**	**	**	2**	2**	**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	2	-	2	-	36%	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	68%	-	100%	-		-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	68%	-	67%	
11-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	1	-	-	64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	32%	100%	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	32%	-	33%	
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 491

Q181. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Pick-Up Truck/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	
Unweighted total	3	1	1	-	1	2	3	-	-	1	1	-	-	3	-	1	1	-	3
Weighted total	2**	***	1**	..	1**	1**	2**	1**	1**	2**	..	1**	1**	..	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	2	*	1	-	-	*	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	2
	68%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	68%	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	68%	-	100%	100%	-	67%
11-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	32%	-	-	-	100%	-	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	-	-	-	33%
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 492

Q181. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Pick-Up Truck/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	3	1	1	1	3	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	3
Weighted total	2**	***	1**	1**	2**	..*	1**	..*	***	..*	..*	1**	2**	..*	1**	2**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	2	*	1	-	2	-	1	-	*	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	2
	68%	100%	100%	-	68%	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	67%
11-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
	32%	-	-	100%	32%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	33%
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 493

Q18l. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Pick-Up Truck/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Weighted total	2**	**	**	**	**	**	1**	1**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
11-19	68%	-	-	-	-	-	36%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67%
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
100+	32%	-	-	-	-	-	64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 494

Q18m. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Train/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (g)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	3	3	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3
Weighted total	2**	2**	..*	..*	***	..*	1**	..*	..*	..*	1**	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	1**	1**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	36%	36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	33%
11-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	64%	64%	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	67%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 495

Q18m. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Train/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	3	-	3	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	3	-	3
Weighted total	2**	..*	2**	***	..*	..*	..*	1**	1**	..*	..*	2**	..*	..*	..*	2**	2**	..*	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	36%	-	36%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	36%	-	-	-	36%	36%	-	33%
11-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	
	64%	-	64%	100%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	64%	-	-	-	64%	64%	-	67%	
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 496

Q18m. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Train/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	3	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	2	2	-	2	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	3
Weighted total	2**	***	1**	-**	-**	1**	-**	***	1**	1**	-**	2**	-**	-**	2**	2**	-**	-**	-**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	36%	-	100%	-	-	63%	-	-	63%	-	-	45%	-	-	36%	36%	-	-	-	33%
11-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
	64%	100%	-	-	-	37%	-	100%	37%	100%	-	55%	-	-	64%	64%	-	-	-	67%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 497

Q18m. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Train/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	(p)
Unweighted total	3	2	-	1	3	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	3
Weighted total	2**	2**	**	***	2**	**	**	1**	1**	**	**	2**	***	**	2**	***	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	36%	45%	-	-	36%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	45%	-	-	45%	-	33%
11-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
	64%	55%	-	100%	64%	-	-	100%	-	-	55%	100%	-	55%	100%	-	67%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 498

Q18m. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Train/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Weighted total	2**	**	**	**	**	**	1**	**	1**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	36%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%
11-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 499

Q18n. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Van/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	54	51	1	2	1	9	6	4	6	2	7	10	4	2	1	-	2	31	23	54
Weighted total	51*	46*	***	4**	1**	7**	5**	4**	8**	2**	7**	9**	3**	2**	2**	**	2**	28**	23**	54*
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	15	15	-	-	-	1	2	2	3	-	3	3	-	-	2	-	-	10	5	13
	30%	33%	-	-	-	8%	43%	51%	38%	-	36%	33%	-	-	100%	-	-	35%	23%	24%
2-10	16	15	*	-	1	4	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	-	-	2	9	7	19
	31%	33%	100%	-	100%	53%	21%	25%	24%	53%	18%	17%	54%	28%	-	-	100%	33%	30%	35%
11-19	9	5	-	4	-	-	2	1	2	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	8	8
	18%	11%	-	100%	-	-	36%	24%	30%	-	16%	-	46%	72%	-	-	-	4%	35%	15%
20-49	3	3	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	4
	7%	8%	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	24%	14%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	10%	7%
50-99	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	3%	3%	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	4%
100+	6	6	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1	8
	12%	13%	-	-	-	22%	-	-	7%	47%	6%	28%	-	-	-	-	-	19%	2%	15%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 500

Q18n. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Van/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	54	8	46	7	15	11	16	2	3	18	4	22	2	6	6	34	54	-	54
Weighted total	51*	9**	42*	6**	12**	10**	16**	3**	2**	18**	3**	21**	2**	6**	6**	29**	51*	**	54*
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	15	2	13	4	3	1	4	3	-	3	-	7	-	2	2	8	15	-	13
	30%	27%	30%	57%	27%	12%	24%	100%	-	18%	-	34%	-	28%	42%	27%	30%	-	24%
2-10	16	4	12	1	7	3	4	-	1	8	1	7	2	1	2	8	16	-	19
	31%	46%	28%	15%	53%	28%	26%	-	51%	44%	30%	33%	100%	14%	41%	29%	31%	-	35%
11-19	9	2	7	1	-	3	5	-	-	4	-	2	-	3	-	4	9	-	8
	18%	27%	16%	9%	-	34%	30%	-	-	23%	-	11%	-	45%	-	13%	18%	-	15%
20-49	3	-	3	*	-	1	2	-	-	*	1	2	-	-	-	3	3	-	4
	7%	-	8%	7%	-	13%	11%	-	-	2%	36%	9%	-	-	-	12%	7%	-	7%
50-99	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	2
	3%	-	4%	-	-	8%	4%	-	-	-	-	7%	-	13%	-	2%	3%	-	4%
100+	6	-	6	1	2	1	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	1	5	6	-	8
	12%	-	14%	11%	20%	5%	6%	-	49%	13%	35%	6%	-	6%	17%	17%	12%	-	15%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 501

Q18n. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Van/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	54	10	27	7	8	9	42	49	4	6	9	25	4	11	40	16	7	11	13	54
Weighted total	51*	11**	24**	5**	9**	10**	36*	44*	2**	6**	8**	21**	3**	10**	36*	13**	6**	11**	14**	54*
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	15	1	5	1	7	6	8	14	1	4	1	5	-	3	10	5	-	1	4	13
	30%	12%	21%	20%	81%	57%	24%	31%	38%	63%	9%	22%	-	35%	29%	37%	-	13%	29%	24%
2-10	16	3	10	1	-	2	14	16	1	2	6	10	1	4	12	3	4	5	4	19
	31%	25%	44%	23%	-	20%	39%	36%	22%	37%	77%	47%	21%	44%	33%	24%	70%	46%	28%	35%
11-19	9	4	4	1	-	1	4	5	-	-	1	4	-	1	6	2	1	3	3	8
	18%	33%	18%	21%	-	11%	11%	11%	-	-	13%	21%	-	6%	15%	13%	10%	30%	25%	15%
20-49	3	1	1	1	-	1	3	3	1	-	-	*	2	-	2	*	-	-	1	4
	7%	12%	5%	18%	-	6%	8%	7%	22%	-	-	2%	63%	-	6%	3%	-	-	8%	7%
50-99	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
	3%	-	6%	-	-	7%	2%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	2%	5%	11%	6%	6%	4%
100+	6	2	1	1	2	-	6	5	*	-	-	2	*	1	5	2	1	1	1	8
	12%	19%	5%	18%	19%	-	16%	12%	18%	-	-	8%	16%	7%	15%	17%	9%	5%	4%	15%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 502

Q18n. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Van/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	54	33	3	18	54	6	11	10	6	7	14	29	11	13	31	10	54
Weighted total	51*	32**	3**	15**	51*	6**	11**	8**	5**	8**	14**	28**	8**	13**	30**	8**	54*
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	15	11	2	2	15	-	1	3	-	4	3	11	1	3	11	1	13
	30%	33%	65%	14%	30%	-	12%	39%	-	56%	23%	38%	14%	25%	37%	7%	24%
2-10	16	9	1	6	16	2	5	2	1	2	7	6	3	6	6	4	19
	31%	28%	35%	38%	31%	33%	46%	20%	25%	28%	49%	21%	34%	49%	19%	50%	35%
11-19	9	9	-	-	9	2	2	1	1	-	2	5	3	2	5	3	8
	18%	28%	-	-	18%	31%	21%	13%	32%	-	12%	17%	30%	14%	16%	34%	15%
20-49	3	1	-	2	3	1	1	2	-	-	-	3	1	-	3	-	4
	7%	4%	-	15%	7%	9%	11%	21%	-	-	-	11%	6%	-	12%	-	7%
50-99	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
	3%	3%	-	4%	3%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	3%	8%	-	3%	9%	4%
100+	6	2	-	4	6	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	4	-	8
	12%	5%	-	28%	12%	27%	10%	7%	44%	8%	16%	11%	7%	13%	14%	-	15%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 503

Q18n. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Van/s

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	54	-	-	12	1	-	3	4	5	3	1	2	1	7	1	-	3	1	2	8	-	54
Weighted total	51*	**	**	11**	1**	**	2**	4**	4**	3**	1**	3**	***	4**	2**	**	3**	1**	2**	8**	**	54*
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	15	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	13
	30%	-	-	15%	-	-	-	22%	53%	38%	-	100%	-	25%	-	-	-	-	54%	44%	-	24%
2-10	16	-	-	4	-	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	-	2	-	-	3	1	-	1	-	19
	31%	-	-	36%	-	-	46%	29%	-	62%	100%	-	-	37%	-	-	100%	100%	-	18%	-	35%
11-19	9	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	8
	18%	-	-	17%	100%	-	-	13%	20%	-	-	-	-	12%	100%	-	-	-	46%	14%	-	15%
20-49	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4
	7%	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	11%	-	-	-	-	15%	-	7%
50-99	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	3%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	4%
100+	6	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	12%	-	-	14%	-	-	54%	36%	26%	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 504

Q18o. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Other vehicle

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	16	16	-	-	2	-	2	1	2	-	3	2	1	1	-	1	1	9	7	16
Weighted total	14**	14**	**	**	2**	**	1**	1**	3**	**	3**	1**	1**	1**	**	1**	1**	8**	6**	16**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	6	6	-	-	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	3	6
	43%	43%	-	-	45%	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	-	42%	43%	38%
11-19	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	13%
20-49	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
	11%	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	6%	17%	13%
50-99	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	7%	7%	-	-	55%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	6%
100+	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	2	5
	30%	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66%	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	23%	40%	31%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 505

Q18o. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Other vehicle

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	16	3	13	3	4	2	4	-	3	7	2	1	-	1	2	10	16	-	16
Weighted total	14**	3**	11**	3**	3**	1**	5**	**	3**	5**	1**	1**	**	1**	2**	9**	14**	**	16**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	6	3	3	2	2	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	3	6	-	6
	43%	100%	29%	68%	81%	-	41%	-	-	57%	-	-	-	-	43%	36%	43%	-	38%
11-19	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
	9%	-	11%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	9%	-	13%
20-49	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	11%	-	14%	-	19%	-	-	41%	-	-	35%	-	-	-	-	17%	11%	-	13%
50-99	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	7%	-	8%	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	65%	-	-	-	57%	-	7%	-	6%
100+	4	-	4	-	-	-	3	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	4	4	-	5
	30%	-	37%	-	-	-	59%	-	59%	31%	-	100%	-	-	-	47%	30%	-	31%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 506

Q18o. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Other vehicle

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	
Unweighted total	16	2	11	1	2	10	12	2	4	-	8	2	5	12	7	3	2	4	16
Weighted total	14**	2**	9**	2**	2**	8**	10**	2**	4**	**	8**	2**	4**	11**	7**	2**	1**	3**	16**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	6	1	3	2	-	4	3	1	3	-	5	1	1	5	3	-	1	1	6
	43%	61%	33%	100%	-	53%	35%	43%	60%	-	59%	43%	17%	41%	38%	-	50%	52%	38%
11-19	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	2
	9%	-	15%	-	40%	8%	14%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	12%	9%	66%	50%	-	13%
20-49	2	-	1	-	1	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	1	2
	11%	-	12%	-	60%	7%	16%	57%	-	-	-	-	40%	9%	15%	-	-	19%	13%
50-99	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	7%	-	11%	-	-	12%	10%	-	-	-	-	57%	-	8%	13%	-	-	-	6%
100+	4	1	2	-	1	2	2	-	2	-	3	-	2	3	2	1	-	1	5
	30%	39%	28%	-	66%	-	26%	-	40%	-	33%	-	43%	30%	25%	34%	-	30%	31%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 507

Q18o. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Other vehicle

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	16	8	2	6	16	1	1	1	5	4	7	4	4	6	7	3	16
Weighted total	14**	7**	2**	6**	14**	1**	1**	1**	5**	3**	5**	4**	4**	5**	7**	2**	16**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	6	4	-	2	6	-	1	1	3	1	1	2	3	1	5	-	6
	43%	62%	-	32%	43%	-	100%	100%	52%	19%	26%	49%	65%	30%	63%	-	38%
11-19	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2
	9%	-	-	22%	9%	-	-	-	13%	-	13%	-	-	-	-	63%	13%
20-49	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	2
	11%	23%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	30%	-	29%	-	-	33%	-	-	13%
50-99	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	7%	14%	-	-	7%	100%	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	20%	-	-	6%
100+	4	-	2	3	4	-	-	-	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	1	5
	30%	-	100%	45%	30%	-	-	-	35%	51%	15%	51%	35%	17%	37%	37%	31%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 508

Q18o. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Other vehicle

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	16	-	1	4	1	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	16
Weighted total	14**	**	1**	4**	1**	**	**	2**	4**	**	**	**	**	**	1**	**	**	**	**	3**	**	16**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-10	6	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6
	43%	-	-	77%	-	-	-	100%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	-	38%
11-19	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	9%	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
20-49	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
50-99	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36%	-	6%
100+	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5
	30%	-	-	23%	-	-	-	66%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39%	-	31%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 509

Q18a-f. Thinking back to early 2015 again, approximately how many of each of the following types of vehicle did your company own or lease?

Summary

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Cars	LGVs	HGVs	Minibuses	Coaches	Agricultural Vehicle/s	ATVs / Golf Buggies	Non-road mobile machinery (other)	Digger / Excavator	Forklift/s	Grass Cutter/s / Lawnmower/s	Pick-Up Truck/s	Train/s	Van/s	Other vehicle
Unweighted total	640	640	640	640	640	28	6	18	10	50	11	3	3	54	16
Weighted total	628	628	628	628	628	26	6	17	8	47	11	2	2	51	14
0	65 10%	282 45%	453 72%	483 77%	586 93%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	16 2%	45 7%	21 3%	27 4%	4 1%	-	-	2 12%	-	2 4%	-	-	-	15 30%	-
2-10	141 22%	130 21%	51 8%	60 10%	4 1%	16 62%	3 47%	5 30%	3 40%	17 37%	5 48%	2 68%	1 36%	16 31%	6 43%
11-19	57 9%	16 2%	11 2%	10 2%	1 *	6 23%	3 53%	2 10%	1 9%	8 17%	5 43%	-	-	9 18%	1 9%
20-49	114 18%	26 4%	16 3%	9 1%	-	2 9%	-	1 6%	-	14 29%	-	-	-	3 7%	2 11%
50-99	60 10%	26 4%	17 3%	2 *	1 *	-	-	1 5%	1 10%	3 6%	-	1 32%	-	1 3%	1 7%
100+	118 19%	59 9%	25 4%	3 *	-	2 6%	-	6 37%	3 41%	4 8%	1 8%	-	1 64%	6 12%	4 30%
Don't know	56 9%	44 7%	33 5%	34 5%	32 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 510

Q19.1 And what proportion of these Cars, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease cars for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	521	491	10	20	23	50	35	40	36	8	95	113	37	36	8	8	26	277	238	521
Weighted total	506	462	6**	39**	19**	46*	31*	44*	39*	8**	104*	97*	31*	33**	10**	13**	25**	264	235	521
All	44	37	1	6	2	2	2	2	7	-	11	8	4	4	-	-	2	19	24	42
	9%	8%	12%	14%	11%	4%	8%	5%	19% <i>e</i>	-	10%	8%	13%	12%	-	-	7%	7%	10%	8%
75%-50%	20	18	-	3	-	4	-	-	2	-	6	4	-	1	1	3	-	9	12	18
	4%	4%	-	7%	-	8%	-	-	6%	-	6%	4%	-	3%	7%	21%	-	3%	5%	3%
50%	15	12	-	2	1	1	1	3	-	-	7	1	1	1	-	-	1	6	8	14
	3%	3%	-	6%	4%	3%	2%	6%	-	-	6% <i>k</i>	1%	2%	2%	-	-	3%	2%	4%	3%
50%-25%	21	21	1	-	1	1	2	3	-	-	5	6	1	*	-	2	-	12	8	23
	4%	4%	9%	-	5%	3%	6%	8%	-	-	5%	6%	2%	1%	-	14%	-	5%	3%	4%
Less than 25%	149	140	1	8	4	14	6	18	12	2	31	34	3	13	2	1	8	80	67	160
	29% <i>l</i>	30%	19%	21%	22%	31% <i>l</i>	19%	41% <i>l</i>	30%	24%	30% <i>l</i>	36% <i>l</i>	10%	38%	20%	9%	34%	30%	29%	31%
None	229	209	3	17	10	22	20	14	12	6	40	39	22	13	7	6	12	120	107	237
	45%	45%	60%	44%	53%	49%	66% <i>szghjk</i>	33%	32%	76%	38%	41%	72% <i>szghjk</i>	39%	73%	49%	47%	46%	45%	45%
Don't know	28	25	-	3	1	1	4	4	5	-	5	5	2	2	-	1	2	17	9	27
	6%	5%	-	8%	7%	3%	-	8%	14% <i>ll</i>	-	5%	5%	-	5%	-	6%	9%	7%	4%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 511

Q19.1 And what proportion of these Cars, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease cars for commercial use

	Number of sites			Number of employees					Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	521	83	438	88	130	124	122	20	35	194	55	137	10	55	91	301	521	-	521
Weighted total	506	79*	427	89*	124	127	116	18**	31*	189	57*	131	12**	58*	96*	276	506	**	521
All	44	7	37	7	13	6	13	1	3	20	5	9	-	4	11	22	44	-	42
	9%	9%	9%	8%	11%	5%	11%	8%	9%	10%	9%	7%	-	6%	11%	8%	9%	-	8%
75%-50%	20	2	19	4	6	5	5	1	-	10	3	3	-	1	3	13	20	-	18
	4%	2%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	-	5%	5%	2%	-	2%	3%	5%	4%	-	3%
50%	15	3	11	4	2	5	1	2	1	6	3	4	-	-	6	9	15	-	14
	3%	4%	3%	5%	1%	4%	1%	12%	4%	3%	5%	3%	-	-	6%	3%	3%	-	3%
50%-25%	21	6	15	8	3	4	3	-	3	8	1	5	2	2	2	10	21	-	23
	4%	8%	4%	9% <i>f</i>	2%	4%	2%	-	9%	4%	2%	4%	21%	4%	2%	4%	4%	-	4%
Less than 25%	149	12	137	18	31	39	40	5	15	56	17	38	2	10	23	104	149	-	160
	29% <i>a</i>	15%	32% <i>a</i>	20%	25%	31%	35% <i>c</i>	26%	46% <i>zcd</i>	29%	30%	29%	20%	17%	24%	37% <i>zmm</i>	29%	-	31%
None	229	48	182	43	67	58	49	9	3	81	25	66	6	35	48	107	229	-	237
	45% <i>h</i>	60% <i>zb</i>	43%	49% <i>h</i>	54% <i>h</i>	46% <i>h</i>	42% <i>h</i>	50%	10%	43%	44%	50%	51%	60% <i>o</i>	50%	39%	45%	-	45%
Don't know	28	2	26	2	2	10	6	-	6	9	4	3	1	6	3	13	28	-	27
	6%	2%	6%	5%	2%	8% <i>d</i>	5%	-	16% <i>zcdl</i>	5%	6%	5%	8%	11%	3%	5%	6%	-	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 512

Q19.1 And what proportion of these Cars, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease cars for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	521	104	277	54	80	83	363	433	55	67	86	233	26	143	377	168	61	115	133	521
Weighted total	506	102*	260	56*	82*	81*	343	413	52*	58*	77*	223	21**	133	354	152	56*	105	141	521
All	44	14	17	6	6	3	30	33	4	3	5	18	1	8	29	11	6	8	14	42
	9%	13%	7%	11%	8%	4%	9%	8%	7%	5%	7%	8%	6%	6%	8%	7%	11%	7%	10%	8%
75%-50%	20	1	13	-	5	6	10	19	4	2	2	12	-	4	15	3	1	5	6	18
	4%	1%	5%	-	6%	7%	3%	5%	7%	3%	2%	6%	-	3%	4%	2%	3%	5%	4%	3%
50%	15	2	8	2	3	2	9	10	2	3	1	4	2	2	14	5	2	3	1	14
	3%	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%	4%	6%	2%	2%	10%	1%	4%	3%	4%	3%	1%	3%
50%-25%	21	7	12	2	1	5	13	17	2	4	7	6	2	8	16	7	1	6	5	23
	4%	7%	5%	3%	1%	6%	4%	4%	4%	7%	9%	3%	8%	6%	4%	5%	2%	6%	3%	4%
Less than 25%	149	30	77	20	22	23	109	123	24	22	23	78	4	41	110	60	17	27	37	160
	29%	29%	30%	36%	26%	29%	32%	30%	46% <i>zq</i>	38%	30%	35%	20%	30%	31%	38% <i>zqr</i>	31%	26%	26%	31%
None	229	44	116	21	44	35	153	189	14	22	34	94	11	63	157	60	26	50	66	237
	45% <i>h</i>	44%	45%	37%	53%	44%	45%	46% <i>h</i>	26%	38%	44% <i>h</i>	42%	53%	48%	44%	39%	47%	48%	47%	45%
Don't know	28	4	17	5	2	6	18	23	3	2	5	11	1	7	15	6	2	6	12	27
	6%	4%	7%	10%	2%	7%	5%	5%	6%	4%	6%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%	5%	9%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 513

Q19.1 And what proportion of these Cars, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease cars for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	521	320	22	178	521	63	116	59	84	84	143	256	113	120	290	105	521
Weighted total	506	308	20**	175	506	67*	119*	55*	75*	76*	138	246	112*	117	279	104*	521
All	44	31	3	8	44	3	15	1	8	9	4	23	14	4	28	9	42
	9% <i>f</i>	10% <i>c</i>	15%	5%	9%	4%	13% <i>g</i>	1%	11% <i>g</i>	11% <i>g</i>	3%	9% <i>j</i>	12% <i>f</i>	4%	10%	9%	8%
75%-50%	20	12	-	8	20	1	9	-	5	3	5	9	7	5	10	6	18
	4%	4%	-	5%	4%	1%	8% <i>g</i>	-	6%	4%	3%	4%	6%	4%	3%	6%	3%
50%	15	10	-	5	15	2	1	-	2	5	4	9	2	3	10	2	14
	3%	3%	-	3%	3%	4%	1%	-	3%	6% <i>f</i>	3%	4%	1%	3%	4%	1%	3%
50%-25%	21	17	-	5	21	5	4	1	*	3	6	10	5	6	10	6	23
	4%	5%	-	3%	4%	7%	3%	2%	1%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	3%	6%	4%
Less than 25%	149	92	5	52	149	15	36	19	26	33	41	68	39	32	83	33	160
	29%	30%	24%	30%	29%	22%	30%	35%	35%	44% <i>z</i> <i>d</i> <i>e</i>	30%	28%	35%	27%	30%	32%	31%
None	229	135	10	84	229	39	50	32	31	20	75	109	41	63	119	45	237
	45% <i>f</i>	44%	50%	48%	45% <i>l</i>	59% <i>l</i>	42% <i>l</i>	59% <i>l</i>	42%	26%	55% <i>l</i>	44%	37%	54%	43%	43%	45%
Don't know	28	12	2	13	28	2	3	1	2	4	3	17	5	4	19	4	27
	6%	4%	11%	8%	6%	3%	3%	2%	3%	5%	2%	7%	4%	3%	7%	4%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 514

Q19.1 And what proportion of these Cars, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease cars for commercial use

	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	521	10	3	143	7	6	35	50	37	17	18	12	29	10	2	13	25	8	81	1	521	
Weighted total	506	11**	3**	129	5**	5**	25*	62*	31*	19**	13**	23**	10**	22**	15**	3**	13**	31**	12**	73*	2**	521
All	44	-	-	7	-	-	2	3	3	1	2	2	-	1	4	3	1	3	1	10	-	42
	9%	-	-	6%	-	-	9%	5%	11%	4%	12%	10%	-	3%	26%	100%	11%	11%	11%	13%	-	8%
75%-50%	20	-	-	5	2	-	1	5	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	18
	4%	-	-	4%	29%	-	6%	8%	6%	6%	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	3%
50%	15	-	-	5	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	14
	3%	-	-	4%	-	-	2%	3%	4%	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	4%	-	3%	-	3%
50%-25%	21	-	-	6	1	1	2	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	1	3	-	23
	4%	-	-	5%	10%	16%	6%	5%	-	4%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	10%	9%	5%	-	4%
Less than 25%	149	4	1	43	2	1	10	23	9	5	3	5	5	6	-	4	2	2	20	-	160	
	29%	39%	20%	33%	31%	27%	42%	36%	29%	25%	20%	51%	23%	38%	-	30%	8%	17%	27%	-	31%	
None	229	7	3	59	2	3	8	24	13	9	6	13	5	12	3	7	17	5	32	2	237	
	45%	61%	80%	46%	30%	57%	32%	38%	43%	49%	44%	56%	49%	55%	22%	52%	56%	46%	44%	100%	45%	
Don't know	28	-	-	4	-	-	1	4	2	3	2	3	-	1	-	1	3	2	3	-	27	
	6%	-	-	3%	-	-	4%	6%	6%	15%	14%	-	4%	-	-	7%	10%	17%	4%	-	5%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 515

Q19.2 And what proportion of these LGVs, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease LGVs for commercial use

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	311	290	4	17	15	34	18	27	23	6	46	64	22	30	6	5	11	150	157	311
Weighted total	302	266	2**	33**	11**	32*	17**	29**	27**	5**	51*	54*	22**	25**	6**	8**	12**	140	157	311
All	11	9	-	2	1	3	-	-	-	-	5	2	-	1	-	-	-	7	4	11
	4%	3%	-	7%	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	9%	3%	-	3%	-	-	-	5%	2%	4%
75%-50%	8	5	-	3	-	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	4	4	6
	3%	2%	-	8%	-	-	-	14%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	37%	-	3%	3%	2%
50%	3	3	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	4
	1%	1%	-	-	6%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	2%	*	1%
50%-25%	5	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	5	5
	2%	2%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	4%	-	-	-	24%	-	-	3%	2%
Less than 25%	27	27	-	-	1	3	-	3	5	-	6	6	1	1	-	-	1	15	12	31
	9%	10%	-	-	14%	10%	-	9%	17%	-	12%	11%	3%	3%	-	-	9%	11%	8%	10%
None	237	209	2	26	6	26	16	24	18	5	39	43	19	22	6	3	8	105	129	243
	79%	79%	76%	80%	61%	82%	97%	84%	64%	100%	77%	78%	87%	90%	100%	39%	69%	75%	82%	78%
Don't know	11	9	1	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	3	7	4	11
	4%	3%	24%	5%	-	-	3%	3%	4%	-	-	5%	6%	-	-	-	22%	5%	2%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 516

Q19.2 And what proportion of these LGVs, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease LGVs for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	311	36	275	43	73	84	69	16	24	110	28	78	6	31	53	177	311	-	311
Weighted total	302	36*	265	43*	72*	85*	65*	13**	21**	109*	30**	74*	7**	35**	58*	158	302	-**	311
All	11	*	10	1	4	3	3	-	*	3	2	2	-	-	4	4	11	-	11
	4%	1%	4%	2%	6%	3%	4%	-	2%	3%	8%	3%	-	-	7%	2%	4%	-	4%
75%-50%	8	-	8	3	-	3	-	3	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	8	8	-	6
	3%	-	3%	6%	-	3%	-	20%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	3%	-	2%
50%	3	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	3	-	4
	1%	-	1%	3%	2%	-	-	-	3%	1%	2%	1%	-	-	-	2%	1%	-	1%
50%-25%	5	-	5	-	2	2	-	1	-	3	-	1	-	-	2	1	5	-	5
	2%	-	2%	-	3%	2%	-	8%	-	3%	-	1%	-	-	3%	1%	2%	-	2%
Less than 25%	27	1	26	1	2	4	9	1	9	6	2	8	-	-	5	19	27	-	31
	9%	3%	10%	2%	3%	5%	14% <i>d</i>	9%	43%	6%	8%	10%	-	-	8%	12%	9%	-	10%
None	237	35	202	38	60	71	50	8	9	88	22	61	5	35	46	117	237	-	243
	79%	96% <i>zb</i>	76%	87%	83%	83%	77%	63%	45%	81%	76%	82%	74%	100%	80%	74%	79%	-	78%
Don't know	11	-	11	-	3	3	4	-	1	3	2	1	2	-	1	6	11	-	11
	4%	-	4%	-	4%	4%	5%	-	7%	3%	7%	2%	26%	-	3%	4%	4%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 517

Q19.2 And what proportion of these LGVs, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease LGVs for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	311	70	175	32	31	59	205	252	36	47	58	135	19	83	230	98	29	56	69	311
Weighted total	302	69*	168	29**	33**	54*	190	237	35**	42*	54*	128	16**	78*	219	85*	25**	53*	69*	311
All	11	6	3	1	1	2	7	9	2	2	6	5	1	1	11	5	1	4	-	11
	4%	8% ^b	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	5%	5%	10% ^z	4%	7%	1%	5%	5%	3%	7% ^r	-	4%
75%-50%	8	-	6	2	-	2	3	7	3	2	1	7	-	1	7	3	1	-	1	6
	3%	-	3%	8%	-	4%	1%	3%	8%	4%	2%	6%	-	1%	3%	3%	5%	-	2%	2%
50%	3	1	1	-	1	-	2	2	1	1	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	1	1	4
	1%	2%	1%	-	2%	-	1%	1%	3%	1%	-	1%	4%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%
50%-25%	5	2	3	-	-	1	4	4	-	-	2	3	-	2	4	3	-	2	1	5
	2%	2%	2%	-	-	1%	2%	2%	-	-	3%	2%	-	2%	2%	3%	-	3%	1%	2%
Less than 25%	27	8	13	4	1	7	18	18	9	5	5	13	1	4	22	15	6	7	4	31
	9%	11%	8%	15%	4%	12%	10%	7%	26%	11%	9%	10%	8%	5%	10%	18% ^{zr}	24%	13%	6%	10%
None	237	48	136	20	30	42	149	190	17	33	41	94	13	65	165	57	17	38	62	243
	79% ^o	70%	81%	68%	91%	77%	78%	80%	47%	77%	76%	74%	78%	83%	75%	67%	68%	72%	90% ^{noq}	78%
Don't know	11	5	5	2	-	1	8	7	4	1	-	4	1	5	9	2	-	2	-	11
	4%	7%	3%	6%	-	2%	4%	3%	10%	1%	-	3%	3%	7%	4%	3%	-	4%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 518

Q19.2 And what proportion of these LGVs, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease LGVs for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	311	201	14	96	311	35	72	30	53	53	77	161	68	72	173	62	311
Weighted total	302	195	13**	93*	302	34*	71*	28**	51*	50*	74*	148	73*	68*	163	67*	311
All	11	8	1	2	11	1	3	1	1	*	1	4	6	1	5	4	11
	4%	4%	6%	2%	4%	3%	4%	4%	2%	1%	2%	2%	8%	2%	3%	6%	4%
75%-50%	8	7	-	1	8	-	4	1	2	1	1	2	5	1	2	5	6
	3%	3%	-	2%	3%	-	6%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	6%	2%	1%	7% <i>n</i>	2%
50%	3	1	-	2	3	2	1	-	-	1	-	2	1	1	2	-	4
	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	5%	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%
50%-25%	5	5	-	-	5	-	1	-	2	*	1	1	3	1	1	3	5
	2%	2%	-	-	2%	-	1%	-	3%	1%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	4%	2%
Less than 25%	27	14	3	10	27	1	1	2	5	9	4	15	7	4	12	10	31
	9%	7%	20%	11%	9%	2%	2%	9%	9%	18% <i>n</i>	5%	10%	10%	5%	7%	14%	10%
None	237	153	8	76	237	29	59	23	39	38	62	119	52	57	133	45	243
	79%	78%	67%	81%	79%	85%	83%	83%	76%	76%	84%	80%	70%	83%	81%	68%	78%
Don't know	11	7	1	3	11	1	2	1	3	1	5	5	1	4	7	-	11
	4%	3%	8%	3%	4%	4%	2%	2%	5%	1%	7%	4%	1%	6%	4%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 519

Q19.2 And what proportion of these LGVs, if any, were either electric or low carbon? This could include, for example, vehicles subject to a reduced level of Vehicle Excise Duty due to their fuel efficiency.

Base: all participants who own or lease LGVs for commercial use

	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	311	6	2	65	6	5	27	35	30	12	6	7	9	17	7	-	14	8	4	51	-	311
Weighted total	302	6**	3**	58*	4**	4**	19**	43*	25**	16**	5**	10**	10**	13**	8**	**	14**	9**	7**	47*	**	311
All	11	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	11
	4%	-	-	3%	-	-	13%	-	3%	-	13%	31%	-	-	-	-	-	13%	17%	-	-	4%
75%-50%	8	-	-	1	1	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6
	3%	-	-	1%	18%	-	8%	6%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	2%
50%	3	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	3%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%
50%-25%	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	17%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	2%
Less than 25%	27	-	-	5	1	1	4	5	4	2	-	-	*	1	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	31
	9%	-	-	9%	24%	16%	19%	11%	15%	12%	-	-	5%	5%	-	-	14%	-	-	6%	-	10%
None	237	6	3	49	2	3	9	33	17	14	4	5	9	10	7	-	10	8	6	43	-	243
	79%	100%	100%	83%	45%	84%	49%	76%	70%	84%	70%	55%	95%	81%	83%	-	70%	87%	83%	90%	-	78%
Don't know	11	-	-	1	1	-	2	1	2	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	11
	4%	-	-	1%	12%	-	9%	2%	7%	-	-	15%	-	14%	17%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 520

Q22b. And have these been the number of vehicles owned or leased across all your organisation's sites, or just those owned or leased by your organisation at sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use and responsible for one/some but not all sites in a multi-site organisation

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	131	123	1	7	7	13	9	10	2	5	25	25	11	7	1	2	12	88	42	131
Weighted total	124	111	1**	12**	6**	13**	9**	10**	2**	4**	25**	23**	9**	7**	1**	2**	11**	81*	43*	131
For all sites	73	68	1	5	2	6	5	9	-	4	17	17	5	4	1	3	46	27	78	
	59%	61%	100%	43%	35%	48%	61%	95%	-	89%	66%	75%	60%	51%	100%	39%	24%	56%	64%	60%
For sites I'm responsible for	47	42	-	5	4	7	3	*	2	*	9	5	2	3	-	1	8	32	15	49
	38%	37%	-	43%	65%	52%	39%	5%	100%	11%	34%	23%	21%	49%	-	61%	68%	40%	34%	37%
Don't know / Refused	4	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	2	-	-	-	1	3	1	4
	3%	2%	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	19%	-	-	-	7%	4%	2%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 521

Q22b. And have these been the number of vehicles owned or leased across all your organisation's sites, or just those owned or leased by your organisation at sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use and responsible for one/some but not all sites in a multi-site organisation

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	131	-	131	24	29	29	28	3	16	48	16	33	3	16	13	69	131	-	131
Weighted total	124	**	124	22**	30**	28**	25**	3**	14**	46*	16**	28**	3**	15**	13**	64*	124	**	131
For all sites	73	-	73	13	19	19	13	2	7	24	9	17	2	11	8	37	73	-	78
	59%	-	59%	61%	64%	69%	54%	57%	48%	53%	57%	60%	58%	72%	58%	59%	59%	-	60%
For sites I'm responsible for	47	-	47	9	11	9	10	1	7	21	6	9	1	4	6	25	47	-	49
	38%	-	38%	39%	36%	31%	41%	43%	46%	45%	40%	31%	42%	28%	42%	39%	38%	-	37%
Don't know / Refused	4	-	4	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	*	3	-	-	-	1	4	-	4
	3%	-	3%	-	-	-	5%	-	6%	2%	3%	9%	-	-	-	2%	3%	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 522

Q22b. And have these been the number of vehicles owned or leased across all your organisation's sites, or just those owned or leased by your organisation at sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use and responsible for one/some but not all sites in a multi-site organisation

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	131	26	68	10	23	18	95	116	9	18	25	53	7	40	97	42	17	36	30	131
Weighted total	124	26**	66*	8**	21**	18**	85*	107	9**	16**	23**	47*	7**	35*	89*	35*	15**	34*	30**	131
For all sites	73	16	37	3	14	12	50	65	8	12	14	23	5	22	50	17	8	19	21	78
	59%	64%	56%	44%	67%	66%	59%	61%	94%	75%	62%	50%	76%	62%	56%	48%	51%	55%	69%	60%
For sites I'm responsible for	47	9	27	4	6	6	33	39	*	4	9	23	2	13	35	16	7	15	10	49
	38%	36%	41%	56%	29%	34%	38%	37%	6%	22%	38%	48%	24%	36%	39%	45%	49%	44%	31%	37%
Don't know / Refused	4	-	2	-	1	-	2	2	-	*	-	1	-	1	4	2	-	*	-	4
	3%	-	3%	-	4%	-	3%	2%	-	3%	-	2%	-	2%	4%	6%	-	1%	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 523

Q22b. And have these been the number of vehicles owned or leased across all your organisation's sites, or just those owned or leased by your organisation at sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use and responsible for one/some but not all sites in a multi-site organisation

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		(p)
Unweighted total	131	81	7	40	131	17	25	14	23	19	38	63	24	34	62	28	131
Weighted total	124	73*	6**	40*	124	18**	23**	14**	22**	15**	31*	62*	22**	28*	61*	26**	131
For all sites	73	44	2	23	73	12	17	5	14	8	18	40	9	18	34	14	78
	59%	61%	33%	58%	59%	65%	73%	39%	62%	56%	58%	64%	42%	63%	56%	56%	60%
For sites I'm responsible for	47	28	4	15	47	6	6	8	8	7	11	20	13	9	26	11	49
	38%	38%	67%	38%	38%	30%	27%	61%	38%	44%	36%	33%	58%	31%	43%	44%	37%
Don't know / Refused	4	*	-	2	4	1	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	2	*	-	4
	3%	1%	-	4%	3%	5%	-	-	-	-	6%	3%	-	6%	1%	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 524

Q22b. And have these been the number of vehicles owned or leased across all your organisation's sites, or just those owned or leased by your organisation at sites at which you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use and responsible for one/some but not all sites in a multi-site organisation

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	131	4	1	38	3	1	5	7	7	5	3	3	14	3	-	3	4	1	22	2	131	
Weighted total	124	4**	1**	35*	2**	1**	3**	8**	7**	6**	5**	4**	2**	9**	4**	-**	4**	5**	1**	20**	4**	131
For all sites	73	4	1	19	-	1	3	3	5	5	2	1	*	5	2	-	3	1	15	2	78	
	59%	100%	100%	54%	-	100%	100%	44%	71%	81%	26%	27%	55%	64%	-	-	67%	100%	74%	54%	60%	
For sites I'm responsible for	47	-	-	15	2	-	-	3	2	1	3	1	4	1	-	4	2	-	5	2	49	
	36%	-	-	43%	100%	-	-	44%	29%	19%	74%	73%	41%	36%	-	100%	33%	-	26%	46%	37%	
Don't know / Refused	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	
	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	12%	-	-	33%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 525

Q20a. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129**	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
Done since early 2015	262	230	2	30	9	24	15	29	28	7	49	39	17	19	6	8	9	121	136	265
	42%	41%	25%	48%	44%	40%	42%	55% <i>k</i>	58% <i>jk</i>	66%	38%	34%	39%	43%	40%	55%	28%	38%	46%	41%
Considered since early 2015	67	60	1	6	4	3	5	5	6	-	10	17	5	6	-	4	3	38	29	69
	11%	11%	14%	10%	18%	6%	14%	10%	12%	-	8%	15%	11%	12%	-	29%	8%	12%	10%	11%
Neither done nor considered	155	139	1	15	7	15	8	11	7	2	32	29	11	14	6	1	10	83	72	161
	25%	25%	21%	24%	30%	26%	21%	21%	14%	19%	25%	25%	27%	32%	39%	10%	30%	26%	24%	25%
Don't know/Refused	46	40	-	5	1	4	3	3	2	-	12	8	3	2	2	-	5	29	17	41
	7%	7%	-	9%	3%	7%	8%	6%	5%	-	9%	7%	8%	5%	12%	-	14%	9%	6%	6%
Not applicable	97	89	3	6	1	12	6	5	6	2	25	22	6	3	1	1	6	50	45	104
	16%	16%	40%	9%	5%	21%	15%	9%	12%	15%	20%	19%	15%	8%	9%	6%	19%	16%	15%	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	329	290	3	36	13	27	20	34	33	7	59	56	22	25	6	12	12	159	165	334
	52%	52%	39%	59%	61%	46%	56%	64% <i>lj</i>	69% <i>ejk</i>	66%	46%	49%	50%	55%	40%	84%	37%	50%	55%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 526

Q20a. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	-**	640
Done since early 2015	262	30	232	34	62	64	65	14	21	98	25	62	4	26	45	145	262	-	265
	42%	31%	44% ^a	34%	40%	42%	45%	52%	47%	43%	38%	36%	24%	35%	41%	44%	42%	-	41%
Considered since early 2015	67	5	63	10	15	19	15	3	6	17	10	21	1	10	7	38	67	-	69
	11%	5%	12%	10%	10%	12%	11%	10%	13%	7%	15%	12%	3%	14%	6%	11%	11%	-	11%
Neither done nor considered	155	31	124	34	42	43	27	3	7	55	16	47	10	21	33	79	155	-	161
	25%	32%	23%	33% ^f	27%	28%	19%	11%	16%	24%	24%	27%	61%	28%	31%	24%	25%	-	25%
Don't know/Refused	46	8	37	5	7	8	14	4	6	16	4	12	-	2	6	23	46	-	41
	7%	9%	7%	5%	5%	5%	10%	14%	13%	7%	6%	7%	-	2%	6%	7%	7%	-	6%
Not applicable	97	23	74	19	28	21	22	3	5	40	11	31	2	16	18	44	97	-	104
	16%	24% ^b	14%	18%	18%	13%	15%	13%	10%	18%	16%	18%	12%	21%	16%	13%	16%	-	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	329	34	295	45	77	82	81	17	27	115	35	82	4	36	52	182	329	-	334
	52% ^{aa}	35%	56% ^{aa}	44%	50%	54%	56%	62%	60%	51%	54%	48%	27%	49%	47%	55%	52%	-	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 527

Q20a. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
Done since early 2015	262	46	140	37	39	42	168	204	36	28	48	109	15	67	191	82	27	58	64	265
	42%	37%	43%	55% ^a	39%	43%	41%	41%	59% ^{zgi}	37%	48%	41%	59%	41%	43%	43%	41%	46%	40%	41%
Considered since early 2015	67	11	35	4	15	7	47	55	10	17	15	31	3	18	53	25	6	15	14	69
	11%	9%	11%	6%	15%	7%	12%	11%	16%	22% ^{zg}	15%	12%	11%	11%	12%	13%	9%	12%	8%	11%
Neither done nor considered	155	37	82	11	24	27	102	127	4	13	21	67	2	44	97	41	10	22	55	161
	25% ^h	29%	25%	16%	24%	27%	25%	25% ^h	6%	18%	21% ^h	26%	8%	27%	22%	21%	16%	18%	34% ^{znopq}	25%
Don't know/Refused	46	10	24	5	5	9	25	33	7	6	5	13	1	11	36	20	8	13	7	41
	7%	8%	7%	8%	5%	9%	6%	7%	11%	8%	5%	5%	4%	7%	8%	10%	12% ^r	11%	5%	6%
Not applicable	97	22	47	10	16	13	68	81	4	11	11	44	4	22	73	25	14	16	19	104
	16%	17%	14%	15%	16%	14%	17%	16%	7%	15%	11%	17%	18%	13%	16%	13%	22%	13%	12%	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	329	58	175	41	54	49	216	259	45	45	62	140	18	86	244	107	33	73	78	334
	52%	46%	53%	61%	55%	50%	53%	52%	75% ^{ag}	60%	63% ^g	53%	70%	53%	54%	55%	50%	59%	49%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 528

Q20a. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
Done since early 2015	262	178	10	74	262	30	55	28	37	55	57	126	74	45	149	66	265
	42% <i>m</i>	47% <i>c</i>	41%	34%	42%	39%	42%	42%	39%	59% <i>zdefgh</i>	35%	41%	54% <i>zjkl</i>	32%	43% <i>m</i>	52% <i>m</i>	41%
Considered since early 2015	67	42	2	24	67	10	13	11	13	12	12	38	17	9	37	22	69
	11%	11%	8%	11%	11%	13%	10%	16%	14%	13%	8%	12%	12%	6%	11%	17% <i>m</i>	11%
Neither done nor considered	155	83	8	64	155	24	40	17	26	10	51	79	20	44	91	17	161
	25% <i>lo</i>	22%	33%	30% <i>a</i>	25% <i>l</i>	31% <i>l</i>	30% <i>l</i>	26% <i>l</i>	27% <i>l</i>	11%	31% <i>l</i>	26% <i>l</i>	15%	32% <i>o</i>	26% <i>o</i>	13%	25%
Don't know/Refused	46	25	1	16	46	4	5	6	7	4	12	19	9	14	17	7	41
	7%	7%	5%	7%	7%	5%	4%	10%	7%	4%	7%	6%	6%	10%	5%	6%	6%
Not applicable	97	54	3	38	97	9	19	5	12	12	31	46	18	28	52	15	104
	16%	14%	14%	18%	16%	12%	14%	7%	12%	13%	19%	15%	13%	20%	15%	12%	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	329	220	12	98	329	41	68	38	50	67	69	164	91	54	186	88	334
	52% <i>lm</i>	57% <i>c</i>	48%	45%	52%	53%	51%	58%	53%	72% <i>zdefh</i>	42%	53% <i>j</i>	66% <i>zjk</i>	38%	54% <i>m</i>	69% <i>zmn</i>	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 529

Q20a. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	21**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
Done since early 2015	262	7	3	55	2	4	11	35	16	14	5	12	13	6	10	3	5	14	7	36	4	265
	42% <i>m</i>	67%	100%	37%	26%	72%	41%	48% <i>m</i>	47% <i>m</i>	54%	30%	37%	79%	21%	49%	62%	22%	39%	38%	38%	68%	41%
Considered since early 2015	67	1	-	19	1	1	3	5	6	3	1	3	-	2	-	-	3	6	4	10	-	69
	11%	10%	-	13%	13%	13%	13%	7%	17%	12%	8%	10%	-	6%	-	-	12%	18%	20%	11%	-	11%
Neither done nor considered	155	2	-	42	-	1	5	14	4	4	5	11	3	11	7	-	8	10	5	23	-	161
	25%	23%	-	29%	-	15%	20%	19%	13%	16%	31%	33%	18%	39% <i>gh</i>	33%	-	37%	29%	25%	24%	-	25%
Don't know/Refused	46	-	-	9	-	-	2	12	2	2	2	3	1	-	2	-	4	1	1	3	2	41
	7%	-	-	6%	-	-	8%	17% <i>zcms</i>	7%	7%	11%	8%	4%	2%	8%	-	17%	3%	6%	4%	32%	6%
Not applicable	97	-	-	22	4	-	5	7	6	3	3	4	-	9	2	2	3	4	2	21	-	104
	16%	-	-	15%	61%	-	19%	9%	17%	12%	21%	12%	-	32% <i>zcg</i>	10%	38%	13%	12%	11%	23% <i>g</i>	-	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	329	8	3	74	3	4	15	40	21	18	6	15	13	7	10	3	8	20	11	46	4	334
	52% <i>m</i>	77%	100%	50% <i>m</i>	39%	85%	54% <i>m</i>	55% <i>m</i>	63% <i>m</i>	66%	37%	47%	79%	27%	49%	62%	34%	56%	57%	49% <i>m</i>	68%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 530

Q20b. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
Done since early 2015	51	49	-	2	2	5	3	4	3	1	13	8	2	4	-	2	2	32	16	53
	8%	9%	-	3%	9%	9%	7%	7%	5%	9%	10%	7%	6%	8%	-	13%	7%	10% <i>r</i>	5%	8%
Considered since early 2015	29	27	1	2	1	2	2	4	2	1	5	5	2	3	-	1	2	17	11	31
	5%	5%	7%	3%	3%	4%	6%	8%	3%	8%	4%	4%	4%	6%	-	9%	7%	5%	4%	5%
Neither done nor considered	150	131	-	20	8	14	8	13	11	4	20	30	12	13	2	5	9	77	73	152
	24%	23%	-	31%	39%	24%	23%	24%	23%	35%	15%	26% <i>j</i>	28%	29%	13%	36%	28%	24%	24%	24%
Don't know/Refused	44	42	-	2	3	3	2	5	1	-	8	7	4	3	-	-	6	29	14	46
	7%	8%	-	3%	13%	6%	6%	9%	2%	-	6%	7%	10%	7%	-	-	18%	9%	5%	7%
Not applicable	354	309	7	38	8	35	21	27	32	5	83	64	22	22	13	6	13	167	185	358
	56%	55%	93%	61%	35%	58%	57%	52%	65%	48%	65%	55%	52%	50%	87%	42%	40%	52%	62% <i>q</i>	56%
Done or considered since early 2015	80	76	1	3	3	7	5	8	4	2	18	13	4	6	-	3	4	49	27	84
	13%	14%	7%	5%	13%	13%	14%	15%	9%	17%	14%	12%	9%	14%	-	22%	13%	15% <i>r</i>	9%	13%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 531

Q20b. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	-**	640
Done since early 2015	51	8	43	9	16	14	9	1	3	17	4	16	1	2	8	30	51	-	53
	8%	8%	8%	8%	11%	9%	6%	3%	6%	7%	5%	9%	5%	3%	7%	9%	8%	-	8%
Considered since early 2015	29	-	29	4	6	7	10	1	3	10	2	5	-	1	4	21	29	-	31
	5% <i>ad</i>	-	6% <i>ad</i>	4%	4%	4%	7%	2%	6%	4%	3%	3%	-	2%	3%	6%	5%	-	5%
Neither done nor considered	150	21	129	27	36	35	32	6	13	63	15	38	5	19	33	81	150	-	152
	24%	22%	24%	26%	23%	23%	22%	23%	30%	28%	23%	22%	29%	25%	30%	25%	24%	-	24%
Don't know/Refused	44	6	37	4	10	6	8	3	9	16	2	10	1	2	2	27	44	-	46
	7%	6%	7%	4%	7%	4%	6%	10%	20% <i>zccdef</i>	7%	4%	6%	6%	2%	2%	8% <i>gh</i>	7%	-	7%
Not applicable	354	62	292	59	86	91	85	17	16	120	43	104	10	51	63	169	354	-	358
	56% <i>h</i>	64%	55%	57% <i>h</i>	55% <i>h</i>	60% <i>h</i>	59% <i>h</i>	62%	37%	53%	65%	60%	60%	68% <i>o</i>	57%	51%	56%	-	56%
Done or considered since early 2015	80	8	72	12	22	20	18	1	5	27	6	20	1	3	12	51	80	-	84
	13%	8%	14%	12%	14%	13%	13%	6%	12%	12%	9%	12%	5%	4%	11%	16% <i>km</i>	13%	-	13%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 532

Q20b. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
Done since early 2015	51	10	23	6	11	5	40	43	2	5	10	21	1	15	37	17	13	23	13	53
	8%	8%	7%	9%	11%	5%	10%	9%	3%	6%	11%	8%	3%	9%	8%	9%	20%znor	16%znor	8%	8%
Considered since early 2015	29	4	22	1	1	6	19	26	5	6	4	16	1	6	22	7	2	9	7	31
	5%	3%	7%	2%	1%	7%	5%	5%	8%	8%	4%	6%	5%	4%	5%	4%	3%	7%	5%	5%
Neither done nor considered	150	39	82	15	13	22	93	117	12	20	23	71	4	36	111	55	11	38	36	152
	24% <i>d</i>	31% <i>d</i>	25% <i>d</i>	23%	13%	22%	23%	23%	21%	27%	24%	27%	14%	22%	25%	28%	16%	31% <i>p</i>	22%	24%
Don't know/Refused	44	11	23	4	4	7	31	35	8	12	7	19	3	12	37	18	7	13	6	46
	7%	9%	7%	6%	4%	7%	8%	7%	13%	15% <i>zg</i>	7%	7%	13%	7%	8%	9% <i>r</i>	11% <i>r</i>	11% <i>r</i>	4%	7%
Not applicable	354	62	178	40	70	58	228	281	33	33	54	137	17	93	242	97	32	42	98	358
	56% <i>q</i>	49%	54%	60%	71% <i>zab</i>	59%	56%	56% <i>l</i>	55%	44%	54%	52%	65%	57%	54% <i>q</i>	50% <i>q</i>	49% <i>q</i>	34%	61% <i>q</i>	56%
Done or considered since early 2015	80	14	45	8	12	12	59	68	7	11	15	37	2	21	59	23	15	31	21	84
	13%	11%	14%	11%	12%	12%	14%	14%	11%	14%	15%	14%	8%	13%	13%	12%	23% <i>zno</i>	25% <i>znor</i>	13%	13%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 533

Q20b. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
Done since early 2015	51	35	2	14	51	8	11	7	8	8	12	23	14	11	28	11	53
	8%	9%	7%	7%	8%	10%	8%	10%	8%	8%	7%	8%	10%	8%	8%	9%	8%
Considered since early 2015	29	16	1	13	29	2	8	1	8	6	4	16	9	5	17	7	31
	5%	4%	4%	6%	5%	3%	6%	2%	9%	6%	2%	5%	6%	3%	5%	6%	5%
Neither done nor considered	150	102	6	40	150	19	36	20	25	22	40	75	31	37	78	30	152
	24%	27% ^c	26%	18%	24%	25%	28%	31%	27%	23%	25%	24%	23%	27%	23%	24%	24%
Don't know/Refused	44	26	1	15	44	1	6	4	10	7	8	24	10	9	20	12	46
	7%	7%	5%	7%	7%	1%	5%	6%	10% ^e	8%	5%	8%	7%	6%	6%	9%	7%
Not applicable	354	203	14	134	354	47	70	34	43	51	100	170	74	78	202	66	358
	56%	53%	59%	62% ^d	56%	61%	53%	51%	46%	55%	61%	55%	54%	56%	58%	52%	56%
Done or considered since early 2015	80	50	3	27	80	10	19	8	16	13	16	39	22	16	45	19	84
	13%	13%	11%	13%	13%	13%	15%	12%	17%	14%	10%	13%	16%	11%	13%	15%	13%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 534

Q20b. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	(u)
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	21**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
Done since early 2015	51	2	1	13	-	1	2	9	2	1	1	4	1	4	-	-	-	-	3	6	-	53
	8%	15%	41%	9%	-	15%	7%	13%	7%	4%	5%	12%	5%	16%	-	-	-	-	17%	7%	-	8%
Considered since early 2015	29	2	-	8	1	-	1	3	2	3	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	31
	5%	18%	-	6%	7%	-	3%	4%	6%	10%	-	4%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	5%
Neither done nor considered	150	2	-	57	1	2	6	21	7	5	4	8	2	8	4	3	2	4	4	10	-	152
	24% <i>s</i>	16%	-	39% <i>zhs</i>	17%	44%	22%	29% <i>s</i>	20%	18%	25%	26%	13%	29% <i>s</i>	17%	62%	9%	12%	21%	11%	-	24%
Don't know/Refused	44	1	-	16	-	-	1	11	2	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	2	4	-	46
	7%	12%	-	11%	-	-	5%	14% <i>ms</i>	7%	-	16%	3%	4%	-	-	-	8%	3%	11%	4%	-	7%
Not applicable	354	4	2	52	5	2	17	29	20	18	8	18	13	14	17	2	19	30	10	65	6	358
	56% <i>cg</i>	40%	59%	36%	75%	41%	63% <i>cg</i>	40%	60% <i>c</i>	68%	54%	55%	78%	52%	83%	38%	83%	85%	51%	70% <i>zcg</i>	100%	56%
Done or considered since early 2015	80	4	1	22	1	1	3	12	4	4	1	5	1	5	-	-	-	-	3	15	-	84
	13%	33%	41%	15%	7%	15%	10%	17%	13%	14%	5%	16%	5%	19%	-	-	-	-	17%	15%	-	13%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 535

Q20c. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
Done since early 2015	203	178	1	24	10	19	11	25	21	3	31	34	15	16	4	3	6	102	96	210
	32%	32%	15%	39%	46%	33%	30%	47% <i>zjk</i>	44% <i>j</i>	27%	24%	30%	36%	35%	27%	24%	19%	32%	32%	33%
Considered since early 2015	45	44	1	-	1	2	5	3	5	2	7	8	1	5	3	-	4	25	20	50
	7%	8%	8%	-	4%	3%	12%	6%	11%	15%	6%	7%	2%	10%	19%	-	11%	8%	7%	8%
Neither done nor considered	174	156	2	16	8	17	11	14	7	6	32	32	13	14	2	10	8	81	91	173
	28%	28%	30%	26%	38%	29%	30%	26%	13%	52%	25%	28%	30%	32%	11%	71%	26%	25%	30%	27%
Don't know/Refused	52	42	1	10	-	7	3	1	3	-	15	12	5	5	-	-	2	33	19	51
	8%	7%	7%	16%	-	12% <i>g</i>	7%	1%	7%	-	12% <i>g</i>	10%	12% <i>g</i>	10%	-	-	5%	10%	6%	8%
Not applicable	153	139	3	11	3	14	7	10	12	1	44	29	8	6	1	13	80	73	156	
	24%	25%	40%	18%	12%	24%	20%	19%	24%	7%	34% <i>m</i>	25%	19%	12%	43%	6%	39%	25%	25%	24%
Done or considered since early 2015	248	222	2	24	11	21	15	28	27	5	38	42	16	20	7	3	10	128	116	260
	40%	40%	23%	39%	49%	36%	43%	53% <i>j</i>	55% <i>j</i>	42%	30%	37%	38%	45%	47%	24%	30%	40%	39%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 536

Q20c. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	-**	640
Done since early 2015	203	16	187	20	39	61	53	11	18	77	13	55	3	23	29	119	203	-	210
	32% ^{ac}	16%	35% ^{ad}	20%	25%	40% ^{cd}	37% ^{cd}	41%	41% ^{cd}	34%	20%	32%	17%	31%	27%	36%	32%	-	33%
Considered since early 2015	45	7	38	7	16	5	13	2	3	15	4	14	1	2	8	27	45	-	50
	7%	7%	7%	6%	10% ^e	3%	9%	6%	8%	7%	6%	8%	3%	3%	7%	8%	7%	-	8%
Neither done nor considered	174	38	136	38	50	44	29	4	9	65	27	43	11	25	37	78	174	-	173
	28%	39% ^{zb}	26%	37% ^f	32% ^f	29%	20%	15%	21%	29%	40% ^k	25%	66%	34%	34%	24%	28%	-	27%
Don't know/Refused	52	9	43	9	11	11	11	3	6	17	3	13	-	1	5	29	52	-	51
	8%	10%	8%	8%	7%	7%	8%	10%	14%	8%	4%	7%	-	1%	5%	9% ^m	8%	-	8%
Not applicable	153	27	127	29	39	33	38	8	7	53	19	49	2	23	30	76	153	-	156
	24%	28%	24%	28%	26%	21%	27%	28%	15%	23%	29%	28%	14%	31%	27%	23%	24%	-	24%
Done or considered since early 2015	248	23	225	27	54	66	65	13	22	92	17	68	3	26	37	146	248	-	260
	40% ^{ac}	23%	43% ^a	26%	35%	43% ^c	45% ^c	47%	49% ^c	40%	26%	40%	20%	34%	34%	44%	40%	-	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 537

Q20c. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
Done since early 2015	203	51	106	25	20	31	131	157	25	28	32	89	11	49	147	62	21	42	50	210
	32% <i>d</i>	41% <i>d</i>	32% <i>d</i>	38% <i>d</i>	20%	31%	32%	31%	42%	38%	32%	34%	45%	30%	33%	32%	32%	34%	31%	33%
Considered since early 2015	45	6	23	3	12	9	30	37	7	8	9	16	-	20	31	14	7	9	14	50
	7%	5%	7%	4%	12%	9%	7%	7%	11%	11%	9%	6%	-	13% <i>zk</i>	7%	7%	10%	7%	9%	8%
Neither done nor considered	174	33	94	16	29	26	118	143	13	14	30	80	4	45	118	50	11	30	54	173
	28% <i>p</i>	26%	29%	25%	29%	27%	29%	29%	21%	19%	30%	30%	17%	27%	26%	26%	16%	24%	34% <i>p</i>	27%
Don't know/Refused	52	8	27	6	7	9	28	34	8	10	6	14	2	10	41	19	8	13	5	51
	8% <i>r</i>	6%	8%	9%	7%	9%	7%	7%	13%	13% <i>g</i>	6%	5%	7%	6%	9% <i>r</i>	10% <i>r</i>	13% <i>r</i>	11% <i>r</i>	3%	8%
Not applicable	153	27	77	16	30	23	103	130	8	14	22	64	8	38	112	48	19	31	37	156
	24%	22%	24%	24%	31%	24%	25%	26% <i>h</i>	13%	19%	23%	24%	32%	24%	25%	25%	29%	24%	23%	24%
Done or considered since early 2015	248	57	129	28	32	40	161	194	32	36	41	105	11	70	178	76	27	51	64	260
	40%	46%	39%	42%	33%	41%	39%	39%	53% <i>g</i>	48%	41%	40%	45%	43%	40%	40%	42%	41%	40%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 538

Q20c. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)		
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)	
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
Done since early 2015	203	141	9	53	203	23	45	24	28	35	45	110	47	44	114	45	210
	32% ^c	37% ^c	39%	24%	32%	29%	34%	36%	30%	38%	27%	36%	34%	32%	33%	35%	33%
Considered since early 2015	45	24	2	19	45	6	9	5	10	10	12	18	15	11	20	14	50
	7%	6%	8%	9%	7%	8%	7%	7%	10%	11%	7%	6%	11%	8%	6%	11%	8%
Neither done nor considered	174	111	6	57	174	26	51	19	27	17	51	94	23	40	106	25	173
	28% ^f	29%	24%	26%	28%	33% ^f	39% ^{zdi}	28%	28%	18%	31% ^f	31% ^f	17%	29%	31% ^o	20%	27%
Don't know/Refused	52	26	2	20	52	6	5	5	9	10	11	23	13	9	25	13	51
	8%	7%	9%	9%	8%	7%	4%	8%	10%	11%	7%	8%	10%	6%	7%	10%	8%
Not applicable	153	79	5	67	153	17	21	13	20	21	44	62	39	35	81	30	156
	24%	21%	20%	31% ^a	24%	22%	16%	20%	22%	23%	27%	20%	29%	25%	23%	23%	24%
Done or considered since early 2015	248	166	11	71	248	28	54	29	38	45	57	128	62	55	134	59	260
	40%	43% ^c	47%	33%	40%	37%	41%	43%	40%	48%	35%	42%	45%	40%	39%	47%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 539

Q20c. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	21**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
Done since early 2015	203	9	1	32	2	3	14	23	16	7	5	10	8	8	7	3	5	7	7	35	-	210
	32% c	85%	20%	22%	34%	64%	53% zcg	31%	48% zc	28%	31%	32%	49%	28%	32%	62%	20%	19%	37%	38% c	-	33%
Considered since early 2015	45	-	2	18	-	1	2	5	2	-	1	-	-	3	2	-	2	1	-	6	-	50
	7%	-	59%	13% z	-	13%	6%	6%	7%	-	4%	-	-	10%	9%	-	10%	2%	-	6%	-	8%
Neither done nor considered	174	-	1	50	*	-	4	23	4	8	4	11	4	5	6	-	11	16	6	17	2	173
	28% h	-	22%	34% h	6%	-	16%	32% h	12%	30%	25%	33%	26%	19%	28%	-	49%	47%	34%	19%	30%	27%
Don't know/Refused	52	2	-	12	1	1	2	6	4	4	2	4	3	*	1	-	2	1	2	4	2	51
	8%	15%	-	8%	7%	15%	8%	8%	13%	16%	11%	12%	17%	2%	4%	-	9%	3%	11%	4%	32%	8%
Not applicable	153	-	-	34	4	*	5	17	7	7	4	6	1	11	5	2	3	10	3	31	2	156
	24%	-	-	23%	52%	9%	18%	23%	20%	26%	29%	19%	7%	41% zcf	26%	38%	13%	29%	18%	33%	38%	24%
Done or considered since early 2015	248	9	3	51	2	4	16	27	19	7	5	12	8	10	9	3	7	8	7	41	-	260
	40%	85%	78%	35%	34%	77%	59% zc	38%	55% c	28%	35%	36%	49%	39%	41%	62%	30%	21%	37%	44%	-	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 540

Q20d. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
Done since early 2015	265	237	2	26	10	24	13	21	25	5	53	47	14	25	4	8	11	139	124	280
	42%	42%	30%	42%	47%	41%	35%	39%	53%	49%	41%	41%	33%	55% <i>l</i>	30%	55%	35%	43%	41%	44%
Considered since early 2015	60	55	1	5	1	9	2	6	5	-	10	9	1	8	2	4	2	33	26	59
	10%	10%	8%	7%	4%	15% <i>l</i>	6%	12%	11%	-	8%	8%	3%	17% <i>l</i>	14%	29%	5%	10%	9%	9%
Neither done nor considered	166	146	2	18	7	12	11	18	9	6	33	28	17	9	3	1	9	82	82	164
	26%	26%	22%	29%	31%	20%	31%	34%	18%	51%	26%	25%	40% <i>eh</i>	20%	21%	11%	28%	26%	27%	26%
Don't know/Refused	37	34	1	3	2	1	1	2	3	-	8	9	4	1	2	-	5	25	10	35
	6%	6%	7%	5%	9%	1%	3%	4%	7%	-	6%	8%	9%	3%	14%	-	14%	8% <i>r</i>	4%	5%
Not applicable	99	87	2	10	2	13	9	6	6	-	24	22	6	2	3	1	6	42	57	102
	16%	16%	34%	16%	9%	22% <i>m</i>	24% <i>m</i>	11%	12%	-	19% <i>m</i>	15% <i>m</i>	15%	5%	22%	6%	17%	13%	19%	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	326	292	3	31	11	34	15	27	31	5	64	56	16	33	6	11	13	172	150	339
	52% <i>d</i>	52%	37%	50%	51%	57% <i>d</i>	42%	51%	64% <i>d</i>	49%	49%	48%	36%	72% <i>afjkl</i>	44%	84%	40%	53%	50%	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 541

Q20d. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	-**	640
Done since early 2015	265	27	238	33	58	65	67	15	27	99	21	65	2	18	40	171	265	-	280
	42% <i>am</i>	28%	45% <i>a</i>	32%	37%	42%	47% <i>c</i>	56%	62% <i>zcde</i>	44%	32%	38%	11%	24%	36%	52% <i>zmn</i>	42%	-	44%
Considered since early 2015	60	8	52	11	15	16	16	2	1	16	13	16	1	7	9	29	60	-	59
	10%	8%	10%	10%	10%	10%	11%	6%	3%	7%	20% <i>zik</i>	9%	3%	10%	9%	9%	10%	-	9%
Neither done nor considered	166	35	131	36	50	40	28	6	5	57	21	51	12	28	34	71	166	-	164
	26% <i>h</i>	36% <i>b</i>	25%	35% <i>fh</i>	32% <i>fh</i>	26% <i>h</i>	20%	23%	11%	25%	31%	30%	75%	38% <i>o</i>	32%	21%	26%	-	26%
Don't know/Refused	37	1	36	2	6	11	8	2	7	15	-	5	2	3	3	20	37	-	35
	6%	1%	7%	2%	4%	7%	5%	7%	16% <i>zcdf</i>	7%	-	3%	11%	5%	2%	6%	6%	-	5%
Not applicable	99	26	73	21	26	21	25	2	3	39	12	35	-	17	23	38	99	-	102
	16%	27% <i>zb</i>	14%	21%	17%	14%	17%	8%	7%	17%	17%	20%	-	23% <i>o</i>	21% <i>o</i>	11%	16%	-	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	326	35	291	44	73	80	83	17	29	115	34	81	2	25	49	201	326	-	339
	52% <i>am</i>	36%	55% <i>a</i>	43%	47%	53%	58% <i>c</i>	62%	65% <i>cd</i>	51%	51%	47%	14%	34%	45%	61% <i>zmn</i>	52%	-	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 542

Q20d. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
Done since early 2015	265	41	149	28	45	46	173	210	40	37	44	119	15	73	195	95	32	63	60	280
	42%	33%	45% ^a	42%	46%	47%	42%	42%	65% ^{zgj}	49%	45%	45%	57%	45%	43%	49% ^r	49%	51% ^r	38%	44%
Considered since early 2015	60	17	22	7	13	9	44	50	7	2	9	24	-	15	41	18	2	10	19	59
	10% ^{if}	14% ^b	7%	10%	13%	9%	11%	10% ⁱ	11% ⁱ	2%	9%	9%	-	9%	9%	9%	3%	8%	12% ^p	9%
Neither done nor considered	166	33	92	15	26	25	105	133	7	17	29	72	4	36	109	43	10	23	51	164
	26% ^h	26%	28%	22%	26%	25%	26%	27% ^h	11%	23%	29% ^h	27%	17%	22%	24%	23%	16%	18%	32% ^{pg}	26%
Don't know/Refused	37	9	20	5	2	6	25	28	6	9	8	10	2	13	31	11	7	7	5	35
	6%	7%	6%	8%	2%	6%	6%	6%	10%	12% ^{zg}	8%	4%	7%	8%	7%	6%	10% ^r	5%	3%	5%
Not applicable	99	26	45	12	13	13	63	79	2	10	10	38	5	25	73	26	15	22	26	102
	16% ^h	21%	14%	18%	13%	14%	15%	16% ^h	3%	13% ^h	10%	15%	19%	15%	16%	13%	22%	17%	16%	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	326	58	171	35	57	54	217	260	46	39	53	143	15	88	236	113	34	73	79	339
	52%	46%	52%	53%	58%	55%	53%	52%	76% ^{zgj}	51%	54%	54%	57%	54%	53%	58%	52%	59%	50%	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 543

Q20d. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
Done since early 2015	265	167	14	85	265	23	51	32	44	57	58	128	78	47	148	68	280
	42%	44%	57%	39%	42%	30%	39%	48% <i>e</i>	46% <i>e</i>	61% <i>zdef</i>	35%	42%	56% <i>zjk</i>	34%	43%	54% <i>zmn</i>	44%
Considered since early 2015	60	38	1	21	60	16	25	2	3	4	14	30	16	15	28	17	59
	10%	10%	4%	10%	10%	20% <i>zdghi</i>	19% <i>zdghi</i>	3%	4%	4%	9%	10%	11%	11%	8%	13%	9%
Neither done nor considered	166	104	5	54	166	28	33	19	28	14	53	87	17	42	102	16	164
	26% <i>lo</i>	27%	22%	25%	26% <i>l</i>	37% <i>l</i>	25%	28%	30% <i>l</i>	15%	32% <i>l</i>	28% <i>l</i>	12%	30% <i>o</i>	29% <i>o</i>	13%	26%
Don't know/Refused	37	18	1	17	37	2	3	4	7	6	11	15	9	8	18	9	35
	6%	5%	5%	8%	6%	3%	3%	6%	7%	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%	5%	7%	5%
Not applicable	99	55	3	39	99	8	19	10	12	12	27	46	19	27	50	16	102
	16%	14%	12%	18%	16%	10%	15%	15%	13%	13%	17%	15%	14%	19%	15%	13%	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	326	205	15	106	326	39	76	33	47	61	72	158	93	62	175	86	339
	52%	54%	61%	49%	52%	50%	58%	50%	50%	65% <i>zdh</i>	44%	51%	68% <i>zjk</i>	45%	51%	67% <i>zmn</i>	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 544

Q20d. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	21**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
Done since early 2015	265	10	3	52	4	15	32	22	6	3	13	9	10	10	3	3	12	6	41	6	280	44%
	42%	92%	100%	35%	60%	77%	56% <i>c</i>	45%	64% <i>zcms</i>	24%	22%	40%	52%	39%	46%	62%	12%	34%	31%	44%	100%	44%
Considered since early 2015	60	1	-	19	-	-	6	6	3	-	2	1	-	1	4	-	1	3	-	13	-	59
	10%	8%	-	13%	-	-	22% <i>zgm</i>	8%	9%	-	14%	3%	-	5%	21%	-	6%	8%	-	14%	-	9%
Neither done nor considered	166	-	-	46	-	1	3	18	4	12	4	15	6	5	3	-	12	11	6	19	-	164
	26% <i>fh</i>	-	-	31% <i>fh</i>	-	15%	11%	24%	11%	46%	24%	48%	36%	20%	14%	-	55%	32%	34%	20%	-	26%
Don't know/Refused	37	-	-	7	-	-	1	6	2	3	2	1	1	2	-	-	3	3	3	2	-	35
	6%	-	-	5%	-	-	3%	8%	6%	12%	16%	3%	7%	9%	-	-	12%	10%	17%	2%	-	5%
Not applicable	99	-	-	23	3	*	2	11	4	5	4	2	1	7	4	2	3	6	3	19	-	102
	16%	-	-	16%	40%	9%	8%	15%	11%	18%	24%	7%	5%	27% <i>f</i>	19%	38%	15%	16%	18%	20%	-	16%
Done or considered since early 2015	326	11	3	71	4	4	21	38	25	6	6	14	9	12	14	3	4	15	6	54	6	339
	52%	100%	100%	48%	60%	77%	78% <i>zcgms</i>	53%	73% <i>zcm</i>	24%	36%	43%	52%	44%	66%	62%	18%	42%	31%	58%	100%	53%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 545

Q20e. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
Done since early 2015	170	152	1	18	6	21	6	16	15	2	29	32	10	9	7	3	11	98	71	174
	27%	27%	8%	29%	30%	35%	17%	31%	32%	19%	23%	28%	22%	20%	46%	22%	35%	31%	24%	27%
Considered since early 2015	94	88	1	6	5	2	10	8	8	2	25	16	3	9	-	2	4	56	37	99
	15%e	16%	15%	9%	25%	4%	28% <i>azekf</i>	16% <i>e</i>	16%	21%	19% <i>e</i>	14% <i>e</i>	7%	20% <i>e</i>	-	11%	11%	17%	12%	15%
Neither done nor considered	221	191	3	27	8	17	11	21	18	7	42	41	18	16	5	8	8	100	119	223
	35%	34%	44%	44%	36%	28%	32%	39%	37%	60%	33%	36%	41%	36%	32%	61%	24%	31%	40% <i>q</i>	35%
Don't know/Refused	31	29	-	2	1	4	-	1	-	-	8	7	3	1	-	-	4	14	17	32
	5%	5%	-	3%	6%	6%	-	2%	-	-	6%	6%	8%	2%	-	-	12%	4%	6%	5%
Not applicable	111	99	2	9	1	16	8	6	8	-	24	19	9	10	3	1	5	53	55	112
	18%	18%	34%	15%	3%	26%	23%	12%	16%	-	19%	17%	21%	22%	22%	6%	17%	17%	19%	18%
Done or considered since early 2015	264	239	2	24	12	23	16	25	23	4	54	48	13	18	7	5	15	155	108	273
	42%	43%	23%	38%	54%	39%	46%	47%	47%	40%	42%	41%	30%	40%	46%	33%	47%	48% <i>r</i>	36%	43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 546

Q20e. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	-**	640
Done since early 2015	170	24	146	22	35	40	45	9	18	71	16	39	1	16	31	99	170	-	174
	27%	25%	27%	21%	23%	26%	32%	34%	41%zcd	31%	24%	23%	3%	21%	28%	30%	27%	-	27%
Considered since early 2015	94	10	84	10	24	25	23	3	9	23	13	29	6	6	13	55	94	-	99
	15%	11%	16%	10%	15%	16%	16%	9%	21%	10%	20%	17%	36%	8%	11%	17%	15%	-	15%
Neither done nor considered	221	33	188	42	59	61	42	10	6	70	25	68	8	33	43	106	221	-	223
	35%h	34%	35%	41%h	38%h	40%h	30%	37%	14%	31%	37%	39%	50%	45%	40%	32%	35%	-	35%
Don't know/Refused	31	3	28	-	5	5	9	3	7	13	1	8	-	-	1	20	31	-	32
	5%c	3%	5%	-	3%	6%c	12%	16%zcd	6%	2%	5%	-	-	-	1%	6%mn	5%	-	5%
Not applicable	111	26	85	28	31	22	24	2	3	49	12	29	2	19	22	49	111	-	112
	18%	27%zb	16%	27%zeh	20%h	15%	17%	7%	7%	22%	17%	17%	11%	26%o	20%	15%	18%	-	18%
Done or considered since early 2015	264	35	230	32	59	65	69	12	27	94	29	68	6	22	44	154	264	-	273
	42%	36%	43%	32%	38%	42%	48%c	44%	63%zcd	42%	43%	40%	39%	29%	40%	47%lm	42%	-	43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 547

Q20e. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
Done since early 2015	170	35	88	17	28	28	112	133	25	25	30	78	6	45	131	67	17	34	35	174
	27%	28%	27%	25%	29%	28%	27%	27%	41%zg	33%	31%	30%	22%	28%	29%	35%r	26%	28%	22%	27%
Considered since early 2015	94	12	55	13	13	20	55	74	9	20	20	39	6	24	74	35	6	19	19	99
	15%	9%	17%	20%	13%	20%	13%	15%	15%	26%zg	20%	15%	24%	14%	17%	18%	9%	15%	12%	15%
Neither done nor considered	221	50	112	21	37	37	143	180	19	16	35	94	7	57	137	53	19	37	75	223
	35%j	40%	34%	31%	37%	38%	35%	36%i	32%	21%	36%i	36%	27%	35%	31%	28%	30%	29%	47%znopq	35%
Don't know/Refused	31	4	18	3	5	3	22	24	4	4	5	13	1	11	28	16	6	10	1	32
	5%r	3%	5%	5%	5%	3%	5%	5%	7%	6%	5%	5%	3%	7%	6%r	8%r	9%r	8%r	1%	5%
Not applicable	111	25	55	13	15	11	80	91	3	10	9	39	6	26	79	23	18	24	29	112
	18%hj	20%	17%	19%	16%	11%	19%	18%hj	6%	13%	9%	15%	24%	16%	17%	12%	27%o	19%	18%	18%
Done or considered since early 2015	264	47	143	30	41	47	167	206	34	45	50	118	12	69	206	101	23	54	55	273
	42%	37%	44%	45%	42%	48%	41%	41%	56%zg	59%zg	51%	45%	47%	42%	46%r	53%zpr	35%	43%	34%	43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 548

Q20e. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
Done since early 2015	170	112	5	53	170	17	43	21	21	41	40	76	49	37	85	43	174
	27%	29%	21%	25%	27%	21%	32%	31%	23%	44% <i>zdeh</i>	24%	25%	36% <i>k</i>	27%	25%	34%	27%
Considered since early 2015	94	63	4	28	94	10	17	10	25	12	16	55	21	12	64	19	99
	15%	16%	16%	13%	15%	13%	13%	16%	27% <i>zdefi</i>	13%	10%	18% <i>j</i>	15%	8%	18% <i>m</i>	15%	15%
Neither done nor considered	221	138	11	72	221	40	54	23	27	25	69	109	39	58	120	40	223
	35%	36%	47%	34%	35%	52% <i>zdhi</i>	41% <i>i</i>	34%	28%	27%	42% <i>l</i>	35%	29%	42%	35%	32%	35%
Don't know/Refused	31	15	-	14	31	1	1	2	7	4	9	15	6	7	15	5	32
	5%	4%	-	6%	5%	1%	1%	3%	7% <i>f</i>	4%	5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%	5%
Not applicable	111	54	4	49	111	10	17	10	15	11	30	54	22	26	61	20	112
	18%	14%	16%	23% <i>a</i>	18%	12%	13%	16%	15%	12%	18%	17%	16%	18%	18%	16%	18%
Done or considered since early 2015	264	175	9	81	264	27	60	31	47	53	55	130	70	49	149	62	273
	42%	46%	37%	37%	42%	35%	45%	47%	49%	57% <i>zde</i>	34%	42%	51% <i>j</i>	35%	43%	49% <i>m</i>	43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 549

Q20e. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	21**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
Done since early 2015	170	2	1	36	2	1	11	17	7	6	13	6	5	6	3	6	7	5	21	6	174	27%
		20%	20%	24%	34%	26%	39%	23%	22%	26%	39%	41%	37%	19%	30%	62%	27%	19%	29%	23%	100%	
Considered since early 2015	94	4	-	22	1	1	5	11	10	4	1	4	1	3	2	-	5	2	4	12	-	99
	15%	36%	-	15%	13%	28%	19%	16%	29% zs	16%	8%	13%	4%	11%	11%	-	22%	6%	24%	13%	-	15%
Neither done nor considered	221	2	1	54	-	2	7	29	10	10	4	10	10	10	10	-	9	18	6	29	-	223
	35%	23%	22%	37%	-	37%	27%	40%	29%	38%	28%	31%	59%	37%	47%	-	41%	50%	31%	31%	-	35%
Don't know/Refused	31	-	-	9	-	-	1	5	2	2	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	3	-	32
	5%	-	-	6%	-	-	3%	7%	6%	4%	11%	12%	-	2%	4%	-	-	6%	6%	3%	-	5%
Not applicable	111	2	2	25	4	*	3	10	5	4	2	1	-	8	2	2	2	7	2	29	-	112
	18%	21%	59%	17%	52%	9%	12%	14%	14%	16%	15%	3%	-	31%	8%	38%	10%	18%	11%	31% zcfg	-	18%
Done or considered since early 2015	264	6	1	58	3	3	16	28	17	11	7	17	7	8	9	3	11	9	10	34	6	273
	42%	56%	20%	40%	48%	54%	58% cms	39%	51%	42%	47%	54%	41%	31%	41%	62%	49%	25%	52%	36%	100%	43%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 550

Q20f. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	640	595	13	32	28	63	40	48	41	12	116	135	50	47	11	9	34	334	299	640
Weighted total	628	558	7**	62*	22**	59*	36*	53*	48*	11**	129*	115	43*	45*	15**	14**	33**	321	299	640
Done since early 2015	377	332	3	43	16	31	16	35	28	9	86	57	23	32	10	11	19	197	174	380
	60% <i>k</i>	59%	37%	69%	72%	52%	46%	65%	58%	85%	67% <i>fk</i>	50%	53%	70% <i>fk</i>	70%	79%	59%	61%	58%	59%
Considered since early 2015	53	49	1	2	2	5	3	3	7	-	10	13	1	2	2	-	4	37	16	55
	8%	9%	17%	4%	8%	8%	9%	6%	14%	-	8%	12%	3%	4%	12%	-	14%	11% <i>r</i>	5%	9%
Neither done nor considered	104	92	2	10	3	13	9	9	10	1	13	24	9	6	1	2	4	47	57	108
	17%	17%	23%	16%	15%	21%	26% <i>j</i>	16%	20%	8%	10%	21% <i>j</i>	22%	14%	6%	15%	12%	15%	19%	17%
Don't know/Refused	16	14	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	3	5	2	2	-	-	2	11	5	15
	2%	3%	-	3%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	3%	4%	4%	4%	-	-	6%	3%	2%	2%
Not applicable	78	71	2	6	1	11	7	4	4	1	15	16	8	4	2	1	3	29	48	82
	12%	13%	23%	9%	6%	19%	19%	8%	8%	7%	12%	14%	18%	8%	12%	6%	9%	9%	16% <i>q</i>	13%
Done or considered since early 2015	430	381	4	45	17	35	20	38	35	9	97	71	24	33	12	11	24	234	190	435
	68%	68%	54%	73%	79%	60%	55%	71%	72%	85%	75% <i>kel</i>	61%	56%	74%	83%	79%	73% <i>r</i>	63%	63%	68%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 551

Q20f. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	640	99	541	102	159	148	150	29	48	229	63	178	15	70	101	355	640	-	640
Weighted total	628	97*	530	102*	154	153	143	27**	44*	226	66*	173	16**	74*	109*	329	628	-**	640
Done since early 2015	377	44	333	55	86	92	86	23	33	125	35	103	7	33	68	211	377	-	380
	60% <i>am</i>	45%	63% <i>ad</i>	54%	56%	60%	60%	86%	75% <i>cd</i>	55%	52%	60%	45%	44%	62% <i>m</i>	64% <i>m</i>	60%	-	59%
Considered since early 2015	53	12	41	10	8	13	21	-	2	20	8	14	-	4	9	32	53	-	55
	8%	12%	8%	9%	5%	8%	15% <i>zd</i>	-	4%	9%	12%	8%	-	5%	9%	10%	8%	-	9%
Neither done nor considered	104	22	82	25	26	29	19	3	2	44	14	30	8	25	17	47	104	-	108
	17%	23%	15%	24% <i>fh</i>	17%	19% <i>h</i>	13%	11%	5%	19%	22%	17%	51%	33% <i>zno</i>	15%	14%	17%	-	17%
Don't know/Refused	16	1	14	1	3	3	4	-	3	6	-	3	-	-	-	8	16	-	15
	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%	3%	-	8% <i>cd</i>	3%	-	2%	-	-	-	3%	2%	-	2%
Not applicable	78	18	60	12	32	16	14	1	3	32	10	22	1	13	15	31	78	-	82
	12%	19%	11%	12%	21% <i>zef</i>	10%	10%	3%	8%	14%	15%	13%	5%	17%	14%	9%	12%	-	13%
Done or considered since early 2015	430	55	375	65	94	105	107	23	35	145	42	118	7	37	77	242	430	-	435
	68% <i>am</i>	57%	71% <i>a</i>	64%	61%	69%	74% <i>d</i>	86%	79% <i>d</i>	64%	64%	68%	45%	50%	71% <i>m</i>	74% <i>m</i>	68%	-	68%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 552

Q20f. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	640	130	341	66	93	101	436	524	65	87	106	279	30	173	469	210	74	135	155	640
Weighted total	628	126	327	67*	98*	98*	411	501	60*	75*	99*	264	26**	163	450	193	65*	125	160	640
Done since early 2015	377	64	200	42	67	61	246	296	47	46	70	158	17	94	291	141	39	80	74	380
	60% ^r	51%	61%	64%	68% ^a	62%	60%	59%	78% ^{zgi}	61%	70% ^g	60%	65%	58%	65% ^r	73% ^{znpr}	59%	64% ^r	46%	59%
Considered since early 2015	53	9	27	7	7	10	32	45	3	9	8	21	3	18	33	14	8	15	19	55
	8%	7%	8%	10%	7%	10%	8%	9%	6%	13%	8%	8%	10%	11%	7%	7%	13%	12%	12%	9%
Neither done nor considered	104	36	47	7	13	18	68	86	4	7	11	46	3	25	58	21	5	15	42	108
	17%	29% ^{zabcd}	14%	11%	14%	18%	16%	17%	7%	9%	11%	17%	13%	15%	13%	11%	7%	12%	26% ^{znopq}	17%
Don't know/Refused	16	4	7	1	2	2	11	11	4	3	1	5	1	6	15	4	1	-	-	15
	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	7% ^z	4%	1%	2%	4%	4%	3% ^{qr}	2%	2%	-	-	2%
Not applicable	78	13	46	9	9	7	54	63	1	10	8	34	2	20	53	13	12	15	25	82
	12% ^{ho}	10%	14%	14%	9%	8%	13%	13% ^h	2%	13% ^h	9%	13%	7%	12%	12%	7%	15% ^o	12%	16% ^o	13%
Done or considered since early 2015	430	73	228	49	74	71	278	341	51	55	78	179	19	112	324	154	47	95	93	435
	68% ^{ar}	58%	69% ^a	73%	76% ^a	73%	68%	68%	84% ^{zg}	73%	79% ^{zg}	68%	75%	69%	72% ^r	80% ^{znr}	72%	77% ^r	58%	68%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 553

Q20f. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	640	392	25	220	640	72	132	69	102	99	169	319	136	144	357	126	640
Weighted total	628	382	24**	216	628	77*	132	66*	95*	94*	163	307	138	140	345	127	640
Done since early 2015	377	236	12	129	377	49	80	36	55	76	90	183	94	69	212	92	380
	60% <i>m</i>	62%	50%	60%	60%	64%	61%	54%	58%	81% <i>szdefgh</i>	55%	59%	68% <i>ij</i>	50%	61% <i>m</i>	73% <i>zmn</i>	59%
Considered since early 2015	53	38	3	12	53	5	10	9	9	6	12	28	10	12	32	7	55
	8%	10%	11%	6%	8%	6%	8%	14%	9%	7%	8%	9%	7%	8%	9%	6%	9%
Neither done nor considered	104	59	8	35	104	16	26	12	14	7	40	50	11	37	53	10	108
	17% <i>lo</i>	15%	35%	16%	17% <i>l</i>	21% <i>l</i>	20% <i>l</i>	18%	15%	8%	24% <i>zl</i>	16% <i>l</i>	8%	26% <i>zno</i>	15%	8%	17%
Don't know/Refused	16	9	1	4	16	1	2	1	4	-	3	8	4	3	7	4	15
	2%	2%	5%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	4%	-	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%
Not applicable	78	41	-	35	78	6	13	8	13	4	18	38	18	19	42	13	82
	12% <i>l</i>	11%	-	16%	12% <i>l</i>	8%	10%	12%	14% <i>l</i>	4%	11%	12%	13%	14%	12%	11%	13%
Done or considered since early 2015	430	274	15	141	430	54	91	45	64	83	102	211	104	81	244	99	435
	68% <i>m</i>	72%	60%	65%	68%	70%	69%	68%	68%	88% <i>szdefgh</i>	63%	69%	76% <i>ij</i>	58%	71% <i>m</i>	78% <i>m</i>	68%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 554

Q20f. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	640	10	3	163	10	7	38	60	41	21	16	25	18	37	16	3	24	30	13	102	3	640
Weighted total	628	11**	3**	147	7**	5**	27*	73*	34*	27**	15**	32**	17**	27*	21**	5**	23**	35**	19**	94*	6**	640
Done since early 2015	377	6	3	78	4	3	16	41	21	13	7	27	14	19	11	5	14	22	14	55	6	380
	60%	52%	78%	53%	49%	67%	57%	56%	61%	49%	47%	82%	82%	72% ^c	50%	100%	61%	62%	75%	59%	100%	59%
Considered since early 2015	53	1	-	14	1	1	5	6	3	7	3	1	-	-	3	-	1	1	-	7	-	55
	8%	13%	-	9%	7%	13%	17% ^m	8%	9%	25%	17%	4%	-	2%	15%	-	3%	3%	-	8%	-	9%
Neither done nor considered	104	3	1	32	-	1	3	11	5	4	4	2	3	4	5	-	5	5	1	15	-	108
	17%	28%	22%	22%	-	20%	13%	14%	16%	25%	6%	18%	17%	24%	-	20%	13%	13%	7%	16%	-	17%
Don't know/Refused	16	-	-	6	-	-	-	3	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	15
	2%	-	-	4%	-	2%	4%	3%	-	11%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	6%	1%	-	2%
Not applicable	78	1	-	17	3	-	3	12	4	3	-	2	-	2	2	-	4	7	2	15	-	82
	12%	7%	-	12%	44%	-	12%	17%	11%	12%	-	6%	-	9%	12%	-	17%	19%	12%	16%	-	13%
Done or considered since early 2015	430	7	3	92	4	4	20	47	24	20	10	28	14	20	14	5	14	23	14	62	6	435
	68%	66%	78%	63%	56%	80%	74%	64%	70%	74%	64%	86%	82%	74%	65%	100%	63%	65%	75%	66%	100%	68%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 555

Q20a-f. I'm going to read out a list and I'd like you to tell me if your organisation has done this at any of its sites since early 2015, and if not, if it's something your organisation has considered at any point since early 2015

Summary

Base: all participants who own or lease vehicles for commercial use

	Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights	Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail	Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or	Driver awareness training (eco-driving, training, idling practices, etc.)	Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles	Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys e.g. better cycling facilities.
Unweighted total	640	640	640	640	640	640
Weighted total	628	628	628	628	628	628
Done since early 2015	262 42%	51 8%	203 32%	265 42%	170 27%	377 60%
Considered since early 2015	67 11%	29 5%	45 7%	60 10%	94 15%	53 8%
Neither done nor considered	155 25%	150 24%	174 28%	166 26%	221 35%	104 17%
Don't know/Refused	46 7%	44 7%	52 8%	37 6%	31 5%	16 2%
Not applicable	97 16%	354 56%	153 24%	99 16%	111 18%	78 12%
Done or considered since early 2015	329 52%	80 13%	248 40%	326 52%	264 42%	430 68%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 556

Q21. Since early 2015, overall would you say that the amount of action your organisation takes on energy efficiency has increased, decreased or stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Increased since early 2015	522	458	7	56	15	35	25	40	41	12	133	88	41	34	8	15	29	246	271	530
	60%e	60%	65%	58%	65%	46%	54%	68%e	63%	68%	58%	61%e	68%e	62%	42%	87%	62%	57%	64%	61%
Decreased since early 2015	30	29	-	2	*	4	4	2	3	1	3	6	2	2	2	-	*	14	16	32
	3%	4%	-	2%	2%	6%	9%j	3%	4%	4%	1%	4%	3%	4%	10%	-	1%	3%	4%	4%
Stayed the same since early 2015	313	271	4	38	8	36	17	17	22	5	90	50	16	19	9	2	17	169	137	306
	36%	36%	35%	39%	33%	48%zgl	37%	29%	33%	28%	39%	34%	26%	34%	48%	13%	37%	39%r	32%	35%
Don't know	6	4	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	4	2	3
	1%	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	3%	-	-	-	-	1%	*	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 557

Q21. Since early 2015, overall would you say that the amount of action your organisation takes on energy efficiency has increased, decreased or stayed the same?

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owred (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total 871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Increased since early 2015 522 60%	97	425	107	132	122	104	22	31	187	66	163	21	76	85	250	382	134	530
Decreased since early 2015 30 3%	9	22	7	3	4	11	1	4	9	-	12	4	4	5	14	24	6	32
Stayed the same since early 2015 313 36%	61	252	83	72	62	65	10	20	106	36	102	17	42	56	142	216	95	306
Don't know 6 1%	-	6	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	6	-	3
	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	2% <i>f</i>	1%	-	-	-	*	1%	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 558

Q21. Since early 2015, overall would you say that the amount of action your organisation takes on energy efficiency has increased, decreased or stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Increased since early 2015	522	114	263	62 ^{cd}	74	85	330	425	42	66	90	226	20	146	365	140	50	102	138	530
	60%	58%	62%	70%	50%	74%	57%	62%	52%	66%	64%	64%	64%	66%	61%	56%	55%	64%	56%	61%
Decreased since early 2015	30	12	14	2	3	2	23	26	4	4	9	12	3	5	24	11	5	7	7	32
	3%	6%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%	7%	3%	8%	2%	4%	4%	5%	4%	3%	4%
Stayed the same since early 2015	313	67	145	25	69	27	223	233	35	30	41	114	8	70	205	100	36	50	101	306
	36%	35%	34%	28%	47%	23%	39%	34%	44%	30%	29%	32%	27%	32%	34%	40%	40%	31%	41%	35%
Don't know	6	2	2	-	2	2	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	3
	1%	1%	*	-	1%	2%	*	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 559

Q21. Since early 2015, overall would you say that the amount of action your organisation takes on energy efficiency has increased, decreased or stayed the same?

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		(p)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Increased since early 2015	522	522	-	-	522	64	106	61	77	72	127	265	117	113	296	99	530
	60% <i>cj</i>	100% <i>zc</i>	-	-	60%	53%	63%	69% <i>e</i>	59%	62%	52%	64% <i>fj</i>	62% <i>jl</i>	52%	65% <i>nm</i>	57%	61%
Decreased since early 2015	30	30	-	-	30	5	8	1	5	5	9	16	6	9	15	6	32
	3% <i>ac</i>	100%	-	-	3%	4%	5%	2%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%
Stayed the same since early 2015	313	-	-	313	313	50	52	26	49	39	109	129	65	95	146	67	306
	36% <i>ad</i>	-	-	100% <i>za</i>	36%	41%	31%	30%	37%	33%	44% <i>zk</i>	31%	35%	44% <i>no</i>	32%	39%	35%
Don't know	6	-	-	-	6	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	3
	1%	-	-	-	1%	2%	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 560

Q21. Since early 2015, overall would you say that the amount of action your organisation takes on energy efficiency has increased, decreased or stayed the same?

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Increased since early 2015	522	11	1	93	6	2	21	55	20	22	11	39	19	29	22	3	28	28	19	90	4	530
	60%	100%	13%	54%	57%	43%	67%	68%	55%	57%	39%	52%	63%	63%	65%	62%	62%	60%	64%	66% ^c	49%	61%
Decreased since early 2015	30	-	2	3	-	1	4	5	5	-	-	-	*	2	-	2	-	-	3	4	-	32
	3%	-	40%	2%	-	11%	13% ^{zckpqs}	6%	13% ^{zckpqs}	-	-	2%	4%	-	38%	-	-	11%	3%	-	-	4%
Stayed the same since early 2015	313	-	2	73	4	3	6	21	12	17	16	36	11	15	12	-	17	19	7	40	4	306
	36% ^f	-	47%	43% ^{fgs}	43%	46%	20%	26%	33%	43%	55%	46% ^{fgs}	35%	33%	35%	-	38%	40%	24%	29%	51%	35%
Don't know	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 561

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	530	489	13	28	19	40	29	37	34	12	121	104	45	38	6	11	30	254	271	530
Weighted total	522	458	7**	56**	15**	35*	25**	40*	41**	12**	133	88*	41*	34*	8**	15**	29**	246	271	530
Increased Action	486	427	7	51	13	33	23	40	41	9	123	80	38	32	8	15	23	231	251	484
	93%	93%	100%	91%	84%	95%	93%	100%	100%	78%	93%	91%	94%	95%	100%	100%	79%	94%	92%	93%
To reduce energy expenditure	103	98	1	4	3	11	7	6	10	3	19	18	9	6	2	3	6	46	55	107
	20%	21%	9%	8%	19%	32%j	27%	16%	25%	26%	14%	20%	21%	17%	23%	20%	20%	19%	20%	20%
Increasing energy prices	41	37	2	2	1	1	3	5	2	-	8	7	9	4	1	1	*	18	23	46
	8%	8%	25%	3%	4%	2%	12%	14%	5%	-	6%	8%	21%zejk	11%	13%	5%	2%	7%	8%	9%
Carbon footprint/sustainability/climate change/environmental concerns/reduce carbon emissions	115	103	3	9	3	6	4	12	12	2	39	16	7	7	2	2	2	48	67	120
	22%	23%	36%	15%	19%	17%	15%	31%	30%	17%	29%	18%	17%	21%	24%	14%	8%	20%	25%	23%
Shift in corporate ethos	42	39	-	3	1	2	3	3	3	1	14	5	3	-	-	3	2	23	18	43
	8%	8%	-	5%	6%	5%	11%	9%	7%	12%	10%	6%	7%	-	-	18%	8%	9%	6%	8%
Response to Climate Change Levy	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
Response to climate change agreements (CCAs)	6	6	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	7
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	3%	3%	-	-	4%zj	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
Improve Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
Improve Display Energy Certificates (DEC) rating	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	3%z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
ESOS requirements	138	136	2	-	6	9	7	9	16	4	28	26	6	9	4	2	9	79	59	149
	26%	30%	32%	-	42%	26%	29%	22%	39%	35%	21%	29%	15%	26%	53%	11%	32%r	32%r	22%	28%
ESOS requirements (e.g. to implement an energy audit)	75	74	1	-	2	6	3	6	6	1	18	14	3	5	2	1	5	44	32	79
	14%	16%	18%	-	13%	18%	10%	15%	14%	12%	14%	15%	7%	16%	25%	6%	18%	18%	12%	15%
ESOS requirements - In response to ESOS audit recommendations	60	59	1	-	3	2	5	4	11	3	8	14	1	1	4	1	4	35	25	65
	12%	13%	14%	-	16%	5%	18%	9%	27%	23%	6%	15%jl	3%	3%	53%	5%	13%	14%	9%	12%
ESOS requirements - To help gather information needed for ESOS audits	9	9	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	3	-	1	-	-	-	6	2	9
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	3%	3%	-	2%	-	-	-	3%	1%	2%
ESOS requirements - To help meet requirements of ISO 50001 for ESOS compliance	19	19	-	-	2	1	3	-	-	-	2	4	2	3	2	1	-	12	7	22
	4%	4%	-	-	12%	3%	10%	-	-	-	1%	5%	5%	7%	25%	6%	-	5%	3%	4%
Reduce costs for tenants (landlords)	6	4	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	6
	1%	1%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 561

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Weighted total	522	458	7**	56**	15**	35*	25**	40*	41**	12**	133	88*	41*	34*	8**	15**	29**	246	271	530
Other environmental/energy efficiency agreements	31 6%	28 6%	-	2 4%	1 4%	4 11%g	4 16%	-	2 4%	2 15%	8 6%	4 5%	3 6%	3 8%	-	-	2 5%	19 8%	11 4%	31 6%
To improve/protect reputation	27 5%	23 5%	-	5 8%	2 12%	1 2%	-	1 3%	3 8%	-	11 8%	4 4%	4 9%	2 5%	-	-	1 3%	17 7%	10 4%	28 5%
To show leadership on energy efficiency	25 5%	22 5%	1 8%	2 4%	-	2 7%	4 10%k	3 8%	-	8 6%	2 2%	1 3%	2 5%	1 5%	-	-	2 6%	11 4%	13 5%	25 5%
To assist in meeting internal targets	19 4%	19 4%	-	-	-	3 10%k	1 4%	2 4%	1 4%	-	4 3%	2 2%	1 4%	2 5%	-	-	3 10%	12 5%	7 3%	21 4%
Reduce cost/make savings	199 38%	163 35%	1 20%	35 62%	4 26%	15 43%	12 48%	21 52%jk	2 16%	27 28%	12 31%	21 51%jk	21 61%zjk	2 24%	7 43%	7 26%	83 34%	114 42%	198 37%	
CRC requirements	9 2%	8 2%	-	2 2%	1 9%	-	-	1 2%	1 3%	-	2 1%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	6 2%	3 1%	9 2%	
Legislation/regulation/government targets	50 10%	46 10%	-	3 6%	1 6%	5 15%	4 18%	4 9%	4 9%	1 8%	8 6%	7 7%	6 14%	4 11%	2 22%	2 16%	26 10%	23 8%	49 9%	
Decreased Action	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
Lack of finance	2	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
Financial requirement / to control costs	6 1%	4 1%	-	4%	-	1 3%	-	1 3%	-	-	4 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%	3 1%	5 1%
Availability of money / resources	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	2 6%zj	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%	-	3 1%
Because of the customers / clients / client requirements	9 2%	9 2%	-	-	1 4%	-	2 7%	1 3%	-	-	1 1%	1 2%	1 3%	-	-	-	1 4%	4 2%	4 2%	9 2%
Board level interest	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	
Company has expanded / is planning on expanding	4 1%	4 1%	-	-	1 6%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	2 4%z	-	-	-	3 1%	1 *	4 1%	
Office refurb	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 15%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1 *	2 *	
Company moved to new premises	3 1%	1	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%	1 *	3 1%	
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	8 1%	5 1%	-	3 5%	2 11%	1 2%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	3 18%	1 4%	3 1%	4 2%	6 1%	
CSR / Corporate Social Responsibility	6 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 3%	-	-	1 3%	-	-	-	4 2%	2 1%	5 1%	
Employee engagement / interest	6 1%	6 1%	-	-	1 5%	-	-	-	1 7%	3 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 2%q	6 1%	
Health and safety	2	2	-	-	-	1 2%	1 4%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 561

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Weighted total	522	458	71*	56**	15**	35*	25**	40*	41**	12**	133	88*	41*	34*	8**	15**	29**	246	271	530
Increased awareness / environmental awareness	10 2%	8 2%	-	2 3%	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	5 5%j	1 2%	2 5%j	-	-	-	2	6	11
It was needed / necessary / replacements / updates were required	6 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	1 4%j	1 2%	* 1%	-	1 8%	-	-	-	1 3%	-	-	1 4%	4	2	6
ISO 14001	11 2%	11 2%	-	-	-	2 5%	2 8%	-	-	2 15%	1	1 2%	2 5%	1 2%	-	-	1 4%	7	4	12
Board / Management decision / change in management	7 1%	7 2%	-	-	1 5%	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	3 4%	1 3%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	6	7
Pressure from investors	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1	3
To improve efficiency	6 1%	4 1%	-	2 3%	-	-	1 4%	1 4%	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	1	5	5
Funding / grants / support	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	* 2%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
New scheme has been put in place	2 *	2 *	-	-	1 4%	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3
Other	17 3%	15 3%	-	2 4%	-	-	1 4%	-	2 4%	-	4 3%	5 5%	1 4%	1 4%	-	-	2 8%	8	9	18
Don't know/refused	3 *	1 *	-	2 3%	2 11%	-	-	-	-	1 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 562

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	530	97	433	104	140	120	109	21	32	189	61	165	21	71	81	266	392	133	530
Weighted total	522	97*	425	107*	132	122*	104*	22**	31**	187	66*	163	21**	76*	85*	250	382	134	530
Increased Action	486	90	396	97	121	115	99	20	30	174	64	152	17	72	80	239	355	125	494
	93%	92%	93%	90%	91%	94%	96%	94%	95%	93%	97%	93%	83%	94%	94%	96%	93%	93%	93%
To reduce energy expenditure	103	20	83	19	27	23	23	6	5	47	12	24	1	14	19	58	80	23	107
	20%	20%	20%	18%	21%	18%	22%	26%	15%	25%k	18%	15%	5%	18%	23%	23%	21%	17%	20%
Increasing energy prices	41	5	35	6	12	6	12	3	3	22	*	8	-	7	6	26	29	11	46
	8%	6%	8%	6%	9%	5%	11%	14%	8%	12%jk	1%	5%	-	10%	7%	10%	7%	8%	9%
Carbon footprint/sustainability/climate change/environmental concerns/reduce carbon emissions	115	23	92	19	29	24	29	6	9	45	10	35	2	17	14	60	86	28	120
	22%	23%	22%	18%	22%	20%	28%	27%	27%	24%	14%	21%	9%	22%	17%	24%	22%	21%	23%
Shift in corporate ethos	42	5	36	8	8	12	8	1	4	14	6	15	1	7	10	19	27	13	43
	8%	5%	9%	8%	6%	10%	8%	4%	14%	7%	9%	9%	2%	9%	11%	8%	7%	10%	8%
Response to Climate Change Levy	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	2%	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
Response to climate change agreements (CCAs)	6	2	4	2	3	1	1	-	-	3	-	2	-	1	2	4	5	1	7
	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	-	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Improve Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
Improve Display Energy Certificates (DEC) rating	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
ESOS requirements	138	26	112	29	35	38	22	7	5	42	23	52	5	14	30	66	100	36	149
	26%	27%	26%	27%	27%	31%	21%	32%	18%	22%	35%	32%	22%	18%	35%am	26%	26%	27%	28%
ESOS requirements (e.g. to implement an energy audit)	75	15	60	16	19	22	12	3	3	20	13	35	1	5	17	40	53	22	79
	14%	16%	14%	15%	14%	18%	12%	13%	11%	11%	20%	22%z	6%	7%	20%am	16%	14%	16%	15%
ESOS requirements - In response to ESOS audit recommendations	60	11	49	15	13	15	12	5	1	20	10	19	3	7	15	27	44	15	65
	12%	11%	12%	14%	10%	12%	12%	21%	3%	11%	16%	11%	16%	9%	17%	11%	12%	11%	12%
ESOS requirements - To help gather information needed for ESOS audits	9	-	9	2	1	1	2	-	2	2	2	3	-	-	-	5	4	5	9
	2%	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	-	5%	1%	3%	2%	-	-	-	2%	1%	4%p	2%
ESOS requirements - To help meet requirements of ISO 50001 for ESOS compliance	19	4	15	3	6	3	2	3	1	6	1	9	-	2	2	11	17	2	22
	4%	4%	4%	3%	5%	3%	2%	16%	4%	3%	1%	5%	-	3%	2%	4%	4%	2%	4%
Reduce costs for tenants (landlords)	6	3	3	3	2	1	-	-	1	1	1	3	-	-	4	2	4	2	6
	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	-	5%zo	1%	1%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 562

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owmed (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Weighted total	522	97*	425	107*	132	122*	104*	22**	31**	187	66*	163	21**	76*	85*	250	382	134	530
Other environmental/ energy efficiency agreements	31 6%	4 4%	27 6%	3 3%	8 6%	12 10% <i>f</i>	2 1%	4 18%	2 5%	9 5%	4 6%	13 8%	1 6%	4 5%	5 6%	16 6%	26 7%	5 4%	31 6%
To improve/protect reputation	27 5%	4 4%	23 6%	6 6%	2 2%	8 6%	9 8% <i>d</i>	1 4%	2 5%	6 3%	4 6%	10 6%	3 15%	5 6%	1 1%	15 6%	22 6%	4 3%	28 5%
To show leadership on energy efficiency	25 5%	5 5%	20 5%	2 2%	7 6%	7 6%	5 5%	2 8%	1 3%	8 4%	2 3%	1 5%	-	4 5%	2 3%	15 6%	18 5%	5 4%	25 5%
To assist in meeting internal targets	19 4%	2 2%	17 4%	1 1%	4 3%	6 5%	4 4%	1 4%	3 10%	5 3%	* 1%	7 4%	-	2 2%	3 3%	13 5%	15 4%	4 3%	21 4%
Reduce cost/make savings	199 38% <i>n</i>	29 30%	170 40%	37 34%	45 34%	53 44%	42 41%	10 47%	10 33%	78 42%	18 27%	58 36%	9 43%	32 42% <i>n</i>	21 24%	104 41% <i>n</i>	158 41%	41 31%	198 37%
CRC requirements	9 2%	1 1%	8 2%	1 1%	2 2%	2 2%	1 1%	2 10%	1 4%	3 2%	2 3%	3 2%	-	-	1 2%	5 2%	6 1%	3 2%	9 2%
Legislation/ regulation/government targets	50 10%	14 14%	36 8%	12 11%	13 10%	9 8%	8 7%	3 14%	4 13%	13 7%	8 12%	21 13%	3 14%	6 8%	9 10%	25 10%	35 9%	15 11%	49 9%
Decreased Action	2 *	-	2 1%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 3% <i>zo</i>	-	-	-	2 2% <i>p</i>	1 *
Lack of finance	2 *	-	2 1%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 3% <i>zo</i>	-	-	-	2 2% <i>p</i>	1 *
Financial requirement / to control costs	6 1%	2 2%	4 1%	1 1%	2 2%	1 1%	-	1 6%	1 3%	5 2%	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 *	3 1%	3 3%	5 1%
Availability of money / resources	3 1%	1 1%	2 *	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	1 2%	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 *	2 *	1 1%	3 1%
Because of the customers / clients / client requirements	9 2%	1 1%	7 2%	1 1%	3 2%	2 2%	1 1%	-	3 3%	2 3%	* *	2 *	2 9%	1 -	4 1%	4 2%	5 1%	9 3%	9 2%
Board level interest	2 *	-	2 *	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 *	2 *	-	2 *
Company has expanded / is planning on expanding	4 1%	-	4 1%	1 1%	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	2 1%	1 4%	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	3 1%	1 1%	4 1%
Office refurb	3 1%	-	3 1%	1 1%	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 -	-	2 2% <i>o</i>	1 1%	-	3 1%	-	2 *
Company moved to new premises	3 1%	-	3 1%	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	-	1 2%	2 1%	-	1 1%	2 8%	-	-	1 *	2 1%	1 1%	3 1%
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	8 1%	-	8 2%	1 1%	-	4 3%	3 3%	-	-	1 *	4 6% <i>zi</i>	2 1%	-	-	-	4 1%	8 2%	-	6 1%
CSR / Corporate Social Responsibility	6 1%	2 2%	4 1%	3 3%	-	2 1%	1 1%	-	-	2 1%	-	4 2%	-	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	5 1%	1 1%	5 1%
Employee engagement / interest	6 1%	1 1%	5 1%	-	3 3%	2 2%	-	-	-	3 1%	-	1 *	-	* 1%	3 3%	2 1%	4 1%	2 1%	6 1%
Health and safety	2 *	1 1%	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	1 1%	1 2%	-	1 1%	1 *	2 *	1 *	3 1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 562

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Weighted total	522	97*	425	107*	132	122*	104*	22**	31**	187	66*	163	21**	76*	85*	250	382	134	530
Increased awareness / environmental awareness	10 2%	1 1%	9 2%	2 2%	4 3%	1 1%	2 2%	-	-	2 1%	1 2%	-	-	*	-	7 3%	8 2%	1 1%	11 2%
It was needed / necessary / replacements / updates were required	6 1%	3 3% 	2 1%	3 3%	2 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	2 1%	-	4 2%	-	2 2%	3 3%	1 1%	5 1%	*	6 1%
ISO 14001	11 2%	3 3%	8 2%	2 2%	5 3%	3 3%	1 1%	-	-	4 2%	2 3%	4 2%	1 6%	2 2%	2 3%	3 1%	10 3%	1 1%	12 2%
Board / Management decision / change in management	7 1%	2 2%	5 1%	2 2%	2 2%	2 1%	-	1 3%	-	2 1%	-	4 2%	-	-	-	5 2%	6 2%	1 1%	7 1%
Pressure from investors	3 1%	1 1%	2 *	2 2%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	1 *	2 1%	3 1%
To improve efficiency	6 1%	-	6 1%	1 1%	-	2 2%	2 2%	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	2 2%	2 1%	5 1%	1 1%	5 1%
Funding / grants / support	2 *	-	2 *	-	-	*	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	*	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	2 *	-	2 *
New scheme has been put in place	2 *	-	2 1%	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 4%	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 1%	2 1%	-	3 1%
Other	17 3%	2 2%	15 3%	4 3%	8 6% 	2 2%	-	3 16%	-	5 2%	5 7%	3 2%	1 3%	3 4%	1 1%	8 3%	12 3%	5 4%	18 3%
Don't know/refused	3 *	-	3 1%	2 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	2 1%	2 *

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 563

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	530	117	273	62	70	86	352	445	43	78	94	241	21	152	379	153	51	104	135	530
Weighted total	522	114*	263	62*	74*	85*	330	425	42*	66*	90*	226	20**	146	365	140	50*	102*	138	530
Increased Action	486	165	242	60	72	83	304	395	40	65	82	214	20	127	343	131	45	97	129	484
	93% ^m	92%	92%	97%	97%	97%	92%	93%	97%	99% ^j	91%	94% ^m	100%	87%	94%	94%	91%	94%	93%	93%
To reduce energy expenditure	103	20	57	12	11	20	66	88	10	14	17	46	4	24	81	30	12	27	21	107
	20%	17%	22%	20%	15%	24%	20%	21%	24%	22%	19%	20%	22%	16%	22%	21%	25%	26%	15%	20%
Increasing energy prices	41	8	25	4	4	7	27	34	5	9	11	16	4	13	34	15	9	11	7	46
	8%	7%	9%	6%	5%	8%	8%	8%	12%	14%	12%	7%	20%	9%	9%	11%	17% ^{zr}	11%	5%	9%
Carbon footprint/sustainability/climate change/environmental concerns/reduce carbon emissions	115	24	55	15	16	18	79	101	10	19	22	56	3	32	81	41	13	25	29	120
	22%	21%	21%	24%	21%	21%	24%	24%	24%	29%	24%	25%	17%	22%	22%	29%	27%	24%	21%	23%
Shift in corporate ethos	42	11	17	3	8	3	32	34	2	5	5	23	1	8	31	13	5	9	10	43
	8%	10%	6%	5%	11%	4%	10%	8%	4%	8%	6%	10%	5%	5%	9%	9%	11%	9%	7%	8%
Response to Climate Change Levy	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	1
	*	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	2% ^g	-	1%	-	-	*	*	*	-	1%	-	*
Response to climate change agreements (CCAs)	6	2	3	1	-	2	4	6	-	1	2	4	-	1	6	1	2	4	-	7
	1%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	1%	-	2%	3%	2%	-	1%	2%	*	4% ^r	4% ^r	-	1%
Improve Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	1%	-	*	-	-	1%	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*
Improve Display Energy Certificates (DEC) rating	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1
	*	-	-	2%	-	-	*	*	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	*	-	2% ^z	-	-	*
ESOS requirements	138	32	67	16	23	32	89	120	13	25	15	68	6	37	90	30	13	19	47	149
	26%	28%	25%	26%	31%	38% ^z	27%	28% ^j	32%	38% ^j	17%	30%	32%	25%	24%	22%	27%	18%	34% ^{oq}	28%
ESOS requirements (e.g. to implement an energy audit)	75	20	33	10	13	15	54	67	8	12	9	37	2	22	52	18	9	11	23	79
	14%	18%	12%	16%	17%	18%	16%	16%	19%	19%	10%	16%	12%	15%	14%	13%	18%	11%	17%	15%
ESOS requirements - In response to ESOS audit recommendations	60	11	33	6	10	14	44	57	3	4	7	29	4	15	38	16	3	7	23	65
	12%	10%	12%	9%	14%	16%	13%	13%	7%	6%	7%	13%	20%	10%	10%	12%	7%	7%	16% ^q	12%
ESOS requirements - To help gather information needed for ESOS audits	9	1	3	2	3	5	3	8	2	-	1	1	1	4	6	3	2	2	1	9
	2%	1%	1%	3%	4%	6% ^{zf}	1%	2%	4%	-	1%	*	4%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%
ESOS requirements - To help meet requirements of ISO 50001 for ESOS compliance	19	2	10	3	3	7	3	10	3	16	3	12	-	6	14	8	2	4	5	22
	4% ^f	2%	4%	4%	4%	8% ^f	1%	2%	6%	25% ^{zghj}	3%	5%	-	4%	4%	5%	5%	3%	4%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Weighted total	522	114*	263	62*	74*	85*	330	425	42*	66*	90*	226	20**	146	365	140	50*	102*	138	530
Reduce costs for tenants (landlords)	6	1	1	4	-	2	2	4	1	1	2	3	-	1	2	2	-	-	1	6
1%	1%	-	-	6%zb	-	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%
Other environmental/energy efficiency agreements	31	6	16	6	2	6	19	24	2	5	2	16	1	4	28	8	2	7	3	31
6%	5%	6%	10%	2%	7%	6%	6%	6%	5%	8%	2%	7%	4%	3%	8%r	6%	4%	7%	2%	6%
To improve/protect reputation	27	2	18	5	2	7	13	20	4	7	6	12	2	6	18	10	1	5	9	28
5%	2%	7%	7%	3%	8%	4%	4%	5%	9%	11%g	7%	5%	10%	4%	5%	7%	3%	5%	7%	5%
To show leadership on energy efficiency	25	4	13	5	2	6	13	16	4	5	3	9	1	8	19	10	3	2	5	25
5%	3%	5%	8%	3%	7%	4%	4%	4%	9%	8%	3%	4%	3%	5%	5%	7%	6%	2%	3%	5%
To assist in meeting internal targets	19	1	9	5	3	5	14	18	1	5	3	10	-	5	19	13	4	3	-	21
4%r	1%	3%	8%a	4%	6%	4%	4%	4%	2%	8%	3%	5%	-	3%	5%r	9%zr	8%r	3%	-	4%
Reduce cost/make savings	199	41	106	24	26	30	122	153	20	24	38	91	10	52	140	48	17	37	55	198
38%	36%	40%	39%	35%	35%	37%	36%	48%	37%	42%	40%	53%	36%	38%	34%	33%	36%	39%	37%	37%
CRC requirements	9	4	4	-	1	1	7	7	2	1	1	3	-	4	8	7	-	2	1	9
2%	3%	2%	-	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	4%	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	5%zr	-	2%	-	2%
Legislation/regulation/government targets	50	8	23	7	12	7	27	35	6	12	8	16	2	20	35	14	8	10	13	49
10%	7%	9%	11%	16%	8%	8%	8%	14%	18%zg	9%	7%	12%	13%	10%	10%	16%	10%	10%	10%	9%
Decreased Action	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	1
*	2%b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%zgj	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	2%	-	*
Lack of finance	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	1
*	2%b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%zgj	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	2%	-	*
Financial requirement / to control costs	6	1	3	-	-	1	3	6	-	-	2	1	-	1	3	2	2	3	3	5
1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	2%	2%	-	-	3%	*	-	1%	1%	1%	4%	3%	2%	1%
Availability of money / resources	3	-	2	-	1	1	2	3	-	1	-	-	-	3	3	3	1	2	-	3
1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	2%	1%	2%	-	-	1%
Because of the customers / clients / client requirements	9	2	5	-	1	-	7	7	-	2	-	6	-	7	7	1	-	3	1	9
2%	2%	2%	-	1%	-	2%	2%	2%	-	2%	-	3%	-	*	2%	1%	-	3%	1%	2%
Board level interest	2	1	-	1	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
*	1%	-	1%	-	-	*	*	*	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*
Company has expanded / is planning on expanding	4	-	3	2	-	1	2	4	-	-	1	-	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	4
1%	-	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	12%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%
Office refurb	3	-	1	2	-	-	3	3	-	-	1	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	2
1%	-	*	3%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*
Company moved to new premises	3	3	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	3
1%	2%b	-	-	1%	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	2%	*	*	-	-	-	1%
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	8	2	2	1	3	1	4	5	1	1	3	3	-	2	5	2	-	1	3	6
1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	2%	1%
CSR / Corporate Social Responsibility	6	2	4	-	-	-	3	3	-	3	2	4	-	2	5	4	4	4	1	5
1%	2%	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	5%zg	2%	2%	-	1%	1%	3%	8%znr	4%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 563

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Weighted total	522	114*	263	62*	74*	85*	330	425	42*	66*	90*	226	20**	146	365	140	50*	102*	138	530
Employee engagement / interest	6 1%	-	5	1	-	2	4	6	-	-	3	-	-	6	4	1	-	-	2	6
Health and safety	2 *	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	3
Increased awareness / environmental awareness	10 2%	2	4	1	*	1	5	8	-	-	2	3	-	3	5	3	1	-	2	11
It was needed / necessary / replacements / updates were required	6 1%	3	3	-	-	1	4	6	*	*	2	1	-	4	4	-	1	3	2	6
ISO 14001	11 2%	2	5	3	1	1	9	10	1	1	1	6	1	2	9	1	1	3	2	12
Board / Management decision / change in management	7 1%	-	4	3	-	1	6	6	2	-	1	4	-	2	4	2	-	-	1	7
Pressure from investors	3 1%	-	1	-	1	-	3	3	-	-	-	2	-	1	3	2	-	-	-	3
To improve efficiency	6 1%	1	4	-	-	1	2	4	1	-	2	2	1	-	4	1	-	-	1	5
Funding / grants / support	2 *	-	*	1	-	-	2	2	-	1	1	*	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	2
New scheme has been put in place	2 *	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	3
Other	17 3%	5	7	1	2	3	9	12	-	2	1	6	1	4	16	6	5	7	1	18
Don't know/refused	3 *	2	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 564

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	530	530	-	-	530	59	110	63	85	72	133	270	114	118	303	96	530
Weighted total	522	522	**	**	522	64*	106*	61*	77*	72*	127	265	117*	113	296	99*	530
Increased Action	486	486	-	-	486	55	103	58	71	68	110	254	109	100	281	92	494
	93% _j	93%	-	-	93%	86%	97% _e	95%	93%	94%	87%	96% _j	93%	88%	95% _m	94%	93%
To reduce energy expenditure	103	103	-	-	103	9	17	14	18	16	28	52	19	23	15	18	107
	20%	20%	-	-	20%	14%	16%	23%	24%	22%	22%	19%	16%	20%	20%	18%	20%
Increasing energy prices	41	41	-	-	41	2	6	6	9	12	7	24	9	4	27	9	46
	8%	8%	-	-	8%	3%	5%	10%	12%	17% _{zdef}	6%	9%	7%	4%	9%	9%	9%
Carbon footprint/sustainability/climate change/environmental concerns/reduce carbon emissions	115	115	-	-	115	5	24	15	18	22	17	66	28	16	70	24	120
	22% _{ej}	22%	-	-	22% _e	8%	23% _e	25% _e	23% _e	30% _e	13%	25% _j	24% _j	14%	24% _m	24%	23%
Shift in corporate ethos	42	42	-	-	42	8	8	3	9	6	10	22	8	8	22	10	43
	8%	8%	-	-	8%	13%	7%	5%	12%	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%	11%	11%	8%
Response to Climate Change Levy	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*	-	-	*	-	*
Response to climate change agreements (CCAs)	6	6	-	-	6	-	2	2	1	1	-	1	5	-	3	3	7
	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	2%	3%	1%	1%	-	1%	4% _{j/k}	-	3%	3%	1%
Improve Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*
Improve Display Energy Certificates (DEC) rating	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	*
ESOS requirements	138	138	-	-	138	24	35	13	20	9	45	69	20	41	78	16	149
	26% _{il}	26%	-	-	26% _{il}	38% _{il}	33% _{il}	22%	25% _{il}	12%	36% _{zl}	26%	17%	36% _{zo}	26%	16%	28%
ESOS requirements (e.g. to implement an energy audit)	75	75	-	-	75	12	22	8	8	6	28	35	10	26	40	9	79
	14%	14%	-	-	14%	19%	21% _{il}	13%	11%	9%	22% _{zkl}	13%	9%	23% _{zno}	14%	9%	15%
ESOS requirements - In response to ESOS audit recommendations	60	60	-	-	60	12	10	4	14	3	17	35	7	14	40	6	65
	12%	12%	-	-	12%	19% _{il}	10%	7%	18% _{il}	5%	14%	13%	6%	13%	13%	6%	12%
ESOS requirements - To help gather information needed for ESOS audits	9	9	-	-	9	-	-	-	3	2	2	5	-	1	4	1	9
	2%	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	4%	2%	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%
ESOS requirements - To help meet requirements of ISO 50001 for ESOS compliance	19	19	-	-	19	-	6	3	3	3	2	12	5	4	12	3	22
	4%	4%	-	-	4%	-	5%	5%	4%	5%	1%	5%	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%
Reduce costs for tenants (landlords)	6	6	-	-	6	-	-	-	3	2	-	2	4	1	2	3	6
	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	4% _{fl}	2%	-	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 564

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Weighted total	522	522	**	**	522	64*	106*	61*	77*	72*	127	265	117*	113	296	99*	530
Other environmental/energy efficiency agreements	31	31	-	-	31	3	7	3	3	5	4	20	7	3	21	6	31
To improve/protect reputation	27	27	-	-	27	3	5	3	3	7	4	21	3	3	21	3	28
To show leadership on energy efficiency	25	25	-	-	25	1	5	6	3	3	2	18	5	2	16	7	25
To assist in meeting internal targets	19	19	-	-	19	3	5	2	4	3	3	14	2	1	16	3	21
Reduce cost/make savings	199	199	-	-	199	15	52	22	33	27	35	111	52	36	122	41	198
CRC requirements	9	9	-	-	9	-	2	1	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	1	9
Legislation/regulation/government targets	50	50	-	-	50	6	8	7	7	5	10	22	15	10	27	12	49
Decreased Action	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	1
Lack of finance	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	1
Financial requirement / to control costs	6	6	-	-	6	-	1	-	-	1	1	3	-	1	3	-	5
Availability of money / resources	3	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	-	1	2	-	3
Because of the customers / clients / client requirements	9	9	-	-	9	-	3	2	1	1	4	4	-	5	2	1	9
Board level interest	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	2
Company has expanded / is planning on expanding	4	4	-	-	4	2	-	2	1	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	4
Office refurb	3	3	-	-	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	3	-	2
Company moved to new premises	3	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	2	1	-	3
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	8	8	-	-	8	3	1	-	1	1	1	4	2	1	2	4	6
CSR / Corporate Social Responsibility	6	6	-	-	6	-	1	3	-	2	-	2	4	-	2	4	5
Employee engagement / interest	6	6	-	-	6	-	1	-	1	-	3	2	-	3	2	-	6
Health and safety	2	2	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	3

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 564

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Weighted total	522	522	**	**	522	64*	106*	61*	77*	72*	127	265	117*	113	296	99*	530
Increased awareness / environmental awareness	10 2%	10 2%	-	-	10 2%	2 4%	* *	1 1%	3 3%	* 1%	3 2%	2 1%	3 3%	3 2%	4 1%	2 2%	11 2%
It was needed / necessary / replacements / updates were required	6 1%	6 1%	-	-	6 1%	3 5% <i>zdf</i>	-	-	-	1 2%	4 3% <i>k</i>	-	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	3 3%	6 1%
ISO 14001	11 2%	11 2%	-	-	11 2%	2 4%	2 2%	1 1%	2 3%	1 1%	2 2%	6 2%	3 3%	1 1%	8 3%	2 2%	12 2%
Board / Management decision / change in management	7 1%	7 1%	-	-	7 1%	2 4%	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	4 1%	3 3%	-	6 2%	1 1%	7 1%
Pressure from investors	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	3 1%	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 *	1 1%	-	2 1%	1 1%	3 1%
To improve efficiency	6 1%	6 1%	-	-	6 1%	2 4%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	6 2%	-	-	6 2%	-	5 1%
Funding / grants / support	2 *	2 *	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	* 1%	1 2%	1 1%	-	* *	-	1 *	* *	2 *
New scheme has been put in place	2 *	2 *	-	-	2 *	-	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	2 1%	-	3 1%
Other	17 3%	17 3%	-	-	17 3%	2 4%	2 2%	3 4%	1 1%	2 3%	5 4%	7 3%	5 5%	5 4%	7 3%	5 5%	18 3%
Don't know/refused	3 *	3 *	-	-	3 *	2 3%	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%	-	-	3 1%	-	2 *

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 565

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	530	10	1	104	8	3	29	44	24	17	13	30	22	40	17	2	29	24	12	99	2	530
Weighted total	522	11**	1**	93*	6**	2**	21**	55*	20**	22**	6**	11**	29*	19**	22**	3**	28**	28**	19**	90*	4**	530
Increased Action	486	9	1	90	5	2	20	52	20	19	10	39	18	25	21	3	26	24	18	80	4	494
	93%	85%	100%	96%	85%	100%	96%	94%	100%	88%	89%	100%	96%	87%	96%	100%	92%	85%	95%	89%	100%	93%
To reduce energy expenditure	103	2	-	21	-	2	3	16	7	7	1	6	3	5	2	-	6	3	3	16	-	107
	20%	16%	-	22%	-	100%	16%	28%	35%	31%	11%	14%	15%	19%	9%	-	21%	12%	15%	18%	-	20%
Increasing energy prices	41	2	-	11	-	-	1	6	2	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	5	1	1	7	-	46
	8%	16%	-	11%	-	-	4%	10%	9%	8%	3%	-	-	2%	6%	-	17%	4%	7%	8%	-	9%
Carbon footprint/sustainability/climate change/environmental concerns/reduce carbon emissions	115	1	1	22	2	1	4	9	5	2	4	3	6	8	3	-	6	5	5	17	2	120
	22%	10%	100%	23%	42%	36%	21%	16%	24%	8%	38%	28%	33%	29%	15%	-	22%	19%	25%	18%	56%	23%
Shift in corporate ethos	42	-	-	7	1	-	1	2	1	2	-	3	1	4	2	-	2	4	2	9	-	43
	8%	-	-	8%	9%	-	7%	3%	5%	10%	-	9%	5%	14%	8%	-	9%	14%	11%	10%	-	8%
Response to Climate Change Levy	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*
Response to climate change agreements (CCAs)	6	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	1%	-	-	5%zs	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
Improve Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Improve Display Energy Certificates (DEC) rating	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
ESOS requirements	138	4	-	26	1	1	9	14	6	4	-	11	4	5	7	-	2	4	5	33	-	149
	26%	36%	-	28%	21%	36%	44%	26%	32%	18%	-	28%	19%	19%	33%	-	8%	15%	29%	37%z	-	28%
ESOS requirements (e.g. to implement an energy audit)	75	1	-	12	*	-	6	7	5	2	-	8	3	5	3	-	1	2	5	14	-	79
	14%	10%	-	13%	8%	-	27%	14%	23%	8%	-	21%	15%	19%	14%	-	3%	7%	29%	16%	-	15%
ESOS requirements - in response to ESOS audit recommendations	60	3	-	13	1	1	2	6	1	2	-	6	1	1	4	-	2	2	1	15	-	65
	12%	26%	-	14%	13%	36%	10%	11%	4%	10%	-	16%	4%	2%	19%	-	7%	8%	8%	16% <i>m</i>	-	12%
ESOS requirements - To help gather information needed for ESOS audits	9	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	9
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	3%	4%	-	5%	-	-	3%	-	2%	-	2%
ESOS requirements - To help meet requirements of ISO 50001 for ESOS compliance	19	-	-	5	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	3	-	1	-	-	*	1	-	4	-	22
	4%	-	-	5%	-	-	11%	-	9%	3%	-	8%	-	2%	-	-	2%	3%	-	5%	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 565

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Weighted total	522	11**	1**	93*	6**	2**	21**	55*	20**	22**	11**	39**	19**	29*	22**	3**	28**	28**	19**	90*	4**	530
Reduce costs for tenants (landlords)	6 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 4%	2 11%	-	-	2 10%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	6 1%
Other environmental/energy efficiency agreements	31 6%	1 7%	-	5 5%	1 10%	-	3 16%	6 11%	2 8%	1 5%	-	3 8%	1 3%	1 6%	-	-	1 3%	-	3 17%	3 4%	-	31 6%
To improve/protect reputation	27 5%	1 12%	-	7 8%	-	-	1 6%	1 1%	1 4%	-	-	2 6%	4 22%	2 7%	-	-	2 7%	-	-	5 6%	-	28 5%
To show leadership on energy efficiency	25 5%	-	-	7 7%	-	-	-	4 9%	2 7%	-	-	2 6%	1 7%	1 3%	1 4%	-	4 13%	-	1 6%	3 3%	-	25 5%
To assist in meeting internal targets	19 4%	-	-	5 5%	-	2 69%	1 4%	1 1%	2 9%	2 9%	-	2 5%	-	1 4%	1 4%	-	2 7%	-	1 6%	1 1%	-	21 4%
Reduce cost/make savings	199 38%	6 57%	1 100%	33 36%	3 56%	1 33%	8 40%	22 40%	7 35%	4 19%	7 60%	13 33%	11 57%	7 25%	11 51%	3 100%	13 47%	10 35%	7 35%	30 34%	2 44%	198 37%
CRC requirements	9 2%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 2%	1 7%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	1 43%	-	-	2 11%	1 1%	-	9 2%
Legislation/regulation/government targets	50 10%	1 12%	-	8 9%	1 13%	1 33%	4 2%	3 6%	4 20%	-	1 7%	4 10%	1 8%	3 11%	7 31%	2 57%	1 3%	4 13%	-	9 10%	-	49 9%
Decreased Action	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1
Lack of finance	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	1
Financial requirement / to control costs	6 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	3 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 12%	-	-	5 1%
Availability of money / resources	3 1%	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	3 1%
Because of the customers / clients / client requirements	9 2%	-	-	4 5%	-	1 3%	-	-	1 6%	-	-	-	-	1 3%	1 4%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	9 2%
Board level interest	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Company has expanded / is planning on expanding	4 1%	2 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%	-	4 1%
Office refurb	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	1 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Company moved to new premises	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 6%	zcgsg	-	1 3%	-	-	-	-	3
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	8 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	2 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 10%	-	1 1%	-	6 1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 565

Q22.1 What do you think has motivated this increase in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has increased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Weighted total	522	11**	1**	93*	6**	2**	21**	55*	20**	22**	11**	39**	19**	29*	22**	3**	28**	28**	19**	90*	4**	530
CSR / Corporate Social Responsibility	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	5
Employee engagement / interest	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	3	-	6
Health and safety	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	6%	-	4%	-	1%
Increased awareness / environmental awareness	10	2	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	11
It was needed / necessary / replacements / updates were required	6	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6
ISO 14001	11	1	-	4	-	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	12
Board / Management decision / change in management	7	7%	-	4%	-	-	-	3%	3%	5%	6%	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%
Pressure from investors	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
To improve efficiency	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	5
Funding / grants / support	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	*	-	2
New scheme has been put in place	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Other	17	-	-	4	1	-	1	2	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	18
Don't know/refused	3	-	-	4%	15%	-	6%	3%	5%	-	16%	6%	4%	3%	-	5%	-	9%	-	2%	-	2

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 566

Q22.2 What do you think has motivated this decrease in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has decreased in the last 18 months

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	32	31	-	1	1	3	4	2	3	1	5	7	1	2	1	-	1	15	17	32
Weighted total	30**	29**	..	2**	***	4**	4**	2**	3**	1**	3**	6**	2**	2**	2**	..	***	14**	16**	32*
Decreased Action	15	15	-	-	-	3	2	1	3	1	1	1	-	2	2	-	*	6	9	15
	49%	52%	-	-	-	57%	50%	56%	100%	100%	24%	13%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	41%	56%	47%
Lack of finance	5	5	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	2	3	5
	16%	17%	-	-	-	35%	22%	-	71%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	15%	17%	16%
Lack of staff time	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
	5%	5%	-	-	-	35%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	3%
Have done all the obvious things	7	7	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	2	2	-	-	2	5	7
	23%	25%	-	-	-	-	56%	29%	100%	-	13%	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	13%	32%	22%
Other business priorities	6	6	-	-	-	3	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	2	4	6
	19%	20%	-	-	-	57%	28%	-	28%	-	24%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	13%	24%	19%
Energy has become a smaller proportion of our costs	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	6%	7%	-	-	-	-	28%	-	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	6%
Changing job roles / responsibilities / restructuring of teams	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
	5%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	-	6%
Office refurb	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	3%
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	3%
Cost implications / government cuts / no longer have the budget	6	4	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	4	5
	20%	15%	-	100%	-	43%	-	44%	-	-	42%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	17%	22%	16%
Downsizing / moved somewhere more energy efficient	4	4	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
	12%	13%	-	-	-	35%	-	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	14%	9%
ESOS	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
	7%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	43%	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	6%
Lack of interest / proactive approach towards energy / fuel efficiency	2	2	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3
	7%	8%	-	-	100%	-	24%	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	9%
Board / Management decision / change in management	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	3%
To improve efficiency	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	3%	3%	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	3%
Other	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 567

Q22.2 What do you think has motivated this decrease in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has decreased in the last 18 months

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	32	8	24	6	3	4	13	2	4	9	-	12	4	3	4	17	25	7	32
Weighted total	30**	9**	22**	7**	3**	4**	11**	1**	4**	9**	**	12**	4**	4**	5**	14**	24**	6**	32*
Decreased Action	15	6	9	4	2	1	6	-	2	5	-	4	2	1	2	7	13	2	15
	49%	68%	42%	56%	66%	18%	56%	-	55%	54%	-	29%	53%	29%	38%	50%	54%	32%	47%
Lack of finance	5	2	3	2	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	-	3	4	*	5
	16%	23%	13%	29%	-	-	8%	-	55%	17%	-	19%	53%	-	-	20%	18%	7%	16%
Lack of staff time	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	1
	5%	18%	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	41%	-	-	-	6%	-	3%
Have done all the obvious things	7	2	5	2	2	1	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	3	6	1	7
	23%	22%	24%	27%	66%	18%	22%	-	-	37%	-	-	-	-	38%	17%	26%	13%	22%
Other business priorities	6	4	2	2	-	-	3	-	1	*	-	4	2	1	-	3	4	1	6
	19%	46%	8%	29%	-	-	26%	-	22%	5%	-	29%	53%	29%	-	18%	19%	20%	19%
Energy has become a smaller proportion of our costs	2	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	-	2
	6%	14%	4%	-	27%	-	10%	-	-	-	-	10%	-	29%	-	5%	8%	-	6%
Changing job roles / responsibilities / restructuring of teams	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	-	2
	5%	8%	4%	10%	-	-	-	-	23%	9%	-	6%	19%	-	-	6%	6%	-	6%
Office refurb	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	3%
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
	4%	13%	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	29%	-	-	-	-	17%	3%
Cost implications / government cuts / no longer have the budget	6	-	6	-	-	3	2	-	1	2	-	3	-	3	-	3	4	2	5
	20%	-	28%	-	-	65%	21%	-	21%	20%	-	22%	-	71%	-	22%	17%	31%	16%
Downsizing / moved somewhere more energy efficient	4	2	2	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	1	1	3	1	3
	12%	18%	9%	41%	-	17%	-	-	-	-	-	29%	41%	-	27%	5%	12%	12%	9%
ESOS	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	7%	-	10%	-	-	-	8%	-	34%	13%	-	7%	-	-	-	14%	9%	-	6%
Lack of interest / proactive approach towards energy / fuel efficiency	2	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	*	2	-	3
	7%	11%	5%	-	34%	-	11%	-	-	11%	-	6%	-	-	35%	3%	9%	-	9%
Board / Management decision / change in management	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	2%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	51%	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	4%	3%	-	3%
To improve efficiency	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	3%	-	5%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	4%	-	3%
Other	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	2%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	49%	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	2%	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 568

Q22.2 What do you think has motivated this decrease in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has decreased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	32	12	14	3	3	2	25	28	4	5	9	13	3	6	26	13	5	8	6	32
Weighted total	30**	12**	14**	2**	3**	2**	23**	26**	4**	4**	9**	12**	3**	5**	24**	11**	5**	7**	7**	32*
Decreased Action	15	4	7	1	3	2	10	13	1	2	3	4	2	4	11	6	2	3	4	15
	49%	35%	52%	45%	100%	100%	44%	50%	32%	46%	34%	31%	77%	81%	46%	54%	47%	40%	60%	47%
Lack of finance	5	1	4	-	-	1	4	5	-	-	1	2	-	1	3	2	1	1	2	5
	16%	10%	27%	-	-	55%	16%	19%	-	-	13%	18%	-	26%	12%	16%	26%	18%	31%	16%
Lack of staff time	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
	5%	-	12%	-	-	-	7%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24%	3%
Have done all the obvious things	7	3	2	1	1	-	6	6	1	2	2	2	2	1	5	2	-	2	2	7
	23%	25%	17%	45%	27%	-	24%	24%	32%	46%	21%	13%	77%	16%	22%	21%	-	23%	29%	22%
Other business priorities	6	1	3	-	2	1	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	3	1	-	2	6
	19%	10%	19%	-	73%	45%	16%	18%	-	-	-	-	-	65%	16%	24%	21%	-	31%	19%
Energy has become a smaller proportion of our costs	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	2	2
	6%	-	6%	-	43%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	16%	8%	7%	-	-	-	6%
Changing job roles / responsibilities / restructuring of teams	2	1	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	2
	5%	7%	5%	-	-	-	3%	6%	-	-	-	7%	-	-	3%	-	-	10%	13%	6%
Office refurb	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	4%	-	-	-	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	3%
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	4%	-	8%	-	-	-	5%	4%	-	-	12%	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	3%
Cost implications / government cuts / no longer have the budget	6	4	2	-	-	-	4	4	1	1	3	4	-	-	6	3	-	1	-	5
	20%	30%	14%	21%	-	-	18%	16%	27%	34%	37%	36%	-	-	25%	29%	-	11%	-	16%
Downsizing / moved somewhere more energy efficient	4	1	2	1	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	3
	12%	11%	12%	35%	-	-	16%	14%	-	-	-	7%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	44%	9%
ESOS	2	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	-	1	2	-	2	2	-	2
	7%	7%	9%	-	-	55%	4%	8%	25%	21%	23%	10%	-	19%	9%	-	45%	31%	-	6%
Lack of interest / proactive approach towards energy / fuel efficiency	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	2	1	1	2	-	3
	7%	-	16%	-	-	-	10%	8%	-	-	8%	15%	-	-	9%	11%	21%	25%	-	9%
Board / Management decision / change in management	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	5%	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	3%
To improve efficiency	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	1
	3%	-	7%	-	-	45%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	21%	4%	9%	21%	-	-	3%
Other	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	1
	2%	-	4%	-	-	-	3%	-	17%	-	-	-	23%	-	2%	6%	13%	-	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 569

Q22.2 What do you think has motivated this decrease in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has decreased in the last 18 months

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	32	-	32	-	32	5	9	2	5	6	10	17	5	10	16	6	32
Weighted total	30**	**	30**	**	30**	5**	8**	1**	5**	5**	9**	16**	6**	9**	15**	6**	32*
Decreased Action	15	-	15	-	15	3	6	1	1	4	3	6	6	3	6	6	15
	49%	-	49%	-	49%	65%	76%	66%	15%	67%	34%	39%	100%	34%	42%	86%	47%
Lack of finance	5	-	5	-	5	2	1	1	1	-	2	1	1	2	1	1	5
	16%	-	16%	-	16%	41%	14%	66%	15%	-	25%	9%	21%	25%	9%	19%	16%
Lack of staff time	2	-	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	1
	5%	-	5%	-	5%	32%	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	17%	-	-	3%
Have done all the obvious things	7	-	7	-	7	-	4	-	-	3	-	4	3	-	4	3	7
	23%	-	23%	-	23%	-	52%	-	-	49%	-	23%	61%	-	25%	53%	22%
Other business priorities	6	-	6	-	6	3	1	-	1	-	3	2	1	3	2	1	6
	19%	-	19%	-	19%	65%	10%	-	15%	18%	34%	10%	18%	34%	11%	15%	19%
Energy has become a smaller proportion of our costs	2	-	2	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
	6%	-	6%	-	6%	24%	9%	-	-	-	-	7%	14%	-	8%	12%	6%
Changing job roles / responsibilities / restructuring of teams	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	2
	5%	-	5%	-	5%	-	-	-	29%	-	17%	-	-	17%	-	-	6%
Office refurb	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	2%	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	3%	-	3%
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	4%	-	4%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	7%	-	3%
Cost implications / government cuts / no longer have the budget	6	-	6	-	6	1	-	-	2	1	3	3	-	3	3	-	5
	20%	-	20%	-	20%	20%	-	-	37%	22%	29%	22%	-	29%	23%	-	16%
Downsizing / moved somewhere more energy efficient	4	-	4	-	4	2	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	3
	12%	-	12%	-	12%	47%	15%	-	-	-	25%	8%	-	25%	9%	-	9%
ESOS	2	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	2
	7%	-	7%	-	7%	-	14%	-	-	-	-	6%	21%	-	-	32%	6%
Lack of interest / proactive approach towards energy / fuel efficiency	2	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	*	2	-	*	2	-	3
	7%	-	7%	-	7%	-	9%	34%	19%	-	5%	11%	-	5%	12%	-	9%
Board / Management decision / change in management	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	2%	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	7%	-	-	3%
To improve efficiency	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
	3%	-	3%	-	3%	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-	18%	-	-	15%	3%
Other	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	2%	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	11%	-	-	4%	-	-	4%	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 570

Q22.2 What do you think has motivated this decrease in action on energy and/or fuel efficiency?

Base: all participants whose organisation's action on energy efficiency has decreased in the last 18 months

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	
Unweighted total	32	-	1	4	-	1	5	5	5	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	2	4	-	32
Weighted total	30**	..*	2**	3**	..*	1**	4**	5**	5**	..*	..*	..*	2**	..*	2**	..*	..*	3**	4**	..*	32*
Decreased Action	15	-	2	1	-	-	3	4	4	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	15
	49%	-	100%	24%	-	-	63%	85%	84%	-	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	47%
Lack of finance	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	70%	20%	-	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%
Lack of staff time	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Have done all the obvious things	7	-	2	1	-	-	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	23%	-	100%	24%	-	-	43%	15%	42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%
Other business priorities	6	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6
	19%	-	-	-	-	-	20%	46%	22%	-	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	19%
Energy has become a smaller proportion of our costs	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	6%
Changing job roles / responsibilities / restructuring of teams	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	5%	-	-	46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
Office refurb	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Company policy / new policies / procedures put in place	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	-	3%
Cost implications / government cuts / no longer have the budget	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	*	-	-	2	-	-	2	1	-	5
	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	60%	26%	-	16%
Downsizing / moved somewhere more energy efficient	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	3
	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	-	-	-	-	44%	-	-	-	-	40%	-	-	9%
ESOS	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	22%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
Lack of interest / proactive approach towards energy / fuel efficiency	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	3
	7%	-	-	30%	-	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	9%
Board / Management decision / change in management	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
To improve efficiency	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Other	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 571

Q23. Which of the following best describes your organisation's current status with respect to the ESOS scheme?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
ESOS is not applicable to my organisation	71 8% <i>aks</i>	18 2%	1 4%	53 54% <i>za</i>	5 21%	10 13% <i>k</i>	3 7% <i>k</i>	3 5%	9 14% <i>k</i>	2 12%	16 7% <i>k</i>	2 1%	8 14% <i>k</i>	8 14% <i>k</i>	-	3 19%	2 5%	25 6%	46 11% <i>q</i>	46 5%
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has complied	748 86% <i>c</i>	731 96% <i>zc</i>	6 56%	11 11%	17 72%	63 83%	38 82%	56 95% <i>fl</i>	56 85%	14 81%	193 84%	135 93% <i>zeffj</i>	49 82%	47 86%	19 100%	10 57%	43 91%	389 90% <i>r</i>	350 82%	786 90% <i>z</i>
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has not yet complied with ESOS, but intends to in future	17 2% <i>a</i>	5 1%	4 34%	9 9% <i>za</i>	* 2%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	7 3%	3 2%	1 2%	-	-	3 16%	-	4 1%	12 3% <i>q</i>	16 2%
ESOS is applicable to my organisation. My organisation has not complied with ESOS, and does not intend to	2 *	1 *	1 6%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 *	2 *
I have not heard of ESOS	16 2% <i>a</i>	1 *	-	15 15% <i>za</i>	1 6%	1 1%	3 7% <i>zghkm</i>	-	-	-	7 3%	2 1%	2 3%	-	-	-	-	6 1%	9 2%	9 1%
Don't know	17 2%	6 1%	-	11 11% <i>za</i>	-	2 3%	1 2%	-	-	-	6 3%	5 3%	-	-	-	2 9%	2 4%	8 2%	9 2%	12 1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 572

Q23. Which of the following best describes your organisation's current status with respect to the ESOS scheme?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (j)	Rented (i)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)	
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871	
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871	
ESOS is not applicable to my organisation	71	22	50	37	6	16	5	2	5	27	10	19	14	12	14	12	42	29	46	
		8%df	13%b	7%	18%zdef	3%	8%df	3%	10%df	9%	10%	7%	33%	10%o	10%o	3%	7%	12%p	5%	
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has complied	748	129	619	141	188	169	166	31	49	253	80	249	23	101	126	382	551	190	786	
		86%acj	77%	88%a	71%	91%c	89%c	92%zc	95%c	90%c	84%	78%	89%f	55%	82%	86%	93%zmn	88%q	81%	90%z
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has not yet complied with ESOS, but intends to in future	17	1	16	7	4	-	6	-	-	11	1	5	1	4	-	8	8	9	16	
		2%	1%	2%	4%e	2%	-	3%e	-	4%	1%	2%	2%	3%	-	2%	1%	4%p	2%	
ESOS is applicable to my organisation. My organisation has not complied with ESOS, and does not intend to	2	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	2	-	2	
		*	*	1%	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	1%	*	-	*	-	*	
I have not heard of ESOS	16	6	9	8	2	3	-	-	-	-	10	3	2	1	2	2	12	4	9	
		2%f	4%	1%	4%f	1%	2%	-	-	-	10%zik	1%	6%	1%	1%	*	2%	2%	1%	
Don't know	17	8	8	5	6	3	3	-	-	11	2	2	2	3	3	4	13	3	12	
		2%	5%zb	1%	3%	3%	1%	2%	-	4%k	2%	1%	4%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 573

Q23. Which of the following best describes your organisation's current status with respect to the ESOS scheme?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total					
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)				
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871				
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871				
ESOS is not applicable to my organisation	71	19	31	5	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	11	4	6	27	46				
	8%	efghijk	10%	7%	6%	10%									7%	5%	5%	4%	11%	oq	5%			
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has complied	748	162	368	77	130	116	572	673	75	97	134	339	30	213	530	236	85	148	202	786				
	86%	83%	87%	86%	88%	100%	z	96%	zh	94%	98%	z	96%	z	89%	r	94%	znr	94%	zr	93%	zr	82%	90%
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has not yet complied with ESOS, but intends to in future	17	2	11	1	1	-	4	13	5	1	4	7	1	3	12	1	-	3	5	16				
	2%	1%	3%	1%	*	-	1%	2%	6%	zg	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%	*	-	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	
ESOS is applicable to my organisation. My organisation has not complied with ESOS, and does not intend to	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2				
	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*				
I have not heard of ESOS	16	6	7	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	2	7	9				
	2%	fgko	3%	2%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	3%	o	1%			
Don't know	17	6	5	4	2	-	2	2	-	1	2	5	1	5	4	2	2	-	5	12				
	2%	fg	3%	1%	4%	1%	-	*	-	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%				

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 574

Q23. Which of the following best describes your organisation's current status with respect to the ESOS scheme?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
ESOS is not applicable to my organisation	71	37	3	31	71	18	15	1	5	10	25	29	15	23	33	15	46
	8% <i>gp</i>	7%	10%	10%	8% <i>g</i>	15% <i>zdgh</i>	9% <i>g</i>	1%	4%	9% <i>g</i>	10%	7%	8%	10%	7%	9%	5%
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has complied	748	454	27	263	748	88	146	83	123	104	207	357	163	183	401	147	786
	86% <i>ee</i>	87%	90%	84%	86% <i>ee</i>	74%	87% <i>ee</i>	94% <i>ee</i>	94% <i>zdef</i>	89% <i>ee</i>	85%	87%	87%	84%	88%	85%	90% <i>z</i>
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has not yet complied with ESOS, but intends to in future	17	13	-	4	17	1	6	3	-	1	4	6	4	3	6	6	16
	2%	3%	-	1%	2%	1%	4% <i>h</i>	3%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%
ESOS is applicable to my organisation. My organisation has not complied with ESOS, and does not intend to	2	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
	*	*	-	*	*	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	*
I have not heard of ESOS	16	7	-	7	16	10	-	-	-	-	2	11	2	4	8	2	9
	2%	1%	-	2%	2%	9% <i>zdfghi</i>	-	-	-	-	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Don't know	17	10	-	6	17	1	1	2	3	1	6	8	2	4	8	2	12
	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 575

Q23. Which of the following best describes your organisation's current status with respect to the ESOS scheme?

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
ESOS is not applicable to my organisation	71	-	-	8	2	-	-	2	-	4	2	5	9	2	6	5	8	5	-	10	4	46
	8%u	-	-	5%	16%	-	-	2%	-	9%	7%	30%	5%	19%	100%	17% <i>cfgh</i>	10%	-	7%	49%	5%	5%
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has complied	748	9	5	156	8	5	31	75	36	32	24	63	20	39	26	-	29	36	26	124	2	786
	86%p	85%	100%	91% <i>pq</i>	78%	100%	100% <i>zkmpq</i>	93% <i>pq</i>	100% <i>zkmpq</i>	85%	85%	84% <i>p</i>	67%	86% <i>p</i>	76%	-	65%	77%	89%	92% <i>pq</i>	28%	90% <i>z</i>
ESOS is applicable to my organisation, and my organisation has not yet complied with ESOS, but intends to in future	17	-	-	1	1	-	-	4	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	5	2	3	-	-	16
	2%	-	-	1%	5%	-	-	5% <i>cs</i>	-	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	11% <i>zcms</i>	3%	11%	-	-	2%
ESOS is applicable to my organisation. My organisation has not complied with ESOS, and does not intend to	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*
I have not heard of ESOS	16	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	9
	2%	15%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	3%	-	5% <i>s</i>	5%	-	4% <i>ss</i>	3%	-	-	-	1%
Don't know	17	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	1	2	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	12
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	2%	2%	4%	-	-	3%	5%	-	1%	23%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 576

Q24. When do you expect your organisation to submit a compliance notification for ESOS?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	16	5	7	4	1	1	1	-	-	-	6	3	2	-	-	1	-	6	8	16
Weighted total	17**	5**	4**	9**	***	1**	1**	**	**	**	7**	3**	1**	**	**	3**	**	4**	12**	16**
Within the next month	5	1	2	3	*	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	3	5
	28%	11%	43%	31%	100%	100%	-	-	-	9%	18%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	49%	27%	31%
Within the next 3 months	4	1	*	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3
	23%	26%	13%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	50%	-	49%	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	19%
By the end of 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
In 2017	6	1	1	4	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	5
	35%	25%	27%	43%	-	-	100%	-	-	16%	58%	51%	-	-	-	-	-	14%	42%	31%
Don't know / Refused	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3
	14%	38%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	37%	9%	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 577

Q24. When do you expect your organisation to submit a compliance notification for ESOS?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	16	2	14	6	4	-	6	-	-	7	1	7	2	4	-	7	9	7	16
Weighted total	17**	1**	16**	7**	4**	-**	6**	-**	-**	11**	1**	5**	1**	4**	-**	8**	8**	9**	16**
Within the next month	5	1	4	5	-	-	*	-	-	3	-	2	1	1	-	3	4	1	5
	28%	100%	24%	61%	-	-	7%	-	-	29%	-	38%	100%	15%	-	41%	53%	7%	31%
Within the next 3 months	4	-	4	-	3	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	*	-	-	2	2	3
	23%	-	24%	-	71%	-	20%	-	-	25%	-	-	-	13%	-	-	21%	25%	19%
By the end of 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
In 2017	6	-	6	2	1	-	3	-	-	4	-	2	-	3	-	3	1	5	5
	35%	-	37%	31%	13%	-	55%	-	-	36%	-	48%	-	73%	-	39%	13%	54%	31%
Don't know / Refused	2	-	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	1	3
	14%	-	15%	9%	17%	-	18%	-	-	10%	100%	14%	-	-	-	21%	13%	14%	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 578

Q24. When do you expect your organisation to submit a compliance notification for ESOS?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	16	1	12	1	1	-	5	12	2	2	2	7	1	3	10	1	-	2	6	16
Weighted total	17**	2**	11**	1**	1**	-**	4**	13**	5**	1**	4**	7**	1**	3**	12**	1**	-**	3**	5**	16**
Within the next month	5	-	5	-	-	-	2	5	3	1	-	4	-	1	3	-	-	-	2	5
	28%	-	45%	-	-	-	44%	38%	55%	49%	-	59%	-	17%	29%	-	-	-	27%	31%
Within the next 3 months	4	-	2	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3
	23%	-	15%	-	-	-	13%	31%	-	-	59%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	73%	19%
By the end of 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
In 2017	6	2	3	1	-	-	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	3	6	1	-	2	-	5
	35%	100%	24%	100%	-	-	43%	21%	45%	51%	41%	8%	100%	83%	51%	100%	-	78%	-	31%
Don't know / Refused	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	3
	14%	-	16%	-	100%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	26%	-	-	20%	-	-	22%	-	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 579

Q24. When do you expect your organisation to submit a compliance notification for ESOS?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	16	10	-	6	16	2	4	4	-	1	5	6	3	4	7	4	16
Weighted total	17**	13**	-**	4**	17**	1**	6**	3**	-**	1**	4**	6**	4**	3**	6**	6**	16**
Within the next month	5	4	-	1	5	1	3	*	-	-	1	1	3	1	1	3	5
	28%	28%	-	30%	28%	50%	54%	17%	-	-	35%	16%	62%	43%	14%	49%	31%
Within the next 3 months	4	3	-	1	4	-	1	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	1	3
	23%	21%	-	29%	23%	-	20%	19%	-	-	-	8%	-	-	8%	21%	19%
By the end of 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
In 2017	6	5	-	1	6	-	2	1	-	1	2	4	-	2	4	-	5
	35%	38%	-	25%	35%	-	26%	21%	-	100%	47%	76%	-	57%	68%	-	31%
Don't know / Refused	2	2	-	1	2	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	2	3
	14%	13%	-	16%	14%	50%	-	43%	-	-	19%	-	38%	-	10%	30%	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 580

Q24. When do you expect your organisation to submit a compliance notification for ESOS?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	16	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	4	2	2	-	-	16
Weighted total	17**	-.**	-.**	1**	1**	-.**	-.**	4**	-.**	1**	1**	1**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	5**	2**	3**	-.**	-.**	16**
Within the next month	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	5
	28%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	70%	-	-	-	50%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	31%
Within the next 3 months	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	2	-	-	3
	23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	68%	-	-	19%
By the end of 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
In 2017	6	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	5
	35%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	81%	100%	-	-	-	31%
Don't know / Refused	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	3
	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	-	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 581

Q25. You said that your organisation was working towards compliance. What are the main reasons that mean your organisation has not yet been able to comply?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	16	5	7	4	1	1	1	-	-	-	6	3	2	-	-	1	-	6	8	16
Weighted total	17**	5**	4**	9**	***	1**	1**	**	**	**	7**	3**	1**	**	**	3**	**	4**	12**	16**
My organisation recently found out we were eligible for ESOS	6	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	3	-	1	5	3
Costs associated with compliance e.g. appointing a lead assessor	4	-	*	4	*	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3
External auditors were not available to conduct the audit	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3
Compliance process took longer than anticipated	6	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	49%	-	-	-	-	-	1	*	2
There were delays in delivery of the audit report from an external auditor	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
There were delays in certification of an internal auditor	3	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	6%
Complying through ISO5001 route - which has taken a long time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asked to do further compliance work by the scheme regulator / EA / Environment Agency / Northern Ireland Environment Agency / SEPA / Scottish Environmental Protection Agency / NRW / Natural Resource Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
Don't know	13%	48%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	13%
	2	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3
	13%	26%	27%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	17%	-	51%	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 582

Q25. You said that your organisation was working towards compliance. What are the main reasons that mean your organisation has not yet been able to comply?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	
Unweighted total	16	2	14	6	4	-	6	-	7	1	7	2	4	-	7	9	7	16
Weighted total	17**	1**	16**	7**	4**	-**	6**	-**	11**	1**	5**	1**	4**	-**	8**	8**	9**	16**
My organisation recently found out we were eligible for ESOS	6	-	6	3	3	-	-	-	5	-	1	-	-	-	3	3	3	3
Costs associated with compliance e.g. appointing a lead assessor	4	-	4	2	-	-	2	-	4	-	-	4	2	-	2	5	4	3
External auditors were not available to conduct the audit	2	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	3
Compliance process took longer than anticipated	6	53%	3%	8%	12%	-	-	-	4%	-	12%	-	27%	-	-	13%	-	13%
There were delays in delivery of the audit report from an external auditor	1	47%	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
There were delays in certification of an internal auditor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Complying through ISO5001 route - which has taken a long time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asked to do further compliance work by the scheme regulator / EA / Environment Agency / Northern Ireland Environment Agency / SEPA / Scottish Environmental Protection Agency / NRW / Natural Resource Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	1	2
Don't know	13%	-	14%	-	-	-	37%	-	10%	-	25%	-	-	-	26%	13%	12%	13%
	2	-	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	-	3
	13%	-	14%	-	13%	-	29%	-	-	-	23%	-	13%	-	6%	28%	-	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 583

Q25. You said that your organisation was working towards compliance. What are the main reasons that mean your organisation has not yet been able to comply?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	16	1	12	1	1	-	5	12	2	2	2	7	1	3	10	1	-	2	6	16
Weighted total	17**	2**	11**	1**	1**	-**	4**	13**	5**	1**	4**	7**	1**	3**	12**	1**	-**	3**	5**	16**
My organisation recently found out we were eligible for ESOS	6	-	3	-	-	-	-	6	3	-	2	3	-	-	3	-	-	1	2	3
	33%	-	31%	-	-	-	-	44%	55%	-	59%	42%	-	-	29%	-	-	22%	42%	19%
Costs associated with compliance e.g. appointing a lead assessor	4	2	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	4	-	-	2	-	3
	25%	100%	18%	-	-	-	54%	16%	45%	-	41%	-	-	48%	33%	-	-	78%	8%	19%
External auditors were not available to conduct the audit	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	3
	11%	-	11%	-	100%	-	18%	14%	-	49%	-	27%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	9%	19%
Compliance process took longer than anticipated	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2
	6%	-	10%	-	-	-	28%	8%	-	-	-	7%	-	17%	-	-	-	-	19%	13%
There were delays in delivery of the audit report from an external auditor	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	3%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	49%	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	6%
There were delays in certification of an internal auditor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Complying through ISO50001 route - which has taken a long time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asked to do further compliance work by the scheme regulator / EA / Environment Agency / Northern Ireland Environment Agency / SEPA / Scottish Environmental Protection Agency / NRW / Natural Resource Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	2
	13%	-	10%	100%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	16%	-	35%	19%	100%	-	-	-	13%
Don't know	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	3
	13%	-	20%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	51%	-	8%	100%	-	9%	-	-	-	22%	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 584

Q25. You said that your organisation was working towards compliance. What are the main reasons that mean your organisation has not yet been able to comply?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	16	10	-	6	16	2	4	4	-	1	5	6	3	4	7	4	16
Weighted total	17**	13**	-**	4**	17**	1**	6**	3**	-**	1**	4**	6**	4**	3**	6**	6**	16**
My organisation recently found out we were eligible for ESOS	6	6	-	-	6	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	3
Costs associated with compliance e.g. appointing a lead assessor	4	4	-	-	4	-	2	*	-	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	3
External auditors were not available to conduct the audit	2	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	3
Compliance process took longer than anticipated	6*	4%	-	14%	6%	-	-	19%	-	-	16%	8%	-	20%	8%	-	13%
There were delays in delivery of the audit report from an external auditor	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
There were delays in certification of an internal auditor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Complying through ISO5001 route - which has taken a long time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asked to do further compliance work by the scheme regulator / EA / Environment Agency / Northern Ireland Environment Agency / SEPA / Scottish Environmental Protection Agency / NRW / Natural Resource Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	2
Don't know	13*	17%	-	-	13%	-	-	43%	-	100%	32%	-	24%	40%	-	19%	13%
	2	-	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	3
	13%	-	-	54%	13%	-	20%	21%	-	-	14%	9%	-	18%	8%	21%	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 585

Q25. You said that your organisation was working towards compliance. What are the main reasons that mean your organisation has not yet been able to comply?

Base: all participants who have not complied but intend to in the future

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	16	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	4	2	2	-	-	16
Weighted total	17**	..*	..*	1**	1**	..*	..*	4**	..*	..*	1**	1**	..*	..*	..*	..*	5**	2**	3**	..*	..*	16**
My organisation recently found out we were eligible for ESOS	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	3
	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	70%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68%	-	-	19%
Costs associated with compliance e.g. appointing a lead assessor	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	3
	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90%	-	-	-	-	19%
External auditors were not available to conduct the audit	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	11%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%
Compliance process took longer than anticipated	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	2
	6%	-	-	53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	13%
There were delays in delivery of the audit report from an external auditor	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	3%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
There were delays in certification of an internal auditor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Complying through ISO5001 route - which has taken a long time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asked to do further compliance work by the scheme regulator / EA / Environment Agency / Northern Ireland Environment Agency / SEPA / Scottish Environmental Protection Agency / NRW / Natural Resource Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2
	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69%	32%	-	-	13%
Don't know	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
	13%	-	-	100%	-	-	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	-	-	-	19%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 586

Q26. You said that ESOS is not applicable to your organisation. Can you tell me why this is the case?

Base: all participants who said that ESOS does not apply to their organisation

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region											Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)		
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)		Yes (q)	No (r)
Unweighted total	46	18	1	27	4	5	3	2	5	1	9	2	5	5	-	2	3	18	28	46
Weighted total	71*	18**	1**	53**	5**	10**	3**	3**	9**	2**	16**	2**	8**	8**	**	3**	2**	25**	46**	46*
My organisation has too few employees	28	7	1	20	-	2	2	-	4	2	9	1	7	-	4	1	1	8	19	17
	39%	40%	100%	38%	-	20%	65%	-	39%	100%	55%	70%	80%	-	15%	31%	32%	42%	37%	
My organisation has too small a turnover	23	4	-	19	-	2	1	-	2	2	11	-	3	1	-	1	1	8	15	13
	32%	23%	-	36%	-	20%	30%	-	26%	100%	69%	-	40%	8%	-	-	30%	34%	28%	
My organisation has no private funding	14	1	-	13	1	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	2	5	-	-	6	7	8	
	19%	4%	-	24%	28%	-	-	100%	26%	-	-	-	20%	69%	-	-	25%	16%	17%	
We have charity status	6	2	-	4	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	1	5	4	
	9%	11%	-	8%	28%	-	-	25%	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	85%	5%	10%	9%	
The landlord for the property/properties will undertake the audit	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	2	
	4%	17%	-	-	-	-	35%	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	4%	
My organisation has low / no energy use	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	
	4%	15%	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	-	-	11%	-	7%	
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	2	
	2%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69%	3%	2%	4%	
My organisation is self-sufficient in energy (e.g. renewable sources)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Not aware of ESOS	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
	3%	-	-	4%	-	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	2%	
Other	6	2	-	4	*	4	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	4	
	9%	13%	-	7%	9%	40%	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	15%	5%	9%	
Don't know	6	1	-	5	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	5	4	
	8%	3%	-	10%	35%	20%	-	-	-	-	30%	-	23%	-	-	-	2%	12%	9%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 587

Q26. You said that ESOS is not applicable to your organisation. Can you tell me why this is the case?

Base: all participants who said that ESOS does not apply to their organisation

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	46	13	33	24	4	9	3	2	4	17	7	12	8	8	9	9	28	18	46
Weighted total	71*	22**	50**	37**	6**	16**	5**	2**	5**	27**	10**	19**	14**	12**	14**	12**	42**	29**	46*
My organisation has too few employees	28	10	18	22	-	2	4	-	-	5	3	12	5	8	7	2	13	15	17
	39%	44%	36%	60%	-	14%	65%	-	-	19%	25%	65%	38%	63%	47%	14%	31%	50%	37%
My organisation has too small a turnover	23	9	14	21	-	2	-	-	-	5	6	6	8	7	7	-	9	14	13
	32%	41%	28%	57%	-	14%	-	-	-	18%	54%	34%	56%	54%	50%	-	23%	46%	28%
My organisation has no private funding	14	-	14	-	3	6	-	1	4	9	-	1	-	3	1	6	11	2	8
	19%	-	27%	-	46%	36%	-	75%	67%	35%	-	4%	-	22%	10%	49%	27%	7%	17%
We have charity status	6	-	6	-	2	3	-	-	1	-	3	1	-	1	1	-	6	-	4
	9%	-	12%	-	34%	17%	-	-	24%	-	27%	4%	-	6%	10%	-	15%	-	9%
The landlord for the property/properties will undertake the audit	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3	-	-	-	1	2	2
	4%	15%	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	11%	23%	-	-	-	3%	7%	4%
My organisation has low / no energy use	3	2	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	3
	4%	8%	2%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	8%	-	7%	-	-	8%	2%	6%	7%
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	2	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
	2%	3%	2%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	6%	2%	3%	4%
My organisation is self-sufficient in energy (e.g. renewable sources)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not aware of ESOS	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	1
	3%	9%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	14%	-	-	-	-	7%	2%
Other	6	2	4	2	-	2	2	-	-	2	-	4	2	-	2	2	4	2	4
	9%	9%	9%	5%	-	12%	35%	25%	-	9%	-	21%	15%	-	13%	19%	10%	7%	9%
Don't know	6	-	6	2	2	2	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	2	-	1	2	4	4
	8%	-	12%	5%	32%	11%	-	-	10%	20%	-	-	-	14%	-	4%	6%	12%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 588

Q26. You said that ESOS is not applicable to your organisation. Can you tell me why this is the case?

Base: all participants who said that ESOS does not apply to their organisation

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	
Unweighted total	46	12	20	4	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	9	3	5	15	46
Weighted total	71*	19**	31**	5**	15**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	44**	11**	4**	6**	27**	46*
My organisation has too few employees	28	10	12	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	2	3	13	17
	39%	54%	37%	40%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%	-	48%	45%	47%	37%
My organisation has too small a turnover	23	8	11	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	2	3	11	13
	32%	39%	34%	40%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	48%	45%	40%	28%
My organisation has no private funding	14	-	10	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	5	-	-	-	8
	19%	-	31%	34%	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	43%	-	-	-	17%
We have charity status	6	-	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	1	-	3	4
	9%	-	2%	-	37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	23%	33%	-	10%	9%
The landlord for the property/properties will undertake the audit	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2
	4%	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	4%
My organisation has low / no energy use	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	3
	4%	4%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	7%	7%
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	1	2	-	2
	2%	-	2%	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	13%	20%	26%	-	4%
My organisation is self-sufficient in energy (e.g. renewable sources)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not aware of ESOS	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
	3%	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	2%
Other	6	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	-	2	4
	9%	10%	8%	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	21%	-	-	7%	9%
Don't know	6	4	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	2	2	4
	8%	19%	6%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	30%	8%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 589

Q26. You said that ESOS is not applicable to your organisation. Can you tell me why this is the case?

Base: all participants who said that ESOS does not apply to their organisation

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	46	23	2	21	46	12	11	1	3	7	14	19	11	12	23	10	46
Weighted total	71*	37**	3**	31**	71*	18**	15**	1**	5**	10**	25**	29**	15**	23**	33**	15**	46*
My organisation has too few employees	28	17	1	10	28	6	11	1	2	-	13	12	3	13	11	4	17
	39%	46%	38%	31%	39%	33%	74%	100%	36%	-	51%	41%	21%	56%	32%	29%	37%
My organisation has too small a turnover	23	16	-	7	23	3	7	-	2	-	10	9	3	10	9	4	13
	32%	44%	-	22%	32%	14%	48%	-	36%	-	43%	32%	21%	46%	27%	25%	28%
My organisation has no private funding	14	10	-	4	14	-	1	-	2	7	1	6	6	-	12	2	8
	19%	26%	-	12%	19%	-	5%	-	45%	70%	3%	19%	36%	-	36%	12%	17%
We have charity status	6	3	-	3	6	3	3	-	-	-	2	3	1	-	2	4	4
	9%	9%	-	8%	9%	15%	22%	-	-	-	8%	10%	8%	-	6%	27%	9%
The landlord for the property/properties will undertake the audit	3	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	2
	4%	-	-	10%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	4%	-	9%	4%	-	4%
My organisation has low / no energy use	3	1	-	2	3	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	3
	4%	2%	-	6%	4%	5%	-	-	18%	-	-	3%	6%	-	3%	6%	7%
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	2	-	-	2	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	2
	2%	-	-	5%	2%	4%	-	-	-	8%	-	5%	-	-	5%	-	4%
My organisation is self-sufficient in energy (e.g. renewable sources)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not aware of ESOS	2	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	1
	3%	-	-	6%	3%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	13%	2%
Other	6	-	2	4	6	-	-	-	-	2	4	-	2	4	-	2	4
	9%	1%	62%	12%	9%	-	-	-	-	22%	16%	2%	12%	17%	1%	13%	9%
Don't know	6	4	-	2	6	5	1	-	-	-	4	2	-	4	2	-	4
	8%	10%	-	8%	8%	29%	4%	-	-	-	15%	8%	-	16%	7%	-	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 590

Q26. You said that ESOS is not applicable to your organisation. Can you tell me why this is the case?

Base: all participants who said that ESOS does not apply to their organisation

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	46	-	-	6	1	-	-	1	-	2	1	3	6	3	3	3	6	2	-	7	2	46
Weighted total	71*	..*	..*	8**	2**	..*	..*	2**	..*	4**	2**	5**	9**	2**	6**	5**	8**	5**	..*	10**	4**	46*
My organisation has too few employees	28	-	-	1	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	3	-	2	6	-	2	-	-	5	2	17
39%	39%	-	-	15%	100%	-	-	100%	-	47%	-	64%	-	100%	100%	-	21%	-	-	54%	56%	37%
My organisation has too small a turnover	23	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	4	-	2	-	-	5	2	13
32%	32%	-	-	28%	-	-	-	100%	-	47%	-	41%	-	77%	63%	-	21%	-	-	55%	56%	28%
My organisation has no private funding	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	2	8
19%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67%	-	-	62%	32%	-	-	-	-	44%	17%
We have charity status	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	4
9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	25%	61%	-	-	-	-	9%
The landlord for the property/properties will undertake the audit	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
4%	4%	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
My organisation has low / no energy use	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3
4%	4%	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	7%
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
2%	2%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
My organisation is self-sufficient in energy (e.g. renewable sources)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not aware of ESOS	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%
Other	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	*	-	-	-	-	-	4
9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53%	-	36%	-	-	-	36%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	9%
Don't know	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	4
8%	8%	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	39%	-	-	6%	-	-	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 591

Q27. You said that your organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS. Please can you tell me the main reasons for this?

Base: all participants who said their organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
Weighted total	2**	1**	1**	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	1**	1**	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	1**	1**	2**
Do not think the scheme would be of benefit to my organisation / it would not have told us anything new / would not have led to energy saving	2 100%	1 100%	1 100%	-	-	-	-	-	1 100%	1 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 100%	1 100%	2 100%
Cost of compliance (general mention)	1 63%	1 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 100%	-	1 50%
Don't agree with the ESOS policy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation does not have time to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation cannot afford to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Do not believe ESOS penalties will be enforced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The cost of a lead assessor exceeds my annual energy bill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't agree that we qualify	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
It is not mandatory that we comply / We don't have to / We thought it was optional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No reputational reason to comply / don't think there are any reputational impacts from not complying	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know /Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 592

Q27. You said that your organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS. Please can you tell me the main reasons for this?

Base: all participants who said their organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	2	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	2	-	2
Weighted total	2**	..**	2**	1**	1**	..**	..**	..**	..**	1**	..**	1**	..**	1**	1**	..**	2**	..**	2**
Do not think the scheme would be of benefit to my organisation / it would not have told us anything new / would not have led to energy saving	2	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	2	-	2
100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	100%
Cost of compliance (general mention)	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
63%	63%	-	63%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	63%	-	50%
Don't agree with the ESOS policy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation does not have time to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation cannot afford to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Do not believe ESOS penalties will be enforced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The cost of a lead assessor exceeds my annual energy bill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't agree that we qualify	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
It is not mandatory that we comply / We don't have to / We thought it was optional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No reputational reason to comply / don't think there are any reputational impacts from not complying	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know /Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 593

Q27. You said that your organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS. Please can you tell me the main reasons for this?

Base: all participants who said their organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
Weighted total	2**	**	1**	**	1**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	2**	2**
Do not think the scheme would be of benefit to my organisation / it would not have told us anything new / would not have led to energy saving	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%
Cost of compliance (general mention)	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	63%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63%	50%
Don't agree with the ESOS policy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation does not have time to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation cannot afford to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Do not believe ESOS penalties will be enforced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The cost of a lead assessor exceeds my annual energy bill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't agree that we qualify	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
It is not mandatory that we comply / We don't have to / We thought it was optional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No reputational reason to comply / don't think there are any reputational impacts from not complying	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know /Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 594

Q27. You said that your organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS. Please can you tell me the main reasons for this?

Base: all participants who said their organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	2	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
Weighted total	2**	1**	-**	1**	2**	1**	**	**	**	**	1**	**	**	1**	**	**	2**
Do not think the scheme would be of benefit to my organisation / it would not have told us anything new / would not have led to energy saving	2	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	100%
Cost of compliance (general mention)	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
63%	-	-	-	100%	63%	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	50%
Don't agree with the ESOS policy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation does not have time to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation cannot afford to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Do not believe ESOS penalties will be enforced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The cost of a lead assessor exceeds my annual energy bill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't agree that we qualify	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
It is not mandatory that we comply / We don't have to / We thought it was optional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No reputational reason to comply / don't think there are any reputational impacts from not complying	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know /Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 595

Q27. You said that your organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS. Please can you tell me the main reasons for this?

Base: all participants who said their organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
Weighted total	2**	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	1**	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	1**	..*	..*	..*	..*	2**
Do not think the scheme would be of benefit to my organisation / it would not have told us anything new / would not have led to energy saving	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%
Cost of compliance (general mention)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%
Don't agree with the ESOS policy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation does not have time to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My organisation cannot afford to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Do not believe ESOS penalties will be enforced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The cost of a lead assessor exceeds my annual energy bill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't agree that we qualify	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other parts of the business are submitting compliance on our behalf, so we don't have to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
It is not mandatory that we comply / We don't have to / We thought it was optional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No reputational reason to comply / don't think there are any reputational impacts from not complying	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Already have ISO50001 so do not need to comply with ESOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 595

Q27. You said that your organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS. Please can you tell me the main reasons for this?

Base: all participants who said their organisation does not intend to comply with ESOS

	Sector																			Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence, compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Weighted total	2**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	1**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	1**	-**	-**	-**	2**
Don't know /Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 596

Q28. Can I confirm in which of the following ways your organisation is complying/planning to comply with ESOS?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Audits through a Lead Assessor external to your organisation	688	662	9	18	15	61	33	53	48	13	179	124	46	41	17	13	38	347	331	711
Audits through a Lead Assessor internal to your organisation	80	74	1	5	1	4	3	4	6	-	25	14	4	4	2	4	5	43	36	84
ISO50001 compliance route, via an existing/planned ISO50001 certification	62	60	2	-	4	1	7	4	1	1	15	10	3	4	5	-	5	37	24	71
ISO50001 compliance route, with certification process prompted by ESOS	58	55	2	-	3	3	2	4	4	-	15	15	3	5	1	1	2	28	29	67
Display Energy Certificates	140	131	1	8	4	11	7	3	6	5	38	30	14	9	3	3	7	60	79	146
Green Deal Assessments	33	31	1	2	1	4	1	2	-	1	10	8	1	2	-	-	3	14	19	34
Audits through a Lead Assessor (not specified)	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
Other	16	15	*	-	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	-	-	1	6	10	20
Don't know	16	4	1	11	-	2	1	-	-	-	4	5	1	-	-	2	2	7	8	12
None	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 597

Q28. Can I confirm in which of the following ways your organisation is complying/planning to comply with ESOS?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Audits through a Lead Assessor external to your organisation	688	116	572	135	174	159	152	28	37	236	75	227	22	99	118	338	501	179	711
	88%h	84%	89%	88%h	88%h	93%h	87%h	90%	74%	86%	90%	89%	85%	92%	91%	86%	88%	89%	87%
Audits through a Lead Assessor internal to your organisation	80	7	73	16	17	14	17	3	13	27	12	21	-	10	10	48	60	19	84
	10%	5%	11%a	11%	9%	8%	10%	9%	26%zcd	10%	15%	8%	-	9%	8%	12%	11%	10%	10%
ISO50001 compliance route, via an existing/planned ISO50001 certification	62	5	56	9	12	15	15	4	6	25	5	18	-	6	5	41	49	12	71
	8%	4%	9%	6%	6%	9%	9%	14%	11%	9%	6%	7%	-	5%	4%	10%n	9%	6%	9%
ISO50001 compliance route, with certification process prompted by ESOS	58	11	47	8	16	13	12	2	7	21	2	18	1	5	8	35	43	14	67
	7%	8%	7%	5%	8%	7%	7%	8%	13%	7%	2%	7%	2%	5%	6%	9%	8%	7%	8%
Display Energy Certificates	140	22	118	24	34	32	37	5	8	50	11	48	4	23	27	66	99	40	146
	18%	16%	18%	16%	17%	19%	21%	16%	15%	18%	13%	19%	16%	21%	21%	17%	17%	20%	18%
Green Deal Assessments	33	7	26	4	11	2	13	1	1	15	4	9	-	3	10	14	22	11	34
	4%	5%	4%	3%	6%e	1%	7%e	3%	3%	5%	5%	4%	-	3%	8%	3%	4%	6%	4%
Audits through a Lead Assessor (not specified)	2	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	1	2
	*	-	*	*	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*	*	*	*
Other	16	3	13	4	4	5	3	-	1	6	1	5	1	4	-	8	14	2	20
	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	2%	5%	4%n	-	2%	2%	1%	2%
Don't know	16	8	8	5	6	3	2	-	-	10	2	3	2	4	2	3	13	3	12
	2%	5%zb	1%	3%	3%	2%	1%	-	-	4%	3%	1%	10%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%
None	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 598

Q28. Can I confirm in which of the following ways your organisation is complying/planning to comply with ESOS?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Audits through a Lead Assessor external to your organisation	688 86% <i>hi</i>	148 87%	341 89%	72 88%	114 86%	105 91%	554 96% <i>ze</i>	688 100% <i>zhij</i>	41 52%	58 59%	130 93% <i>hi</i>	311 89%	25 83%	196 89%	478 88%	201 84%	71 82%	130 86%	193 91% <i>op</i>	711 87%
Audits through a Lead Assessor internal to your organisation	80 10% <i>g</i>	24 14% <i>c</i>	36 9%	3 4%	15 12%	16 14%	55 10%	41 6%	80 100% <i>zgj</i>	20 20% <i>zg</i>	20 14% <i>g</i>	38 11%	7 24% <i>zkm</i>	20 9%	63 12%	30 13%	6 7%	18 12%	16 7%	84 10%
ISO50001 compliance route, via an existing/ planned ISO50001 certification	62 8% <i>gr</i>	12 7%	28 7%	7 9%	13 10%	4 4%	33 6%	36 5%	17 21% <i>zg</i>	62 62% <i>zghj</i>	18 13% <i>g</i>	38 11% <i>um</i>	3 10%	12 6%	55 10% <i>r</i>	28 12% <i>r</i>	13 16% <i>zr</i>	17 11% <i>r</i>	6 3%	71 9%
ISO50001 compliance route, with certification process prompted by ESOS	58 7%	11 7%	25 7%	11 13%	8 6%	6 5%	28 5%	35 5%	10 12% <i>g</i>	58 58% <i>zghj</i>	19 14% <i>zg</i>	27 8%	3 9%	17 8%	49 9% <i>r</i>	19 8%	11 13% <i>r</i>	12 8%	9 4%	67 8%
Display Energy Certificates	140 18% <i>r</i>	30 18%	70 18%	17 20%	20 15%	23 20%	104 18%	130 19%	20 25%	31 31% <i>zg</i>	140 100% <i>zghi</i>	59 17%	8 25%	46 21%	127 23% <i>zr</i>	49 20% <i>r</i>	14 16% <i>r</i>	31 21% <i>r</i>	13 6%	146 18%
Green Deal Assessments	33 4%	6 4%	20 5%	2 3%	4 3%	2 2%	30 5%	32 5%	7 9%	7 7%	24 17% <i>zgi</i>	15 4%	- 2% <i>um</i>	15 7%	30 5% <i>r</i>	8 3%	5 6%	11 8% <i>r</i>	4 2%	34 4%
Audits through a Lead Assessor (not specified)	2 *	-	2 *	-	-	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	1 1%	1 *	-	-	1 *	1 *	-	1 1%	1 *	2 *
Other	16 2%	5 3%	8 2%	1 1%	2 1%	2 2%	11 2%	13 2%	3 4%	2 2%	5 3%	8 2%	2 6%	4 2%	10 2%	6 2%	2 2%	3 2%	6 3%	20 2%
Don't know	16 2% <i>fg</i>	5 3%	6 1%	2 3%	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 2%	1 2%	3 1%	4 1%	1 *	2 2%	-	4 2%	12 1%
None	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 *

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 599

Q28. Can I confirm in which of the following ways your organisation is complying/planning to comply with ESOS?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Audits through a Lead Assessor external to your organisation	688	425	26	233	688	81	142	73	106	91	195	325	144	171	365	132	711
Audits through a Lead Assessor internal to your organisation	88%	89%	95%	85%	88%	90%	93% <i>gh</i>	84%	84%	85%	90%	87%	85%	90%	88%	86%	87%
ISO50001 compliance route, via an existing/ planned ISO50001 certification	80	42	4	35	80	12	15	6	15	16	19	40	20	14	47	19	84
ISO50001 compliance route, with certification process prompted by ESOS	10%	9%	13%	13%	10%	14%	10%	7%	12%	15%	9%	11%	12%	8%	11%	12%	10%
Display Energy Certificates	62	38	4	20	62	2	13	13	10	15	8	33	19	7	34	19	71
Green Deal Assessments	8% <i>j</i>	8%	14%	7%	8%	2%	8%	15% <i>zde</i>	8%	14% <i>ee</i>	4%	9% <i>j</i>	11% <i>j</i>	4%	8%	12% <i>mm</i>	9%
Audits through a Lead Assessor (not specified)	58	41	2	14	58	2	11	9	13	12	9	32	16	10	36	10	67
Other	7%	9%	9%	5%	7%	2%	7%	10% <i>ee</i>	11% <i>ee</i>	11% <i>ee</i>	4%	9% <i>j</i>	9%	5%	9%	7%	8%
Don't know	140	90	9	41	140	13	28	22	17	29	27	70	37	26	75	33	146
None	18%	19%	33%	15%	18%	15%	18%	25% <i>h</i>	14%	26% <i>zdeh</i>	12%	19% <i>j</i>	22% <i>j</i>	14%	18%	21%	18%
	33	21	2	11	33	1	14	5	4	3	5	20	8	5	19	8	34
	4%	4%	6%	4%	4%	1%	9% <i>zde</i>	6%	4%	3%	2%	5%	5%	3%	5%	5%	4%
	2	1	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-
	16	8	1	7	16	1	3	4	1	2	4	8	3	4	7	4	20
	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	1%	2%	4%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%
	16	8	-	8	16	1	1	2	3	-	6	7	2	5	7	2	12
	2%	2%	-	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	-	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 600

Q28. Can I confirm in which of the following ways your organisation is complying/planning to comply with ESOS?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	21**	41*	26**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
Audits through a Lead Assessor external to your organisation	688	9	3	140	6	4	23	72	32	30	23	58	17	34	22	-	31	37	28	116	2	711
	88% <i>f</i>	100%	74%	88% <i>f</i>	76%	81%	75%	91% <i>f</i>	89%	87%	93%	87%	81%	82%	84%	-	86%	91%	96%	92% <i>fm</i>	54%	87%
Audits through a Lead Assessor internal to your organisation	80	-	1	11	1	1	6	10	4	3	2	5	3	6	9	-	4	2	2	11	-	84
	10%	-	13%	7%	13%	22%	19% <i>c</i>	12%	11%	9%	9%	8%	15%	16%	34%	-	10%	5%	6%	8%	-	10%
ISO50001 compliance route, via an existing/ planned ISO50001 certification	62	-	1	17	1	-	4	4	6	2	2	3	2	-	-	-	1	6	1	9	-	71
	8%	-	13%	11%	11%	-	13%	5%	16%	6%	10%	5%	9%	4%	-	-	4%	16%	3%	7%	-	9%
ISO50001 compliance route, with certification process prompted by ESOS	58	-	1	13	*	2	5	5	4	4	1	4	2	2	-	-	5	6	-	6	-	67
	7%	-	13%	8%	5%	30%	15% <i>s</i>	6%	11%	12%	3%	5%	8%	4%	-	-	13%	15%	-	5%	-	8%
Display Energy Certificates	140	-	-	17	*	1	5	4	11	6	6	11	7	6	2	-	13	7	13	31	-	146
	18% <i>cg</i>	-	-	10%	5%	13%	16%	5%	30% <i>cg</i>	17%	25%	17% <i>g</i>	34%	16%	7%	-	36% <i>zcg</i>	18% <i>g</i>	45%	25% <i>cg</i>	-	18%
Green Deal Assessments	33	-	-	4	-	-	1	1	4	3	2	3	2	-	1	-	4	3	2	4	-	34
	4%	-	-	3%	-	-	3%	1%	10% <i>cgm</i>	7%	8%	4%	12%	-	6%	-	10% <i>cgm</i>	7%	7%	3%	-	4%
Audits through a Lead Assessor (not specified)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*
Other	16	-	-	5	1	-	*	3	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	*	1	1	1	-	20
	2%	-	-	3%	7%	-	1%	3%	5%	-	-	2%	3%	-	-	-	1%	1%	4%	1%	-	2%
Don't know	16	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	1	2	-	-	-	3	-	1	2	12
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	2%	3%	4%	-	-	-	7% <i>zgs</i>	-	1%	46%	1%
None	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 601

Q28b. Did you undertake your organisation's ESOS audits?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an internal Lead Assessor

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	84	80	2	2	2	5	5	4	5	-	25	17	5	5	1	2	6	48	35	84
Weighted total	80*	74*	1**	5**	1**	4**	3**	4**	6**	**	25**	14**	4**	4**	2**	4**	5**	43*	36**	84*
Yes	50	47	1	2	1	3	3	3	1	-	16	10	1	4	2	1	2	26	22	53
	62%	63%	49%	45%	100%	85%	82%	88%	22%	-	64%	69%	35%	88%	100%	25%	40%	61%	63%	63%
No	30	26	1	3	-	1	1	-	5	3	9	4	3	1	-	3	3	17	13	30
	37%	36%	51%	55%	-	15%	18%	-	78%	-	36%	31%	65%	12%	-	75%	60%	39%	36%	36%
Don't know/Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 602

Q28b. Did you undertake your organisation's ESOS audits?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an internal Lead Assessor

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	84	6	78	15	18	14	19	4	14	24	11	26	-	8	10	55	65	19	84
Weighted total	80*	7**	73*	16**	17**	14**	17**	3**	13**	27**	12**	21**	-**	10**	10**	48*	60*	19**	84*
Yes	50	2	48	5	6	11	16	2	9	15	8	12	-	7	6	30	40	10	53
	62%	30%	65%	34%	36%	83%	93%	52%	72%	56%	68%	58%	-	73%	56%	62%	66%	51%	63%
No	30	5	25	11	10	2	1	1	4	11	4	9	-	3	4	18	21	9	30
	37%	70%	34%	66%	61%	17%	7%	48%	28%	43%	32%	42%	-	27%	44%	37%	34%	46%	36%
Don't know/Not sure	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	1
	1%	-	1%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 603

Q28b. Did you undertake your organisation's ESOS audits?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an internal Lead Assessor

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	84	26	37	5	14	18	59	44	84	23	22	39	9	20	65	35	7	18	18	84
Weighted total	80*	24**	36*	3**	15**	16**	55*	41*	80*	20**	20**	38*	7**	20**	63*	30*	6**	18**	16**	84*
Yes	50	18	22	2	7	8	36	24	50	15	16	23	6	11	42	21	4	11	7	53
	62%	78%	61%	85%	42%	53%	66%	57%	62%	73%	79%	60%	86%	55%	65%	68%	77%	62%	46%	63%
No	30	5	14	-	9	8	19	17	30	5	4	15	1	9	22	10	1	7	8	30
	37%	21%	39%	15%	58%	47%	34%	42%	37%	25%	21%	40%	14%	45%	35%	32%	23%	38%	51%	36%
Don't know/Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 604

Q28b. Did you undertake your organisation's ESOS audits?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an internal Lead Assessor

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 84	43	4	37	84	13	15	6	15	18	20	44	20	15	51	18	84
Weighted total 80*	42*	4**	35*	80*	12**	15**	6**	15**	16**	19**	40*	20**	14**	47*	19**	84*
Yes 50 62%	27	3	20	50	6	10	4	11	9	7	29	13	5	34	11	53
	64%	83%	57%	62%	47%	64%	69%	70%	60%	37%	72%	66%	33%	73%	58%	63%
No 30 37%	14	1	15	30	7	5	2	5	6	12	11	6	10	13	7	30
	34%	17%	43%	37%	53%	36%	31%	30%	37%	63%	28%	32%	67%	27%	40%	36%
Don't know/Not sure *	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	1
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	2%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 605

Q28b. Did you undertake your organisation's ESOS audits?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an internal Lead Assessor

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	84	-	1	13	1	2	8	7	5	2	3	4	4	10	6	-	2	2	1	13	-	84
Weighted total	80*	..	1**	11**	1**	1**	6**	10**	4**	3**	2**	5**	3**	6**	9**	..	4**	2**	2**	11**	..	84*
Yes	50	-	-	5	1	-	5	5	4	3	1	-	2	5	5	-	4	2	2	7	-	53
	62%	-	-	43%	100%	-	85%	57%	100%	100%	65%	-	50%	71%	54%	-	100%	100%	100%	64%	-	63%
No	30	-	1	6	-	1	*	4	-	-	1	5	2	2	4	-	-	-	-	4	-	30
	37%	-	100%	57%	-	100%	8%	43%	-	-	35%	100%	50%	29%	46%	-	-	-	-	36%	-	36%
Don't know/Not sure	+	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 606

Q29a. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Finding out about, and understanding the scheme requirements, including whether your organisation was eligible

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	862	800	20	42	28	78	49	53	55	18	199	173	65	59	14	13	48	441	411	862
Weighted total	855	761	11**	83*	22**	75*	43*	58*	66*	17**	222	144	58*	55*	19**	18**	46*	427	417	862
Less than an hour	201	157	3	42	7	23	10	11	14	4	54	32	19	6	5	1	12	83	118	184
	24% <i>m</i>	21%	22%	50% <i>za</i>	33%	31% <i>m</i>	22%	19%	22%	23%	25% <i>m</i>	22%	32% <i>m</i>	10%	27%	4%	25%	20%	28% <i>q</i>	21%
1-10	525	491	7	27	13	38	27	32	40	13	137	90	37	41	10	10	29	282	236	553
	61% <i>c</i>	65% <i>c</i>	60%	33%	59%	51%	64%	55%	61%	74%	62%	63%	63%	76% <i>zeg</i>	52%	57%	62%	66% <i>r</i>	57%	64%
11-20	25	24	1	-	-	4	-	4	3	-	5	2	1	4	2	-	1	16	9	26
	3%	3%	5%	-	-	5%	-	7% <i>k</i>	4%	-	2%	1%	1%	7% <i>k</i>	11%	-	2%	4%	2%	3%
21-30	24	24	-	-	-	2	1	2	7	-	6	5	-	1	-	-	1	19	4	23
	3%	3%	-	-	-	3%	1%	3%	10% <i>zjl</i>	-	3%	3%	-	1%	-	-	2%	5% <i>r</i>	1%	3%
31-40	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1
41-50	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
51-99	5	5	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	4	5
	1%	1%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	8%	-	*	1%	1%
100+	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
Don't know/Refused	73	58	1	14	2	8	5	9	2	1	17	12	2	3	2	5	4	24	45	68
	9%	8%	9%	17% <i>a</i>	8%	11%	12%	15% <i>h</i>	3%	3%	7%	8%	4%	6%	10%	31%	8%	6%	11% <i>q</i>	8%
Mean	4.39	4.60	5.69	1.53	2.86	3.51	3.00	5.02f	5.58f	2.02	4.55	5.67	2.23	3.96f	3.46	10.00	3.95f	4.50	4.27	4.47

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 607

Q29a. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Finding out about, and understanding the scheme requirements, including whether your organisation was eligible

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	862	160	702	185	210	182	189	35	57	304	91	276	35	111	133	439	633	222	862
Weighted total	855	160	695	191	204	188	181	33*	55*	303	94*	276	39**	121*	144	407	616	231	862
Less than an hour	201	50	151	65	45	42	32	10	8	74	31	61	19	37	40	82	131	69	184
	24%	31% 	22%	34% zdefh	22%	22%	18%	30%	15%	24%	33%	22%	48%	31% o	27%	20%	21%	30% p	21%
1-10	525	88	437	109	130	113	117	17	38	180	50	179	16	67	93	265	382	137	553
	61%	55%	63%	57%	63%	60%	65%	52%	70%	59%	53%	65%	41%	55%	65%	65%	62%	59%	64%
11-20	25	3	22	3	3	8	8	-	3	8	2	8	1	3	1	16	22	3	26
	3%	2%	3%	2%	1%	4%	4%	-	6%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	1%	4%	4%	1%	3%
21-30	24	2	22	3	4	6	6	3	1	10	2	9	-	*	3	16	17	7	23
	3%	1%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	8% c	2%	3%	2%	3%	-	*	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%
31-40	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	*
41-50	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
51-99	5	*	5	-	*	3	1	-	1	1	1	3	2	-	-	2	3	2	5
	1%	*	1%	-	*	2%	*	-	1%	*	1%	1%	4%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%
100+	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
Don't know/Refused	73	17	56	11	23	15	16	3	3	29	9	15	2	13	7	25	60	12	68
	9%	10%	8%	6%	11%	8%	9%	11%	6%	9%	9%	5%	4%	11%	5%	6%	10%	5%	8%
Mean	4.39	2.98	4.69	3.08	3.29	5.40cd	5.43	4.88	5.15	4.58	3.06	5.05	8.08	2.32	3.06	4.99m	4.47	4.26	4.47

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 608

Q29a. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Finding out about, and understanding the scheme requirements, including whether your organisation was eligible

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	862	192	432	88	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	614	272	98	170	227	862
Weighted total	855	189	416	87*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	590	251	90*	157	241	862
Less than an hour	201	50	96	10	40	23	121	149	15	18	33	81	5	36	129	44	12	28	73	184
	24% <i>cmop</i>	26% <i>c</i>	23% <i>c</i>	11%	27% <i>c</i>	20%	21%	22%	19%	19%	24%	23%	16%	16%	22%	17%	13%	18%	30% <i>nopq</i>	21%
1-10	525	113	256	61	90	78	381	449	53	63	91	228	17	149	383	169	65	111	130	553
	61%	60%	62%	70%	61%	67%	66%	65%	67%	64%	65%	65%	56%	67%	65% <i>r</i>	67% <i>r</i>	72% <i>r</i>	71% <i>zr</i>	54%	64%
11-20	25	4	15	3	1	6	17	18	4	5	6	7	3	8	19	11	3	6	6	26
	3%	2%	4%	3%	1%	5%	3%	3%	5%	5%	4%	2%	10% <i>zk</i>	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%	2%	3%
21-30	24	3	13	1	7	4	16	18	1	4	6	9	4	7	19	13	3	2	5	23
	3%	2%	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	4%	3%	12% <i>zkm</i>	3%	3%	5%	4%	1%	2%	3%
31-40	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	*
41-50	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
51-99	5	4	1	1	-	2	2	4	2	*	1	4	-	*	1	1	-	*	4	5
	1%	2% <i>b</i>	*	1%	-	2%	*	1%	2%	*	1%	1%	-	*	*	*	-	*	2% <i>n</i>	1%
100+	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	1%	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	*
Don't know/Refused	73	15	34	12	10	3	39	48	3	7	3	23	2	20	39	15	7	9	22	68
	9% <i>j</i>	8%	8%	13%	7%	3%	7%	7% <i>j</i>	4%	7%	2%	6%	7%	9%	7%	6%	8%	5%	9%	8%
Mean	4.39	5.15	4.44	3.85	3.58	5.83	4.21	4.29	7.79 <i>zg</i>	5.37	4.34	4.82	7.01	4.34	4.28	5.14	4.71	4.93	4.72	4.47

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 609

Q29a. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Finding out about, and understanding the scheme requirements, including whether your organisation was eligible

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	862	526	32	302	862	104	170	92	140	121	241	410	186	210	462	170	862
Weighted total	855	515	30**	306	855	110*	168	88*	130	117	242	400	185	213	449	169	862
Less than an hour	201	113	10	77	201	31	39	17	24	26	70	86	38	59	106	29	184
	24%	22%	32%	25%	24%	28%	23%	20%	19%	22%	29% <i>k</i>	21%	21%	28% <i>o</i>	24%	17%	21%
1-10	525	325	19	179	525	64	114	49	90	78	150	255	111	131	282	103	553
	61%	63%	63%	59%	61%	58%	68%	55%	69% <i>g</i>	67%	62%	64%	60%	61%	63%	61%	64%
11-20	25	17	1	7	25	3	4	3	7	6	5	11	8	4	14	5	26
	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	5%	5%	2%	3%	5%	2%	3%	3%	3%
21-30	24	13	-	10	24	1	3	9	1	2	5	11	8	5	11	7	23
	3%	3%	-	3%	3%	*	2%	10% <i>zdefhi</i>	1%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	2%	4%	3%
31-40	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
41-50	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*
51-99	5	3	-	2	5	2	-	1	1	-	-	2	3	1	1	3	5
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	*	2% <i>n</i>	1%
100+	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	1%	*	-	-	*	-	-	*
Don't know/Refused	73	43	1	29	73	10	8	10	7	4	11	35	17	13	33	21	68
	9%	8%	3%	10%	9%	9%	5%	11%	5%	4%	5%	9%	9%	6%	7%	13% <i>m</i>	8%
Mean	4.39	4.21	2.66	4.92	4.39	4.48	3.59	6.90zdfh	4.11	4.99	3.72	4.12	5.90	4.38	3.83	6.06n	4.47

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 610

Q29a. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Finding out about, and understanding the scheme requirements, including whether your organisation was eligible

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	862	9	5	187	13	8	43	66	44	29	28	55	33	63	23	3	42	39	20	148	4	862
Weighted total	855	9**	5**	168	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	27**	73*	30**	43*	32**	5**	43*	46*	29**	135	8**	862
Less than an hour	201	1	-	28	3	*	6	22	5	16	5	19	6	6	10	3	14	11	13	27	5	184
	24% <i>c</i>	15%	-	16%	30%	8%	19%	27%	15%	42%	19%	26%	21%	14%	33%	65%	32% <i>c</i>	25%	44%	20%	55%	21%
1-10	525	4	4	113	5	5	22	50	27	15	16	46	21	33	21	2	23	17	13	87	2	553
	61% <i>q</i>	43%	87%	67% <i>q</i>	54%	92%	71% <i>q</i>	62% <i>q</i>	75% <i>pq</i>	39%	62%	63% <i>q</i>	69%	76% <i>zpq</i>	64%	35%	53%	38%	45%	64% <i>q</i>	22%	64%
11-20	25	1	-	5	-	-	1	3	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	3	-	5	-	26
	3%	12%	-	3%	-	-	2%	4%	5%	-	-	2%	5%	3%	-	-	2%	7%	-	4%	-	3%
21-30	24	-	1	7	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	3	1	2	-	-	3	1	1	4	-	23
	3%	-	13%	4%	-	-	2%	3%	-	-	-	4%	5%	-	-	-	6%	3%	4%	3%	-	3%
31-40	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
41-50	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
51-99	5	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	*	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	3%	-	1%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
100+	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Don't know/Refused	73	3	-	14	2	-	1	3	1	5	5	3	-	3	1	-	3	12	2	11	2	68
	9%	31%	-	8%	16%	-	4%	4%	4%	14%	19%	4%	-	7%	3%	-	7%	27% <i>zcfghkmps</i>	7%	8%	23%	8%
Mean	4.39	4.78	8.60	5.83	1.98	4.23	6.27	3.48	3.85	6.16	3.17	4.15	4.79	2.85	2.37	0.78	3.72	3.88	2.02	4.71	1.26	4.47

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 611

Q29b. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Deciding whether, and through what route, to comply with ESOS

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	862	800	20	42	28	78	49	53	55	18	199	173	65	59	14	13	48	441	411	862
Weighted total	855	761	11**	83*	22**	75*	43*	58*	66*	17**	222	144	58*	55*	19**	18**	46*	427	417	862
Less than an hour	305 36% <i>m</i>	263 35%	5 48%	37 44%	8 38%	34 45% <i>m</i>	19 44% <i>m</i>	20 34%	26 39% <i>m</i>	8 43%	75 34% <i>m</i>	56 39% <i>m</i>	20 34%	9 17%	4 22%	4 23%	17 37% <i>m</i>	142 33%	160 38%	302 35%
1-10	437 51% <i>c</i>	414 54% <i>c</i>	3 22%	20 25%	11 51%	30 40%	17 39%	28 49%	33 50%	9 54%	115 52%	70 49%	32 55%	41 74% <i>szefghijkl</i>	13 68%	8 43%	25 54%	242 57% <i>r</i>	191 46%	454 53%
11-20	11 1%	10 1%	1 5%	-	1 3%	2 3%	-	2 3%	1 1%	-	3 1%	2 1%	-	1 3%	-	-	-	8 2%	3 1%	13 2%
21-30	11 1%	11 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	2 5% <i>z</i>	-	-	-	3 1%	4 3%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	5 1%	6 1%	11 1%
31-40	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 1%	-	3 *
41-50	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2% <i>z</i>	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 *
51-99	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 *
100+	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	1 *
Don't know/Refused	85 10% <i>q</i>	57 7%	3 25%	26 31% <i>z</i>	2 8%	8 10%	5 12%	9 15%	4 6%	1 3%	24 11%	12 8%	6 10%	2 5%	2 10%	6 34%	4 9%	27 6%	55 13% <i>q</i>	76 9%
Mean	2.97	3.08	2.18	1.29	2.81	2.82	3.56	2.60	3.35	1.51	3.58	2.86	2.25	3.38	1.96	2.58	2.04	2.99	2.99	2.88

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 612

Q29b. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Deciding whether, and through what route, to comply with ESOS

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	862	160	702	185	210	182	189	35	57	304	91	276	35	111	133	439	633	222	862
Weighted total	855	160	695	191	204	188	181	33*	55*	303	94*	276	39**	121*	144	407	616	231	862
Less than an hour	305	72	233	90	75	59	60	11	10	106	48	96	22	57	54	130	198	102	302
	36%h	45%zb	34%	47%zefh	37%h	31%	33%	35%	18%	35%	51%zik	35%	57%	47%zo	38%	32%	32%	44%zp	35%
1-10	437	64	373	77	103	103	92	18	41	151	35	150	9	49	76	233	329	105	454
	51%acjm	40%	54%a	40%	50%	55%c	51%	55%	75%zdef	50%	38%	54%f	23%	40%	53%	57%zm	53%	45%	53%
11-20	11	-	11	-	1	4	5	1	-	3	1	5	-	-	1	7	11	-	13
	1%	-	2%	-	*	2%	3%c	2%	-	1%	1%	2%	-	-	1%	2%	2%	-	2%
21-30	11	1	9	1	1	2	5	1	1	3	1	3	-	-	3	7	9	2	11
	1%	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%
31-40	4	2	2	-	2	1	-	1	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	4	1	3	3
	*	1%	*	-	1%	*	-	2%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	*	1%	*
41-50	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
51-99	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1%z	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
100+	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	1
	*	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	4%	-	-	-	-	1%	*
Don't know/Refused	85	22	64	23	23	17	18	1	2	36	8	21	6	16	10	25	68	17	76
	10%o	13%	9%	12%	11%	9%	10%	4%	4%	12%	8%	8%	15%	13%o	7%	6%	11%	7%	9%
Mean	2.97m	2.34	3.10	1.79	2.30	4.13	3.42c	3.95	3.14	2.84	1.88	3.51	9.14	1.12	2.29m	3.33m	2.75	3.65	2.88

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 613

Q29b. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Deciding whether, and through what route, to comply with ESOS

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	862	192	432	88	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	614	272	98	170	227	862
Weighted total	855	189	416	87*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	590	251	90*	157	241	862
Less than an hour	305	72	142	34	54	33	204	233	32	35	44	123	7	72	206	64	19	42	95	302
	36% <i>opq</i>	38%	34%	40%	36%	29%	35%	34%	40%	35%	32%	35%	21%	33%	35% <i>op</i>	26%	21%	26%	40% <i>opq</i>	35%
1-10	437	91	220	39	79	74	317	384	40	54	82	196	21	117	318	155	58	95	111	454
	51%	48%	53%	44%	53%	64% <i>z</i>	55%	56%	50%	54%	58%	56%	68%	53%	54%	62% <i>znr</i>	65% <i>zr</i>	61% <i>zr</i>	46%	53%
11-20	11	1	8	1	1	-	8	8	1	3	4	3	1	5	9	7	4	4	2	13
	1%	*	2%	2%	*	-	1%	1%	2%	3%	3%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4% <i>zr</i>	3%	1%	2%
21-30	11	2	8	1	-	2	6	8	3	1	3	3	2	3	9	5	1	1	1	11
	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	7% <i>zkm</i>	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	*	1%
31-40	4	1	1	-	2	3	1	2	2	-	1	1	-	3	4	1	-	3	-	3
	*	*	*	-	1%	2% <i>zf</i>	*	*	2% <i>zg</i>	*	*	*	-	1%	1%	*	-	2% <i>zr</i>	-	*
41-50	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*
51-99	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	1%	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*
100+	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
	*	1%	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*
Don't know/Refused	85	22	36	12	12	4	38	49	2	6	7	22	1	21	43	18	8	11	30	76
	10% <i>efhk</i>	11%	9%	14%	8%	3%	7%	7%	2%	6%	5%	6%	2%	10%	7%	7%	9%	7%	12% <i>nr</i>	9%
Mean	2.97	3.66	2.91	2.27	2.80	3.54	2.85	2.88	4.07	3.86	3.31	3.28	4.76	3.08	2.96	3.22	3.15	3.77	2.98	2.88

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 614

Q29b. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Deciding whether, and through what route, to comply with ESOS

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	862	526	32	302	862	104	170	92	140	121	241	410	186	210	462	170	862
Weighted total	855	515	30**	306	855	110*	168	88*	130	117	242	400	185	213	449	169	862
Less than an hour	305	176	12	114	305	46	66	23	52	37	97	140	60	86	162	54	302
	36%	34%	41%	37%	36%	42%g	39%g	26%	40%g	31%	40%	35%	33%	40%	36%	32%	35%
1-10	437	273	15	146	437	51	91	50	62	74	117	219	91	100	245	79	454
	51%	53%	51%	48%	51%	46%	54%	56%	48%	63%zdeh	48%	55%	49%	47%	55%	47%	53%
11-20	11	6	-	4	11	1	-	5	1	2	3	4	4	2	4	4	13
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	6%zdefh	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%
21-30	11	8	-	2	11	1	1	2	2	1	1	8	2	1	8	2	11
	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
31-40	4	3	-	1	4	-	1	-	2	1	1	-	3	1	1	2	3
	*	1%	-	*	*	-	1%	-	2%	1%	*	-	1%k	*	*	1%	*
41-50	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	*	-	*
51-99	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	*
100+	2	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	1
	*	-	-	1%	*	2%zd	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%n	*
Don't know/Refused	85	46	3	37	85	10	10	8	9	2	23	30	22	22	29	26	76
	10%i	9%	9%	12%	10%i	9%i	6%	9%i	7%	2%	9%	7%	12%	10%	7%	16%n	9%
Mean	2.97	3.01	1.77	3.08	2.97	4.03	2.31	4.20i	3.61	2.90	2.11	2.53	5.29zjk	2.35	2.60	4.96zmn	2.88

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 615

Q29b. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Deciding whether, and through what route, to comply with ESOS

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)			
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	862	9	5	187	13	8	43	66	44	29	28	55	33	63	23	3	42	39	20	148	4	862	
Weighted total	855	9**	5**	168	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	27**	73*	31*	30**	43*	32**	5**	43*	46*	29**	135	8**	862
Less than an hour	305	1	-	48	4	1	10	41	8	18	8	26	12	14	13	3	22	14	10	48	2	302	
	36%	15%	-	29%	37%	20%	32%	51% <i>zch</i>	23%	48%	30%	36%	39%	32%	42%	62%	50% <i>ch</i>	30%	36%	36%	28%	35%	
1-10	437	5	4	96	5	4	18	37	27	14	13	40	16	22	16	-	17	20	17	65	2	454	
	51%	60%	87%	57%	46%	66%	57%	46%	75% <i>zgmpps</i>	37%	47%	55%	54%	50%	49%	-	40%	43%	57%	48%	22%	53%	
11-20	11	-	-	3	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	13	
	1%	-	-	2%	-	14%	2%	-	-	-	-	4%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	2%	
21-30	11	-	1	3	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	11	
	1%	-	13%	2%	-	-	3%	1%	2%	-	3%	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%	
31-40	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	2% <i>c</i>	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	
41-50	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
	*	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	
51-99	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2% <i>z</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	
100+	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	
Don't know/Refused	85	1	-	18	2	-	2	2	1	4	4	5	-	5	1	2	4	12	2	16	4	76	
	10%	14%	-	17% <i>g</i>	16%	-	6%	2%	2%	11%	17%	7%	-	12% <i>g</i>	3%	38%	10%	27% <i>zcfghks</i>	7%	12% <i>g</i>	51%	9%	
Mean	2.97	7.68	6.04	2.81	1.13	5.56	2.94	1.63	2.36	7.91	4.83	2.54	3.54	3.87	4.38	0.14	1.52	1.89	1.52	2.80	0.52	2.88	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 616

Q29c. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Procuring or training an auditor / assessor

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	862	800	20	42	28	78	49	53	55	18	199	173	65	59	14	13	48	441	411	862
Weighted total	855	761	11**	83*	22**	75*	43*	58*	66*	17**	222	144	58*	55*	19**	18**	46*	427	417	862
Less than an hour	312	259	4	49	12	36	16	19	28	8	75	51	21	5	1	15	151	160	310	
	37%	34%	37%	59%za	55%	48%j	37%	33%	43%	43%	34%	36%	36%	38%	28%	5%	32%	35%	38%	36%
1-10	427	413	5	9	8	28	20	31	30	8	121	70	29	28	12	11	26	230	190	445
	50%c	54%c	43%	11%	38%	38%	46%	53%	45%	48%	55%e	48%	51%	51%	63%	61%	56%	54%r	46%	52%
11-20	15	15	*	-	-	1	1	-	2	4	2	2	2	-	-	-	1	8	7	18
	2%	2%	4%	-	-	1%	3%	-	4%	-	1%	3%	3%	-	-	-	1%	2%	2%	2%
21-30	13	11	1	2	-	2	-	3	-	3	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	7	6	12
	2%	1%	5%	2%	-	3%	-	4%	-	-	1%	1%	4%	3%	-	-	-	2%	1%	1%
31-40	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	-	*
41-50	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	*
51-99	4	4	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	4
	*	*	-	-	-	1%	2%j	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	*	*	*
100+	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
Don't know/Refused	81	56	1	24	2	7	5	6	5	1	20	14	4	3	2	6	4	26	51	68
	9%	7%	10%	28%za	8%	9%	12%	10%	8%	8%	9%	10%	7%	5%	10%	34%	8%	6%	12%q	8%
Mean	3.42	3.39	4.34	4.08	2.24	4.03	4.64	3.84	2.81	2.24	2.52	4.57	3.46	2.88	1.81	2.63	3.50	3.40	3.49	3.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 617

Q29c. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Procuring or training an auditor / assessor

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	862	160	702	185	210	182	189	35	57	304	91	276	35	111	133	439	633	222	862
Weighted total	855	160	695	191	204	188	181	33*	55*	303	94*	276	39**	121*	144	407	616	231	862
Less than an hour	312	72	241	89	77	63	50	13	21	114	49	96	25	57	52	138	207	101	310
	37% <i>f</i>	45% <i>b</i>	35%	46% <i>zef</i>	37%	34%	28%	40%	38%	38%	52% <i>zik</i>	35%	64%	47% <i>o</i>	36%	34%	34%	44% <i>p</i>	36%
1-10	427	60	367	71	99	101	108	15	30	147	34	147	8	43	76	228	322	101	445
	50% <i>acjm</i>	37%	53% <i>a</i>	37%	48% <i>c</i>	54% <i>c</i>	60% <i>zcd</i>	46%	55% <i>c</i>	48%	37%	53% <i>f</i>	20%	36%	52% <i>m</i>	56% <i>zm</i>	52% <i>q</i>	44%	52%
11-20	15	1	14	3	4	4	4	-	-	7	2	4	-	2	2	7	11	4	18
	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	-	-	2%	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%
21-30	13	2	11	3	3	5	-	2	-	3	-	8	3	4	1	4	8	5	12
	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3% <i>f</i>	-	6% <i>f</i>	-	1%	-	3%	7%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
31-40	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	2% <i>z</i>	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	*
41-50	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
	*	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	*
51-99	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	3	1	4	-	4
	*	1%	*	*	*	*	1%	-	-	*	-	1%	-	-	2%	*	1%	-	*
100+	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
Don't know/Refused	81	23	57	23	20	13	18	2	4	31	7	19	4	15	11	26	61	19	68
	9%	15% <i>b</i>	8%	12%	10%	7%	10%	6%	7%	10%	8%	7%	9%	13% <i>o</i>	8%	6%	10%	8%	8%
Mean	3.42	3.32	3.45	3.29	3.91	3.78	3.11	4.08	1.63	3.00	2.38	3.56	4.39	2.99	3.46	3.48	3.55	3.16	3.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 618

Q29c. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Procuring or training an auditor / assessor

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	862	192	432	88	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	614	272	98	170	227	862
Weighted total	855	189	416	87*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	590	251	90*	157	241	862
Less than an hour	312	62	151	33	60	35	194	222	35	35	46	113	13	69	220	83	30	52	88	310
	37%	33%	36%	38%	41%	31%	34%	32%	44%g	35%	33%	32%	42%	31%	37%	33%	34%	33%	37%	36%
1-10	427	98	208	40	73	70	329	398	39	47	83	202	15	121	310	144	48	88	112	445
	50%	52%	50%	46%	49%	60%	57%z	58%zi	49%	47%	59%	58%z	50%	55%	52%	57%r	53%	56%	46%	52%
11-20	15	7	7	1	1	3	9	11	2	3	3	5	1	5	9	1	1	4	5	18
	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	*	1%	3%	2%	2%
21-30	13	4	6	2	-	3	8	12	-	-	2	7	-	5	6	1	2	-	6	12
	2%	2%	2%	3%	-	3%	1%	2%	-	-	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%
31-40	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	2
	*	*	*	-	-	1%	*	*	-	1%	1%	-	2%zk	*	*	*	-	-	-	*
41-50	2	-	2	-	-	2	2	2	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	2
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	1%	1%	*	-	-	*	-	-	1%	*	*
51-99	4	2	2	-	-	3	3	3	1	1	1	3	1	-	3	1	1	2	1	4
	*	1%	*	-	-	-	*	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%zm	-	*	*	1%	1%	*	*
100+	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Don't know/Refused	81	16	38	11	13	4	31	39	3	12	4	20	-	20	40	19	8	10	28	68
	9%efgj	8%	9%	12%	9%	3%	5%	6%	4%	12%gj	3%	6%	-	9%	7%	8%	9%	6%	12%hn	8%
Mean	3.42	4.16d	3.79	2.97	1.87	3.95	3.26	3.34	3.39	3.75	3.63	3.89	5.15	3.23	3.01	2.77	3.49	3.43	3.58	3.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 619

Q29c. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Procuring or training an auditor / assessor

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	862	526	32	302	862	104	170	92	140	121	241	410	186	210	462	170	862
Weighted total	855	515	30**	306	855	110*	168	88*	130	117	242	400	185	213	449	169	862
Less than an hour	312	185	9	118	312	50	60	28	48	36	100	149	61	87	163	59	310
	37%	36%	30%	39%	37%	45% <i>f</i>	36%	32%	37%	31%	41%	37%	33%	41%	36%	35%	36%
1-10	427	265	17	141	427	44	90	46	68	76	113	207	93	100	235	80	445
	50%	52%	56%	46%	50%	40%	54% <i>e</i>	52%	52%	65% <i>zde</i>	47%	52%	50%	47%	52%	47%	52%
11-20	15	12	1	3	15	3	2	4	2	1	3	8	4	4	7	5	18
	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	4%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%
21-30	13	5	-	8	13	3	3	-	1	1	4	6	4	1	8	3	12
	2%	1%	-	3%	2%	2%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	*	2%	2%	1%
31-40	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	2
	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	*	*	-	*	-	*
41-50	2	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	2
	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	1%	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	1%	*
51-99	4	3	-	1	4	2	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	4
	*	1%	-	*	*	2%	1%	-	-	1%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
100+	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	*
Don't know/Refused	81	42	4	35	81	9	12	9	11	1	21	27	21	21	30	21	68
	9% <i>f</i>	8%	12%	11%	9% <i>f</i>	8% <i>f</i>	7% <i>f</i>	10% <i>f</i>	8% <i>f</i>	1%	9%	7%	11%	10%	7%	12% <i>n</i>	8%
Mean	3.42	3.49	2.18	3.46	3.42	4.37	3.15	3.80	2.61	2.79	3.06	3.48	3.96	2.50	3.69	3.66	3.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 620

Q29c. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Procuring or training an auditor / assessor

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	862	9	5	187	13	8	43	66	44	29	28	55	33	63	23	3	42	39	20	148	4	862
Weighted total	855	9**	5**	168	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	27**	73*	30**	43*	32**	5**	43*	46*	29**	135	8**	862
Less than an hour	312	4	-	54	3	1	9	32	14	16	8	28	11	16	13	3	25	11	11	49	4	310
		37%	48%	32%	27%	19%	30%	39%	38%	43%	31%	38%	38%	36%	40%	62%	58%zcfmq	24%	38%	36%	49%	36%
1-10	427	5	5	93	6	4	18	41	19	13	11	39	16	20	16	-	13	20	14	73	-	445
		50%p	52%	56%p	62%	81%	59%p	51%	51%	34%	43%	53%p	54%	46%	50%	-	30%	43%	47%	54%p	-	52%
11-20	15	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	1	4	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	18
		2%	-	1%	-	-	5% <i>s</i>	2%	6% <i>cs</i>	-	-	1%	3%	9% <i>zcs</i>	-	-	6% <i>s</i>	2%	-	-	-	2%
21-30	13	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	2	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	1	-	12
		2%	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	2%	5%	3%	-	2%	-	4%	-	-	4%	5%	1%	-	1%
31-40	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
		*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
41-50	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
		*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	1%	*
51-99	4	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4
		*	-	*	-	-	3% <i>z</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*
100+	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
		*	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Don't know/Refused	81	-	-	15	1	-	1	4	1	7	5	5	1	3	2	2	3	12	2	11	4	68
		9%	-	9%	11%	-	4%	5%	3%	18%	20%	7%	3%	7%	6%	38%	6%	27%zcfghkmps	7%	8%	51%	8%
Mean	3.42	0.96	2.64	2.93	2.36	3.57	4.89k	4.95	3.69	3.41	4.53	1.94	3.93	4.91k	4.22	-	2.64	3.82	3.90	2.88	0.14	3.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 621

Q29d. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Supporting auditor / assessor in compliance activity (e.g. collating of organisational data)

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	862	800	20	42	28	78	49	53	55	18	199	173	65	59	14	13	48	441	411	862
Weighted total	855	761	11**	83*	22**	75*	43*	58*	66*	17**	222	144	58*	55*	19**	18**	46*	427	417	862
Less than an hour	99	54	1	43	4	9	6	6	10	3	26	10	8	9	2	-	2	43	56	83
	12% ^a	7%	10%	52% ^{za}	20%	12%	14%	10%	15%	19%	12%	7%	14%	17% ^k	10%	-	5%	10%	13%	10%
1-10	495	482	4	9	13	42	22	34	37	10	125	88	32	30	14	8	32	271	219	512
	58% ^c	63% ^{zc}	36%	11%	57%	56%	50%	59%	57%	59%	56%	61%	55%	55%	77%	45%	68%	63% ^r	52%	59%
11-20	106	104	2	-	2	9	5	6	9	2	37	20	6	5	1	1	2	52	53	111
	12% ^c	14% ^c	15%	-	9%	12%	11%	11%	14%	10%	16%	14%	11%	9%	4%	8%	5%	12%	13%	13%
21-30	42	41	1	-	1	8	2	4	4	-	7	9	2	4	-	-	2	23	18	48
	5%	5%	10%	-	6%	10% ^j	6%	7%	6%	-	3%	6%	3%	6%	-	-	4%	5%	4%	6%
31-40	5	5	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	5	7
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	2%	1%	-	-	-	-	*	1%	1%
41-50	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	-	1	2	4	7
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	*	1%	1%
51-99	18	17	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	5	3	1	3	-	-	-	2	10	8	20
	2%	2%	9%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	4%	2%	2%	2%	6%	-	-	5%	2%	2%	2%	2%
100+	6	6	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	5	8
	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	3%	-	*	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	3%	*	1%	1%
Don't know/Refused	79	46	2	30	2	5	6	5	5	1	18	11	7	3	2	8	4	24	50	66
	9% ^{ag}	6%	21%	36% ^{za}	8%	7%	14%	9%	8%	8%	8%	8%	12%	5%	10%	47%	8%	6%	12% ^q	8%
Mean	12.52	12.68	18.69	1.49	8.34	11.27	11.88	13.42	8.43	11.27	14.70	12.18	12.40	14.33	6.30	7.28	15.49	10.50	14.83	13.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 622

Q29d. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Supporting auditor / assessor in compliance activity (e.g. collating of organisational data)

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	862	160	702	185	210	182	189	35	57	304	91	276	35	111	133	439	633	222	862
Weighted total	855	160	695	191	204	188	181	33*	55*	303	94*	276	39**	121*	144	407	616	231	862
Less than an hour	99	34	65	40	18	20	11	4	6	39	16	31	13	21	13	34	55	44	83
	12% ^f	21% ^{zb}	9%	21% ^{zdef}	9%	10%	6%	13%	12%	13%	17%	11%	32%	17% ^o	9%	8%	9%	19% ^{zp}	10%
1-10	495	89	406	105	137	113	95	18	24	170	60	173	19	72	96	230	352	138	512
	58%	55%	58%	55%	67% ^{zcfh}	60% ^h	53%	54%	44%	56%	64%	63%	48%	59%	66%	57%	57%	60%	59%
11-20	106	9	96	13	21	24	29	3	16	34	7	35	1	8	17	63	83	20	111
	12% ^g	6%	14% ^{aa}	7%	10%	13%	16% ^{cc}	10%	29% ^{zcdef}	11%	7%	13%	4%	7%	12%	15% ⁿⁿ	13%	9%	13%
21-30	42	4	38	5	7	12	15	3	1	14	4	9	1	4	4	28	38	4	48
	5%	2%	5%	2%	3%	6%	8% ^{cc}	8%	3%	5%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	7%	6% ^{qq}	2%	6%
31-40	5	1	5	-	1	1	3	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	1	3	5	1	7
	1%	*	1%	-	1%	*	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	3	1%	*	1%
41-50	6	-	6	1	1	1	1	2	-	2	1	1	-	-	1	3	5	1	7
	1%	-	1%	*	*	1%	1%	5% ^{zcde}	-	1%	1%	*	-	-	1%	3	1%	*	1%
51-99	18	2	16	1	3	6	5	1	2	8	1	3	-	-	3	12	15	3	20
	2%	1%	2%	*	1%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%
100+	6	1	5	1	1	1	2	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	6	5	1	8
	1%	1%	1%	*	*	*	1%	-	4% ^{zcde}	*	-	*	-	-	-	2%	1%	*	1%
Don't know/Refused	79	21	58	26	16	11	20	2	2	32	5	21	5	16	9	27	58	20	66
	9%	13%	8%	14% ^{ee}	8%	6%	11%	6%	4%	11%	5%	8%	13%	14% ^{oo}	6%	7%	9%	9%	8%
Mean	12.52	8.91	13.25	8.01	8.68	11.68	14.20^{cd}	14.55	36.30^{zcd}	11.14	7.38	12.13	5.70	5.79	9.15	16.87	13.89	8.72	13.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 623

Q29d. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Supporting auditor / assessor in compliance activity (e.g. collating of organisational data)

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	862	192	432	88	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	614	272	98	170	227	862
Weighted total	855	189	416	87*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	590	251	90*	157	241	862
Less than an hour	99	23	37	9	22	5	33	40	6	8	8	28	3	8	61	21	7	15	36	83
	12%efgjm	12%	9%	11%	15%	4%	6%	6%	7%	8%	6%	8%	9%	4%	10%	9%	8%	10%	15%o	10%
1-10	495	111	251	52	77	73	394	460	41	47	89	232	20	130	339	143	51	90	145	512
	58%l	58%	60%	60%	52%	63%	68%z	67%zhi	51%	47%	63%l	66%z	66%	59%	57%	57%	57%	58%	60%	59%
11-20	106	24	44	12	24	22	76	89	18	17	22	43	3	32	79	35	11	20	26	111
	12%	13%	11%	14%	16%	19%	13%	13%	22%zg	17%	16%	12%	10%	15%	13%	14%	12%	13%	11%	13%
21-30	42	8	25	5	4	9	28	37	4	4	5	14	1	18	36	17	11	11	6	48
	5%	4%	6%	5%	3%	8%	5%	5%	5%	4%	3%	4%	2%	8%	6%	7%r	13%znr	7%	3%	6%
31-40	5	3	1	1	1	1	5	5	2	1	1	3	-	3	5	2	-	1	-	7
	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	*	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	-	1%
41-50	6	1	3	-	2	2	3	4	1	2	2	5	-	1	6	3	1	2	-	7
	1%	*	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%
51-99	18	3	10	-	4	1	12	13	4	5	6	6	3	6	14	10	2	5	4	20
	2%	2%	2%	-	3%	1%	2%	2%	4%	5%	4%	2%	9%zk	3%	2%	4%	2%	3%	2%	2%
100+	6	1	5	1	-	2	4	5	2	2	1	2	-	2	5	2	2	3	1	8
	1%	*	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	*	1%
Don't know/Refused	79	17	40	7	13	2	23	35	4	15	8	18	1	21	45	17	5	9	23	66
	9%efgk	9%	10%	9%	8%	2%	4%	5%	5%	15%ghj	6%	5%	4%	9%	8%	7%	6%	5%	10%	8%
Mean	12.52	10.09	14.97	9.81	10.84	19.73	10.39	10.41	29.25zg	18.96g	12.29	12.99	15.15	12.62	14.37	17.81	17.34r	15.31r	8.35	13.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 624

Q29d. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Supporting auditor / assessor in compliance activity (e.g. collating of organisational data)

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	862	526	32	302	862	104	170	92	140	121	241	410	186	210	462	170	862
Weighted total	855	515	30**	306	855	110*	168	88*	130	117	242	400	185	213	449	169	862
Less than an hour	99	52	2	44	99	18	17	6	11	14	33	43	19	31	45	20	83
	12%	10%	8%	15%	12%	17%	10%	7%	8%	12%	14%	11%	11%	15%	10%	12%	10%
1-10	495	305	18	170	495	74	103	55	69	64	146	232	108	127	266	95	512
	58%	59%	59%	56%	58%	68%h	61%	62%	53%	55%	60%	58%	58%	59%	59%	56%	59%
11-20	106	66	3	35	106	8	22	10	23	22	24	60	17	20	64	16	111
	12%	13%	9%	11%	12%	7%	13%	11%	18%e	18%e	10%	15%	9%	10%	14%	9%	13%
21-30	42	23	2	17	42	1	8	2	9	10	13	20	9	13	22	8	48
	5%	4%	8%	6%	5%	1%	5%	2%	7%e	9%e	6%	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%
31-40	5	4	-	2	5	1	-	-	1	-	2	2	1	1	4	-	7
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	-	1%
41-50	6	4	1	1	6	-	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	3	3	7
	1%	1%	3%	*	1%	-	*	1%	2%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
51-99	18	10	1	7	18	1	2	3	3	3	5	9	4	2	13	3	20
	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	4%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%
100+	6	5	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	1	4	2	8
	1%	1%	3%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%
Don't know/Refused	79	47	3	29	79	6	15	11	12	2	16	28	23	18	29	25	66
	9%l	9%	9%	9%	9%l	5%	9%l	13%l	9%l	2%	7%	7%	12%k	8%	6%	15%zn	8%
Mean	12.52	13.77	16.28	9.99	12.52	7.86	9.89	14.79	20.50	14.50e	9.70	14.09	13.13	8.54	14.37	12.72	13.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 625

Q29d. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Supporting auditor / assessor in compliance activity (e.g. collating of organisational data)

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	862	9	5	187	13	8	43	66	44	29	28	55	33	63	23	3	42	39	20	148	4	862
Weighted total	855	9**	5**	168	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	27**	73*	31**	43*	32**	5**	43*	46*	29**	135	8**	862
Less than an hour	99	2	-	9	2	-	-	9	2	2	4	9	10	2	8	3	10	3	4	17	4	83
	12% <i>scf</i>	17%	-	6%	16%	-	-	11% <i>f</i>	5%	5%	17%	12% <i>f</i>	32%	5%	24%	62%	22% <i>scfhm</i>	7%	13%	13% <i>cf</i>	49%	10%
1-10	495	5	3	106	4	3	21	47	23	23	14	46	15	30	14	-	23	19	22	77	-	512
	58% <i>q</i>	53%	74%	63% <i>q</i>	44%	56%	69% <i>q</i>	58%	63%	61%	54%	63% <i>q</i>	49%	69% <i>q</i>	44%	-	54%	41%	77%	57%	-	59%
11-20	106	1	-	20	2	1	3	11	4	4	1	13	3	5	6	-	5	8	-	20	-	111
	12%	10%	-	12%	18%	25%	10%	14%	12%	11%	3%	17%	10%	11%	19%	-	11%	17%	-	14%	-	13%
21-30	42	1	1	11	*	1	1	5	6	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	-	3	-	5	-	48
	5%	10%	26%	7%	4%	18%	5%	6%	16% <i>zckmps</i>	6%	2%	3%	3%	1%	4%	-	-	7%	-	4%	-	6%
31-40	5	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	7
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	5% <i>zgs</i>	-	2%	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	1%
41-50	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	7
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	3%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	1%	-	1%
51-99	18	1	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	1	*	-	4	-	20
	2%	12%	-	3%	-	-	4%	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	2%	6%	-	3%	1%	-	3%	-	2%
100+	6	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	6% <i>zcks</i>	1%	-	-	6%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
Don't know/Refused	79	-	-	13	2	-	1	7	-	7	4	4	*	4	1	2	5	12	2	12	4	66
	9% <i>h</i>	-	-	8%	16%	-	2%	8%	-	18%	15%	5%	2%	9% <i>h</i>	3%	38%	11% <i>h</i>	25% <i>zcfghkms</i>	7%	9%	51%	8%
Mean	12.52	16.97	12.75	12.03	10.81	12.10	48.03 <i>zcs</i>	9.63	12.57 <i>k</i>	8.26	28.80	7.06	10.98	9.80	15.72	-	8.11	10.96	5.10	10.64	0.29	13.53

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 626

Q29e. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Submitting notification of compliance

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Less than an hour	422	399	4	19	10	33	17	29	33	6	115	81	26	27	9	5	23	219	198	433
	54%	54%	44%	61%	57%	51%	42%	52%	60%	42%	56%	57%	52%	57%	48%	34%	51%	55%	53%	53%
1-10	261	259	2	-	7	22	15	20	13	8	69	45	18	17	6	4	15	141	118	283
	33%	35%	17%	-	40%	34%	38%	36%	24%	54%	33%	32%	37%	37%	34%	28%	33%	35%	32%	35%
11-20	7	6	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	2	-	2	-	-	-	5	2	9
	1%	1%	5%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	4%z	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
21-30	7	6	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	4	8
	1%	1%	6%	-	4%	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	2%	1%	1%	1%
31-40	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
	*	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	4	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	*	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	4
	*	*	5%	-	-	-	1%	-	4%z	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	*
100+	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	2%zj	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*
Don't know/Refused	78	64	2	12	-	8	7	7	6	1	16	12	4	1	3	5	6	28	46	73
	10%	9%	23%	39%	-	12% <i>m</i>	18% <i>jm</i>	12%	11%	4%	8%	9%	9%	2%	18%	38%	13% <i>m</i>	7%	12% <i>q</i>	9%
Mean	2.53	2.47	12.19	0.50	2.05	2.25	2.04	1.53	3.99	1.38	2.25	3.13	4.28	2.08	0.89	1.11	1.91	2.29	2.81	2.59

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 627

Q29e. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Submitting notification of compliance

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Less than an hour	422	79	343	94	109	96	83	15	23	158	54	132	18	67	78	206	293	123	433
	54%	57%	53%	61% <i>f</i>	55%	56%	47%	48%	46%	57%	65% <i>k</i>	51%	71%	62%	60%	52%	51%	61% <i>p</i>	53%
1-10	261	36	225	46	53	58	68	14	22	78	22	94	5	22	40	147	204	56	283
	33% <i>m</i>	26%	35%	30%	27%	34%	39% <i>d</i>	45%	45% <i>d</i>	28%	27%	37%	19%	21%	31%	37% <i>m</i>	36%	28%	35%
11-20	7	-	7	1	2	1	1	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	6	5	1	9
	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	4% <i>z</i>	*	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%
21-30	7	2	5	1	2	2	2	-	-	2	-	3	-	1	1	4	4	3	8
	1%	2%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
31-40	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	*	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	4	2	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	2	1	3	4
	*	2% <i>b</i>	*	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*	-	1%	-	1%	*	1%	*
100+	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	*	-	*	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	-	*
Don't know/Refused	78	19	60	12	28	14	20	2	2	32	7	24	3	17	10	27	61	16	73
	10%	14%	9%	8%	14%	8%	11%	7%	4%	12%	8%	9%	11%	16% <i>o</i>	8%	7%	11%	8%	9%
Mean	2.53	2.92	2.46	1.70	4.63	1.71	2.22	1.09	2.54	3.05	0.91	1.95	0.59	1.42	1.29	3.10	2.50	2.71	2.59

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 628

Q29e. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Submitting notification of compliance

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Less than an hour	422	93	205	43	74	50	328	375	32	54	68	192	19	111	285	114	38	69	130	433
	51% ^{eh}	55%	53%	52%	56%	43%	57% ^{ee}	55% ^h	40%	55%	48%	55%	63%	50%	52%	48%	44%	46%	61% ^{nopq}	53%
1-10	261	59	132	25	44	55	192	234	35	33	60	123	10	76	201	99	33	62	56	283
	33%	35%	34%	30%	33%	47% ^{zf}	33%	34%	44%	33%	43% ^z	35%	31%	34%	37% ^r	41% ^{zr}	38% ^r	41% ^r	27%	35%
11-20	7	-	4	-	2	3	3	5	2	2	-	3	-	2	5	3	2	1	1	9
	1%	-	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	*	1%	1%
21-30	7	3	1	1	1	1	5	6	1	3	4	2	1	1	5	1	2	3	2	8
	1%	2%	*	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	3%	1%	3%	*	1%	*	2%	2%	1%	1%
31-40	2	1	1	-	2	2	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
	*	*	*	-	1% ^f	-	*	*	1%	-	*	-	-	1%	*	1%	1%	*	-	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	4	1	-	1	2	2	1	1	3	*	-	1	1	2	2	-	-	2	1	4
	*	1%	-	1%	2% ^b	2%	*	*	3% ^{zgj}	*	-	*	2%	1%	*	-	-	2%	1%	*
100+	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	2
	*	-	1%	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	*	*	-	1%	-	*
Don't know/Refused	78	13	39	13	10	4	46	64	6	7	8	28	1	28	45	20	11	12	21	73
	10% ^e	8%	10%	16%	8%	4%	8%	9%	8%	7%	5%	8%	2%	13%	8%	8%	13%	8%	10%	9%
Mean	2.53	2.43	2.48	1.87	2.91	3.46	2.35	2.30	4.98	2.97	2.38	2.69	3.01	2.74	2.43	2.54	2.70	4.47	1.95	2.59

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 629

Q29e. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Submitting notification of compliance

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Less than an hour	422	243	20	155	422	56	82	35	74	55	134	194	80	115	219	75	433
	54%g	51%	72%	57%	54%g	62%g	54%	41%	59%g	52%	62%kl	52%	47%	61%o	53%	49%	53%
1-10	261	173	4	83	261	30	56	42	34	45	59	141	60	55	157	49	283
	33%	36%	15%	31%	33%	33%	36%	48%zdh	27%	42%h	27%	38%f	36%	29%	38%m	32%	35%
11-20	7	6	-	1	7	-	1	-	3	1	2	4	-	-	6	-	9
	1%	1%	-	*	1%	-	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%
21-30	7	3	1	3	7	1	3	1	-	-	1	2	2	1	2	3	8
	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	2%	1%
31-40	2	1	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
	*	*	4%	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	2%zd	*	1%	-	*	1%	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	4	4	-	-	4	-	1	-	3	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	4
	1%	1%	-	-	*	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	*	1%	-	*	2%	*
100+	2	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	2
	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	*	-	*
Don't know/Refused	78	47	2	30	78	3	10	9	11	4	21	25	24	19	28	25	73
	10%f	10%	6%	11%	10%j	3%	7%	10%	9%	4%	10%	7%	14%k	10%	7%	16%zn	9%
Mean	2.53	2.71	3.12	2.18	2.53	1.24	2.36	1.77	4.42	2.06	1.43	2.83	3.12j	1.07	2.81	3.37m	2.59

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 630

Q29e. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Submitting notification of compliance

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	21**	41*	36**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
Less than an hour	422	4	3	86	3	2	19	45	21	18	9	34	14	18	15	-	26	24	19	61	2	433
	54%	47%	54%	54%	31%	28%	62%	57%	58%	52%	38%	52%	67%	44%	56%	-	72% <i>zms</i>	58%	65%	48%	54%	53%
1-10	261	5	2	57	4	4	8	24	13	8	9	26	6	18	8	-	6	6	7	49	-	283
	33% <i>q</i>	53%	46%	36% <i>pq</i>	49%	72%	26%	30%	35% <i>q</i>	25%	38%	39% <i>pq</i>	29%	45% <i>pq</i>	32%	-	17%	15%	23%	39% <i>pq</i>	-	35%
11-20	7	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	9
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	5% <i>zc</i>	2%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%
21-30	7	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	8
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	3% <i>s</i>	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	3%	3%	-	-	1%
31-40	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3% <i>zc</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	4
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2% <i>c</i>	8%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*
100+	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	3% <i>zcs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Don't know/Refused	78	-	-	14	2	-	1	8	-	8	6	5	-	3	1	-	3	9	3	13	2	73
	10% <i>h</i>	-	-	9%	20%	-	4%	10%	-	23%	24%	8%	-	8%	4%	-	7%	22% <i>zcfh</i>	12%	10% <i>h</i>	46%	9%
Mean	2.53	2.32	1.12	1.40	2.89	0.99	2.71	3.89	7.43 <i>zcs</i>	0.92	1.25	1.93	1.47	3.97 <i>c</i>	6.57	-	1.72	3.44	0.91	1.87	-	2.59

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 631

Q29f. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Reviewing and signing off audit report

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Less than an hour	360	337	5	19	8	32	18	27	29	3	98	66	21	16	8	3	26	180	174	365
	46%	45%	46%	61%	47%	48%	45%	48%	51%	23%	48%	46%	42%	33%	45%	23%	58% <i>m</i>	45%	47%	45%
1-10	360	357	3	-	8	29	17	22	26	10	92	66	26	30	8	6	14	202	156	390
	46%	48%	30%	-	49%	44%	42%	39%	47%	73%	45%	47%	52%	63% <i>szegjp</i>	45%	39%	32%	50% <i>r</i>	42%	48%
11-20	5	4	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	2	6
	1%	1%	6%	-	4%	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	2%	1%	1%	1%
21-30	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*
31-40	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2% <i>z</i>	-	-	-	-	*	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/Refused	55	41	2	12	-	5	5	7	1	1	13	8	3	1	2	5	3	16	35	50
	7%	6%	18%	39%	-	7%	12% <i>h</i>	13% <i>h</i>	1%	4%	6%	6%	6%	2%	10%	38%	7%	4%	10% <i>q</i>	6%
Mean	1.60	1.59	3.59	0.70	1.89	1.27	1.76	1.52	1.48	1.71	1.55	1.66	1.54	2.37	1.17	0.72	1.65	1.52	1.69	1.64

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 632

Q29f. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Reviewing and signing off audit report

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Less than an hour	360	72	288	91	96	77	66	15	16	123	53	125	16	66	68	164	246	108	365
	46%	52%	45%	59% <i>zefh</i>	46% <i>fh</i>	45%	38%	47%	32%	45%	64% <i>szik</i>	49%	63%	61% <i>zo</i>	52% <i>o</i>	42%	43%	53% <i>p</i>	45%
1-10	360	50	310	50	83	85	93	15	30	126	27	114	6	30	55	208	278	81	390
	46% <i>acjm</i>	36%	48% <i>a</i>	33%	42%	50% <i>c</i>	53% <i>cd</i>	49%	61% <i>zcd</i>	46% <i>j</i>	32%	45%	25%	28%	43% <i>m</i>	53% <i>zm</i>	49%	40%	48%
11-20	5	1	4	1	1	1	2	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	1	6
	1%	*	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	-	-	2% <i>k</i>	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%
21-30	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	2
	*	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	2% <i>zd</i>	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	*
31-40	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/Refused	55	16	39	10	18	8	14	1	2	22	3	17	3	12	6	19	43	11	50
	7%	11% <i>b</i>	6%	7%	9%	5%	8%	4%	5%	8%	3%	7%	12%	11% <i>o</i>	5%	5%	8%	5%	6%
Mean	1.60m	1.38	1.64	1.39	1.30	1.59	1.93	1.72	2.08	1.65	1.36	1.38	1.54	0.91	1.10	1.73mn	1.60	1.60	1.64

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 633

Q29f. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Reviewing and signing off audit report

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Less than an hour	360	89	163	38	61	39	290	332	23	38	59	168	15	92	237	89	32	59	119	365
	46% ^{eho}	52% ^b	42%	47%	46%	34%	50% ^{ee}	48% ^h	29%	38%	42%	48%	49%	42%	43%	37%	37%	39%	56% ^{znopq}	45%
1-10	360	72	188	33	64	74	263	313	49	49	72	163	16	106	274	136	47	82	78	390
	46% ^{ef}	42%	49%	40%	48%	63% ^{zf}	45%	46%	61% ^{zg}	50%	51%	46%	51%	48%	50% ^{fr}	57% ^{zr}	54% ^r	54% ^r	37%	48%
11-20	5	1	2	1	1	-	3	4	2	2	2	3	-	-	4	2	1	2	1	6
	1%	*	1%	1%	*	-	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	*	1%
21-30	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	-	1	2	1	-	1	-	2
	*	-	1%	-	-	1%	*	*	1%	1%	1%	*	-	*	*	*	-	1%	-	*
31-40	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/Refused	55	9	29	9	7	2	20	36	5	9	6	16	-	22	29	11	7	7	15	50
	7% ^{ef}	5%	7%	11%	5%	2%	4%	5%	6%	9%	4%	5%	-	10% ^k	5%	5%	8%	5%	7%	6%
Mean	1.60r	1.45	1.63	2.00	1.51	2.00	1.46	1.55	2.50zg	2.42zg	2.05	1.68	1.47	1.68	1.81r	2.08zr	1.70r	2.26zr	1.04	1.64

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 634

Q29f. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Reviewing and signing off audit report

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	(p)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Less than an hour	360	208	16	136	360	55	74	30	59	35	111	172	70	102	187	65	365
	46%gi	43%	59%	50%	46%gi	61%zdghi	48%fi	34%	47%fi	33%	51%	46%	41%	54%	45%	42%	45%
1-10	360	225	11	120	360	35	69	46	59	65	91	180	81	73	214	65	390
	46%	47%	41%	44%	46%	38%	45%	53%	47%	61%zdefh	42%	48%	47%	39%	51%mi	42%	48%
11-20	5	3	-	2	5	-	1	1	-	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	6
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	*	*	2%	1%
21-30	2	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	2
	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	1%	-	1%	*	-	1%	1%	-	1%	*
31-40	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/Refused	55	40	-	14	55	1	10	9	7	3	12	17	18	13	13	21	50
	7%en	8%	-	5%	7%e	1%	7%e	10%e	6%	3%	5%	5%	10%k	7%	3%	13%zn	6%
Mean	1.60	1.71	1.14	1.45	1.60	1.16	1.26	2.21ef	1.76	2.26def	1.39	1.61	1.88	1.25	1.63	1.97	1.64

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 635

Q29f. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Reviewing and signing off audit report

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	31**	41*	36**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
Less than an hour	360	4	3	70	3	1	13	39	13	19	7	32	10	16	8	-	20	23	20	60	2	365
	46%	41%	53%	44%	37%	12%	41%	49%	36%	55%	27%	49%	46%	38%	30%	-	58%	56%	69%	47%	54%	45%
1-10	360	4	2	79	4	4	18	35	23	12	14	29	11	21	16	-	13	11	6	57	-	390
	46% <i>q</i>	45%	47%	50% <i>q</i>	49%	75%	57% <i>q</i>	45%	64% <i>zpq</i>	33%	57%	44%	54%	52% <i>q</i>	62%	-	37%	27%	20%	45%	-	48%
11-20	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6
	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	1%
21-30	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	*
31-40	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
41-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51-99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/Refused	55	1	-	8	1	-	1	5	-	4	4	4	-	3	1	-	1	7	2	9	2	50
	7%	14%	-	5%	13%	-	2%	6%	-	12%	15%	6%	-	8%	4%	-	4%	17% <i>zcfh</i>	7%	7%	46%	6%
Mean	1.60	0.78	2.29	1.64	0.87	7.46	1.30	1.12	1.91g	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.84	2.02g	3.59	-	1.68	1.05	1.84	1.39	-	1.64

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 636

Q29g. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Considering whether, and how, to implement recommendations from the ESOS process

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Less than an hour	279	261	5	13	7	28	14	19	23	2	76	53	22	11	8	-	9	139	134	282
	36%	35%	45%	43%	42%	43% <i>mp</i>	36%	33%	42% <i>p</i>	13%	37%	37%	44% <i>mp</i>	24%	42%	-	20%	35%	36%	35%
1-10	359	350	3	6	9	26	18	26	24	11	96	61	19	27	5	8	26	191	166	384
	46%	47%	27%	18%	53%	39%	46%	47%	43%	77%	47%	43%	38%	58% <i>el</i>	27%	57%	58%	48%	45%	47%
11-20	20	20	-	-	-	1	-	2	3	-	5	2	1	3	2	-	1	13	8	20
	3%	3%	-	-	-	2%	-	4%	5%	-	2%	2%	3%	6%	11%	-	1%	3%	2%	2%
21-30	8	8	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	*	-	-	-	4	4	9
	1%	1%	-	-	-	4% <i>z</i>	3%	2%	-	-	1%	*	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
31-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
41-50	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	2% <i>z</i>	-	*	*
51-99	7	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	4	3	5
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5% <i>z</i>	-	1%	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
100+	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	*
Don't know/Refused	107	92	3	12	1	8	6	8	3	1	25	24	6	5	4	6	8	49	54	110
	14%	12%	28%	39%	5%	12%	15%	13%	5%	10%	12%	17% <i>h</i>	13%	11%	20%	43%	12%	12%	15%	14%
Mean	3.97	4.04	2.06	1.30	2.37	3.17	2.69	3.62	5.37	2.05	4.89	3.07	3.87	3.29	3.52	3.53	3.65	4.23	3.75	4.11

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 637

Q29g. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Considering whether, and how, to implement recommendations from the ESOS process

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Less than an hour	279	58	221	70	81	58	46	8	13	96	41	94	13	55	50	131	193	80	282
	36% ^f	42%	34%	46% ^{zefh}	41% ^f	34%	26%	27%	26%	35%	49% ^{zi}	37%	51%	51% ^{zo}	39%	33%	34%	39%	35%
1-10	359	50	309	60	80	90	87	10	31	123	31	117	8	35	65	192	269	89	384
	46% ^{am}	36%	48% ^{aa}	39%	40%	53% ^{cd}	50%	32%	62% ^{zcd}	45%	37%	46%	33%	33%	51% ^m	49% ^m	47%	44%	47%
11-20	20	1	19	2	3	2	8	3	2	4	-	10	-	1	1	15	14	6	20
	3%	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	4%	10%	3%	2%	-	4%	-	1%	1%	4%	3%	3%	2%
21-30	8	1	7	1	2	-	3	2	-	3	1	-	-	-	2	4	8	-	9
	1%	*	1%	*	1%	-	2%	6%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	2%	1%	1%	-	1%
31-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
41-50	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	2% ^z	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
51-99	7	2	5	1	3	2	-	-	-	4	1	2	-	-	-	3	3	4	5
	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	2%	1%
100+	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	2
	*	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	1%	*	*	*	*
Don't know/Refused	107	27	80	20	27	17	31	8	3	43	9	32	4	16	10	47	83	24	110
	14%	19% ^b	12%	13%	14%	10%	18% ^e	25%	7%	16%	11%	13%	17%	15%	8%	12%	14%	12%	14%
Mean	3.97	3.50	4.06	2.28	3.68	5.78	3.56	6.91	3.93	4.38	2.43	4.31	1.57	1.51	3.31	4.62	3.55	5.21	4.11

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 638

Q29g. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Considering whether, and how, to implement recommendations from the ESOS process

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Less than an hour	279	63	123	29	58	29	223	252	16	25	43	122	3	76	171	70	22	38	101	282
	36%ehliq	37%	32%	35%	44%b	25%	39%ee	37%hi	20%	25%	31%	35%l	11%	34%l	31%	29%	26%	25%	46%znopq	35%
1-10	359	77	186	33	59	64	276	321	52	52	71	182	19	101	272	115	43	80	82	384
	46%	45%	48%	40%	44%	55%	48%	47%	65%zgj	52%	50%	52%	62%	46%	50%r	48%	50%	53%r	39%	47%
11-20	20	3	11	3	4	5	10	17	2	7	6	12	1	3	19	15	3	6	1	20
	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%	7%zgj	4%	3%	3%	2%	3%r	6%zr	3%	4%r	*	2%
21-30	8	*	7	1	-	2	6	8	1	-	2	1	2	2	6	3	1	1	2	9
	1%	*	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	*	7%zkm	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%
31-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
41-50	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	2
	*	-	*	1%	-	1%	*	*	-	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	1%	-	*
51-99	7	1	3	-	2	2	5	5	2	1	4	2	1	4	5	2	2	5	1	5
	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%g	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	4%zno	1%	1%
100+	2	-	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	2
	*	-	*	-	1%	1%	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	*
Don't know/Refused	107	26	52	17	8	13	56	83	7	14	14	31	4	34	70	34	16	20	24	110
	14%dfk	15%d	14%d	20%d	6%	11%	10%	12%	9%	14%	10%	9%	15%	15%k	13%	14%	19%	13%	12%	14%
Mean	3.97	2.88	4.64	2.87	4.14	7.88f	3.13	3.85	5.02	4.77	5.29	4.03	6.70	4.75	4.69	5.68	4.95r	6.61r	2.27	4.11

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 639

Q29g. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Considering whether, and how, to implement recommendations from the ESOS process

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Less than an hour	279	149	12	116	279	49	47	24	36	33	102	114	51	92	132	47	282
	36%	31%	43%	42% ^a	36%	54% ^{zdfghi}	30%	28%	29%	31%	47% ^{zkl}	31%	30%	48% ^{zno}	32%	30%	35%
1-10	359	228	12	117	359	33	87	38	67	57	82	192	79	66	220	66	384
	46% ^m	48%	43%	43%	46%	37%	57% ^{zde}	43%	53% ^e	53% ^e	38%	52% ^{fj}	47%	35%	53% ^{zm}	43%	47%
11-20	20	15	1	4	20	1	3	3	4	6	2	12	5	2	14	5	20
	3%	3%	3%	1%	3%	1%	2%	4%	3%	6%	1%	3%	3%	1%	3%	3%	2%
21-30	8	7	-	1	8	2	1	-	1	2	2	6	*	2	5	1	9
	1%	1%	-	*	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	2%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%
31-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
41-50	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	*
51-99	7	5	1	1	7	-	1	4	2	-	1	1	5	1	1	5	5
	1%	1%	3%	*	1%	-	1%	4% ^{zdl}	2%	-	1%	*	3% ^{kl}	1%	*	3% ^{zn}	1%
100+	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	2
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	*	*	-	1%	*	-	*
Don't know/Refused	107	70	2	35	107	5	15	17	16	8	25	46	29	25	45	31	110
	14% ^e	15%	8%	13%	14% ^e	5%	10%	20% ^{effl}	13%	8%	12%	12%	17%	13%	11%	20% ^{on}	14%
Mean	3.97	4.89	3.88	2.35	3.97	2.11	2.77	8.13zdeh	3.75	4.25e	3.26	4.16	4.78	3.63	3.80	5.19	4.11

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 640

Q29g. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Considering whether, and how, to implement recommendations from the ESOS process

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)				
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814			
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	31*	21**	41*	36**	26**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
Less than an hour	279	-	3	54	1	2	7	33	11	12	3	27	5	15	7	-	16	19	14	48	2	282		
	36%	-	53%	34%	13%	35%	23%	42%	31%	35%	13%	40%	24%	37%	28%	-	46%	46%	47%	38%	54%	35%		
1-10	359	6	2	77	5	3	18	33	21	16	33	12	21	14	-	13	13	10	49	-	384			
	48%	62%	47%	48%	55%	46%	58%qs	41%	55%qs	48%	55%	50%	56%	52%	56%	-	36%	33%	33%	39%	-	47%		
11-20	20	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	6	-	20		
	3%	-	-	3%	-	18%	-	-	2%	-	3%	11%	-	-	-	-	7%g	-	-	5%	-	2%		
21-30	8	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	9		
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%		
31-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
41-50	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2		
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*		
51-99	7	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	5		
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	3%	1%	-	1%		
100+	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2		
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	3%zc	-	-	-	-	-	*		
Don't know/Refused	107	4	-	21	3	-	5	12	2	6	4	1	5	2	-	3	9	5	17	2	110			
	14%	38%	-	13%	31%	-	15%	15%	7%	18%	7%	5%	11%	9%	-	9%	21%	17%	13%	46%	-	14%		
Mean	3.97	3.17	1.63	3.92	2.66	4.61	3.02	2.21	3.47	2.14	3.24	2.18	18.20	2.29	7.45	-	7.06	1.37	3.60	4.48	-	4.11		

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 641

Q29a-g. Approximately how many hours of staff time, at any level, did the following elements of ESOS take for your organisation?

Summary

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's) in hours (including converting days into hours)

	Finding out about, and understanding the scheme requirements, including whether your organisation was eligible	Deciding whether, and through what route, to comply with ESOS	Procuring an auditor / assessor	Supporting auditor / assessor in compliance activity (e.g. collating of organisational data)	Submitting notification of compliance	Reviewing and signing off audit report	Considering whether, and how, to implement recommendations from the ESOS process
Unweighted total	862	862	862	862	814	814	814
Weighted total	855	855	855	855	782	782	782
Less than an hour	201 24%	305 36%	312 37%	99 12%	422 54%	360 46%	279 36%
1-10	525 61%	437 51%	427 50%	495 58%	261 33%	360 46%	359 46%
11-20	25 3%	11 1%	15 2%	106 12%	7 1%	5 1%	20 3%
21-30	24 3%	11 1%	13 2%	42 5%	7 1%	2 *	8 1%
31-40	* *	4 *	1 *	5 1%	2 *	1 *	- -
41-50	1 *	1 *	2 *	6 1%	- -	- -	1 *
51-99	5 1%	1 *	4 *	18 2%	4 *	- -	7 1%
100+	1 *	2 *	1 *	6 1%	2 *	- -	2 *
Don't know/Refused	73 9%	85 10%	81 9%	79 9%	78 10%	55 7%	107 14%
Mean	4.39	2.97	3.42	12.52	2.53	1.60	3.97

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 642

Q30. Are you able instead to provide an estimate for the total number of days spent on ESOS by your organisation? Remembering to only include time your organisation would not have spent in the absence of the ESOS policy and also only time spent by your own organization and not any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants who don't know how much time was spent on one or more stages of ESOS

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	181	156	10	15	3	14	11	13	11	2	38	39	13	9	4	6	16	78	98	181
Weighted total	184	148	6**	30**	3**	14**	9**	12**	12**	1**	44*	35*	13**	9**	5**	9**	15**	75*	105*	181
1-10	41	26	1	14	-	3	2	1	4	-	11	8	2	2	2	6	1	9	32	36
	22%	17%	20%	47%	-	18%	19%	11%	33%	-	25%	23%	15%	17%	29%	64%	9%	12%	30%q	20%
11-20	25	22	1	2	-	2	-	3	2	-	9	3	3	-	-	-	1	11	13	22
	13%	15%	10%	5%	-	14%	-	24%	13%	-	21%	8%	21%	-	36%	-	5%	15%	13%	12%
21-30	15	15	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	1	3	5	-	1	-	-	2	4	11	16
	8%	10%	-	-	28%	12%	-	7%	-	65%	14%	-	6%	-	-	-	16%	6%	10%	9%
31-40	6	6	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	5	1	6
	3%	4%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	16%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	13%	7%	1%	3%
41-50	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	1	4
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	11%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	11%	3%	1%	2%
More than 50	14	13	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	5	1	2	-	-	-	1	13	1	15
	8%r	9%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	24%	-	3%	15%	9%	28%	-	-	7%	17%zr	1%	8%
Don't know/Refused	77	62	3	11	2	7	7	7	2	1	19	13	4	4	2	3	6	30	42	80
	42%	42%	58%	36%	72%	48%	70%	57%	14%	35%	42%	38%	29%	48%	34%	36%	39%	40%	40%	44%
Mean	28.83r	34.48	23.93	4.24	23.00	19.52	20.18	17.39	33.37	21.00	16.60	56.38	15.29	47.72	10.30	4.54	39.87	49.86r	13.60	34.37

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 643

Q30. Are you able instead to provide an estimate for the total number of days spent on ESOS by your organisation? Remembering to only include time your organisation would not have spent in the absence of the ESOS policy and also only time spent by your own organization and not any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants who don't know how much time was spent on one or more stages of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	181	39	142	41	43	31	43	11	10	68	19	51	10	28	17	82	131	48	181
Weighted total	184	42*	142	45*	44*	32**	45*	9**	8**	70*	20**	51*	10**	31**	19**	78*	135	47*	181
1-10	41	13	28	17	8	10	5	1	1	19	9	7	5	6	7	13	27	14	36
	22%	31%	20%	37% <i>f</i>	18%	31%	11%	12%	9%	27%	46%	13%	51%	20%	36%	16%	20%	29%	20%
11-20	25	5	20	3	8	6	7	1	-	10	1	10	-	6	2	14	19	5	22
	13%	11%	14%	6%	18%	19%	15%	9%	-	15%	7%	19%	-	20%	10%	18%	14%	11%	12%
21-30	15	2	13	2	3	5	4	-	1	2	-	9	-	2	-	9	9	6	16
	8%	5%	9%	4%	6%	16%	9%	-	10%	2%	-	17% <i>f</i>	-	8%	-	11%	7%	13%	9%
31-40	6	2	4	1	2	-	3	-	*	1	3	3	-	-	1	2	4	1	6
	3%	5%	3%	3%	4%	-	6%	-	6%	1%	15%	5%	-	-	6%	2%	3%	3%	3%
41-50	3	1	2	-	1	-	1	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	1	3	-	4
	2%	2%	2%	-	2%	-	2%	16%	-	3%	-	1%	-	-	5%	1%	2%	-	2%
More than 50	14	3	11	4	1	1	4	3	2	2	3	4	1	4	-	8	10	4	15
	8%	7%	8%	10%	1%	5%	8%	27%	19%	2%	13%	9%	10%	13%	-	10%	8%	8%	8%
Don't know/Refused	77	16	61	15	22	9	22	3	4	34	4	18	4	10	8	31	59	17	80
	42%	38%	43%	32%	49%	29%	50%	36%	56%	48%	19%	35%	39%	33%	42%	40%	44%	36%	44%
Mean	28.83	31.58	27.96	26.67	17.59	21.75	33.32	50.80	98.70	16.43	41.28	26.68	18.32	25.73	14.72	35.24	28.11	30.58	34.37

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 644

Q30. Are you able instead to provide an estimate for the total number of days spent on ESOS by your organisation? Remembering to only include time your organisation would not have spent in the absence of the ESOS policy and also only time spent by your own organization and not any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants who don't know how much time was spent on one or more stages of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	181	45	85	25	18	18	108	134	15	31	22	59	6	51	116	54	24	27	53	181
Weighted total	184	42*	86*	27**	22**	17**	102*	128	16**	27**	21**	58*	5**	47*	112*	52*	22**	26**	58*	181
1-10	41	9	16	7	7	2	18	24	5	3	1	13	-	6	28	13	4	4	12	36
	22%	22%	18%	26%	30%	12%	18%	18%	34%	11%	7%	22%	-	12%	25%	25%	20%	17%	21%	20%
11-20	25	5	9	5	4	4	17	22	2	1	3	7	-	8	15	7	3	1	10	22
	13%	12%	10%	19%	19%	22%	17%	17%	15%	5%	15%	13%	-	18%	13%	13%	15%	4%	17%	12%
21-30	15	7	5	1	2	2	11	11	3	4	4	5	1	4	9	4	1	1	5	16
	8%	16%	6%	4%	10%	10%	11%	9%	21%	16%	19%	8%	17%	8%	8%	8%	3%	3%	9%	9%
31-40	6	-	5	-	-	-	6	6	-	-	1	2	-	-	5	3	2	3	2	6
	3%	-	5%	-	-	-	6%	5%	3%	-	7%	4%	-	-	4%	5%	9%	13%	3%	3%
41-50	3	1	2	-	-	1	2	3	-	-	-	3	-	1	3	2	2	2	-	4
	2%	2%	2%	-	-	5%	2%	3%	-	-	-	4%	-	2%	3%	5%	8%	7%	-	2%
More than 50	14	4	7	2	1	3	4	8	2	5	2	6	-	2	6	5	1	3	6	15
	8%	9%	8%	7%	7%	20%	4%	6%	11%	20%	11%	11%	-	5%	6%	10%	6%	10%	10%	8%
Don't know/Refused	77	17	40	12	8	5	42	54	3	13	9	22	4	26	43	18	8	12	21	80
	42%	39%	46%	44%	34%	31%	41%	42%	16%	48%	41%	38%	83%	55%	39%	35%	37%	46%	37%	44%
Mean	28.83	38.05	31.41	18.09	18.88	43.02	26.54	27.86	27.37	63.39	36.87	33.87	25.00	28.06	28.47	32.41	56.31	66.55	26.06	34.37

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 645

Q30. Are you able instead to provide an estimate for the total number of days spent on ESOS by your organisation? Remembering to only include time your organisation would not have spent in the absence of the ESOS policy and also only time spent by your own organization and not any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants who don't know how much time was spent on one or more stages of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	181	110	6	65	181	16	25	24	24	14	44	78	46	40	88	43	181
Weighted total	184	109*	5**	70*	184	18**	25**	23**	27**	11**	47*	77*	47*	44*	86*	45*	181
1-10	41	23	3	16	41	5	5	4	3	3	15	17	10	13	15	13	36
	22%	21%	52%	22%	22%	29%	22%	18%	10%	30%	31%	22%	20%	30%	17%	30%	20%
11-20	25	14	-	10	25	2	4	1	9	1	7	7	8	6	10	6	22
	13%	13%	-	14%	13%	13%	15%	5%	34%	10%	16%	10%	16%	15%	11%	14%	12%
21-30	15	8	*	6	15	1	3	3	1	1	4	7	4	4	9	2	16
	8%	7%	9%	9%	8%	7%	12%	14%	2%	11%	8%	10%	8%	9%	11%	4%	9%
31-40	6	3	-	3	6	1	-	-	1	-	1	3	2	1	3	2	6
	3%	3%	-	5%	3%	7%	-	-	3%	-	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%
41-50	3	2	1	1	3	-	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	4
	2%	1%	19%	1%	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	3%	2%	-	3%	2%	-	2%
More than 50	14	7	-	7	14	3	4	1	2	2	2	5	7	2	8	3	15
	8%	6%	-	10%	8%	16%	16%	6%	7%	15%	4%	6%	14%	4%	10%	7%	8%
Don't know/Refused	77	51	1	25	77	5	7	13	9	4	15	34	18	14	37	19	80
	42%	47%	20%	35%	42%	28%	29%	57%	33%	34%	32%	44%	38%	33%	43%	41%	44%
Mean	28.83	27.91	18.18	30.98	28.83	37.88	27.62	64.56	21.72	35.04	18.56	24.51	46.51	18.97	30.48	37.04	34.37

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 646

Q30. Are you able instead to provide an estimate for the total number of days spent on ESOS by your organisation? Remembering to only include time your organisation would not have spent in the absence of the ESOS policy and also only time spent by your own organization and not any subsidiaries or other group members.

Base: all participants who don't know how much time was spent on one or more stages of ESOS

	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	181	3	-	37	5	-	9	13	6	8	10	10	4	9	3	1	9	15	4	33	2	181
Weighted total	184	4**	**	37*	3**	**	6**	17**	4**	12**	10**	12**	3**	7**	3**	2**	8**	19**	5**	29**	4**	181
1-10	41	1	-	7	-	-	-	4	-	3	-	8	1	1	-	2	1	4	2	6	2	36
	22%	20%	-	18%	-	-	-	25%	-	23%	-	64%	27%	18%	-	100%	14%	19%	49%	20%	54%	20%
11-20	25	-	-	4	1	-	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	5	-	4	-	22
	13%	-	-	12%	24%	-	14%	20%	35%	-	23%	12%	36%	-	-	-	11%	24%	-	12%	-	12%
21-30	15	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	1	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	16
	8%	-	-	6%	-	-	16%	10%	18%	-	17%	18%	14%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	11%	-	9%
31-40	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	*	-	6
	3%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	11%	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	2%	-	3%
41-50	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	2%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%
More than 50	14	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	2	-	3	-	15
	8%	-	-	3%	-	-	19%	11%	12%	-	15%	-	-	11%	66%	-	-	9%	-	12%	-	8%
Don't know/Refused	77	3	-	18	2	-	3	5	2	6	3	1	*	4	1	-	6	8	1	11	2	80
	42%	80%	-	49%	76%	-	51%	30%	34%	53%	31%	7%	19%	57%	34%	-	74%	44%	22%	38%	46%	44%
Mean	28.83	10.00	-	25.73	14.00	-	74.29	23.65	84.71	10.86	74.52	10.49	14.47	36.81	78.09	4.00	9.39	24.92	15.69	27.77	2.00	34.37

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 647

Q31. Did your organisation incur any external costs as a direct result of ESOS, that would not have been incurred anyway (this could include, for example, the cost of commissioning an external assessor, or purchasing energy monitoring equipment or software)?

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's)

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	862	800	20	42	28	78	49	53	55	18	199	173	65	59	14	13	48	441	411	862
Weighted total	855	761	11**	83*	22**	75*	43*	58*	66*	17**	222	144	58*	55*	19**	18**	46*	427	417	862
Yes	681	654	9	18	17	60	32	49	47	11	175	125	46	41	13	15	40	355	316	716
	80% <i>c</i>	86% <i>zc</i>	79%	22%	78%	80%	74%	83%	72%	66%	79%	86% <i>fh</i>	80%	75%	70%	87%	87%	83% <i>r</i>	76%	83%
No	155	97	2	56	5	12	9	8	16	6	45	16	12	12	4	2	4	64	89	131
	18% <i>ak</i>	13%	16%	67% <i>za</i>	22%	16%	21%	13%	24% <i>k</i>	34%	20% <i>k</i>	11%	20%	22%	20%	13%	9%	15%	21% <i>q</i>	15%
Don't know	20	10	1	9	-	3	2	2	2	-	1	4	-	2	2	-	2	7	12	15
	2%	1%	5%	11% <i>za</i>	-	3%	5% <i>j</i>	3%	4%	-	1%	3%	-	3%	10%	-	4%	2%	3%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 648

Q31. Did your organisation incur any external costs as a direct result of ESOS, that would not have been incurred anyway (this could include, for example, the cost of commissioning an external assessor, or purchasing energy monitoring equipment or software)?

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's)

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	862	160	702	185	210	182	189	35	57	304	91	276	35	111	133	439	633	222	862
Weighted total	855	160	695	191	204	188	181	33*	55*	303	94*	276	39**	121*	144	407	616	231	862
Yes	681	110	571	132	157	162	153	29	45	224	75	230	20	94	114	347	505	169	716
	80% <i>aa</i>	68%	82% <i>a</i>	69%	77%	86% <i>cd</i>	85% <i>c</i>	89% <i>c</i>	83%	74%	80%	83% <i>f</i>	51%	77%	79%	85% <i>z</i>	82% <i>q</i>	73%	83%
No	155	44	111	57	42	22	22	4	9	66	18	44	17	25	28	55	91	63	131
	18%	27% <i>zb</i>	16%	30% <i>zdefg</i>	20% <i>ef</i>	12%	12%	11%	17%	22%	19%	16%	45%	20%	19%	14%	15%	27% <i>zfp</i>	15%
Don't know	20	7	13	2	6	4	6	-	-	13	1	2	2	3	2	4	20	-	15
	2% <i>g</i>	4%	2%	1%	3%	2%	3%	-	-	4% <i>k</i>	1%	1%	4%	2%	2%	1%	3% <i>q</i>	-	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 649

Q31. Did your organisation incur any external costs as a direct result of ESOS, that would not have been incurred anyway (this could include, for example, the cost of commissioning an external assessor, or purchasing energy monitoring equipment or software)?

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's)

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	862	192	432	88	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	614	272	98	170	227	862
Weighted total	855	189	416	87*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	590	251	90*	157	241	862
Yes	681	147	340	69	116	108	514	625	61	77	123	314	23	194	474	210	70	127	191	716
	80%	78%	82%	80%	78%	93%z	89%z	91%zh	76%	78%	87%zh	89%zl	76%	88%z	80%	84%	77%	81%	80%	83%
No	155	33	66	18	32	8	61	56	19	20	16	34	7	22	106	37	20	26	46	131
	18%efgkm	17%	16%	20%	22%	7%	10%	8%	24%gj	20%g	11%	10%	23%km	10%	18%	15%	22%	17%	19%	15%
Don't know	20	9	10	-	-	-	3	7	-	2	2	3	1	5	10	5	1	3	3	15
	2%l	5%d	2%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 650

Q31. Did your organisation incur any external costs as a direct result of ESOS, that would not have been incurred anyway (this could include, for example, the cost of commissioning an external assessor, or purchasing energy monitoring equipment or software)?

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's)

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	862	526	32	302	862	104	170	92	140	121	241	410	186	210	462	170	862
Weighted total	855	515	30**	306	855	110*	168	88*	130	117	242	400	185	213	449	169	862
Yes	681	420	25	234	681	85	136	68	109	100	190	324	149	167	366	135	716
	80%	82%	83%	76%	80%	77%	81%	77%	83%	85%	78%	81%	81%	78%	82%	80%	83%
No	155	85	5	63	155	25	29	16	19	17	48	66	35	42	71	34	131
	18%	16%	17%	21%	18%	23%	17%	18%	15%	15%	20%	16%	19%	20%	16%	20%	15%
Don't know	20	10	-	9	20	-	4	4	3	-	4	10	1	4	12	1	15
	2%	2%	-	3%	2%	-	2%	5%ei	2%	-	2%	3%	*	2%	3%	1%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 651

Q31. Did your organisation incur any external costs as a direct result of ESOS, that would not have been incurred anyway (this could include, for example, the cost of commissioning an external assessor, or purchasing energy monitoring equipment or software)?

Base: all participants (excluding DNQ's)

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	862	9	5	187	13	8	43	66	44	29	55	33	63	23	3	42	39	20	148	4	862	
Weighted total	855	9**	5**	168	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	27**	73*	30**	43*	32**	5**	43*	46*	29**	135	8**	862
Yes	681	6	5	143	6	4	27	70	32	29	60	18	35	24	-	28	38	25	106	2	716	
	80%p	69%	100%	85%p	55%	73%	89%p	86%p	89%p	76%	81%	83%	60%	81%	74%	-	66%	83%	85%	79%	28%	83%
No	155	3	-	22	4	1	4	9	4	7	5	13	12	6	5	13	7	4	25	4	131	
	18%	31%	-	13%	39%	27%	12%	12%	11%	19%	19%	17%	40%	13%	19%	100%	30% <i>cgh</i>	15%	15%	19%	49%	15%
Don't know	20	-	-	3	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	2	1	-	3	2	15	
	2%	-	-	2%	5%	-	-	2%	-	5%	-	-	5%	7%	-	4%	2%	-	2%	23%	2%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 652

Q32a. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in £) for each external expenditure?

External consultant / assessor services

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (£)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (£)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	716	692	16	8	24	67	37	45	42	13	162	153	55	48	9	11	42	378	330	716
Weighted total	681	654	9**	18**	17**	60*	32*	49*	47*	11**	175	125	46*	41*	13**	15**	40*	355	316	716
Under 5000	244	233	4	7	8	21	12	22	23	6	51	43	17	14	5	7	15	119	122	255
	36%	36%	39%	41%	45%	35%	37%	45%	48% <i>f</i>	50%	29%	34%	38%	35%	39%	43%	37%	34%	39%	36%
5001-20000	303	293	3	7	6	29	13	18	19	5	82	60	21	14	6	8	16	164	137	315
	45%	45%	36%	37%	33%	48%	43%	37%	40%	42%	47%	48%	46%	34%	45%	50%	39%	46%	43%	44%
20001-100000	49	48	1	-	3	4	2	2	2	-	21	7	4	3	-	-	1	32	4	53
	7%	7%	12%	-	17%	6%	7%	3%	5%	-	12%	6%	8%	9%	-	-	1%	9%	5%	7%
100001-200000	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	3% <i>zk</i>	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*
200001-500000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
500001-999999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1000000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	65	63	1	2	1	5	3	6	2	1	15	12	4	8	1	1	5	33	28	72
	10%	10%	6%	9%	5%	9%	9%	12%	4%	8%	9%	10%	8%	19% <i>h</i>	9%	8%	13%	9%	9%	10%
N/A	18	15	1	2	-	1	1	1	1	-	5	2	-	2	1	-	4	7	11	19
	3%	2%	7%	13%	-	1%	2%	3%	2%	-	3%	2%	-	4%	8%	-	9% <i>zk/l</i>	2%	3%	3%
Mean	10436.98	10503.54	10096.69	7940.25	11938.76	9954.46	16095.39	8104.80	9100.34	6641.87	12642.25k	9139.89	10796.25	9974.19	7877.14	7622.78	7063.46	10836.51	10065.46	10576.40

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 653

Q32a. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in £) for each external expenditure?

External consultant / assessor services

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	716	120	596	140	168	161	163	31	50	240	77	235	22	91	107	381	538	172	716
Weighted total	681	110	571	132	157	162	153	29**	45*	224	75*	230	20**	94*	114*	347	505	169	716
Under 5000	244	55	189	60	74	52	42	8	7	78	44	84	13	46	43	111	177	66	255
	36%h	50%zb	33%	45%zefh	47%zefh	32%h	27%	27%	16%	35%	58%zik	36%	65%	49%zo	38%	32%	35%	39%	36%
5001-20000	303	36	267	48	62	79	82	16	15	108	20	99	7	38	54	162	226	73	315
	45%aj	33%	47%a	37%	39%	49%	54%zcdf	56%	34%	48%j	26%	43%f	35%	41%	48%	47%	45%	43%	44%
20001-100000	49	2	47	5	4	10	9	3	15	12	4	21	-	2	8	33	37	10	53
	7%a	2%	8%a	4%	3%	6%	6%	10%	33%zcdef	5%	6%	9%	-	2%	7%	9%n	7%	6%	7%
100001-200000	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	*	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	*	-	*	-	-	-	1%	*	-	*
200001-500000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
500001-999999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1000000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	65	14	51	17	13	16	13	1	4	19	7	20	-	8	8	24	49	16	72
	10%	13%	9%	13%	8%	10%	9%	4%	10%	8%	9%	9%	-	8%	7%	7%	10%	9%	10%
N/A	18	3	15	2	3	4	5	1	2	7	1	6	-	-	1	15	15	3	19
	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	5%	3%	1%	3%	-	-	1%	4%	3%	2%	3%
Mean	10436.98adm	6566.07	11157.40a	7801.59	7362.40	10359.72cd	11595.23d	12627.92	24358.77zede	10563.65	7321.60	10511.63	5764.65	7132.69	9468.71	12115.02m	10964.65	8668.22	10576.40

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 654

Q32a. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in £) for each external expenditure?

External consultant / assessor services

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	716	161	364	72	108	112	536	652	66	90	131	328	27	206	511	229	78	141	189	716
Weighted total	681	147	340	69*	116*	108*	514	625	61*	77*	123	314	23**	194	474	210	70*	127	191	716
Under 5000	244	55	114	28	43	24	197	221	19	26	48	120	9	61	146	49	25	37	94	255
	36%eo	37%	34%	41%	37%	23%	38%e	35%	31%	33%	39%	38%	40%	31%	31%	24%	36%o	29%	49%znoq	36%
5001-20000	303	63	159	30	49	54	230	289	18	30	52	137	9	89	227	108	27	60	71	315
	45%h	43%	47%	43%	42%	51%	46%h	29%	38%	42%	44%	40%	46%	48%r	51%r	39%	47%	47%	37%	44%
20001-100000	49	8	22	4	13	15	32	46	8	9	7	23	3	17	44	33	7	10	2	53
	7%r	6%	7%	6%	11%	14%zf	6%	7%	13%	12%	6%	7%	11%	9%	9%r	16%znqr	10%r	8%r	1%	7%
100001-200000	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	2
	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	*	*	1%	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	1%	-	*
200001-500000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
500001-999999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1000000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	65	17	33	6	7	9	47	62	7	7	12	25	1	20	40	11	5	10	22	72
	10%	12%	10%	9%	6%	8%	9%	10%	12%	10%	10%	8%	4%	10%	8%	5%	7%	8%	12%o	10%
N/A	18	5	9	1	4	4	6	7	9	5	3	9	1	7	16	7	5	9	2	19
	3%	3%	3%	1%	3%	4%	1%	1%	14%zgj	7%zg	3%	3%	5%	4%	3%	3%	7%zr	7%zr	1%	3%
Mean	10436.98r	9058.29	10970.87	9354.41	11172.28	15024.03zf	9759.54	10278.56	16648.20zgj	11076.20	8896.17	10394.27	10608.32	10176.27	11990.24r	14836.56znr	11966.85r	12867.11r	6683.23	10576.40

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 655

Q32a. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in £) for each external expenditure?

External consultant / assessor services

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (£)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	716	449	27	239	716	83	144	74	120	105	198	343	157	173	390	140	716
Weighted total	681	420	25**	234	681	85*	136	68*	109	100*	190	324	149	167	366	135	716
Under 5000	244	153	11	80	244	41	59	24	32	21	66	115	57	62	126	54	255
	36% <i>fi</i>	36%	44%	34%	36% <i>fi</i>	48% <i>hi</i>	43% <i>hi</i>	35%	29%	21%	35%	36%	38%	37%	34%	40%	36%
5001-20000	303	184	10	107	303	29	66	39	56	49	92	145	62	84	166	49	315
	45%	44%	38%	46%	45%	34%	48%	57% <i>e</i>	51% <i>e</i>	49%	49%	45%	41%	50% <i>o</i>	45%	37%	44%
20001-100000	49	30	1	17	49	2	3	3	11	21	14	24	8	7	34	6	53
	7% <i>f</i>	7%	3%	7%	7% <i>f</i>	2%	2%	4%	10% <i>ef</i>	21% <i>zdefg</i>	7%	7%	5%	4%	9% <i>m</i>	4%	7%
100001-200000	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	2
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	*	-	*
200001-500000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
500001-999999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1000000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	65	40	2	23	65	9	8	1	7	3	15	30	14	13	31	17	72
	10% <i>g</i>	10%	7%	10%	10% <i>g</i>	10% <i>g</i>	6%	1%	7%	3%	8%	9%	10%	8%	8%	13%	10%
N/A	18	10	2	6	18	4	-	1	2	5	3	7	8	2	8	8	19
	3%	2%	9%	2%	3%	5% <i>f</i>	-	2%	2%	5% <i>f</i>	2%	2%	5%	1%	2%	6% <i>zmn</i>	3%
Mean	10436.98f	10659.90	7694.15	10275.16	10436.98f	7748.38	7469.94	9913.10f	12711.42f	15643.09zdefg	10520.29	10982.29	9104.50	9354.04	11376.95	8975.04	10576.40

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 656

Q32a. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in £) for each external expenditure?

External consultant / assessor services

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)			
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	716	7	5	162	8	6	38	58	40	24	24	46	22	53	19	-	31	32	17	123	1	716	
Weighted total	681	6**	5**	143	6**	4**	27*	70*	32*	29**	22**	60*	27*	18**	35*	24**	**	28**	38**	25**	106	2**	716
Under 5000	244	2	2	43	4	2	12	20	11	11	8	24	2	13	10	-	14	15	14	38	-	255	
	36%	33%	40%	30%	64%	50%	43%	28%	34%	38%	35%	40%	9%	38%	44%	-	50%	40%	56%	35%	-	36%	
5001-20000	303	3	2	70	1	1	10	34	15	14	8	21	12	14	8	-	12	18	8	53	-	315	
	45%	50%	32%	49%	22%	16%	36%	49%	45%	48%	37%	35%	64%	40%	32%	-	43%	48%	34%	50%	-	44%	
20001-100000	49	-	1	9	1	1	-	10	3	2	3	7	4	1	3	-	-	1	-	4	-	53	
	7%	-	15%	6%	14%	19%	-	14%fs	10%	6%	12%	12%	20%	4%	13%	-	-	3%	-	3%	-	7%	
100001-200000	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	3%z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	
200001-500000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
500001-999999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
1000000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Don't know/refused	65	1	-	15	-	-	2	5	3	2	2	7	1	6	2	-	2	3	2	11	-	72	
	10%	17%	-	10%	-	-	9%	7%	9%	8%	11%	11%	7%	17%	8%	-	7%	9%	10%	11%	-	10%	
N/A	18	-	1	6	-	1	3	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	19	
	3%	-	13%	4%	-	15%	10%zs	2%	2%	-	5%	1%	-	2%	4%	-	-	-	-	1%	100%	3%	
Mean	10436.98	7738.83	15943.53	11689.86	7780.63	11714.97	13519.57	13161.48s	11309.08s	9717.29	10352.22	10267.86	17474.96	9331.77	11269.85	-	7593.93	8435.95	5945.56	7965.31	-	10576.40	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 657

Q32b. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Training internal assessor

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwt'd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	716	692	16	8	24	67	37	45	42	13	162	153	55	48	9	11	42	378	330	716
Weighted total	681	654	9**	18**	17**	60*	32*	49*	47*	11**	175	125	46*	41*	13**	15**	40*	355	316	716
0	625	602	8	15	16	57	29	45	46	11	158	113	42	37	13	12	36	328	288	655
	92%	92%	88%	85%	93%	95%	93%	92%	97%	100%	90%	91%	91%	91%	100%	76%	89%	92%	91%	91%
1-1000	7	7	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	3	2	-	-	-	-	5	2	8
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	*	2%	5%zj	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
1001-2000	9	8	1	-	1	1	2	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	6	9
	1%	1%	6%	-	5%	1%	3%k	5%k	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	6%	-	1%	2%	1%
2001-3000	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	5
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	1%
3001-4000	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	4
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	5%zjk	-	-	-	-	*	*	1%
4001-5000	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	3
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	3%z	1%	-	*
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
Don't know/refused	9	9	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	1	-	-	1	5	3	10
	1%	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	2%	1%	-	1%	-	-	3%	1%	1%	1%
N/A	21	18	1	3	*	3	-	-	1	-	6	3	-	3	-	3	2	8	13	20
	3%	3%	6%	15%	3%	4%	-	-	3%	-	3%	3%	-	8%	-	18%	5%	2%	4%	3%
Mean	2736.65	2752.99	2000.00	-	1500.00	2000.00	1954.09	4529.24	-	-	2399.25	2551.17	2167.94	-	-	2000.00	5000.00	2544.73	2960.90	3295.16

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 658

Q32b. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Training internal assessor

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites			Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	716	120	596	140	168	161	163	31	50	240	77	235	22	91	107	381	538	172	716
Weighted total	681	110	571	132	157	162	153	29**	45*	224	75*	230	20**	94*	114*	347	505	169	716
0	625	105	520	119	147	153	138	27	37	204	68	217	20	89	108	310	460	158	655
	92%h	96%	91%	90%	94%h	95%h	90%	93%	82%	91%	90%	94%	100%	95%	95%	89%	91%	93%	91%
1-1000	7	1	6	2	1	1	2	-	1	2	1	3	-	-	-	5	7	-	8
	1%	1%	1%	2%	*	*	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%
1001-2000	9	1	8	1	2	-	3	-	2	3	-	2	-	-	1	8	6	2	9
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	-	5%e	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
2001-3000	4	-	4	-	-	1	1	1	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	5
	1%	-	1%	-	-	*	1%	5%	1%	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%
3001-4000	3	1	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	2	3	-	4
	*	1%	*	1%	*	-	*	-	-	1%	-	*	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	1%
4001-5000	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	2	2	2	-	3
	*	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	3%zde	*	-	*	-	-	1%	*	*	-	*
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	*	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	1
	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*
Don't know/refused	9	1	7	4	1	2	-	-	1	-	4	2	-	-	5	4	5	5	10
	1%	1%	1%	3%f	1%	1%	-	-	3%f	-	5%zlk	1%	-	-	1%	1%	3%	3%	1%
N/A	21	-	21	4	4	4	5	1	2	9	1	5	-	5	4	9	18	4	20
	3%	-	4%a	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	2%	2%	-	5%	4%	3%	4%	2%	3%
Mean	2736.65	1695.16	2871.22	1729.44	4971.05	1538.84	2493.91	2774.80	2647.02	3460.54	1659.74	2535.68	-	-	2373.02	2986.38	2315.65	6090.96	3295.16

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 659

Q32b. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Training internal assessor

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	716	161	364	72	108	112	536	652	66	90	131	328	27	206	511	229	78	141	189	716
Weighted total	681	147	340	69*	116*	108*	514	625	61*	77*	123	314	23**	194	474	210	77*	127	191	716
0	625	129	311	68	109	98	474	588	5	61	106	285	18	182	431	188	66	115	179	655
	92% <i>hi</i>	88%	91%	98% <i>a</i>	95%	91%	92%	94% <i>hij</i>	8%	78% <i>h</i>	86% <i>h</i>	91%	79%	94%	91%	89%	95%	90%	94%	91%
1-1000	7	2	4	1	-	1	6	5	7	1	2	4	-	2	6	3	1	2	1	8
	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	11% <i>zgj</i>	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	*	1%
1001-2000	9	5	4	-	-	1	7	4	9	2	2	3	2	3	7	6	-	1	2	9
	1%	3%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	14% <i>zgj</i>	3% <i>g</i>	2%	1%	8%	1%	1%	3%	-	1%	1%	1%
2001-3000	4	1	2	-	1	1	3	2	4	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	5
	1%	*	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	*	7% <i>zg</i>	2% <i>g</i>	1%	1%	6%	*	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
3001-4000	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	-	1	2	1	-	3	1	-	2	-	4
	*	*	*	1%	*	1%	*	*	4% <i>zg</i>	-	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	*	-	1%	-	1%
4001-5000	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	2	2	1	2	-	1	2	2	1	2	-	3
	*	-	1%	-	-	1%	*	-	4% <i>zg</i>	2% <i>zg</i>	1% <i>g</i>	1%	-	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	*
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	1%	-	*	-	1% <i>g</i>	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
Don't know/refused	9	3	2	-	2	1	7	7	9	3	2	3	-	2	4	1	1	1	5	10
	1%	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	14% <i>zgj</i>	5% <i>zg</i>	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	2%	1%
N/A	21	7	13	-	1	3	15	17	21	6	8	13	1	5	18	8	1	4	3	20
	3%	5%	4%	-	1%	3%	3%	3%	35% <i>zgj</i>	8% <i>zg</i>	6%	4%	5%	2%	4%	4%	1%	3%	2%	3%
Mean	2736.65	3172.31	2185.54	2021.88	4436.53	2871.39	1934.16	2666.92	2736.65	4555.52	2278.16	2260.60	2346.78	2703.94	2336.90	2563.78	2523.70	2996.41	4797.03	3295.16

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 660

Q32b. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Training internal assessor

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	716	449	27	239	716	83	144	74	120	105	198	343	157	173	390	140	716
Weighted total	681	420	25**	234	681	85*	136	68*	109	100*	190	324	149	167	366	135	716
0	625	393	22	209	625	75	125	65	100	87	175	298	134	155	334	122	655
	92%	93%	86%	89%	92%	89%	92%	95%	92%	88%	92%	92%	90%	93%	91%	91%	91%
1-1000	7	2	1	4	7	3	-	-	1	1	1	5	1	1	4	2	8
	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	4%f	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%
1001-2000	9	7	-	2	9	2	-	1	2	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	9
	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	4%f	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%
2001-3000	4	2	1	1	4	-	-	-	1	2	-	3	1	-	3	1	5
	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%
3001-4000	3	2	-	1	3	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	4
	*	*	-	*	*	1%	1%	-	-	-	*	*	*	*	*	1%	1%
4001-5000	2	1	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
	*	*	-	1%	*	-	-	-	1%	2%	*	*	1%	*	*	1%	*
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	*	*	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	*
Don't know/refused	9	3	-	5	9	3	1	1	-	1	4	4	1	4	4	1	10
	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	3%	*	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
N/A	21	10	2	9	21	1	9	2	3	3	5	10	6	2	15	5	20
	3%	2%	8%	4%	3%	1%	7%zd	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	1%	4%	3%	3%
Mean	2736.65	2990.21	1606.26	2570.92	2736.65	1855.83	4000.00	2000.00	2333.64	3913.74	2447.65	1960.86	4100.46	1842.95	2431.00	3995.26	3295.16

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 661

Q32b. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Training internal assessor

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	716	7	5	162	8	6	38	58	40	24	24	46	22	53	19	-	31	32	17	123	1	716
Weighted total	681	6**	5**	143	6**	4**	27*	70*	32*	29**	22**	60*	18**	35*	24**	**	28**	38**	25**	106	2**	716
0	625	6	4	132	6	3	22	63	28	27	19	58	17	32	17	-	28	37	25	97	2	655
	92%f	100%	87%	93%f	100%	69%	80%	90%	87%	95%	90%	96%f	96%	91%	72%	-	100%	97%	100%	92%	100%	91%
1-1000	7	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	8
	1%	-	-	1%	-	16%	6%zc	2%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%
1001-2000	9	-	-	2	-	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	9
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	4%	4%	3%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
2001-3000	4	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	5
	1%	-	-	1%	-	15%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
3001-4000	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
4001-5000	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	3%z	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	3%zc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	*	-	-	-	-	-	2%z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Don't know/refused	9	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	10
	1%	-	13%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	4%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%
N/A	21	-	-	2	N/A	-	1	3	2	1	-	1	*	4	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	20
	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	3%	5%	7%k	5%	-	4%	1%	18%	-	-	-	3%	-	3%	-	3%
Mean	2736.65	-	-	3052.50	-	1729.73	5523.30	1119.75	2235.82	-	-	-	2873.23	2316.22	-	-	-	-	-	1299.44	-	3295.16

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 662

Q32c. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Software

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	716	692	16	8	24	67	37	45	42	13	162	153	55	48	9	11	42	378	330	716
Weighted total	681	654	9**	18**	17**	60*	32*	49*	47*	11**	175	125	46*	41*	13**	15**	40*	355	316	716
0	214	205	3	7	7	17	8	14	12	5	60	35	17	10	5	7	14	121	94	227
	31%	31%	29%	37%	40%	28%	24%	29%	25%	47%	34%	28%	36%	26%	39%	44%	34%	34%	30%	32%
1-1000	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	4
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%z	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	*	1%
1001-2000	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*
2001-3000	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	1%	-	*
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
5001-6000	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	-	2%zj	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
6001-7000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	3%zj	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%z	-	-	-	-	-	*	*
10000 or more	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3
	*	*	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	*
Don't know/refused	32	29	-	2	1	1	5	1	-	11	4	-	1	-	3	5	14	16	29	29
	5%	4%	-	13%	5%	1%	15%zehkl	3%	-	7%	3%	-	3%	-	20%	11%ehl	4%	5%	5%	4%
N/A	422	406	6	9	9	43	19	32	34	6	100	82	30	28	6	6	22	212	202	446
	62%	62%	71%	50%	55%	71%	59%	66%	72%	53%	57%	66%	64%	69%	46%	37%	55%	60%	64%	62%
Mean	9272.62	9272.62	-	-	-	6000.00	15000.00	7000.00	-	19860.38	1827.10	-	5090.70	3000.00	-	-	-	8400.69	10782.63	9482.14

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 663

Q32c. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Software

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	716	120	596	140	168	161	163	31	50	240	77	235	22	91	107	381	538	172	716
Weighted total	681	110	571	132	157	162	153	29**	45*	224	75*	230	20**	94*	114*	347	505	169	716
0	214	28	187	42	44	64	40	6	20	68	28	84	9	23	27	123	166	46	227
	31%	25%	33%	31%	28%	38%df	26%	19%	45%df	30%	37%	36%	48%	24%	24%	35%r	33%	27%	32%
1-1000	3	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	4
	*	-	1%	-	1%	-	*	-	2%	-	2%l	*	5%	1%	1%	*	*	1%	1%
1001-2000	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	*	-	*	-	-	1%	-	3%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	*	-	*
2001-3000	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	*	-	*
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
5001-6000	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	2%	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
6001-7000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*	-	*
10000 or more	3	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	3	3	-	3
	*	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	2%	1%	-	*	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	*
Don't know/refused	32	7	24	9	5	6	9	1	3	9	4	9	1	4	2	13	21	10	29
	5%	7%	4%	6%	3%	4%	6%	2%	6%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	2%	4%	4%	6%	4%
N/A	422	75	347	82	106	89	102	20	21	142	42	132	8	66	84	200	306	112	446
	62%h	68%h	61%	62%	68%eh	55%	67%eh	67%	45%	63%	56%	58%	42%	70%o	74%zo	58%	61%	66%	62%
Mean	9272.62	-	9272.62	-	3174.18	15218.58	4987.80	3403.38	23062.97	13213.68	868.96	9237.46	800.00	3947.98	1000.00	11368.73	9925.40	800.00	9482.14

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 664

Q32c. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Software

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	716	161	364	72	108	112	536	652	66	90	131	328	27	206	511	229	78	141	189	716
Weighted total	681	147	340	69*	116*	108*	514	625	61*	77*	123	314	23**	194	474	210	70*	127	191	716
0	214	42	108	21	42	25	172	193	15	22	26	123	5	42	147	62	24	36	65	227
	31%jm	29%	32%	30%	36%	23%	33%e	31%fj	24%	28%	21%	39%zkm	22%	22%	31%	30%	34%	28%	34%	32%
1-1000	3	-	3	-	1	-	3	3	-	1	1	2	-	1	2	1	-	1	1	4
	*	-	1%	-	*	-	1%	*	-	1%	1%	1%	-	*	*	1%	-	1%	1%	1%
1001-2000	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	2
	*	-	-	-	2%b	2%zf	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	*	*	-	-	1%	*
2001-3000	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	2%b	2%zf	-	*	-	3%zg	-	1%	-	-	*	1%	-	-	-	*
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	1%	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	1%	-	*
5001-6000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	1%	1%	-	-	3%	-	*	-	-	1%	-	*
6001-7000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	1%	-	-	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	1%	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*
10000 or more	3	-	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	-	-	2	-	1	3	2	-	-	-	3
	*	-	*	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	*
Don't know/refused	32	6	15	3	5	6	19	28	5	4	6	8	-	12	21	7	4	12	9	29
	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	6%	4%	5%	9%	6%	5%	2%	-	6%	4%	3%	6%	5%zno	5%	4%
N/A	422	98	209	44	63	71	315	392	39	47	90	173	17	139	294	133	42	77	115	446
	62%	67%	62%	64%	55%	66%	61%	63%	64%	61%	74%zg	55%	75%	71%zk	62%	63%	60%	61%	60%	62%
Mean	9272.62	-	9562.64	15000.00	7746.71	10339.95	9086.03	6946.92	21143.67	4158.61	1000.00	8448.66	6000.00	16866.15	10761.13	10298.85	-	4013.96	1463.83	9482.14

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 665

Q32c. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Software

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (£)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	716	449	27	239	716	83	144	74	120	105	198	343	157	173	390	140	716
Weighted total	681	420	25**	234	681	85*	136	68*	109	100*	190	324	149	167	366	135	716
0	214	131	7	75	214	26	41	23	38	37	58	104	47	56	111	43	227
	31%	31%	26%	32%	31%	30%	30%	34%	35%	37%	30%	32%	31%	34%	30%	32%	32%
1-1000	3	1	1	1	3	1	3	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	4
	*	*	3%	1%	*	1%	2%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%
1001-2000	2	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	2
	*	*	-	-	*	-	1%	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	*
2001-3000	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	2%zd	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	*
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	1%	*	-	-	*	-	-	*
5001-6000	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	1%	*	*	-	*	*	-	*
6001-7000	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	1%	*	-	-	2%zd	-	-	1%	-	-	*	*	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	*
10000 or more	3	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	1	1	1	-	2	1	3
	*	1%	-	-	*	-	-	-	3%zd	-	1%	*	1%	-	1%	1%	*
Don't know/refused	32	19	1	12	32	5	4	1	1	5	4	15	10	5	16	9	29
	5%	4%	4%	5%	5%	6%	3%	1%	1%	5%	2%	5%	7%	3%	4%	7%	4%
N/A	422	261	17	143	422	54	86	43	66	54	123	197	92	103	229	82	446
	62%	62%	67%	61%	62%	63%	63%	63%	61%	54%	65%	61%	61%	62%	63%	61%	62%
Mean	9272.62	11891.81	1000.00	4216.33	9272.62	1000.00	2177.08	7000.00	29666.02	4060.61	9729.46	8081.93	15000.00	2437.68	10334.21	15000.00	9482.14

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 666

Q32c. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Software

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	716	7	5	162	8	6	38	58	40	24	24	46	22	53	19	-	31	32	17	123	1	716
Weighted total	681	6**	5**	143	6**	4**	27*	70*	32*	29**	22**	60*	27*	18**	35*	24**	28**	38**	25**	106	2**	716
0	214	1	3	45	3	1	8	27	6	11	8	21	7	17	3	-	10	8	8	28	-	227
	31%	17%	68%	31%	48%	18%	28%	39%	19%	37%	39%	35%	28%	38%	49% <i>zchs</i>	13%	34%	20%	33%	26%	-	32%
1-1000	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	4
	*	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	1%
1001-2000	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*
2001-3000	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3% <i>z</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
5001-6000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
6001-7000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*
10000 or more	3	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	3%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Don't know/refused	32	-	1	6	-	-	4	2	1	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	5	2	29
	5%	-	13%	4%	-	-	6%	7%	4%	13%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	3%	6%	4%	100%	4%
N/A	422	5	1	88	3	3	18	38	23	17	10	33	11	18	20	-	17	28	15	73	-	446
	62%	83%	19%	61%	52%	82%	68%	54%	72% <i>m</i>	59%	48%	54%	62%	51%	83%	-	59%	74%	61%	68% <i>m</i>	-	62%
Mean	9272.62	-	-	8695.79	-	-	30956.72	30000.00	1000.00	-	-	2624.58	-	-	800.00	-	-	950.00	-	4859.60	-	9482.14

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 667

Q32d. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Energy monitoring equipment / hardware

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	716	692	16	8	24	67	37	45	42	13	162	153	55	48	9	11	42	378	330	716
Weighted total	681	654	9**	18**	17**	60*	32*	49*	47*	11**	175	125	46*	41*	13**	15**	40*	355	316	716
0	209	200	3	7	6	17	8	12	12	5	61	35	16	10	5	7	12	116	94	221
	31%	31%	29%	37%	32%	28%	24%	25%	25%	47%	35%	28%	35%	25%	39%	44%	29%	33%	30%	31%
1-1000	7	7	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	*	-	-	1	3	4	9
	1%	1%	-	-	5%	1%	-	-	-	-	*	2%	2%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	1%
1001-2000	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	3
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	3% <i>f</i>	-	-	-	-	1%	*	*
2001-3000	6	6	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	2	5	2	5
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	3% <i>j</i>	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	15%	-	4% <i>f</i>	1%	1%	1%
3001-4000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	*	*	*
4001-5000	5	5	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	5
	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	2%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	*	1%	1%
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	11	11	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	1	8	3	13
	2%	2%	-	-	8%	2%	5% <i>f</i>	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	2%	1%	-	-	2%	2%	1%	2%
Don't know/refused	37	35	-	2	1	1	5	2	-	-	13	5	-	2	-	3	6	17	18	35
	5%	5%	-	13%	5%	1%	15% <i>zehl</i>	5%	-	-	7%	4%	-	5%	-	20%	14% <i>zehl</i>	5%	6%	5%
N/A	401	386	6	9	9	40	18	31	34	6	98	75	28	27	6	6	19	203	191	423
	59%	59%	71%	50%	50%	67%	56%	63%	71% <i>p</i>	53%	56%	60%	59%	65%	46%	37%	48%	57%	60%	59%
Mean	61725.34	61725.34	-	-	133351.22	11465.25	834433.00	35903.06	32914.80	-	11388.36	4068.27	9062.39	11593.37	3000.00	-	3931.88	87308.93	26447.64	76655.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 668

Q32d. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Energy monitoring equipment / hardware

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	716	120	596	140	168	161	163	31	50	240	77	235	22	91	107	381	538	172	716
Weighted total	681	110	571	132	157	162	153	29**	45*	224	75*	230	20**	94*	114*	347	505	169	716
0	209	27	182	40	41	63	38	6	21	64	29	82	10	23	24	119	161	46	221
	31%	25%	32%	31%	26%	38% <i>df</i>	25%	21%	47% <i>df</i>	28%	39%	36%	50%	25%	21%	34% <i>n</i>	32%	27%	31%
1-1000	7	1	6	2	3	1	-	-	1	2	-	3	1	2	-	4	7	-	9
	1%	*	1%	2%	2%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	-	1%	3%	2%	-	1%	1%	-	1%
1001-2000	3	1	2	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	2	2	1	3
	*	1%	*	1%	-	*	-	-	4%	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	1%	*	1%	*
2001-3000	6	*	6	*	2	1	1	2	-	3	-	2	-	-	2	4	6	*	5
	1%	*	1%	*	1%	*	1%	7%	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	*	1%
3001-4000	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*
4001-5000	5	-	5	-	1	-	4	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	2	3	2	5
	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	*	-	*	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	11	2	9	1	3	3	3	1	1	6	1	3	-	-	2	9	10	1	13
	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	3%	2%	*	2%
Don't know/refused	37	7	30	9	7	7	11	1	3	10	4	10	1	4	3	16	27	10	35
	5%	7%	5%	6%	5%	4%	7%	2%	6%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	2%	5%	5%	6%	5%
N/A	401	71	330	78	99	87	96	18	20	138	42	126	8	64	81	188	289	109	423
	59% <i>h</i>	65%	58%	59%	63% <i>h</i>	54%	62% <i>h</i>	63%	43%	61%	56%	55%	42%	68% <i>o</i>	71% <i>zo</i>	54%	57%	64%	59%
Mean	61725.34	12691.81	68735.22	5498.25	11411.56	34165.22	38632.73	364342.72	5628.94	125197.76	30000.00	26163.37	300.00	2057.63	10324.91	86694.58	69125.27	8101.69	76655.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 669

Q32d. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Energy monitoring equipment / hardware

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	716	161	364	72	108	112	536	652	66	90	131	328	27	206	511	229	78	141	189	716
Weighted total	681	147	340	69*	116*	108*	514	625	61*	77*	123	314	23**	194	474	210	70*	127	191	716
0	209	41	105	21	42	25	169	191	13	19	26	123	4	38	142	58	23	32	65	221
	31% <i>m</i>	28%	31%	30%	36%	23%	33%	31% <i>j</i>	21%	25%	21%	39% <i>zm</i>	18%	20%	30%	28%	33%	25%	34%	31%
1-1000	7	1	4	2	-	2	2	4	2	2	1	3	-	4	5	2	-	2	2	9
	1%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	-	1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%
1001-2000	3	-	2	-	1	1	1	2	-	1	2	1	-	2	1	1	-	1	1	3
	*	-	1%	-	1%	1%	*	*	-	2%	2%	*	-	1%	*	*	-	1%	1%	*
2001-3000	6	1	2	1	2	2	4	5	1	2	-	5	-	2	6	5	-	2	*	5
	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	*	1%
3001-4000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	2
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	*	1%	1%	*	-	*
4001-5000	5	1	3	1	-	-	3	3	3	2	1	4	1	-	5	2	-	1	-	5
	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	*	5% <i>zg</i>	2% <i>g</i>	1%	1%	4%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	1%
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	11	1	6	1	2	2	6	9	2	5	2	7	1	2	9	6	1	5	2	13
	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	7% <i>zgj</i>	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	3%	1%	4%	1%	2%
Don't know/refused	37	8	17	3	6	9	22	33	8	7	9	11	1	12	26	9	4	14	9	35
	5%	6%	5%	4%	5%	8%	4%	5%	13% <i>zgj</i>	9%	8%	4%	5%	6%	6%	4%	6%	11% <i>znor</i>	5%	5%
N/A	401	93	199	41	62	66	306	377	32	38	82	161	16	132	279	125	41	71	112	423
	59% <i>k</i>	63%	59%	59%	54%	62%	60%	60%	53%	49%	67% <i>l</i>	51%	70%	68% <i>zk</i>	59%	60%	58%	56%	58%	59%
Mean	61725.34	64575.95	84574.87	26704.27	13162.52	6346.22	111005.48	81379.66	182250.22	135200.92	4617.88	16898.55	883895.81	26963.03	76011.45	31215.15	16942.04	144818.47	10898.09	76655.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 670

Q32d. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Energy monitoring equipment / hardware

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	716	449	27	239	716	83	144	74	120	105	198	343	157	173	390	140	716
Weighted total	681	420	25**	234	681	85*	136	68*	109	100*	190	324	149	167	366	135	716
0	209	128	7	72	209	26	42	22	34	36	59	101	44	57	106	41	221
	31%	31%	26%	31%	31%	30%	31%	33%	31%	36%	31%	31%	30%	34%	29%	31%	31%
1-1000	7	6	-	1	7	1	2	1	1	-	3	3	1	2	4	1	9
	1%	1%	-	*	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
1001-2000	3	2	1	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	3	-	3
	*	1%	3%	-	*	-	2%zd	-	-	-	-	*	2%	-	1%	-	*
2001-3000	6	4	-	2	6	-	-	-	3	3	-	4	3	-	5	2	5
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	3% <td>3%j</td> <td>-</td> <td>1%</td> <td>2%</td> <td>-</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1%</td>	3%j	-	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%
3001-4000	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	*	*	-	*	*	*
4001-5000	5	3	-	2	5	-	2	-	2	1	2	2	1	1	4	-	5
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	*	1%	*	1%	-	1%
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	11	10	1	1	11	1	1	2	5	2	2	7	2	2	8	2	13
	2%	2%	4%	*	2%	1%	1%	3%	4%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Don't know/refused	37	21	2	14	37	5	7	1	1	8	4	18	13	5	19	11	35
	5%	5%	9%	6%	5%	6%	5%	2%	1%	8%h	2%	5%	9%j	3%	5%	8%	5%
N/A	401	245	15	142	401	53	79	42	62	49	121	188	82	100	217	77	423
	59%	58%	58%	61%	59%	62%	58%	61%	57%	49%	64%	58%	55%	60%	59%	57%	59%
Mean	61725.34	78750.18	15296.63	5564.80	61725.34	11647.55	5510.56	12242.20	43339.21	224017.14	8327.40	109819.58	15492.45	11109.13	78751.60	23910.84	76655.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 671

Q32d. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Energy monitoring equipment / hardware

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	716	7	5	162	8	6	38	58	40	24	24	46	22	53	19	-	31	32	17	123	1	716
Weighted total	681	6**	5**	143	6**	4**	27*	70*	32*	29**	60*	18**	35*	24**	-**	28**	38**	25**	106	2**	716	
0	209	1	3	40	3	1	8	26	6	11	8	21	7	17	4	-	10	8	8	28	-	221
	31%	17%	68%	28%	48%	18%	28%	37%	19%	37%	39%	35%	38%	49%	zchs	17%	34%	20%	33%	27%	-	31%
1-1000	7	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	9
	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	5% <i>s</i>	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	1%
1001-2000	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
2001-3000	6	-	-	2	-	*	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	1%	-	-	1%	-	11%	-	3%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
3001-4000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	*	-	-	*	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
4001-5000	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	5
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	1%	-	1%
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	11	-	-	7	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	13
	2%	-	-	5% <i>z</i>	-	-	2%	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%
Don't know/refused	37	-	1	7	-	-	5	3	1	3	4	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	6	2	35
	5%	-	13%	5%	-	-	2%	7%	10% <i>m</i>	4%	13%	7%	-	-	-	-	7%	3%	6%	5%	100%	5%
N/A	401	5	1	82	3	2	18	36	22	17	30	11	18	18	19	-	17	25	15	70	-	423
	59%	83%	19%	58%	52%	55%	64%	51%	69%	57%	48%	49%	62%	51%	78%	-	59%	66%	61%	66%	-	59%
Mean	61725.34	-	-	117954.59	-	3587.20	9428.19	82973.63	2000.00	-	-	7232.40	-	-	2000.00	-	-	2986.75	-	33467.19	-	76655.41

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 672

Q32e. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Accommodation

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	4	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	4
Weighted total	4**	2**	-**	2**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	2**	2**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	3**	1**	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2
	58%	26%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	51%	100%	50%
1001-2000	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
	42%	74%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	49%	-	50%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	1028.67	1436.08	-	500.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	525.44	1734.36	-	-	-	-	-	1103.44	600.00	1075.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
 Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
 Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
 Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
 * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 673

Q32e. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Accommodation

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	4	1	3	1	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	1	1	-	-	3	4	-	4
Weighted total	4**	1**	3**	1**	**	1**	2**	**	1**	3**	**	1**	1**	**	**	3**	4**	**	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	58%	-	68%	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	61%	-	-	-	-	-	68%	58%	-	50%
1001-2000	2	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	2	2	-	2
	42%	100%	32%	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	39%	-	100%	100%	-	-	32%	42%	-	50%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	1028.67	1200.00	1001.19	1200.00	-	2000.00	500.00	-	600.00	1084.72	-	1200.00	1200.00	-	-	1001.19	1028.67	-	1075.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 674

Q32e. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Accommodation

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	4	1	2	-	1	-	2	3	-	1	-	4	-	-	2	2	-	1	2	4
Weighted total	4**	1**	2**	**	1**	**	2**	2**	**	1**	**	4**	**	**	2**	2**	**	1**	2**	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	2	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	2
	58%	-	76%	-	100%	-	35%	26%	-	-	-	58%	-	-	35%	35%	-	-	76%	50%
1001-2000	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
	42%	100%	24%	-	-	-	65%	74%	100%	-	-	42%	-	-	65%	65%	-	100%	24%	50%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	1028.67	2000.00	668.72	-	600.00	-	1512.58	1436.08	-	1200.00	-	1028.67	-	-	1512.58	1512.58	-	2000.00	668.72	1075.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 675

Q32e. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Accommodation

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (£)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	4	3	-	1	4	-	1	-	1	1	1	3	-	-	4	-	4
Weighted total	4**	3**	-**	1**	4**	-**	1**	-**	1**	1**	1**	3**	-**	-**	4**	-**	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	2
	58%	81%	-	-	58%	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	51%	-	-	58%	-	50%
1001-2000	2	1	-	1	2	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	2
	42%	19%	-	100%	42%	-	100%	-	100%	-	49%	-	-	-	42%	-	50%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	1028.67	654.59	-	2000.00	1028.67	-	1200.00	-	2000.00	600.00	600.00	1103.44	-	-	1028.67	-	1075.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 676

Q32e. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Accommodation

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	
Unweighted total	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Weighted total	4**	2**	2**	..	1**	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	58%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%
1001-2000	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	42%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	1028.67	-	-	1734.36	-	-	-	-	-	-	500.00	-	600.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1075.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 677

Q32f. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other certificate/s (including non specific mentions)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	3
Weighted total	2**	2**	-**	-**	-**	-**	***	-**	-**	-**	-**	***	-**	-**	-**	-**	1**	***	1**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1
2001-3000	25%	25%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35%	33%
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
5001-6000	47%	47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	65%	33%
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Don't know/refused	27%	27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	33%
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	16604.08	16604.08	-	-	-	-	2000.00	-	-	-	-	50000.00	-	-	-	-	5000.00	50000.00	3947.47	19000.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 678

Q32f. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other certificate/s (including non specific mentions)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)
Unweighted total	3	1	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	1	-	3	-	3
Weighted total	2**	1**	1**	1**	**	***	**	**	**	**	2**	**	1**	1**	**	2**	**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	1
	25%	-	48%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	25%	-	48%	-	-	25%	-	33%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	47%	100%	-	63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	47%	-	-	100%	-	47%	-	33%
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	1
	27%	-	52%	37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%	-	52%	-	-	27%	-	33%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	16604.08	5000.00	26925.45	21587.59	-	2000.00	-	-	-	-	16604.08	-	26925.45	5000.00	-	16604.08	-	19000.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 679

Q32f. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other certificate/s (including non specific mentions)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	
Unweighted total	3	1	2	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	3	1	1	1	-	3
Weighted total	2**	1**	1**	**	**	***	***	**	1**	**	1**	**	***	2**	1**	1**	1**	**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	*	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	1
	25%	-	48%	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	35%	-	-	25%	-	-	-	-	33%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	1
	47%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	63%	-	65%	-	-	47%	100%	100%	100%	-	33%
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	1
	27%	-	52%	-	-	-	-	-	37%	-	-	-	100%	27%	-	-	-	-	33%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	16604.08	5000.00	26925.45	-	-	2000.00	2000.00	-	21587.59	-	3947.47	-	50000.00	16604.08	5000.00	5000.00	5000.00	-	19000.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 680

Q32f. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other certificate/s (including non specific mentions)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	3	3	-	-	3	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	1	2	3
Weighted total	2**	2**	2**	..	***	..	***	1**	..	***	1**	..	***	1**	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	1
2001-3000	25%	25%	-	-	25%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	35%	-	-	35%	33%
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1
5001-6000	47%	47%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	65%	-	-	65%	33%	33%
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Don't know/refused	27%	27%	-	-	27%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	33%
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	16604.08	16604.08	-	-	16604.08	-	50000.00	-	2000.00	5000.00	-	50000.00	3947.47	-	50000.00	3947.47	19000.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 681

Q32f. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other certificate/s (including non specific mentions)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3
Weighted total	2**	1**	***	***	..	3**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001-3000	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	1
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
5001-6000	47%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	16604.08	-	-	5000.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50000.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2000.00	-	19000.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 682

Q32g. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Installing new equipment / replacing equipment

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	3	3	6
Weighted total	7**	7**	**	**	**	**	**	3**	**	**	1**	1**	**	**	2**	**	**	4**	3**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	12%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%	17%
1001-2000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	12%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26%	17%
2001-3000	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	21%	21%	-	-	-	-	55%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47%	17%
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	4	4	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	4	-	3
	55%	55%	-	-	-	-	45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	100%	-	50%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	42924.57	42924.57	-	-	-	-	46579.71	-	-	1000.00	2000.00	-	250000.00	25000.00	-	-	76695.50	2199.52	63500.00	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 683

Q32g. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Installing new equipment / replacing equipment

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	6	-	6	-	2	1	1	1	1	3	-	3	-	1	-	5	5	1	6
Weighted total	7**	..**	7**	..**	1**	1**	1**	2**	1**	3**	..**	4**	..**	1**	..**	6**	6**	1**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	12%	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	22%	-	-	-	14%	14%	-	17%
1001-2000	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
	12%	-	12%	-	63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	17%
2001-3000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1
	21%	-	21%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	-	24%	24%	-	-	17%
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	4	-	4	-	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	4	4	-	3	
	55%	-	55%	-	37%	100%	-	100%	-	53%	-	56%	-	-	62%	62%	-	50%	
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	42924.57	-	42924.57	-	92578.12	100000.00	3000.00	25000.00	1000.00	76853.95	-	14644.44	-	2000.00	-	48377.82	48377.82	2000.00	63500.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 684

Q32g. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Installing new equipment / replacing equipment

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	6	2	1	1	2	2	4	4	2	1	-	5	-	-	5	4	-	-	1	6
Weighted total	7**	2**	1**	1**	3**	3**	4**	4**	2**	2**	**	6**	**	**	6**	5**	**	**	1**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	12%	-	100%	-	-	29%	-	-	37%	-	-	13%	-	-	14%	15%	-	-	-	17%
1001-2000	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	12%	-	-	-	28%	-	21%	18%	-	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	17%
2001-3000	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	21%	76%	-	-	-	-	37%	-	63%	-	-	23%	-	-	24%	26%	-	-	-	17%
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	4	-	-	1	2	2	4	4	-	2	-	3	-	-	4	3	-	-	-	3
	55%	24%	-	100%	72%	71%	42%	82%	-	100%	-	51%	-	-	62%	59%	-	-	-	50%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	42924.57	62521.90	1000.00	100000.00	18602.91	18119.66	61471.39	63473.59	2269.40	25000.00	-	27898.14	-	-	48377.82	31635.66	-	-	2000.00	63500.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 685

Q32g. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Installing new equipment / replacing equipment

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	6	6	-	-	6	-	-	-	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	6
Weighted total	7**	7**	7**	2**	3**	1**	3**	3**	1**	3**	3**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	12%	12%	-	-	12%	-	-	-	34%	-	-	29%	-	-	29%	-	17%
1001-2000	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	12%	12%	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	17%
2001-3000	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	21%	21%	-	-	21%	-	-	-	41%	-	-	47%	-	-	47%	-	17%
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	4	4	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	2	2	3
	55%	55%	-	-	55%	-	-	-	66%	59%	-	71%	53%	-	71%	53%	50%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	42924.57	42924.57	-	-	42924.57	-	-	-	94524.59	15954.28	2000.00	18119.66	76853.95	2000.00	18119.66	76853.95	63500.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 686

Q32g. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Installing new equipment / replacing equipment

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	6	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6
Weighted total	7**	..*	..*	1**	..*	..*	1**	1**	..*	..*	2**	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	..*	1**	..*	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	12%	-	-	-	-	-	64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
1001-2000	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	17%
2001-3000	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	4	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	55%	-	-	100%	-	-	36%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	42924.57	-	-	100000.00	-	-	89522.80	3000.00	-	-	25000.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2000.00	-	63500.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 687

Q32h. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ISO 50001 Certificate

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	6	6	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	3	3	6
Weighted total	6**	6**	-**	-**	-**	1**	-**	-**	2**	-**	1**	-**	**	1**	1**	-**	-**	3**	3**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
5001-6000	16%	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	29%	-	17%
6001-7000	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
7001-8000	14%	14%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%
8001-9000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
9001-10000	19%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43%
10000 or more	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1
Don't know/refused	31%	31%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56%	-	17%
N/A	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	*	1	2
Mean	20%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	14%	27%	33%
	11424.21	11424.21	-	-	-	7000.00	-	9000.00	-	8000.00	-	50000.00	12000.00	5000.00	-	-	-	13626.27	8793.72	15166.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 688

Q32h. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ISO 50001 Certificate

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	6	1	5	1	1	1	2	-	1	3	-	2	-	1	-	5	5	1	6
Weighted total	6**	1**	5**	***	1**	1**	3**	**	1**	3**	**	2**	**	***	**	6**	5**	1**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
5001-6000	16%	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	38%	-	-	-	-	-	17%	20%	-	17%
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
8001-9000	14%	-	16%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	33%	-	-	-	-	-	15%	17%	-	17%
10000 or more	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
Don't know/refused	19%	-	23%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	72%	-	-	-	21%	-	100%	17%
N/A	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	1
	31%	-	37%	-	-	-	71%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%	38%	-	17%
	1	-	1	*	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	*	-	-	1	1	-	2	
	20%	-	24%	100%	-	-	29%	-	-	30%	-	28%	-	100%	-	14%	25%	-	33%
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	11424.21	5000.00	12647.53	50000.00	5000.00	7000.00	9865.84	-	8000.00	7719.71	-	19940.89	-	50000.00	-	8204.92	12247.87	8000.00	15166.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 689

Q32h. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ISO 50001 Certificate

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	6	-	4	1	1	-	-	-	-	6	1	3	-	2	6	3	2	1	-	6
Weighted total	6**	**	3**	2**	1**	**	**	**	**	6**	1**	4**	**	1**	6**	4**	2**	1**	**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
	16%	-	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	27%	-	-	16%	-	54%	-	-	17%
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1
	14%	-	27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	100%	-	-	64%	14%	-	46%	100%	-	17%
7001-8000	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	19%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	19%	31%	-	-	-	17%
8001-9000	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1
	31%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	31%	-	52%	-	-	31%	49%	-	-	-	17%
10000 or more	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
	20%	-	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%	-	21%	-	36%	20%	20%	-	-	-	33%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	11424.21	-	14249.24	9000.00	8000.00	-	-	-	-	11424.21	7000.00	8551.05	-	22469.28	11424.21	9287.85	5922.98	7000.00	-	15166.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 690

Q32h. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ISO 50001 Certificate

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	6	2	1	3	6	-	1	1	2	1	-	4	2	-	5	1	6
Weighted total	6**	1**	1**	4**	6**	..**	***	1**	3**	1**	..**	4**	3**	..**	5**	1**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
5001-6000	16%	67%	-	-	16%	-	-	34%	-	-	28%	-	-	18%	-	-	17%
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
7001-8000	14%	-	-	21%	14%	-	-	100%	-	-	24%	-	-	16%	-	-	17%
7001-8000	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
8001-9000	19%	-	-	30%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	34%	-	-	22%	-	-	17%
8001-9000	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	1
10000 or more	31%	-	-	48%	31%	-	-	66%	-	-	-	71%	-	35%	-	-	17%
10000 or more	1	*	1	-	1	-	*	-	1	-	*	1	-	*	1	-	2
Don't know/refused	20%	33%	100%	-	20%	-	100%	-	100%	-	14%	29%	-	9%	100%	-	33%
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	11424.21	19625.90	12000.00	8266.73	11424.21	-	50000.00	7000.00	7630.76	12000.00	-	12609.60	9865.84	-	11342.19	12000.00	15166.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 691

Q32h. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ISO 50001 Certificate

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)
Unweighted total	6	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6
Weighted total	6**	**	**	2**	**	**	2**	1**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	6**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	16%	-	-	54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	14%	-	-	46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
7001-8000	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	17%
8001-9000	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	31%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
10000 or more	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	11424.21	-	-	5922.98	-	-	9000.00	12000.00	-	-	-	50000.00	-	-	-	8000.00	-	-	-	-	15166.67

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 692

Q32i. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ESOS Training / courses (no mention of internal assessor)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	4	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	1	4
Weighted total	3**	3**	**	**	***	**	**	**	**	**	2**	**	-	1**	**	**	**	2**	1**	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	1
	15%	15%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26%	-	25%
1001-2000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	25%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	42%	42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	25%
6001-7000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	25%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	44%	-	25%
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	4537.92	4537.92	-	-	200.00	-	-	-	-	-	4607.29	-	-	7000.00	-	-	-	3466.06	6000.00	3600.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 693

Q32i. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ESOS Training / courses (no mention of internal assessor)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	4	2	2	3	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	3	3	1	4
Weighted total	3**	2**	1**	2**	**	**	1**	**	**	1**	**	2**	1**	**	**	2**	2**	1**	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15%	-	-	38%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	26%	-	25%
1001-2000	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
17%	29%	-	23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	100%	-	-	-	-	30%	-	25%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
42%	71%	-	57%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71%	-	-	-	51%	-	100%	25%	
6001-7000	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	
25%	-	62%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	30%	44%	-	25%	
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Mean	4537.92	4607.29	4435.62	3709.73	-	-	7000.00	-	-	7000.00	-	4607.29	1200.00	-	-	5235.66	3466.06	6000.00	3600.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 694

Q32i. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ESOS Training / courses (no mention of internal assessor)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	4	-	3	-	1	1	-	2	-	3	1	3	-	1	2	1	-	-	2	4
Weighted total	3**	..**	2**	..**	1**	***	..**	1**	..**	2**	1**	2**	..**	1**	1**	***	..**	..**	2**	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	1
	15%	-	26%	-	-	100%	-	47%	-	-	-	26%	-	-	38%	100%	-	-	-	25%
1001-2000	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	17%	-	30%	-	-	-	-	53%	-	20%	-	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	25%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
	42%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	50%	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	71%	25%
6001-7000	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	25%	-	44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	44%	-	-	62%	-	-	-	-	25%
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	4537.92	-	3466.06	-	6000.00	200.00	-	731.52	-	5317.84	6000.00	3466.06	-	6000.00	4435.62	200.00	-	-	4607.29	3600.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 695

Q32i. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ESOS Training / courses (no mention of internal assessor)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	4	3	-	1	4	-	3	-	1	-	1	1	2	1	2	1	4
Weighted total	3**	2**	..	***	3**	..	2**	..	***	..	***	1**	2**	***	2**	1**	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001-2000	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
2001-3000	17%	20%	-	-	17%	-	20%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	29%	-	-	25%
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
6001-7000	42%	50%	-	-	42%	-	50%	-	-	-	-	63%	-	71%	-	-	25%
7001-8000	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
8001-9000	25%	30%	-	-	25%	-	30%	-	-	-	-	37%	-	-	100%	-	25%
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	4537.92	5317.84	-	200.00	4537.92	-	5317.84	-	200.00	-	200.00	1200.00	6373.06	200.00	4607.29	7000.00	3600.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 696

Q32i. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

ESOS Training / courses (no mention of internal assessor)

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)
Unweighted total	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4
Weighted total	3**	1**	1**	1**	..	4**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	15%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%
1001-2000	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	17%	-	-	53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%
6001-7000	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	25%
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	4537.92	-	-	731.52	-	-	-	-	-	-	6000.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7000.00	-	3600.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 697

Q32j. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Travel

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	15	14	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	5	2	2	1	1	-	1	9	6	15	
Weighted total	16**	14**	**	2**	**	**	1**	**	1**	6**	2**	1**	2**	2**	**	1**	10**	5**	15**	
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	10	9	-	2	-	-	1	-	*	6	-	1	-	-	-	1	7	3	11	
	65%	61%	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	66%	63%	73%	
1001-2000	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	2	-	-	4	2	4	
	35%	39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	100%	-	-	34%	37%	27%	
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Mean	922.36	970.53	-	500.00	-	-	100.00	-	500.00	500.00	720.29	1734.36	364.04	1500.00	1500.00	-	954.04	862.04	800.00	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 698

Q32j. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Travel

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	15	1	14	2	2	6	3	-	2	2	2	6	1	2	-	11	13	2	15
Weighted total	16**	1**	15**	1**	2**	7**	4**	**	2**	3**	1**	7**	1**	3**	**	12**	14**	2**	15**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	10	-	10	1	2	2	4	-	2	1	4	-	1	-	9	8	2	11	
	65%	-	67%	56%	100%	27%	100%	100%	61%	100%	64%	-	24%	-	75%	61%	100%	73%	
1001-2000	6	1	5	1	-	5	-	-	1	-	3	1	2	-	3	6	-	4	
	35%	100%	33%	44%	-	73%	-	-	39%	-	36%	100%	76%	-	25%	39%	-	27%	
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Mean	922.36	1200.00	913.03	1088.57	323.31	1304.88	641.37	-	536.04	1084.72	364.04	968.68	1200.00	1258.54	-	853.62	978.58	438.97	800.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 699

Q32j. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Travel

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	15	2	8	1	4	4	9	11	3	2	1	9	-	1	8	5	-	1	7	15
Weighted total	16**	2**	9**	1**	4**	6**	8**	11**	3**	1**	1**	9**	**	1**	7**	4**	**	1**	8**	15**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	10	1	5	1	4	4	5	6	3	1	1	5	-	1	4	3	-	-	6	11
	65%	49%	52%	100%	100%	64%	62%	51%	100%	56%	100%	59%	-	100%	59%	74%	-	-	70%	73%
1001-2000	6	1	4	-	-	2	3	6	-	1	-	4	-	-	3	1	-	1	3	4
	35%	51%	48%	-	-	36%	38%	49%	-	44%	-	41%	-	-	41%	26%	-	100%	30%	27%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	922.36	1211.25	906.85	500.00	875.83	1091.55	870.37	1091.88	463.31	811.27	500.00	900.98	-	200.00	942.17	813.82	-	2000.00	905.07	800.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 700

Q32j. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Travel

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	15	8	1	6	15	4	4	1	2	1	6	6	2	6	7	2	15
Weighted total	16**	7**	1**	7**	16**	4**	5**	1**	2**	1**	5**	7**	3**	5**	8**	3**	15**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	10	5	1	4	10	2	2	1	1	1	5	3	1	5	4	1	11
	65%	66%	100%	59%	65%	50%	50%	100%	38%	100%	100%	50%	24%	100%	53%	24%	73%
1001-2000	6	3	-	3	6	2	3	-	1	-	-	4	2	-	4	2	4
	35%	34%	-	41%	35%	50%	50%	-	62%	-	-	50%	76%	-	47%	76%	27%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	922.36	802.30	100.00	1142.10	922.36	1032.41	1174.01	100.00	1425.46	600.00	642.85	1003.36	1258.54	688.96	974.16	1258.54	800.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 701

Q32j. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Travel

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)
Unweighted total	15	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	3	2	-	1	1	1	1	-	15
Weighted total	16**	2**	2**	..	1**	..	2**	..	2**	3**	..	1**	2**	2**	1**	..	15**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	10	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	2	-	2	3	-	1	-	-	1	-	11
	65%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	73%
1001-2000	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	4
	35%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	27%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5001-6000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6001-7000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7001-8000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	922.36	-	-	1734.36	-	-	323.31	-	100.00	-	500.00	-	531.01	836.46	-	500.00	1500.00	1500.00	1000.00	-	800.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 702

Q32k. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	20	18	1	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	9	4	2	-	1	-	1	16	4	20
Weighted total	21**	19**	***	2**	..	1**	..	1**	1**	..	11**	3**	2**	..	2**	..	1**	17**	4**	20**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	8	6	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	1	6
	36%	32%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	41%	18%	30%
1001-2000	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3
	13%	14%	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	15%	15%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	3	-	3	
	13%	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	66%	-	-	-	100%	16%	-	15%	
5001-6000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	
	6%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	5%	
6001-7000	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	
	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	5%	
7001-8000	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	
	9%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	46%	5%	
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
10000 or more	4	4	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	5	
	20%	20%	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	15%	71%	-	-	-	-	-	20%	21%	25%	
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Mean	8349.45	8556.27	26000.00	500.00	-	10000.00	-	1500.00	2000.00	-	7149.53	22030.59	5674.68	-	8000.00	-	4500.00	8886.67	6133.37	9025.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 703

Q32k. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	20	2	18	4	3	4	5	2	2	3	3	10	-	-	4	13	19	1	20
Weighted total	21**	2**	19**	4**	3**	4**	7**	2**	2**	4**	3**	11**	**	**	4**	14**	20**	1**	20**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	8	-	8	1	2	-	5	-	-	2	2	4	-	-	1	7	7	1	6
	36%	-	41%	36%	58%	-	73%	-	-	39%	74%	33%	-	-	17%	51%	34%	100%	30%
1001-2000	3	-	3	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	3	-	3
	13%	-	15%	-	-	40%	16%	-	-	-	-	16%	-	-	24%	12%	14%	-	15%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	3	-	3	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	2	3	-	3
	13%	-	14%	-	-	-	11%	100%	-	-	-	25%	-	-	16%	14%	13%	-	15%
5001-6000	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	6%	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	6%	-	5%
6001-7000	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	3%	-	3%	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	4%	3%	-	5%
7001-8000	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	1
	9%	79%	-	49%	-	-	-	-	-	46%	-	-	-	-	43%	-	9%	-	5%
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	4	4	4	-	1	2	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	-	1	4	-	5
	20%	21%	20%	-	42%	60%	-	-	36%	15%	26%	20%	-	-	-	9%	21%	-	25%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	8349.45	11709.31	7922.67	5246.25	8275.26	18561.43	1310.46	4798.80	20622.56	5694.05	12479.52	9642.74	-	-	4673.56	5026.15	8636.10	500.00	9025.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 704

Q32k. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	20	5	10	-	5	12	15	3	2	5	7	1	7	12	6	2	4	7	20	
Weighted total	21**	6**	10**	**	6**	13**	16**	3**	1**	5**	7**	1**	6**	10**	6**	2**	4**	9**	20**	
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
1-1000	8	2	4	-	3	3	6	-	-	1	3	1	-	1	-	-	-	7	6	
	36%	27%	36%	-	48%	63%	37%	-	-	16%	43%	100%	-	7%	-	-	-	73%	30%	
1001-2000	3	-	1	-	2	3	3	-	-	1	1	-	2	3	1	-	-	-	3	
	13%	-	6%	-	38%	21%	17%	-	-	14%	14%	-	27%	26%	18%	-	-	-	15%	
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
4001-5000	3	-	2	-	1	2	2	1	-	1	2	-	1	2	1	-	1	-	3	
	13%	-	19%	-	14%	37%	12%	30%	-	16%	21%	-	19%	15%	12%	-	18%	-	15%	
5001-6000	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	
	6%	21%	-	-	-	9%	-	46%	-	-	-	-	-	12%	20%	-	30%	-	5%	
6001-7000	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	
	3%	10%	-	-	-	5%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	10%	6%	-	27%	-	-	5%	
7001-8000	2	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	
	9%	33%	-	-	-	15%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%	5%	
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
10000 or more	4	4	4	-	-	3	3	1	1	2	2	-	3	4	3	2	2	1	5	
	20%	9%	38%	-	-	24%	19%	24%	100%	54%	21%	-	44%	35%	51%	73%	52%	7%	25%	
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Mean	8349.45	7156.56	12733.63	-	1783.84	2326.84	9136.95	7365.16	6986.04	38128.57	17246.78	7167.60	500.00	15810.34	11335.40	15336.91	31163.84	21929.13	5487.67	9025.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 705

Q32k. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	20	13	2	5	20	1	8	3	2	2	4	9	6	6	10	4	20
Weighted total	21**	12**	3**	6**	21**	1**	9**	3**	1**	3**	5**	8**	7**	6**	9**	5**	20**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	8	4	-	4	8	1	5	-	-	-	4	4	-	4	4	-	6
	36%	28%	-	69%	36%	100%	52%	-	-	-	71%	44%	-	65%	37%	-	30%
1001-2000	3	3	-	-	3	-	1	2	-	-	1	1	1	1	2	-	3
	13%	22%	-	-	13%	-	11%	51%	-	-	13%	13%	14%	10%	22%	-	15%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	3	2	1	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	2	-	3
	13%	16%	28%	-	13%	-	30%	-	-	-	16%	9%	16%	12%	20%	-	15%
5001-6000	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
	6%	-	-	20%	6%	-	-	-	39%	-	-	16%	-	-	23%	-	5%
6001-7000	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	3%	5%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	6%	-	-	5%
7001-8000	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1
	9%	-	72%	-	9%	-	-	-	61%	-	-	25%	-	-	36%	-	5%
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	4	4	-	1	4	-	1	2	1	-	2	2	2	1	1	2	5
	20%	29%	-	11%	20%	-	7%	49%	100%	-	27%	28%	13%	14%	41%	25%	25%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	8349.45	11083.37	7167.12	3164.56	8349.45	1000.00	5574.26	20402.37	10850.52	7219.42	1688.95	7357.92	14450.81	2720.23	6159.63	19245.07	9025.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 706

Q32k. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Other

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	20	-	1	1	1	1	-	3	2	1	-	1	3	1	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	20
Weighted total	21**	**	2**	1**	1**	1**	**	4**	1**	1**	**	2**	2**	1**	3**	**	**	**	**	3**	**	20**
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	6
	36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	40%	-	-	-	100%	34%	-	63%	-	-	-	-	53%	-	30%
1001-2000	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	-	-	29%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
2001-3000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60%	-	-	36%	-	37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
5001-6000	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
6001-7000	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	3%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
7001-8000	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	9%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
8001-9000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10000 or more	4	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	5
	20%	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	40%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47%	-	25%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	8349.45	-	8000.00	10000.00	7000.00	12000.00	-	2731.39	13465.43	47000.00	-	500.00	2397.16	2000.00	2481.15	-	-	-	-	19241.88	-	9025.00

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 707

Q32a-e. Please can you tell me what type of external costs you incurred and provide an approximate cost (in ££) for each external expenditure?

Summary

Base: all participants who incurred additional external costs as a result of ESOS

	External consultant / assessor services	Training internal assessor	Software	Energy monitoring equipment / hardware	Accommodation	Other certificate/s (including non specific mentions)	Installing new equipment / replacing equipment	ISO 50001 Certificate	ESOS Training / courses (no mention of internal assessor)	Travel	Other
Unweighted total	716	716	716	716	4	3	6	6	4	15	20
Weighted total	681	681	681	681	4	2	7	6	3	16	21
0	9	625	214	209	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1%	92%	31%	31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-1000	25	7	3	7	2	-	1	-	*	10	8
	4%	1%	*	1%	58%	-	12%	-	15%	65%	36%
1001-2000	52	9	2	3	2	*	1	-	1	6	3
	8%	1%	*	*	42%	25%	12%	-	17%	35%	13%
2001-3000	41	4	2	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
	6%	1%	*	1%	-	-	21%	-	-	-	-
3001-4000	44	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	7%	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4001-5000	73	2	1	5	-	1	-	1	-	-	3
	11%	*	*	1%	-	47%	-	16%	-	-	13%
5001-6000	38	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	6%	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	42%	-	6%
6001-7000	21	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	3%	*	*	-	-	-	-	14%	25%	-	3%
7001-8000	48	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%	-	-	9%
8001-9000	13	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
	2%	-	*	-	-	-	-	31%	-	-	-
10000 or more	232	*	3	11	-	*	4	1	-	-	4
	34%	*	*	2%	-	27%	55%	20%	-	-	20%
Don't know/refused	65	9	32	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	10%	1%	5%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	18	21	422	401	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3%	3%	62%	59%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	10436.98	2736.65	9272.62	61725.34	1028.67	16604.08	42924.57	11424.21	4537.92	922.36	8349.45

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 708

Q33. Have you received your audit report from your ESOS Lead Assessor?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an external or internal Lead assessor

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	751	727	15	9	21	69	39	50	47	15	179	153	54	49	12	10	43	389	353	751
Weighted total	726	698	9**	20**	15**	62*	34*	55*	53*	13**	194	127	47*	43*	17**	13**	42*	371	345	751
Yes - a final version	685	674	4	7	14	59	31	53	53	13	182	120	44	41	15	8	39	355	320	712
	94%	97%	45%	35%	93%	96%	93%	97%	100%	100%	94%	94%	95%	96%	89%	64%	94%	96%	93%	95%
Yes - a draft version	12	8	2	2	*	1	2	-	-	-	2	3	*	-	-	2	-	6	5	12
	2%	1%	25%	8%	3%	2%	7%zj	-	-	-	1%	2%	1%	-	-	14%	-	2%	2%	2%
No	21	9	3	10	1	-	-	*	-	-	10	3	-	1	-	3	2	7	13	18
	3%a	1%	30%	49%	4%	-	-	1%	-	-	5%	2%	-	2%	-	22%	4%	2%	4%	2%
Don't know	9	7	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	2	-	*	3	6	9
	1%	1%	-	8%	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	*	1%	4%f	2%	11%	-	1%	1%	2%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 709

Q33. Have you received your audit report from your ESOS Lead Assessor?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an external or internal Lead assessor

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	751	129	622	145	188	162	171	31	51	256	79	245	24	96	116	394	555	189	751
Weighted total	726	120	606	140	182	162	162	29**	48*	249	80*	240	22**	102*	123	365	530	189	751
Yes - a final version	685	116	569	131	173	154	150	29	45	232	72	229	18	94	118	346	504	173	712
	94%	97%	94%	93%	95%	95%	93%	98%	95%	93%	90%	95%	85%	92%	96%	95%	95%	92%	95%
Yes - a draft version	12	2	10	2	2	2	4	1	1	4	5	2	3	1	3	4	6	6	12
	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	7%zik	1%	13%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%
No	21	1	21	7	5	4	5	-	-	10	2	5	1	4	1	13	12	9	18
	3%	*	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	4%	2%	2%	2%	4%	1%	3%	2%	5%	2%
Don't know	9	2	7	-	3	2	2	-	1	3	*	4	-	3	2	2	8	1	9
	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	2%	-	3%	1%	1%	2%	-	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 710

Q33. Have you received your audit report from your ESOS Lead Assessor?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an external or internal Lead assessor

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	751	168	376	77	117	119	601	711	84	69	142	339	33	214	537	237	79	149	198	751
Weighted total	726	158	356	74*	125	116	578	688	80*	63*	137	325	29**	208	510	219	74*	140	200	751
Yes - a final version	685	150	333	72	120	115	567	648	72	58	124	307	29	196	481	210	72	128	190	712
	94%	94%	94%	98%	96%	99%z	98%z	94%	90%	93%	90%	95%	100%	94%	94%	96%	97%	91%	95%	95%
Yes - a draft version	12	5	7	-	-	1	11	12	-	-	4	8	-	3	9	2	-	2	2	12
	2%	3%	2%	-	-	1%	2%	2%	-	-	3%	3%	-	1%	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	2%
No	21	3	9	2	5	-	-	18	7	4	6	7	-	7	15	5	2	8	6	18
	3%r	2%	2%	2%	4%	-	-	3%	8%zg	7%	5%	2%	-	3%	3%	2%	3%	6%	3%	2%
Don't know	9	1	7	-	-	-	-	9	1	-	3	2	-	2	4	2	-	2	2	9
	1%r	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	3%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 711

Q33. Have you received your audit report from your ESOS Lead Assessor?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an external or internal Lead assessor

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	(p)	
Unweighted total 751	463	29	257	751	86	150	77	128	107	213	363	154	184	409	142	751	
Weighted total 726	443	27**	253	726	87*	146	75*	117	101*	204	347	151	178	389	140	751	
Yes - a final version 685 94%	412	25	244	685	83	135	70	110	96	196	333	138	172	372	127	712	
Yes - a draft version 12 2%	6	-	6	12	1	4	1	3	2	3	5	4	3	7	1	12	
No 21 3%	17	1	3	21	4	5	2	2	3	4	6	7	2	7	9	18	
Don't know 9 1%	8	1	-	9	-	1	2	2	-	2	2	2	1	3	2	9	
	2%^c	3%	-	1%	-	1%	2%	2%	-	1%	1%	2%	*	1%	2%	1%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 712

Q33. Have you received your audit report from your ESOS Lead Assessor?

Base: all participants who complied or intend to comply via audits through an external or internal Lead assessor

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	(u)
Unweighted total	751	9	4	162	10	7	37	63	39	25	25	48	24	59	20	-	35	32	19	132	1	751
Weighted total	726	9**	4**	144	7**	5**	27*	76*	32*	32**	23**	62*	19**	39*	26**	**	34*	37**	28**	119	2**	751
Yes - a final version	685	9	4	138	7	5	26	70	31	30	22	60	19	38	23	-	29	36	26	111	-	712
	94%	100%	100%	96% ^p	100%	100%	95%	92%	95%	94%	95%	97%	100%	96%	91%	-	86%	97%	92%	94%	-	95%
Yes - a draft version	12	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	3	-	-	2	-	12
	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	3%	1%	-	2%	9%	-	7% ^{zc}	-	-	2%	-	2%
No	21	-	-	4	-	-	*	5	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	2	2	18
	3%	-	-	3%	-	-	2%	6%	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	7%	3%	8%	2%	100%	2%
Don't know	9	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	9
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	3%	-	2%	6%	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 713

Q34a. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The level of detail included

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	724	709	11	4	20	68	39	48	47	15	170	148	53	47	11	9	40	376	340	724
Weighted total	696	682	6**	9**	15**	61*	34*	53*	53*	13**	184	123	45*	41*	15**	10**	39*	361	326	724
Extremely satisfied	175	174	1	-	4	16	7	19	16	-	51	20	9	17	7	-	6	93	81	188
	25%k	26%	9%	-	29%	26%	20%	36%k	30%	-	28%k	17%	20%	41%zklp	49%	-	16%	26%	25%	26%
Quite satisfied	389	379	4	6	8	31	22	26	28	11	94	81	23	20	4	9	25	204	179	403
	56%	56%	66%	73%	55%	52%	65%	49%	53%	83%	51%	65%zm	51%	47%	25%	93%	64%	56%	55%	56%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	91	88	1	2	2	12	2	6	8	2	23	17	10	2	-	1	6	45	46	93
	13%	13%	17%	27%	13%	19%f	5%	10%	15%	17%	12%	14%	23%fm	6%	-	7%	16%	13%	14%	13%
Quite dissatisfied	24	24	*	-	*	1	3	2	-	-	9	3	3	1	-	-	2	10	11	26
	4%	4%	8%	-	3%	2%	8%h	4%	-	-	5%	3%	6%	2%	-	-	4%	3%	4%	4%
Extremely dissatisfied	10	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	2	4	-	5	5	5	7
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	1%	1%	-	4%	27%	-	1%	2%	2%	1%
Don't know	7	7	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	-	3	4	4	7
	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	-	-	2%	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%
Satisfied	564	553	5	6	12	47	29	45	44	11	145	101	32	37	11	9	32	297	260	591
	81%	81%	75%	73%	84%	78%	85%	85%	83%	83%	79%	82%	71%	89%l	73%	93%	80%	82%	80%	82%
Dissatisfied	35	34	*	-	*	1	3	2	1	-	12	4	3	2	4	-	2	15	17	33
	5%	5%	8%	-	3%	2%	8%	4%	3%	-	6%	3%	6%	6%	27%	-	4%	4%	5%	5%
Net satisfied	529	519	4	6	12	46	26	43	42	11	133	97	29	35	7	9	30	282	243	558
	76%	76%	67%	73%	81%	76%	77%	81%	80%	83%	73%	79%	66%	83%	47%	93%	76%	78%	75%	77%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 714

Q34a. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The level of detail included

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	724	127	597	140	180	156	165	31	49	247	75	236	23	91	114	380	538	179	724
Weighted total	696	118	579	133	174	155	154	29**	46*	236	77*	231	21**	95*	120	350	510	179	724
Extremely satisfied	175	36	138	30	43	37	42	11	11	52	26	62	5	23	28	91	126	46	188
	25%	31%	24%	22%	25%	24%	27%	38%	24%	22%	34%	27%	23%	24%	24%	26%	25%	26%	26%
Quite satisfied	389	59	330	77	100	86	85	12	26	128	45	127	14	54	73	184	288	97	403
	56%	50%	57%	58%	57%	55%	55%	42%	56%	54%	59%	55%	67%	57%	61%	53%	57%	54%	56%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	91	19	73	19	20	26	16	5	4	38	5	30	1	12	15	53	67	23	93
	13%	16%	13%	15%	12%	17%	10%	17%	10%	16% <i>f</i>	6%	13%	5%	12%	13%	15%	13%	13%	13%
Quite dissatisfied	24	1	23	4	9	2	6	1	3	10	1	8	1	3	4	10	14	11	26
	4%	1%	4%	3%	5%	1%	4%	3%	7% <i>e</i>	4%	1%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	3%	6% <i>p</i>	4%
Extremely dissatisfied	10	-	10	-	2	5	4	-	-	6	-	1	-	2	-	7	10	-	7
	1%	-	2%	-	1%	3%	2%	-	-	3%	-	1	-	2%	-	2%	2%	-	1%
Don't know	7	2	5	3	1	-	2	-	1	2	-	3	-	2	-	4	5	2	7
	1%	2%	1%	2%	-	-	2%	-	2%	1%	-	1%	-	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%
Satisfied	564	95	468	107	143	123	127	24	37	180	71	189	19	76	101	275	414	143	591
	81%	81%	81%	80%	82%	79%	82%	80%	81%	76%	93% <i>z</i> <i>zk</i>	82%	90%	80%	84%	79%	81%	80%	82%
Dissatisfied	35	1	33	4	10	7	9	1	3	16	1	9	1	5	4	17	24	11	33
	5%	1%	6%	3%	6%	4%	6%	3%	7%	7%	1%	4%	5%	5%	3%	5%	5%	6%	5%
Net satisfied	529	94	435	103	133	116	118	23	34	164	71	180	18	71	98	258	391	132	558
	76%	80%	75%	77%	76%	75%	76%	77%	73%	69%	92% <i>z</i> <i>zk</i>	78% <i>kl</i>	86%	75%	81%	74%	77%	74%	77%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 715

Q34a. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The level of detail included

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	724	164	363	75	112	119	601	686	78	64	135	330	33	205	522	231	76	142	189	724
Weighted total	696	154	340	72*	120*	116	578	661	72*	59*	128	315	29**	198	490	212	72*	130	192	724
Extremely satisfied	175	39	80	17	36	43	129	153	34	15	34	76	9	51	122	54	17	33	50	188
	25%	25%	24%	23%	30%	37%zf	22%	23%	47%zgj	25%	27%	24%	29%	26%	25%	25%	24%	25%	26%	26%
Quite satisfied	389	92	193	44	53	58	331	378	32	28	73	183	14	110	274	117	37	73	105	403
	56% <i>d</i>	60% <i>d</i>	57% <i>d</i>	61% <i>d</i>	44%	50%	57%	57%	45%	48%	57%	58%	47%	56%	56%	55%	52%	56%	55%	56%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	91	16	47	3	24	13	78	89	4	10	16	38	5	26	64	28	10	14	27	93
	13% <i>c</i>	11%	14% <i>c</i>	5%	20% <i>ac</i>	11%	14%	13%	6%	17%	13%	12%	16%	13%	13%	13%	15%	11%	14%	13%
Quite dissatisfied	24	3	14	3	5	2	23	24	-	4	3	13	-	6	20	7	4	8	4	26
	4%	2%	4%	4%	4%	2%	4%	4%	-	6% <i>h</i>	2%	4%	-	3%	4%	3%	6%	6%	2%	4%
Extremely dissatisfied	10	1	3	5	1	-	10	10	1	2	1	3	2	2	6	5	2	2	4	7
	1%	*	1%	7% <i>zabd</i>	1%	-	2%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	5%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%
Don't know	7	3	2	1	1	-	7	7	1	-	-	2	1	4	4	1	1	-	2	7
	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	1%
Satisfied	564	131	273	61	89	101	460	530	66	43	107	259	22	161	396	171	55	106	155	591
	81%	85% <i>d</i>	80%	84%	74%	87%	80%	80%	92% <i>zgj</i>	73%	84%	82%	76%	81%	81%	81%	76%	82%	81%	82%
Dissatisfied	35	4	17	7	6	2	33	35	1	6	4	17	2	8	26	12	6	9	7	33
	5%	2%	5%	10% <i>a</i>	5%	2%	6%	5%	1%	10% <i>h</i>	3%	5%	5%	4%	5%	6%	8%	7%	4%	5%
Net satisfied	529	127	256	53	83	99	427	496	66	38	103	243	21	152	370	159	49	97	148	558
	76% <i>kl</i>	83% <i>d</i>	75%	74%	69%	86% <i>czf</i>	74%	75%	91% <i>zgj</i>	64%	81% <i>kl</i>	77%	71%	77%	75%	75%	68%	74%	77%	77%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 716

Q34a. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The level of detail included

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	724	441	27	254	724	83	144	74	124	104	206	355	147	181	399	133	724
Weighted total	696	418	25**	250	696	84*	139	71*	113	99*	199	338	142	176	379	129	724
Extremely satisfied	175	105	8	61	175	22	40	13	33	25	48	75	49	38	91	43	188
	25%	25%	33%	24%	25%	26%	29%	18%	29%	25%	24%	22%	35% <i>zjk</i>	22%	24%	33% <i>m</i>	26%
Quite satisfied	389	241	12	134	389	46	81	42	58	47	110	200	68	103	211	66	403
	56%	58%	48%	54%	56%	56%	58%	59%	51%	47%	56%	59% <i>l</i>	48%	59%	56%	52%	56%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	91	46	4	39	91	12	13	13	12	18	28	44	15	26	52	10	93
Dissatisfied	13%	11%	18%	15%	13%	14%	10%	18%	11%	18%	14%	13%	11%	15%	14%	8%	13%
Quite dissatisfied	24	18	*	6	24	2	4	*	7	7	6	13	4	5	15	4	26
	4%	4%	2%	3%	4%	2%	3%	1%	6%	7%	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%
Extremely dissatisfied	10	3	-	7	10	2	1	3	1	3	4	2	4	1	5	4	7
	1%	1%	-	3%	1%	2%	1%	4%	1%	3%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%	1%
Don't know	7	3	-	4	7	-	-	-	2	-	2	3	1	2	4	1	7
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Satisfied	564	347	20	195	564	68	121	55	91	71	158	275	117	141	303	109	591
	81%	83%	81%	78%	81%	81%	87% <i>ai</i>	77%	81%	72%	80%	81%	83%	80%	80%	85%	82%
Dissatisfied	35	21	*	13	35	4	4	3	8	10	10	16	8	6	20	8	33
	5%	5%	2%	5%	5%	5%	3%	5%	7%	10% <i>f</i>	5%	5%	6%	3%	5%	7%	5%
Net satisfied	529	325	20	182	529	64	117	51	83	61	148	260	109	136	282	101	558
	76% <i>ai</i>	78%	79%	73%	76% <i>ai</i>	77% <i>ai</i>	84% <i>zdhi</i>	72%	73%	62%	75%	77%	77%	77%	74%	78%	77%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 717

Q34a. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The level of detail included

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	724	9	4	157	10	7	35	60	37	24	24	46	24	58	20	-	34	31	18	126	-	724
Weighted total	696	9**	4**	140	7**	5**	26*	72*	31*	30**	22**	61*	19**	39*	26**	**	32*	36**	26**	113	**	724
Extremely satisfied	175	3	3	33	2	1	10	16	6	11	4	13	5	12	12	-	6	5	4	28	-	188
	25%	33%	78%	24%	21%	21%	40%	23%	21%	38%	18%	21%	23%	31%	47%	-	18%	15%	16%	25%	-	26%
Quite satisfied	389	4	1	78	5	3	13	45	16	9	14	41	13	18	11	-	16	20	18	66	-	403
	56%	42%	22%	56%	61%	64%	49%	63%	51%	29%	63%	67%	68%	47%	42%	-	50%	56%	68%	58%	-	56%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	91	1	-	21	1	-	2	7	5	6	4	6	1	5	3	-	8	5	3	13	-	93
	13%	8%	-	15%	7%	-	8%	10%	16%	22%	19%	10%	4%	13%	12%	-	25%	13%	12%	12%	-	13%
Quite dissatisfied	24	-	-	3	1	1	3	3	2	-	2	2	1	3	2	-	1	2	-	3	-	26
	4%	-	-	2%	12%	15%	3%	5%	11%zcs	8%	-	3%	4%	6%	-	-	3%	5%	-	3%	-	4%
Extremely dissatisfied	10	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	7
	1%	17%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	9%	-	1%	-	1%
Don't know	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	7
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	2%	4%	2%	-	1%
Satisfied	564	7	4	111	6	4	23	61	22	20	18	53	18	30	23	-	22	26	22	94	-	591
	81%	76%	100%	80%	82%	85%	89%	86%	72%	66%	81%	88%p	92%	78%	88%	-	68%	72%	84%	83%	-	82%
Dissatisfied	35	2	-	7	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	-	-	2	5	-	4	-	33
	5%	17%	-	5%	12%	15%	3%	5%	11%	8%	-	3%	4%	6%	-	-	7%	13%	-	3%	-	5%
Net satisfied	529	5	4	105	5	3	22	58	19	17	18	52	17	28	23	0	20	21	22	90	0	558
	76%	59%	100%	75%	70%	70%	86%hp	81%hp	61%	58%	81%	85%hp	88%	73%	88%	0%	61%	58%	84%	80%hp	0%	77%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 718

Q34b. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The range of recommendations provided

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	724	709	11	4	20	68	39	48	47	15	170	148	53	47	11	9	40	376	340	724
Weighted total	696	682	6**	9**	15**	61*	34*	53*	53*	13**	184	123	45*	41*	15**	10**	39*	361	326	724
Extremely satisfied	146	146	-	-	4	8	5	15	13	1	40	22	8	13	7	1	7	84	61	157
	21%	21%	-	-	29%	14%	15%	28%	24%	6%	22%	18%	18%	30%e	49%	7%	17%	23%	19%	22%
Quite satisfied	370	362	4	5	5	34	22	29	32	7	90	65	21	22	3	8	25	189	176	381
	53%	53%	64%	55%	37%	56%	65%	55%	61%	51%	49%	53%	47%	54%	20%	78%	63%	52%	54%	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	109	103	2	4	4	10	2	7	2	5	30	25	10	3	1	1	7	52	55	113
	16%h	15%	27%	45%	27%	17%h	6%	13%	4%	39%	16%h	20%fh	23%fh	8%	5%	15%	18%h	14%	17%	16%
Quite dissatisfied	44	44	*	-	1	7	3	1	4	1	12	7	4	2	-	-	1	25	18	51
	6%	6%	8%	-	6%	12%	10%	3%	7%	4%	7%	6%	8%	4%	-	-	3%	7%	6%	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	16	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	6	-	1	2	4	-	-	6	10	13
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	4%k	-	4%k	-	3%	-	3%	4%k	27%	-	-	2%	3%	2%
Don't know	11	11	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	5	4	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	9
	2%	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	2%	1%
Satisfied	517	508	4	5	10	42	27	44	45	8	131	88	30	35	10	9	31	273	237	538
	74%	75%	64%	55%	66%	70%	80%	82%	85%l	57%	71%	71%	80%	84%	68%	85%	80%	76%	73%	74%
Dissatisfied	60	60	*	-	1	7	5	1	6	1	18	7	5	3	4	-	1	31	28	64
	9%	9%	8%	-	8%	12%	14%g	3%	11%	4%	10%	6%	11%	8%	27%	-	3%	8%	9%	9%
Net satisfied	456	448	3	5	9	35	22	42	39	7	112	81	25	32	6	9	30	242	209	474
	66%	66%	56%	55%	60%	57%	65%	80%e j	74%	54%	61%	65%	55%	76%l	42%	85%	77%l	67%	64%	65%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 719

Q34b. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The range of recommendations provided

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	724	127	597	140	180	156	165	31	49	247	75	236	23	91	114	380	538	179	724
Weighted total	696	118	579	133	174	155	154	29**	46*	236	77*	231	21**	95*	120	350	510	179	724
Extremely satisfied	146	31	115	26	32	34	34	9	9	48	22	44	6	19	19	75	103	40	157
	21%	27%	20%	20%	18%	22%	22%	32%	19%	20%	29%	19%	26%	20%	16%	21%	20%	22%	22%
Quite satisfied	370	54	317	67	96	86	82	14	25	113	44	134	12	50	68	183	273	95	381
	53%	46%	55%	50%	55%	55%	53%	48%	53%	48%	57%	58% <i>f</i>	56%	52%	57%	52%	54%	53%	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	109	20	89	22	30	29	15	3	9	48	8	30	2	18	25	52	78	28	113
	16%	17%	15%	16%	17%	18% <i>f</i>	10%	12%	19%	20% <i>j/k</i>	10%	13%	7%	19%	21%	15%	15%	16%	16%
Quite dissatisfied	44	7	37	14	11	2	11	2	3	14	2	16	1	6	7	22	31	13	51
	6% <i>e</i>	6%	6%	11% <i>e</i>	7% <i>e</i>	2%	7% <i>e</i>	8%	7%	6%	3%	7%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	1	16	1	3	5	8	-	-	8	1	3	-	2	1	11	16	1	13
	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	3%	5% <i>c</i>	-	-	4%	1%	1%	-	3%	1%	3%	3%	1	2%
Don't know	11	5	6	3	1	-	5	-	1	5	-	3	1	1	-	7	8	2	9
	2%	4% <i>b</i>	1%	3%	1%	-	3% <i>e</i>	-	2%	2%	-	1%	6%	1%	-	2%	2%	1%	1%
Satisfied	517	85	431	93	129	119	116	24	33	161	67	178	17	68	88	258	377	135	538
	74%	72%	75%	70%	74%	77%	75%	80%	72%	68%	86% <i>z</i>	77% <i>l</i>	82%	72%	73%	74%	74%	75%	74%
Dissatisfied	60	8	52	15	14	8	18	2	3	22	3	19	1	8	8	33	47	14	64
	9%	7%	9%	11%	8%	5%	12% <i>e</i>	8%	7%	9%	4%	8%	5%	8%	7%	9%	9%	8%	9%
Net satisfied	456	77	379	79	114	112	98	21	30	140	63	159	16	60	79	225	330	121	474
	66%	66%	65%	59%	66%	72% <i>c</i>	63%	72%	65%	59%	82% <i>z</i> <i>k</i>	69% <i>l</i>	78%	63%	66%	64%	65%	68%	65%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 720

Q34b. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The range of recommendations provided

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	724	164	363	75	112	119	601	686	78	64	135	330	33	205	522	231	76	142	189	724
Weighted total	696	154	340	72*	120*	116	578	661	72*	59*	128	315	29**	198	490	212	72*	130	192	724
Extremely satisfied	146	33	65	14	31	41	104	128	31	11	23	63	7	36	99	44	14	27	42	157
	21%	21%	19%	19%	26%	35%zf	18%	19%	43%zgj	19%	18%	20%	25%	18%	20%	21%	19%	21%	22%	22%
Quite satisfied	370	84	184	38	59	55	315	355	37	30	77	180	14	109	259	111	38	72	105	381
	53%	54%	54%	53%	49%	47%	55%	54%	51%	51%	60%	57%	49%	55%	53%	52%	53%	55%	55%	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	109	22	58	9	18	11	97	108	4	14	19	46	2	35	78	33	8	13	29	113
	16%h	14%	17%	13%	15%	10%	17%	16%h	5%	23%h	15%	15%	8%	18%	16%	15%	10%	10%	15%	16%
Quite dissatisfied	44	12	22	4	6	10	34	44	*	3	7	16	4	11	35	14	10	15	8	51
	6%	8%	7%	5%	5%	8%	6%	7%h	1%	5%	5%	5%	13%	6%	7%	7%	14%znr	12%zr	4%	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	-	7	6	4	-	16	16	-	1	2	7	2	2	11	8	2	4	6	13
	2%	-	2%	8%zab	3%e	-	3%	2%	-	2%	2%	2%	5%	1%	2%	4%	2%	3%	3%	2%
Don't know	11	4	4	1	2	-	11	11	-	-	-	2	-	5	8	3	1	-	2	9
	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	3%	2%	1%	2%	-	1%	1%
Satisfied	517	117	250	52	90	95	419	482	68	41	100	244	22	144	359	155	52	98	147	538
	74%	76%	73%	73%	75%	82%f	73%	73%	94%zgj	70%	78%	77%	74%	73%	73%	73%	72%	76%	77%	74%
Dissatisfied	60	12	29	9	10	10	51	60	*	4	9	23	5	14	45	22	12	19	14	64
	9%h	8%	9%	13%	9%	8%	9%	9%h	1%	7%	7%h	7%	18%	7%	9%	10%	16%zr	15%zr	7%	9%
Net satisfied	456	105	221	43	79	85	368	422	67	37	90	220	16	131	313	132	40	80	133	474
	66%	68%	65%	60%	66%	74%	64%	64%	93%zgj	63%	71%	70%	56%	66%	64%	62%	55%	61%	69%p	65%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 721

Q34b. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The range of recommendations provided

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	724	441	27	254	724	83	144	74	124	104	206	355	147	181	399	133	724
Weighted total	696	418	25**	250	696	84*	139	71*	113	99*	199	338	142	176	379	129	724
Extremely satisfied	146	90	7	49	146	19	31	11	31	18	40	62	40	30	80	32	157
	21%	22%	29%	19%	21%	22%	23%	15%	27%	19%	20%	18%	28%	17%	21%	25%	22%
Quite satisfied	370	229	11	129	370	46	74	44	52	50	100	192	70	95	204	67	381
	53%	55%	42%	52%	53%	55%	53%	62%	46%	51%	50%	57%	50%	54%	54%	52%	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	109	61	5	41	109	11	23	9	21	16	35	55	14	34	60	11	113
	16%	15%	19%	16%	16%	14%	17%	12%	19%	16%	18%	16%	10%	20%	16%	8%	16%
Quite dissatisfied	44	29	1	13	44	6	9	4	3	10	13	19	11	8	23	13	51
	6%	7%	6%	5%	6%	7%	7%	5%	2%	10%	7%	6%	8%	5%	6%	10%	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	6	-	10	16	2	-	4	4	4	5	6	5	3	8	5	13
	2%	1%	-	4%	2%	2%	-	5%	3%	5%	3%	2%	4%	2%	2%	4%	2%
Don't know	11	2	1	8	11	-	1	-	3	-	5	5	1	5	5	1	9
	2%	1%	4%	3%	2%	-	1%	-	2%	-	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%
Satisfied	517	319	18	178	517	64	105	55	83	69	140	254	110	126	283	99	538
	74%	76%	71%	71%	74%	77%	76%	77%	73%	70%	70%	75%	78%	72%	75%	77%	74%
Dissatisfied	60	35	1	24	60	8	9	8	6	14	19	25	16	11	31	18	64
	9%	8%	6%	9%	9%	10%	7%	11%	5%	14%	9%	7%	11%	6%	8%	14%	9%
Net satisfied	456	284	16	154	456	56	96	47	77	55	121	229	94	115	252	81	474
	66%	68%	65%	62%	66%	67%	69%	67%	68%	55%	61%	68%	67%	65%	66%	63%	65%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 722

Q34b. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The range of recommendations provided

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	724	9	4	157	10	7	35	60	37	24	24	46	24	58	20	-	34	31	18	126	-	724
Weighted total	696	9**	4**	140	7**	5**	26*	72*	31*	30**	22**	61*	19**	39*	31**	**	32*	36**	26**	113	**	724
Extremely satisfied	146	4	3	24	2	*	9	19	4	6	4	10	5	11	11	-	5	6	1	21	-	157
	21%	45%	63%	17%	31%	9%	36% zchs	27%	13%	22%	17%	17%	28%	28%	43%	-	15%	17%	5%	19%	-	22%
Quite satisfied	370	1	2	75	2	4	12	38	14	14	15	36	11	16	12	-	11	18	20	71	-	381
	53%	7%	37%	54%	23%	76%	45%	52%	45%	45%	66%	59% p	59%	42%	47%	-	36%	50%	78%	63% mp	-	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	109	3	-	23	2	-	1	10	7	3	9	1	10	7	2	-	11	7	2	12	-	113
	16%	32%	-	17%	28%	-	5%	15%	23% f	7	25%	15%	14%	5%	18%	-	34% zcfgks	21%	8%	10%	-	16%
Quite dissatisfied	44	-	-	9	1	1	3	3	5	1	*	4	1	4	4	-	4	1	1	6	-	51
	6%	-	-	7%	18%	15%	10%	4%	15% z	4%	2%	6%	4%	10%	-	-	12%	4%	5%	5%	-	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	2	-	6	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	13
	2%	17%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	2%	4%	-	-	-	4%	9%	-	1%	-	2%
Don't know	11	-	-	3	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	9
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	4%	2%	-	4%	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	4%	1%	-	1%
Satisfied	517	5	4	98	4	4	21	57	18	20	18	46	17	27	23	-	16	24	22	93	-	538
	74% hp	52%	100%	71% p	53%	85%	81% p	79% hp	58%	67%	83%	76% p	87%	69%	91%	-	50%	66%	84%	82% chp	-	74%
Dissatisfied	60	2	-	15	1	1	3	3	6	1	*	5	1	4	-	-	5	4	1	7	-	64
	9%	17%	-	11%	18%	15%	10%	4%	19% zgs	4%	2%	8%	7%	10%	-	-	16%	13%	5%	6%	-	9%
Net satisfied	456	3	4	83	3	3	18	54	12	19	18	41	15	23	23	0	11	19	20	85	0	474
	66% hp	35%	100%	59% hp	35%	70%	70% hp	75% chp	39%	63%	81%	68% hp	80%	59% p	91%	0%	35%	54%	79%	76% zchmp	0%	65%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 723

Q34c. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The suitability of the recommendations for your organisation

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	724	709	11	4	20	68	39	48	47	15	170	148	53	47	11	9	40	376	340	724
Weighted total	696	682	6**	9**	15**	61*	34*	53*	53*	13**	184	123	45*	41*	15**	10**	39*	361	326	724
Extremely satisfied	136	136	-	-	5	11	6	15	14	1	34	17	8	8	6	3	8	73	62	152
	20%	20%	-	-	34%	19%	19%	29% <i>k</i>	26%	6%	18%	14%	17%	20%	41%	25%	19%	20%	19%	21%
Quite satisfied	359	353	4	2	6	33	18	26	29	10	86	67	18	26	4	5	24	179	174	370
	52%	52%	65%	28%	39%	54%	54%	49%	55%	72%	47%	54%	39%	64% <i>l</i>	25%	49%	61%	50%	53%	51%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	116	110	1	6	3	9	6	6	7	3	34	22	12	5	1	3	6	71	44	115
	17%	16%	11%	72%	21%	15%	17%	11%	13%	21%	18%	18%	26%	12%	8%	26%	15%	20% <i>r</i>	14%	16%
Quite dissatisfied	55	55	1	-	*	6	3	3	2	-	18	11	5	2	2	-	2	26	30	59
	8%	8%	9%	-	3%	10%	10%	6%	3%	-	10%	9%	12%	4%	13%	-	5%	7%	9%	8%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	15	1	-	*	-	-	-	2	-	7	2	3	-	2	-	-	7	9	16
	2%	2%	15%	-	3%	-	-	-	3%	-	4%	2%	6%	-	13%	-	-	2%	3%	2%
Don't know	13	13	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	5	4	-	-	-	-	-	6	7	12
	2%	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	6%	-	-	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	2%	2%
Satisfied	496	489	4	2	11	44	24	41	43	10	120	84	25	35	10	7	31	252	236	522
	71% <i>l</i>	72%	65%	28%	73%	73%	72%	78% <i>l</i>	81% <i>l</i>	79%	65%	68%	56%	84% <i>jl</i>	66%	74%	80% <i>l</i>	70%	72%	72%
Dissatisfied	71	70	1	-	1	6	3	3	3	-	25	13	8	2	4	-	2	33	38	75
	10%	10%	24%	-	6%	10%	10%	6%	6%	-	13%	11%	18% <i>m</i>	4%	27%	-	5%	9%	12%	10%
Net satisfied	424	420	2	2	10	38	21	38	39	10	96	71	17	33	6	7	29	219	197	447
	61% <i>l</i>	62%	41%	28%	67%	63% <i>l</i>	62% <i>l</i>	71% <i>jl</i>	75% <i>jl</i>	79%	52%	58% <i>l</i>	39%	80% <i>zjkl</i>	39%	74%	75% <i>jl</i>	61%	61%	62%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 724

Q34c. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The suitability of the recommendations for your organisation

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	724	127	597	140	180	156	165	31	49	247	75	236	23	91	114	380	538	179	724
Weighted total	696	118	579	133	174	155	154	29**	46*	236	77*	231	21**	95*	120	350	510	179	724
Extremely satisfied	136	28	109	23	33	27	33	10	10	44	22	44	5	17	17	77	94	39	152
	20%	24%	19%	17%	19%	18%	22%	35%	21%	19%	29%	19%	22%	18%	14%	22%	19%	22%	21%
Quite satisfied	359	57	302	66	91	87	77	11	23	115	39	122	11	51	67	166	273	85	370
	52%	49%	52%	50%	52%	56%	50%	39%	51%	49%	51%	53%	53%	54%	56%	47%	54%	47%	51%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	116	14	102	24	37	25	20	3	8	47	13	36	*	13	26	65	77	36	115
	17%	12%	18%	18%	21%	16%	13%	9%	16%	20%	16%	15%	2%	13%	22%	19%	15%	20%	16%
Quite dissatisfied	55	11	45	16	9	11	12	3	4	19	1	18	3	11	9	24	41	14	59
	8%	9%	8%	12% ^d	5%	7%	8%	11%	10%	8%	2%	8%	15%	12%	7%	7%	8%	8%	8%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	4	12	1	3	4	8	-	-	6	1	6	*	1	1	10	13	3	16
	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	3%	5% ^{zc}	-	-	3%	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	3%	3%	2%	2%
Don't know	13	4	9	3	2	1	3	2	1	5	-	6	1	2	-	8	11	2	12
	2%	4%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	7%	2%	2%	-	2%	6%	2%	-	2%	2%	1%	2%
Satisfied	496	85	411	89	124	115	110	22	33	159	62	166	16	68	84	243	368	124	522
	71%	72%	71%	67%	71%	74%	71%	74%	72%	67%	80% ⁱ	72%	75%	72%	70%	70%	72%	69%	72%
Dissatisfied	71	14	57	16	11	16	20	3	4	25	3	24	4	12	10	33	55	17	75
	10%	12%	10%	12%	7%	10%	13%	11%	10%	11%	4%	10%	17%	13%	8%	9%	11%	9%	10%
Net satisfied	424	71	354	73	112	99	90	18	29	133	59	142	12	56	74	210	313	107	447
	61%	60%	61%	55%	64%	64%	58%	63%	62%	56%	76% ^{zlk}	61%	58%	59%	62%	60%	61%	60%	62%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 725

Q34c. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The suitability of the recommendations for your organisation

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	724	164	363	75	112	119	601	686	78	64	135	330	33	205	522	231	76	142	189	724
Weighted total	696	154	340	72*	120*	116	578	661	72*	59*	128	315	29**	198	490	212	72*	130	192	724
Extremely satisfied	136	35	62	13	25	43	91	114	33	11	23	57	7	38	101	49	14	27	33	152
	20%	22%	18%	19%	21%	37%zf	16%	17%	46%zgj	18%	18%	18%	23%	19%	21%	23%	20%	21%	17%	21%
Quite satisfied	359	70	181	39	61	45	314	350	30	29	78	172	18	100	252	103	37	67	99	370
	52%e	45%	53%	55%	51%	39%	54%e	53%	42%	48%	62%zh	54%	62%	50%	51%	49%	51%	52%	52%	51%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	116	25	60	10	20	18	99	114	6	11	13	59	2	35	78	32	11	19	38	115
	17%	16%	18%	14%	16%	15%	17%	17%j	8%	19%	10%	19%	6%	17%	16%	15%	15%	14%	20%	16%
Quite dissatisfied	55	18	30	3	5	10	45	54	3	7	11	20	2	16	40	18	8	15	12	59
	8%	12%cd	9%	4%	4%	9%	8%	8%	4%	11%	8%	6%	6%	8%	8%	8%	11%	11%	6%	8%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	1	4	4	7	-	16	16	1	2	2	5	1	4	10	8	1	2	6	16
	2%	1%	1%	6%ab	6%ab	-	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	4%	1%	1%	3%	2%
Don't know	13	5	3	2	2	-	13	13	-	-	-	3	-	6	10	3	1	-	3	12
	2%	3%	1%	3%	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	3%	2%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%
Satisfied	496	104	244	53	87	88	405	464	63	39	102	229	25	137	353	152	51	95	132	522
	71%	68%	72%	73%	72%	76%	70%	70%	87%zgj	66%	80%g	73%	85%	69%	72%	71%	71%	73%	69%	72%
Dissatisfied	71	19	33	7	12	10	61	70	3	9	13	25	3	21	50	26	9	17	19	75
	10%	13%	10%	10%	10%	9%	11%	11%	5%	15%	10%	8%	9%	10%	10%	12%	12%	13%	10%	10%
Net satisfied	424	85	210	45	75	78	343	394	59	31	88	204	22	116	303	126	42	78	114	447
	61%	55%	62%	63%	62%	68%	59%	60%	82%zgj	52%	69%gi	65%	76%	59%	62%	59%	59%	60%	59%	62%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 726

Q34c. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The suitability of the recommendations for your organisation

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	724	441	27	254	724	83	144	74	124	104	206	355	147	181	399	133	724
Weighted total	696	418	25**	250	696	84*	139	71*	113	99*	199	338	142	176	379	129	724
Extremely satisfied	136	83	6	47	136	19	26	5	30	25	34	63	38	29	74	32	152
	20%g	20%	23%	19%	20%g	22%g	19%g	8%	26%g	26%g	17%	19%	27%j	16%	20%	25%	21%
Quite satisfied	359	220	11	126	359	42	74	41	52	45	105	178	67	94	196	64	370
	52%	53%	46%	50%	52%	51%	53%	57%	46%	46%	53%	52%	47%	53%	52%	49%	51%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	116	68	2	45	116	12	30	20	18	15	35	60	18	34	65	15	115
	17%	16%	8%	18%	17%	15%	22%	28%zd	16%	15%	18%	18%	13%	19%	17%	12%	16%
Quite dissatisfied	55	37	5	14	55	10	6	4	7	9	16	27	12	13	29	13	59
	8%	9%	19%	6%	8%	12%f	4%	6%	6%	9%	8%	8%	8%	7%	8%	10%	8%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	7	-	9	16	-	1	1	4	4	4	6	5	3	9	4	16
	2%	2%	-	4%	2%	-	1%	2%	3%	5%	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%	3%	2%
Don't know	13	3	1	9	13	-	1	-	3	-	5	5	1	4	6	1	12
	2%	1%	4%	4%g	2%	-	1%	-	2%	-	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
Satisfied	496	303	17	173	496	61	100	46	82	71	139	240	105	122	271	95	522
	71%	73%	68%	69%	71%	73%	72%	65%	73%	72%	70%	71%	74%	70%	71%	74%	72%
Dissatisfied	71	44	5	23	71	10	8	5	11	13	20	33	17	15	38	17	75
	10%	10%	19%	9%	10%	12%	5%	7%	9%	13%f	10%	10%	12%	9%	10%	14%	10%
Net satisfied	424	260	12	150	424	51	93	41	71	57	119	207	88	107	233	78	447
	61%	62%	49%	60%	61%	60%	67%	58%	63%	58%	60%	61%	62%	61%	61%	60%	62%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 727

Q34c. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The suitability of the recommendations for your organisation

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	724	9	4	157	10	7	35	60	37	24	24	46	24	58	20	-	34	31	18	126	-	724
Weighted total	696	9**	4**	140	7**	5**	26*	72*	31*	30**	22**	61*	19**	39*	26**	**	32*	36**	26**	113	**	724
Extremely satisfied	136	3	3	27	2	2	5	10	3	3	3	11	7	10	12	-	6	3	1	26	-	152
	20%	33%	63%	19%	31%	38%	21%	14%	9%	11%	12%	18%	36%	26%	47%	-	18%	8%	5%	23%	-	21%
Quite satisfied	359	4	2	68	2	2	13	35	20	13	15	34	8	17	10	-	11	20	20	66	-	370
	52%	43%	37%	48%	29%	47%	49%	49%	64%p	45%	67%	55%	40%	45%	38%	-	35%	56%	77%	59%p	-	51%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	116	1	-	27	2	1	2	18	3	8	5	10	4	6	2	-	11	4	2	10	-	115
	17% s	9%	-	19% s	29%	15%	9%	25% s	9%	28%	21%	17%	21%	17%	9%	-	33% z f h s	11%	8%	9%	-	16%
Quite dissatisfied	55	1	-	12	1	-	4	5	4	4	-	4	-	3	-	-	3	5	1	8	-	59
	8%	15%	-	9%	12%	-	15%	7%	14%	12%	-	6%	-	8%	-	-	8%	15%	5%	7%	-	8%
Extremely dissatisfied	16	-	-	5	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	2	2	-	2	-	16
	2%	-	-	4%	-	-	3%	1%	4%	-	-	2%	4%	-	5%	-	5%	5%	-	1%	-	2%
Don't know	13	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	12
	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	4%	3%	-	4%	-	2%	-	4%	-	-	-	6%	4%	1%	-	2%
Satisfied	496	7	4	94	4	4	18	45	23	16	18	45	15	27	22	-	17	23	21	92	-	522
	71% p	76%	100%	67%	59%	85%	70%	63%	73%	55%	79%	73%	76%	71%	85%	-	54%	64%	83%	81% z c g p	-	72%
Dissatisfied	71	1	-	17	1	-	5	6	6	4	-	5	1	3	1	-	4	7	1	10	-	75
	10%	15%	-	12%	12%	-	18%	8%	18%	12%	-	8%	4%	8%	5%	-	13%	20%	5%	8%	-	10%
Net satisfied	424	6	4	77	4	4	13	39	17	13	18	40	14	24	21	0	13	16	20	82	0	447
	61% p	61%	100%	55%	48%	85%	52%	55%	55%	43%	79%	66% p	72%	63% p	80%	0%	40%	44%	78%	73% z c f g p	0%	62%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 728

Q34d. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The clarity of the information provided about the cost of implementing recommendations against the potential savings

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	724	709	11	4	20	68	39	48	47	15	170	148	53	47	11	9	40	376	340	724
Weighted total	696	682	6**	9**	15**	61*	34*	53*	53*	13**	184	123	45*	41*	15**	10**	39*	361	326	724
Extremely satisfied	132	132	-	-	4	16	5	12	15	2	30	17	8	11	6	1	5	65	64	135
	19%	19%	-	-	29%	26%	14%	22%	29% <i>k</i>	14%	16%	14%	18%	27%	41%	7%	12%	18%	20%	19%
Quite satisfied	364	358	3	2	7	26	23	33	23	4	94	62	21	26	6	9	24	187	173	382
	52%	53%	54%	28%	47%	43%	69% <i>ehl</i>	62% <i>e</i>	44%	32%	51%	51%	46%	64% <i>ee</i>	41%	86%	60%	52%	53%	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	118	112	2	4	3	13	2	2	11	7	32	32	8	2	1	1	3	63	52	124
	17% <i>gm</i>	16%	30%	45%	18%	21% <i>fgm</i>	5%	4%	21% <i>gm</i>	54%	18% <i>gm</i>	26% <i>zfgmp</i>	18% <i>g</i>	5%	5%	7%	8%	17%	16%	17%
Quite dissatisfied	51	48	*	2	1	6	4	3	3	-	17	6	4	2	-	-	5	29	22	54
	7%	7%	7%	27%	6%	10%	11%	5%	6%	-	9%	5%	9%	4%	-	-	13%	8%	7%	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	12	12	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	2	3	-	2	-	-	6	4	10
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	2%	2%	7% <i>ze</i>	-	13%	-	-	2%	1%	1%
Don't know	20	20	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	7	4	1	1	-	-	2	11	9	19
	3%	3%	9%	-	-	1%	2%	4%	-	-	4%	3%	2%	1%	-	-	6%	3%	3%	3%
Satisfied	496	490	3	2	11	42	28	45	39	6	124	80	29	37	12	9	29	253	238	517
	71%	72%	54%	28%	76%	68%	83% <i>k</i>	84% <i>kl</i>	73%	46%	68%	65%	65%	90% <i>zejkl</i>	82%	93%	73%	70%	73%	71%
Dissatisfied	63	60	*	2	1	6	4	4	3	-	20	8	7	2	2	-	5	35	27	64
	9%	9%	7%	27%	8%	10%	11%	8%	6%	-	11%	7%	16%	4%	13%	-	13%	10%	8%	9%
Net satisfied	433	430	3	*	10	36	24	41	35	6	105	72	22	36	10	9	24	218	211	453
	62%	63%	47%	1%	70%	58%	72% <i>l</i>	76% <i>kl</i>	67%	46%	57%	58%	49%	87% <i>zehjklp</i>	68%	93%	60%	60%	65%	63%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 729

Q34d. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The clarity of the information provided about the cost of implementing recommendations against the potential savings

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	724	127	597	140	180	156	165	31	49	247	75	236	23	91	114	380	538	179	724
Weighted total	696	118	579	133	174	155	154	29**	46*	236	77*	231	21**	95*	120	350	510	179	724
Extremely satisfied	132	31	101	32	27	35	22	8	7	43	20	43	6	18	24	65	95	34	135
	19%	26% b	17%	24%	16%	23%	15%	27%	15%	18%	26%	19%	28%	19%	20%	19%	19%	19%	19%
Quite satisfied	364	57	307	60	100	79	87	12	25	110	43	127	11	50	64	171	273	88	382
	52%	48%	53%	45%	57% c	51%	56%	41%	55%	46%	55%	55%	53%	53%	53%	49%	54%	49%	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	118	15	102	25	29	22	25	8	6	48	12	35	1	15	19	67	48	79	37
	17%	13%	18%	18%	17%	14%	16%	26%	14%	20%	15%	15%	7%	16%	16%	19%	15%	20%	17%
Quite dissatisfied	51	9	42	11	13	13	10	1	3	20	1	15	2	9	13	22	39	13	54
	7%	8%	7%	9%	7%	9%	6%	2%	7%	8%	2%	7%	7%	9%	11%	6%	8%	7%	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	12	1	10	1	3	2	5	-	1	8	1	1	-	2	-	9	9	3	10
	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	-	2%	4% k	1%	1%	-	2%	-	3%	2%	2%	1%
Don't know	20	4	16	5	2	3	6	1	3	8	1	9	1	1	1	16	16	5	19
	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	2%	4%	4%	7% d	3%	1%	4%	6%	1%	1%	5%	3%	3%	3%
Satisfied	496	88	408	92	127	115	109	20	32	153	62	171	17	68	88	237	368	122	517
	71%	75%	70%	69%	73%	74%	71%	68%	70%	65%	81% i	74% l	80%	71%	73%	68%	72%	68%	71%
Dissatisfied	63	11	52	12	16	15	14	1	4	28	2	17	2	11	13	31	47	15	64
	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	10%	9%	2%	9%	12% j	3%	7%	7%	12%	11%	9%	9%	9%	9%
Net satisfied	433	77	355	80	111	100	95	19	28	125	60	154	16	57	75	206	321	106	453
	62% i	66%	61%	60%	63%	64%	61%	65%	60%	53%	78% z	67% l	73%	60%	62%	59%	63%	60%	63%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 730

Q34d. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The clarity of the information provided about the cost of implementing recommendations against the potential savings

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	724	164	363	75	112	119	601	686	78	64	135	330	33	205	522	231	76	142	189	724
Weighted total	696	154	340	72*	120*	116	578	661	72*	59*	128	315	29**	198	490	212	72*	130	192	724
Extremely satisfied	132	33	63	10	24	39	92	118	21	11	23	64	3	31	89	34	10	23	38	135
	19%	21%	19%	14%	20%	33%zf	16%	18%	29%g	19%	18%	20%	9%	16%	18%	16%	13%	18%	20%	19%
Quite satisfied	364	82	177	38	60	49	314	346	37	33	70	163	21	105	256	118	41	72	100	382
	52%	53%	52%	53%	50%	42%	54%e	52%	52%	56%	55%	52%	70%	53%	52%	56%	58%	55%	52%	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	118	23	60	11	23	20	98	116	8	5	20	50	5	36	76	30	10	14	40	124
	17%	15%	18%	15%	19%	17%	17%	18%	11%	9%	15%	16%	16%	18%	15%	14%	14%	11%	21%g	17%
Quite dissatisfied	51	7	27	9	7	7	44	49	5	8	11	28	1	11	44	19	8	16	7	54
	7%	5%	8%	13%a	6%	6%	8%	7%	6%	13%	9%	9%	4%	6%	9%r	9%r	11%r	12%r	4%	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	12	2	4	3	3	1	11	12	-	1	2	6	-	5	8	6	1	4	3	10
	2%	1%	1%	5%	2%	1%	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	1%
Don't know	20	7	9	1	4	1	20	19	1	1	1	5	-	10	17	4	2	1	3	19
	3%	4%	3%	1%	3%	1%	3%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	5%k	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%
Satisfied	496	115	240	48	84	87	405	464	58	44	93	227	23	136	345	152	51	95	139	517
	71%	74%	70%	67%	70%	75%	70%	70%	81%	75%	73%	72%	80%	69%	70%	72%	71%	73%	72%	71%
Dissatisfied	63	9	31	12	10	8	55	61	5	9	14	34	1	16	52	25	9	20	11	64
	9%	6%	9%	17%za	8%	7%	9%	9%	6%	16%	11%	11%	4%	8%	11%	12%r	13%	15%zr	5%	9%
Net satisfied	433	105	209	35	75	79	351	403	53	35	79	194	22	120	293	127	42	75	128	453
	62% c	68% c	61%	49%	62%	68%	61%	61%	74% g	59%	62%	61%	76%	61%	60%	60%	58%	58%	67%	63%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 731

Q34d. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The clarity of the information provided about the cost of implementing recommendations against the potential savings

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	724	441	27	254	724	83	144	74	124	104	206	355	147	181	399	133	724
Weighted total	696	418	25**	250	696	84*	139	71*	113	99*	199	338	142	176	379	129	724
Extremely satisfied	132	82	6	43	132	23	33	7	25	15	32	63	35	30	67	32	135
	19%	20%	23%	17%	19%	28% <i>gi</i>	24% <i>g</i>	9%	22% <i>g</i>	15%	16%	19%	24%	17%	18%	25%	19%
Quite satisfied	364	220	10	132	364	40	68	39	56	53	106	181	69	94	203	63	382
	52%	53%	40%	53%	52%	48%	49%	55%	49%	54%	53%	53%	49%	53%	53%	49%	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	118	71	1	43	118	15	23	17	17	15	38	57	17	34	65	13	124
	17%	17%	6%	17%	17%	18%	16%	24%	15%	15%	19%	17%	12%	20% <i>o</i>	17%	10%	17%
Quite dissatisfied	51	27	7	18	51	5	7	8	9	10	13	25	12	9	27	15	54
	7%	6%	27%	7%	7%	6%	5%	11%	8%	10%	7%	7%	9%	5%	7%	11%	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	12	7	-	5	12	-	3	-	2	4	3	3	6	1	6	5	10
	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	2%	-	2%	4%	2%	1%	4% <i>k</i>	1%	2%	4%	1%
Don't know	20	11	1	9	20	-	5	1	4	2	7	10	3	7	11	2	19
	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	-	4%	1%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%	1%	3%
Satisfied	496	303	16	175	496	64	101	46	81	68	138	244	104	124	270	95	517
	71%	72%	64%	70%	71%	76%	73%	64%	71%	69%	69%	72%	73%	71%	71%	74%	71%
Dissatisfied	63	33	7	23	63	5	10	8	12	14	16	28	18	11	33	19	64
	9%	8%	27%	9%	9%	6%	7%	11%	10%	14%	8%	8%	13%	6%	9%	15% <i>m</i>	9%
Net satisfied	433	270	9	152	433	59	92	38	69	54	122	216	86	113	237	76	453
	62%	65%	37%	61%	62%	70% <i>g</i>	66%	53%	61%	55%	61%	64%	61%	65%	62%	59%	63%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 732

Q34d. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The clarity of the information provided about the cost of implementing recommendations against the potential savings

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	724	9	4	157	10	7	35	60	37	24	24	46	24	58	20	-	34	31	18	126	-	724
Weighted total	696	9**	4**	140	7**	5**	26*	72*	31*	30**	22**	61*	19**	39*	26**	**	32*	36**	26**	113	**	724
Extremely satisfied	132	2	3	23	1	*	3	16	3	9	2	11	4	9	8	-	3	5	2	28	-	135
	19%	26%	63%	16%	10%	9%	12%	22%	8%	31%	11%	18%	21%	22%	32%	-	8%	14%	8%	25% <i>h</i>	-	19%
Quite satisfied	364	5	2	78	4	3	13	31	17	16	11	32	8	22	13	-	13	21	13	63	-	382
	52%	51%	37%	56%	54%	56%	52%	43%	55%	54%	49%	53%	40%	56%	50%	-	39%	58%	52%	56%	-	53%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	118	1	-	20	3	1	7	15	7	2	6	14	3	4	3	-	13	5	2	10	-	124
	17% <i>s</i>	8%	-	14%	36%	20%	27% <i>s</i>	21% <i>s</i>	21%	7%	29%	24% <i>s</i>	17%	11%	13%	-	42% <i>zcgms</i>	15%	7%	9%	-	17%
Quite dissatisfied	51	1	-	12	-	1	1	5	4	1	2	4	2	2	-	-	2	1	6	9	-	54
	7%	15%	-	9%	-	15%	3%	7%	12%	-	6%	3%	20%	6%	-	-	7%	3%	22%	8%	-	7%
Extremely dissatisfied	12	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	2	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	10
	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	3%	4%	1	-	-	2%	5%	-	-	4%	3%	-	1%	-	1%
Don't know	20	-	-	4	-	-	1	3	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	2	3	1	-	19
	3%	-	-	3%	-	-	6%	4%	-	4%	6%	2%	3%	2%	-	-	-	7%	12%	1%	-	3%
Satisfied	496	7	4	101	5	3	17	47	19	25	13	43	12	30	21	-	15	26	15	91	-	517
	71% <i>p</i>	77%	100%	73% <i>p</i>	64%	65%	64%	65%	63%	85%	60%	71% <i>p</i>	61%	79% <i>p</i>	82%	-	47%	72%	60%	81% <i>zfg</i>	-	71%
Dissatisfied	63	1	-	14	-	1	1	7	5	1	1	2	4	3	1	-	3	2	6	10	-	64
	9%	15%	-	10%	-	15%	3%	10%	15% <i>k</i>	4%	6%	3%	20%	8%	5%	-	10%	6%	22%	9%	-	9%
Net satisfied	433	6	4	87	5	2	16	39	15	24	12	42	8	27	20	0	12	23	10	81	0	453
	62% <i>p</i>	62%	100%	63% <i>p</i>	64%	50%	61%	54%	48%	81%	54%	68% <i>p</i>	41%	71% <i>hp</i>	76%	0%	37%	66%	38%	72% <i>zghp</i>	0%	63%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 733

Q34e. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The value for money it represented to you

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	724	709	11	4	20	68	39	48	47	15	170	148	53	47	11	9	40	376	340	724	
Weighted total	696	682	6**	9**	15**	61*	34*	53*	53*	13**	184	123	45*	41*	15**	10**	39*	361	326	724	
Extremely satisfied	83	83	-	-	4	4	3	7	8	-	19	14	7	6	4	2	5	47	35	92	
	12%	12%	-	-	31%	6%	9%	14%	16%	-	10%	11%	15%	13%	28%	16%	13%	13%	13%	11%	
Quite satisfied	233	229	2	2	4	18	12	18	25	4	59	37	10	19	4	4	14	119	109	246	
	33%	34%	28%	28%	27%	30%	35%	35%	48%kl	30%	32%	30%	22%	46%l	28%	44%	35%	33%	33%	34%	
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	143	140	1	2	3	10	5	13	8	4	49	28	10	3	1	3	5	71	71	143	
	20%mn	21%	11%	19%	20%	17%	14%	24%mn	16%	30%	26%mn	23%mn	21%mn	6%	9%	33%	12%	20%	22%	20%	
Quite dissatisfied	124	122	2	-	1	15	8	7	4	3	28	25	11	8	-	1	11	65	57	131	
	18%	18%	36%	-	10%	25%h	25%h	13%	7%	25%	15%	20%h	24%h	20%	-	7%	29%h	18%	18%	18%	
Extremely dissatisfied	95	89	1	5	2	9	5	5	7	1	23	17	8	6	5	-	4	47	46	95	
	14%	13%	16%	53%	12%	15%	16%	9%	14%	7%	13%	14%	18%	15%	34%	-	11%	13%	14%	13%	
Don't know	19	19	1	-	-	4	1	3	-	1	6	3	-	-	-	-	-	12	7	17	
	3%	3%	9%	-	-	7%	2%	6%	-	7%	3%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	2%	
Satisfied	316	312	2	2	8	22	15	26	33	4	78	51	16	25	8	6	19	166	144	338	
	45%	46%	28%	28%	57%	36%	44%	48%	63%zejkl	30%	42%	41%	37%	48%	60%ekl	56%	60%	48%	46%	44%	47%
Dissatisfied	219	211	3	5	3	25	14	12	11	4	52	42	19	14	5	1	16	112	103	226	
	31%	31%	52%	53%	22%	40%gh	41%	22%	21%	32%	28%	34%	42%gh	34%	34%	7%	40%	31%	32%	31%	
Net satisfied	97	100	-1	-2	5	-2	1	14	22	*	26	9	-3	11	3	5	3	54	41	112	
	14%ekl	15%	-24%	-26%	35%	-4%	3%	26%zefklp	42%zefklp	-2%	14%el	7%el	-6%	26%zefkl	22%	53%	8%el	15%	12%	15%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 734

Q34e. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The value for money it represented to you

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	724	127	597	140	180	156	165	31	49	247	75	236	23	91	114	380	538	179	724
Weighted total	696	118	579	133	174	155	154	29**	46*	236	77*	231	21**	95*	120	350	510	179	724
Extremely satisfied	83	18	65	16	20	21	13	8	6	30	6	32	5	11	9	46	56	25	92
	12%	16%	11%	12%	11%	13%	8%	27%	14%	13%	8%	14%	23%	11%	7%	13%	11%	14%	13%
Quite satisfied	233	40	192	40	52	60	55	10	15	68	36	76	6	21	47	110	178	53	246
	33% <i>m</i>	34%	33%	30%	30%	39%	36%	33%	33%	29%	47% <i>z</i> <i>ik</i>	33%	27%	22%	38% <i>m</i>	32%	35%	30%	34%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	143	15	127	27	35	29	30	8	13	47	15	49	1	19	23	83	99	40	143
	20%	13%	22% <i>a</i>	20%	20%	19%	19%	27%	28%	20%	19%	21%	5%	20%	19%	24%	19%	22%	20%
Quite dissatisfied	124	25	99	33	29	25	28	1	7	43	12	40	6	21	27	58	93	30	131
	18%	21%	17%	24%	17%	16%	18%	4%	15%	18%	16%	17%	30%	22%	23%	17%	18%	17%	18%
Extremely dissatisfied	95	14	81	13	35	18	24	1	3	40	8	27	3	22	12	40	68	26	95
	14%	12%	14%	10%	21% <i>z</i> <i>ce</i> <i>h</i>	11%	16%	2%	7%	17%	11%	12%	14%	23% <i>z</i> <i>no</i>	10%	12%	13%	15%	13%
Don't know	19	5	14	5	4	3	4	2	1	9	-	8	-	1	3	12	15	5	17
	3%	4%	2%	4%	2%	2%	3%	7%	2%	4%	-	3%	-	1%	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%
Satisfied	316	59	257	56	71	81	68	18	22	97	42	107	11	31	55	156	235	78	338
	45% <i>m</i>	50%	44%	42%	41%	52%	44%	60%	47%	41%	54%	46%	50%	33%	46%	45%	46%	44%	47%
Dissatisfied	219	38	181	46	65	43	52	2	10	83	21	67	9	43	39	99	161	56	226
	31%	33%	31%	34%	37%	28%	34%	6%	23%	35%	27%	29%	44%	46% <i>z</i> <i>o</i>	33%	28%	32%	31%	31%
Net satisfied	97	20	76	10	6	38	16	16	11	14	21	40	1	-12	16	57	73	22	112
	14% <i>c</i> <i>d</i> <i>l</i> <i>m</i>	17%	13%	7%	4%	24% <i>z</i> <i>c</i> <i>d</i> <i>f</i>	10% <i>d</i>	53%	24% <i>c</i> <i>d</i> <i>f</i>	6%	27% <i>z</i> <i>i</i>	17% <i>d</i>	6%	-13%	13% <i>m</i>	16% <i>m</i>	14%	12%	15%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 735

Q34e. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The value for money it represented to you

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	724	164	363	75	112	119	601	686	78	64	135	330	33	205	522	231	76	142	189	724
Weighted total	696	154	340	72*	120*	116	578	661	72*	59*	128	315	29**	198	490	212	72*	130	192	724
Extremely satisfied	83	19	36	9	19	26	56	74	15	12	13	42	4	23	62	27	11	19	19	92
	12%	12%	10%	13%	16%	23%zf	10%	11%	21%zg	21%gj	10%	13%	13%	12%	13%	13%	15%	15%	10%	13%
Quite satisfied	233	49	123	22	34	43	188	221	27	15	49	109	12	58	163	77	20	44	66	246
	33%	32%	36%	31%	28%	37%	33%	33%	38%	25%	38%	35%	41%	29%	33%	36%	28%	33%	34%	34%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	143	37	68	12	22	24	118	132	17	12	30	63	7	46	101	39	13	24	36	143
	20%	24%	20%	17%	18%	20%	20%	24%	19%	24%	24%	20%	24%	23%	21%	30%	18%	18%	18%	20%
Quite dissatisfied	124	26	57	12	29	13	111	121	8	15	22	55	3	33	85	30	12	26	38	131
	18%	17%	17%	17%	24%	12%	19%	18%	11%	25%h	17%	17%	9%	17%	17%	14%	17%	20%	20%	18%
Extremely dissatisfied	95	18	48	15	13	7	88	94	5	5	13	42	4	29	63	33	13	17	31	95
	14%e	12%	14%	21%	11%	6%	15%e	14%	7%	9%	10%	13%	13%	14%	13%	16%	18%	13%	16%	13%
Don't know	19	6	9	1	3	2	17	19	-	1	1	5	-	9	17	5	3	1	2	17
	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	5%k	4%	3%	4%	1%	1%	2%
Satisfied	316	68	158	31	53	69	244	295	42	27	61	151	16	81	224	104	31	62	84	338
	45%	44%	47%	43%	44%	60%zf	42%	45%	58%zg	45%	48%	48%	54%	41%	46%	49%	43%	48%	44%	47%
Dissatisfied	219	44	105	27	42	21	198	215	13	20	35	97	6	62	147	64	25	42	70	226
	31%eh	28%	31%	38%	35%	18%	34%e	32%h	78%	34%h	28%	31%	22%	31%	30%	30%	35%	33%	36%	31%
Net satisfied	97	24	53	4	11	49	46	81	29	7	26	54	9	19	77	40	6	20	15	112
	14%fr	16%c	16%c	5%	9%	42%zf	8%	12%	41%zgj	11%	20%g	17%lm	31%	10%	16%r	19%r	9%	15%r	8%	15%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 736

Q34e. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The value for money it represented to you

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	724	441	27	254	724	83	144	74	124	104	206	355	147	181	399	133	724
Weighted total	696	418	25**	250	696	84*	139	71*	113	99*	199	338	142	176	379	129	724
Extremely satisfied	83	53	4	26	83	9	19	6	17	11	22	34	25	17	43	22	92
	12%	13%	16%	11%	12%	11%	14%	9%	15%	11%	11%	10%	18% <i>k</i>	10%	11%	17%	13%
Quite satisfied	233	156	8	67	233	26	50	23	32	35	54	126	46	51	136	42	246
	33%	37% <i>c</i>	33%	27%	33%	31%	36%	33%	28%	35%	27%	37% <i>f</i>	32%	29%	36%	32%	34%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	143	89	1	52	143	19	28	16	19	23	37	77	25	34	83	22	143
	20%	21%	5%	21%	20%	23%	20%	23%	17%	23%	19%	23%	17%	19%	22%	17%	20%
Quite dissatisfied	124	66	6	50	124	17	21	17	22	16	37	59	25	32	69	21	131
	18%	16%	24%	20%	18%	20%	15%	24%	19%	17%	19%	17%	18%	18%	18%	16%	18%
Extremely dissatisfied	95	43	6	46	95	11	19	8	19	13	40	34	17	35	40	18	95
	14%	10%	22%	19% <i>a</i>	14%	13%	13%	12%	17%	14%	20% <i>zk</i>	10%	12%	20% <i>zn</i>	11%	14%	13%
Don't know	19	11	-	8	19	2	3	-	4	1	8	7	3	6	8	4	17
	3%	3%	-	3%	3%	3%	2%	-	3%	1%	4%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%
Satisfied	316	208	12	93	316	35	69	30	49	45	76	161	71	68	179	64	338
	45% <i>c</i>	50% <i>c</i>	49%	37%	45%	42%	49%	42%	43%	46%	38%	48%	50% <i>j</i>	39%	47%	50%	47%
Dissatisfied	219	109	12	97	219	27	39	25	41	30	77	93	43	67	109	38	226
	31%	26%	46%	39% <i>a</i>	31%	32%	28%	36%	36%	30%	39% <i>k</i>	28%	30%	38% <i>n</i>	29%	30%	31%
Net satisfied	97	99	1	-3	97	8	29	4	8	15	-1	68	28	1	71	26	112
	14% <i>cjm</i>	24% <i>zc</i>	3%	-1%	14%	10%	21% <i>zdegh</i>	6%	7%	16%	-1%	20% <i>zj</i>	20% <i>f</i>	*	19% <i>m</i>	20% <i>m</i>	15%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 737

Q34e. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

The value for money it represented to you

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	724	9	4	157	10	7	35	60	37	24	24	46	24	58	20	-	34	31	18	126	-	724
Weighted total	696	9**	4**	140	7**	5**	26*	72*	31*	30**	22**	61*	19**	39*	26**	-**	32*	36**	26**	113	-**	724
Extremely satisfied	83	3	1	15	1	3	4	7	2	6	2	6	3	4	9	-	2	1	-	16	-	92
	12%	33%	17%	11%	10%	52%	14%	9%	5%	20%	11%	52%	17%	10%	33%	-	7%	2%	-	14%	-	13%
Quite satisfied	233	2	3	41	2	2	13	25	12	8	9	20	6	12	9	-	9	4	11	47	-	246
	33%	19%	61%	29%	21%	33%	50% <i>c</i>	35%	38%	28%	40%	32%	33%	30%	33%	-	30%	11%	42%	42% <i>c</i>	-	34%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	143	1	-	27	5	-	2	17	7	8	4	21	4	10	1	-	8	12	4	13	-	143
Quite dissatisfied	124	1	-	31	-	-	5	10	7	6	5	11	2	5	3	-	4	9	4	22	-	131
	18%	8%	-	22%	-	-	18%	14%	24%	19%	21%	18%	8%	14%	11%	-	14%	25%	16%	20%	-	18%
Extremely dissatisfied	95	3	1	22	1	1	22	11	4	1	2	3	4	7	4	-	7	8	3	13	-	95
	14%	32%	22%	16%	8%	15%	8%	15%	11%	4%	9%	5%	19%	17%	14%	-	23% <i>k</i>	22%	13%	11%	-	13%
Don't know	19	-	-	5	-	-	1	2	-	5	1	-	2	1	1	-	2	3	1	1	-	17
	3%	-	-	3%	-	-	2%	3%	-	4%	-	2%	-	4%	4%	-	-	7%	12%	1%	-	2%
Satisfied	316	5	3	56	2	4	17	32	13	14	11	25	10	16	17	-	12	5	11	64	-	338
	45%	52%	78%	40%	31%	85%	65% <i>zcmp</i>	44%	43%	47%	51%	41%	50%	40%	67%	-	37%	13%	42%	56% <i>zc</i>	-	47%
Dissatisfied	219	4	1	53	1	1	7	21	11	7	7	14	5	12	6	-	12	17	8	35	-	226
	31%	40%	22%	38%	8%	15%	26%	29%	36%	23%	30%	23%	28%	31%	25%	-	37%	48%	29%	31%	-	31%
Net satisfied	97	1	2	3	2	3	10	11	2	7	5	11	4	4	11	0	*	-12	3	29	0	112
	14% <i>cp</i>	12%	56%	2%	22%	70%	39% <i>zcgkmp</i>	15% <i>cp</i>	7%	24%	21%	18% <i>cp</i>	23%	10% <i>cp</i>	41%	0%	*	-35%	13%	26% <i>zchmp</i>	0%	15%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 738

Q34a-e. Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following aspects of your audit report.

Summary

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	The level of detail included	The range of recommendations provided	The suitability of the recommendations for your organisation	The clarity of the information provided about the cost of implementing recommendations against the potential savings	The value for money it represented to you
Unweighted total	724	724	724	724	724
Weighted total	696	696	696	696	696
Extremely satisfied	175 25%	146 21%	136 20%	132 19%	83 12%
Quite satisfied	389 56%	370 53%	359 52%	364 52%	233 33%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	91 13%	109 16%	116 17%	118 17%	143 20%
Quite dissatisfied	24 4%	44 6%	55 8%	51 7%	124 18%
Extremely dissatisfied	10 1%	16 2%	16 2%	12 2%	95 14%
Don't know	7 1%	11 2%	13 2%	20 3%	19 3%
Satisfied	564 81%	517 74%	496 71%	496 71%	316 45%
Dissatisfied	35 5%	60 9%	71 10%	63 9%	219 31%
Net satisfied	529 76%	456 66%	424 61%	433 62%	97 14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 739

Q35a. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The estimated costs of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	724	709	11	4	20	68	39	48	47	15	170	148	53	47	11	9	40	376	340	724
Weighted total	696	682	6**	9**	15**	61*	34*	53*	53*	13**	184	123	45*	41*	15**	10**	39*	361	326	724
Very confident	102	101	1	-	2	5	3	10	14	1	32	16	4	6	2	-	5	59	43	104
	15%	15%	20%	-	14%	8%	8%	19%	27% <i>zefkl</i>	8%	18%	13%	9%	14%	10%	-	14%	16%	13%	14%
Fairly confident	415	405	4	6	10	42	18	27	29	8	102	79	29	27	11	8	20	208	203	432
	60%	59%	63%	73%	67%	69%	52%	50%	55%	61%	55%	64%	65%	64%	74%	81%	52%	57%	62%	60%
Not very confident	115	114	1	-	2	11	8	8	8	3	31	20	7	4	2	2	9	60	54	124
	17%	17%	17%	-	12%	18%	24%	16%	15%	26%	17%	16%	15%	9%	15%	19%	23%	17%	16%	17%
Not at all confident	31	29	-	2	1	3	3	3	1	1	7	3	4	4	-	-	1	19	10	32
	4%	4%	-	27%	6%	4%	8%	5%	2%	5%	4%	3%	9%	9%	-	-	3%	5%	3%	4%
Don't know	33	33	-	-	-	1	2	5	1	-	12	5	1	1	-	-	3	15	16	32
	5%	5%	-	-	-	1%	7%	9%	1%	-	6%	4%	2%	3%	-	-	9%	4%	5%	4%
Confident	517	506	5	6	12	47	20	37	44	9	134	95	34	32	13	8	26	267	246	536
	74%	74%	83%	73%	81%	76%	60%	69%	82% <i>f</i>	68%	73%	77% <i>f</i>	75%	78%	85%	81%	66%	74%	76%	74%
Not confident	146	143	1	2	3	13	11	11	9	4	38	23	11	8	2	2	10	79	64	156
	21%	21%	17%	27%	19%	22%	32%	21%	16%	32%	21%	18%	24%	18%	15%	19%	25%	22%	20%	22%
Net confident	371	363	4	4	9	33	9	26	35	5	96	72	23	25	10	6	16	187	182	380
	53% <i>f</i>	53%	67%	47%	62%	54% <i>f</i>	28%	48%	66% <i>f</i>	37%	52% <i>f</i>	59% <i>f</i>	51% <i>f</i>	60% <i>f</i>	69%	62%	40%	52%	56%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 740

Q35a. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The estimated costs of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	724	127	597	140	180	156	165	31	49	247	75	236	23	91	114	380	538	179	724
Weighted total	696	118	579	133	174	155	154	29**	46*	236	77*	231	21**	95*	120	350	510	179	724
Very confident	102	20	82	23	23	26	20	3	7	31	16	37	3	10	11	56	69	30	104
	15%	17%	14%	17%	13%	17%	13%	9%	16%	13%	21%	16%	14%	11%	9%	16%	14%	17%	14%
Fairly confident	415	65	350	78	107	97	85	19	27	138	52	131	13	65	75	203	306	106	432
	60%	55%	61%	59%	62%	62%	55%	63%	57%	59%	68%	57%	61%	68%	62%	58%	60%	59%	60%
Not very confident	115	20	96	17	30	21	33	4	10	47	5	37	3	14	24	62	92	22	124
	17%j	17%	17%	13%	17%	13%	21%	13%	22%	20%j	6%	16%j	15%	15%	20%	18%	18%	12%	17%
Not at all confident	31	5	26	8	10	6	5	2	-	11	2	10	1	2	7	13	22	8	32
	4%	5%	4%	6%	6%	4%	3%	7%	-	5%	3%	5%	5%	2%	6%	4%	4%	5%	4%
Don't know	33	8	25	7	4	5	12	2	2	9	1	15	1	4	3	16	20	12	32
	5%	7%	4%	5%	2%	3%	8% <i>d</i>	8%	5%	4%	2%	7%	6%	4%	2%	4%	4%	7%	4%
Confident	517	85	432	101	130	123	105	21	34	169	68	168	16	75	86	259	375	137	536
	74%	72%	75%	76%	74%	79% <i>f</i>	68%	72%	73%	72%	89% <i>z</i> <i>k</i>	73%	75%	79%	72%	74%	74%	76%	74%
Not confident	146	25	121	25	40	27	38	6	10	58	7	48	4	16	31	75	114	30	156
	21% <i>j</i>	21%	21%	19%	23%	17%	24%	20%	22%	25% <i>j</i>	10%	21% <i>j</i>	19%	17%	26%	21%	22%	17%	22%
Net confident	371	60	311	76	90	96	67	15	24	111	61	121	12	59	55	184	261	106	380
	53% <i>f</i>	51%	54%	57% <i>f</i>	51%	62% <i>f</i>	43%	52%	51%	47%	79% <i>z</i> <i>k</i>	52%	55%	62% <i>n</i>	46%	53%	51%	59%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 741

Q35a. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The estimated costs of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	724	164	363	75	112	119	601	686	78	64	135	330	33	205	522	231	76	142	189	724
Weighted total	696	154	340	72*	120*	116	578	661	72*	59*	128	315	29**	198	490	212	72*	130	192	724
Very confident	102	23	52	9	18	24	77	89	18	11	22	45	6	27	69	34	8	17	31	104
	15%	15%	15%	12%	15%	20%	13%	13%	25%zg	19%	17%	14%	22%	14%	14%	16%	11%	13%	16%	14%
Fairly confident	415	92	209	41	66	63	351	396	44	33	83	199	13	121	283	122	39	70	121	432
	60%	60%	61%	58%	55%	54%	61%	60%	61%	55%	65%	63%	46%	61%	58%	57%	54%	54%	63%	60%
Not very confident	115	24	56	12	22	23	92	113	8	10	17	49	6	37	91	39	11	31	24	124
	17%	15%	17%	17%	18%	20%	16%	17%	11%	17%	13%	15%	21%	19%	19%	18%	16%	24%zr	12%	17%
Not at all confident	31	8	14	4	4	3	28	31	1	3	3	14	3	6	23	13	8	8	8	32
	4%	5%	4%	6%	4%	2%	5%	5%	1%	5%	3%	4%	11%	3%	5%	6%	12%znr	6%	4%	4%
Don't know	33	7	9	5	9	3	30	32	1	3	4	9	-	8	24	6	6	4	9	32
	5%	5%	3%	7%	8%b	3%	5%	5%	2%	4%	3%	3%	-	4%	5%	3%	8%	3%	5%	4%
Confident	517	115	261	50	85	87	428	486	62	44	104	244	20	148	383	156	46	86	152	536
	74%	75%	77%	70%	70%	75%	74%	73%	86%zg	74%	82%	77%	68%	75%	72%	73%	64%	66%	79%pg	74%
Not confident	146	32	70	16	26	26	120	144	9	13	20	63	9	43	114	51	20	39	31	156
	21%	21%	21%	23%	22%	22%	21%	22%	12%	22%	16%	20%	32%	22%	23%	24%	28%	30%zr	16%	22%
Net confident	371	83	191	34	59	61	308	342	54	31	84	182	11	105	239	104	27	47	121	380
	53%pg	54%	56%	47%	49%	53%	53%	52%	74%zgi	53%	66%zg	58%	36%	53%	49%q	49%q	37%	36%	63%znopq	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 742

Q35a. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The estimated costs of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	724	441	27	254	724	83	144	74	124	104	206	355	147	181	399	133	724
Weighted total	696	418	25**	250	696	84*	139	71*	113	99*	199	338	142	176	379	129	724
Very confident	102	63	3	34	102	15	20	9	19	11	20	49	30	17	57	25	104
	15%	15%	13%	13%	15%	18%	15%	13%	17%	12%	10%	14%	21% ^j	10%	15%	19% ^m	14%
Fairly confident	415	252	14	149	415	48	88	44	60	61	123	205	78	111	225	73	432
	60%	60%	57%	60%	60%	57%	63%	62%	53%	62%	62%	61%	55%	63%	59%	57%	60%
Not very confident	115	72	6	36	115	18	17	12	24	18	34	57	22	25	69	20	124
	17%	17%	22%	14%	17%	21%	12%	17%	21%	18%	17%	17%	15%	14%	18%	15%	17%
Not at all confident	31	17	1	13	31	1	10	4	3	5	9	16	5	9	18	5	32
	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	1%	7%	6%	3%	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%	4%	4%
Don't know	32	14	1	19	33	2	4	1	6	4	12	12	7	14	11	6	32
	5%	3%	4%	7% ^a	5%	3%	3%	2%	5%	4%	6%	3%	5%	8% ⁿ	3%	5%	4%
Confident	517	315	17	182	517	63	108	53	80	72	144	253	108	128	282	98	536
	74%	75%	70%	73%	74%	75%	78%	75%	71%	73%	72%	75%	76%	73%	74%	76%	74%
Not confident	146	89	7	49	146	19	26	16	27	23	43	73	27	33	86	24	156
	21%	21%	26%	20%	21%	22%	19%	23%	24%	23%	22%	22%	19%	19%	23%	19%	22%
Net confident	371	226	11	134	371	44	82	37	52	50	100	180	81	94	196	74	380
	53%	54%	44%	53%	53%	53%	59%	52%	46%	51%	51%	53%	57%	54%	52%	57%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 743

Q35a. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The estimated costs of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence, compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	724	9	4	157	10	7	35	60	37	24	24	46	24	58	20	-	34	31	18	126	-	724
Weighted total	696	9**	4**	140	7**	5**	26*	72*	31*	30**	22**	61*	19**	39*	26**	**	32*	36**	26**	113	**	724
Very confident	102	2	-	18	-	*	3	10	3	7	3	14	3	6	6	-	4	2	2	19	-	104
	15%	25%	-	13%	-	9%	12%	13%	10%	22%	12%	24%	15%	17%	23%	-	12%	5%	9%	16%	-	14%
Fairly confident	415	5	3	81	5	4	14	42	15	14	15	32	10	21	17	-	20	25	21	71	-	432
	60%	50%	78%	58%	72%	76%	56%	59%	49%	45%	68%	53%	53%	55%	65%	-	62%	71%	83%	63%	-	60%
Not very confident	115	1	-	30	1	-	7	11	10	7	1	7	2	7	2	-	7	6	1	15	-	124
	17%	9%	-	22%	20%	-	25%	15%	33% <i>z</i>	24%	3%	12%	12%	17%	9%	-	21%	17%	5%	13%	-	17%
Not at all confident	31	2	-	4	-	1	1	4	2	1	1	4	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	5	-	32
	4%	17%	-	3%	-	15%	3%	6%	8%	4%	4%	6%	17%	6%	3%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	4%
Don't know	33	-	1	6	1	-	1	5	-	1	3	4	1	2	-	-	2	3	1	4	-	32
	5%	-	22%	4%	8%	-	4%	7%	-	4%	14%	6%	3%	5%	-	-	5%	7%	4%	4%	-	4%
Confident	517	7	3	99	5	4	18	52	18	20	18	46	13	28	23	-	24	27	24	89	-	536
	74% <i>h</i>	75%	78%	71%	72%	85%	68%	72%	59%	68%	79%	76%	68%	71%	88%	-	74%	75%	91%	79% <i>h</i>	-	74%
Not confident	146	2	-	35	1	1	7	15	13	8	2	11	6	9	3	-	7	6	1	19	-	156
	21%	25%	-	25%	20%	15%	28%	21%	41% <i>z</i>	28%	7%	18%	29%	23%	12%	-	21%	17%	5%	17%	-	22%
Net confident	371	5	3	65	4	3	10	37	5	12	16	36	7	19	19	0	17	21	22	70	0	380
	53% <i>h</i>	50%	78%	46% <i>h</i>	53%	70%	39%	51% <i>h</i>	18%	40%	72%	59% <i>h</i>	39%	48% <i>h</i>	75%	0%	53% <i>h</i>	58%	87%	62% <i>c</i>	0%	52%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 744

Q35b. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The predicted benefits of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	724	709	11	4	20	68	39	48	47	15	170	148	53	47	11	9	40	376	340	724
Weighted total	696	682	6**	9**	15**	61*	34*	53*	53*	13**	184	123	45*	41*	15**	10**	39*	361	326	724
Very confident	100	99	1	-	3	5	2	15	12	-	25	15	5	6	2	3	6	54	44	106
	14%	15%	9%	-	19%	8%	6%	27% <i>zefjk</i>	22%	-	14%	12%	12%	15%	15%	27%	14%	15%	14%	15%
Fairly confident	399	387	4	7	8	39	24	18	32	7	106	80	25	23	8	6	18	201	194	419
	57% <i>g</i>	57%	74%	81%	57%	64% <i>g</i>	70% <i>gp</i>	35%	60% <i>g</i>	51%	57% <i>g</i>	65% <i>gp</i>	55%	54%	56%	62%	46%	56%	60%	58%
Not very confident	134	132	1	2	3	10	4	13	7	6	38	19	9	9	2	1	13	70	64	137
	19%	19%	17%	19%	18%	17%	12%	24%	14%	42%	21%	16%	20%	21%	15%	12%	32% <i>fk</i>	19%	20%	19%
Not at all confident	29	29	-	-	1	3	2	1	2	-	4	6	5	2	2	-	1	18	10	29
	4%	4%	-	-	6%	5%	6%	3%	3%	-	2%	5%	11% <i>zj</i>	4%	13%	-	2%	5%	3%	4%
Don't know	35	35	-	-	-	4	2	6	1	1	11	4	1	2	-	-	2	17	14	33
	5%	5%	-	-	-	6%	6%	11%	1%	7%	6%	3%	3%	5%	-	-	5%	5%	4%	5%
Confident	498	486	5	7	11	44	26	33	43	7	131	94	30	29	11	9	24	256	238	525
	72%	71%	83%	81%	76%	72%	77%	62%	82% <i>p</i>	51%	71%	77%	67%	70%	71%	88%	61%	71%	73%	73%
Not confident	163	161	1	2	4	13	6	14	9	6	42	25	13	10	4	1	13	88	74	166
	23%	24%	17%	19%	24%	22%	18%	27%	17%	42%	23%	20%	30%	25%	29%	12%	34%	24%	23%	23%
Net confident	335	325	4	5	8	31	20	19	34	1	88	69	17	18	6	8	10	167	164	359
	48% <i>p</i>	48%	67%	62%	51%	51% <i>p</i>	59% <i>gp</i>	35%	64% <i>zqjp</i>	9%	48% <i>p</i>	56% <i>qjp</i>	37%	44%	43%	77%	26%	46%	50%	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 745

Q35b. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The predicted benefits of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	724	127	597	140	180	156	165	31	49	247	75	236	23	91	114	380	538	179	724
Weighted total	696	118	579	133	174	155	154	29**	46*	236	77*	231	21**	95*	120	350	510	179	724
Very confident	100	20	80	18	23	24	22	5	8	30	8	40	1	12	13	55	67	30	106
	14%	17%	14%	13%	13%	16%	14%	17%	17%	13%	11%	17%	4%	13%	11%	16%	13%	17%	15%
Fairly confident	399	62	336	80	102	94	76	16	29	140	51	117	15	58	70	197	295	101	419
	57%	53%	58%	60%	58%	60%	49%	54%	62%	59%	66%k	51%	69%	61%	58%	56%	58%	57%	58%
Not very confident	134	20	115	22	38	24	39	5	6	46	12	50	3	17	29	68	105	28	137
	19%	17%	20%	17%	22%	15%	25%e	18%	12%	19%	16%	22%	16%	18%	24%	19%	21%	16%	19%
Not at all confident	29	5	24	6	5	8	7	1	2	12	2	10	1	2	6	15	21	9	29
	4%	5%	4%	5%	3%	5%	5%	4%	4%	5%	2%	4%	5%	3%	5%	4%	4%	5%	4%
Don't know	35	11	24	7	7	5	10	2	2	9	4	13	1	5	3	14	22	11	33
	5%	9%b	4%	5%	4%	3%	7%	8%	5%	4%	5%	6%	6%	5%	3%	4%	4%	6%	5%
Confident	498	82	416	98	125	118	98	21	36	170	59	157	16	70	82	252	362	131	525
	72%	70%	72%	73%	71%	76%f	63%	70%	79%	72%	77%	68%	74%	74%	68%	72%	71%	74%	73%
Not confident	163	25	139	29	43	32	46	6	8	57	14	61	4	20	35	83	125	37	166
	23%	21%	24%	21%	25%	21%	30%	22%	16%	24%	18%	26%	20%	21%	29%	24%	25%	20%	23%
Net confident	335	57	277	69	82	86	51	14	29	113	45	96	11	51	48	169	236	95	359
	48%f	49%	48%	52%f	47%f	56%f	33%	49%	63%f	48%	59%k	42%	53%	53%	40%	48%	46%	53%	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 746

Q35b. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The predicted benefits of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	724	164	363	75	112	119	601	686	78	64	135	330	33	205	522	231	76	142	189	724
Weighted total	696	154	340	72*	120*	116	578	661	72*	59*	128	315	29**	198	490	212	72*	130	192	724
Very confident	100	21	49	14	16	27	72	85	20	10	21	47	6	25	68	32	11	15	29	106
	14%	13%	14%	20%	13%	23%zf	12%	13%	27%zg	16%	16%	15%	19%	13%	14%	15%	15%	12%	15%	15%
Fairly confident	399	88	204	34	67	62	335	381	43	35	78	189	17	114	278	125	39	73	111	419
	57%	57%	60%	48%	56%	54%	58%	58%	60%	59%	61%	60%	58%	57%	57%	59%	54%	56%	58%	58%
Not very confident	134	29	65	13	23	18	116	131	6	11	21	59	4	41	100	38	9	30	34	137
	19%h	19%	19%	19%	19%	16%	20%	20%h	9%	19%	16%	19%	14%	21%	20%	18%	13%	23%	18%	19%
Not at all confident	29	6	13	4	7	4	26	29	1	2	5	10	3	9	21	11	6	7	8	29
	4%	4%	4%	6%	5%	3%	4%	4%	2%	4%	4%	3%	9%	5%	4%	5%	8%	5%	4%	4%
Don't know	35	10	9	6	7	5	29	35	1	1	3	10	-	9	24	6	7	5	10	33
	5%	7%	3%	8%b	6%	5%	5%	5%	1%	2%	3%	3%	-	5%	5%	3%	10%o	4%	5%	5%
Confident	498	109	253	48	83	89	407	466	63	44	99	237	23	139	346	157	49	89	140	525
	72%	71%	74%	67%	69%	77%	70%	71%	88%zg	75%	77%	75%	77%	70%	71%	74%	69%	68%	73%	73%
Not confident	163	35	78	18	30	22	142	160	8	13	26	69	7	50	121	49	15	37	42	166
	23%h	23%	23%	24%	25%	19%	25%	24%h	11%	22%	20%	22%	23%	25%	25%	23%	21%	26%	22%	23%
Net confident	335	74	174	31	53	67	265	306	55	31	73	167	16	88	225	108	34	52	98	359
	48%	48%	51%	43%	44%	58%f	46%	46%	77%zgj	53%	57%g	53%	55%	45%	46%	51%	47%	40%	51%	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 747

Q35b. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The predicted benefits of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	724	441	27	254	724	83	144	74	124	104	206	355	147	181	399	133	724
Weighted total	696	418	25**	250	696	84*	139	71*	113	99*	199	338	142	176	379	129	724
Very confident	100	67	3	30	100	14	18	9	20	16	26	41	33	23	52	25	106
	14%	16%	10%	12%	14%	17%	13%	12%	18%	16%	13%	12%	23% <i>zjk</i>	13%	14%	20%	15%
Fairly confident	399	230	17	150	399	45	93	44	59	60	109	206	74	96	225	70	419
	57%	55%	67%	60%	57%	54%	67% <i>zdh</i>	62%	53%	61%	55%	61%	52%	55%	59%	54%	58%
Not very confident	134	89	4	40	134	22	20	15	21	15	46	66	19	36	76	19	137
	19%	21%	15%	16%	19%	26% <i>f</i>	14%	21%	19%	15%	23% <i>l</i>	20%	14%	21%	20%	15%	19%
Not at all confident	29	17	1	11	29	1	6	1	7	6	6	11	12	6	13	10	29
	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	1%	4%	2%	6%	6%	3%	3%	6% <i>zjk</i>	3%	3%	8% <i>n</i>	4%
Don't know	35	15	1	19	35	1	3	2	5	2	12	15	4	14	13	5	33
	5%	4%	4%	7% <i>a</i>	5%	2%	2%	3%	5%	2%	6%	4%	3%	8% <i>n</i>	4%	4%	5%
Confident	498	297	19	180	498	59	110	53	80	75	135	246	107	119	277	95	525
	72%	71%	77%	72%	72%	71%	79%	74%	71%	76%	68%	73%	75%	68%	73%	74%	73%
Not confident	163	106	5	51	163	23	26	16	28	22	52	77	31	43	89	29	166
	23%	25%	19%	20%	23%	27%	19%	23%	25%	22%	26%	23%	22%	24%	24%	23%	23%
Net confident	335	190	15	130	335	37	84	36	52	54	82	169	75	77	187	66	359
	48%	46%	59%	52%	48%	44%	61% <i>zdeh</i>	51%	46%	54%	41%	50%	53% <i>j</i>	44%	49%	51%	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 748

Q35b. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

The predicted benefits of implementing the recommendations

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	724	9	4	157	10	7	35	60	37	24	24	46	24	58	20	-	34	31	18	126	-	724
Weighted total	696	9**	4**	140	7**	5**	26*	72*	31*	30**	22**	61*	19**	39*	26**	**	32*	36**	26**	113	**	724
Very confident	100	5	1	16	1	1	2	11	3	4	2	14	3	7	6	-	3	2	1	17	-	106
	14%	51%	17%	11%	10%	21%	9%	15%	9%	13%	10%	23%	16%	19%	23%	-	11%	5%	5%	15%	-	15%
Fairly confident	399	2	3	83	4	3	19	38	19	15	10	34	15	21	15	-	15	22	20	62	-	419
	57%	23%	61%	59%	55%	64%	72%p	52%	62%	50%	44%	56%	76%	54%	59%	-	46%	61%	78%	55%	-	58%
Not very confident	134	2	-	30	2	1	3	16	8	6	7	6	2	7	2	-	10	7	3	22	-	137
	19%	17%	-	21%	26%	15%	13%	23%	25%	20%	32%	9%	8%	18%	9%	-	32%k	21%	13%	19%	-	19%
Not at all confident	29	1	-	5	-	-	1	3	1	2	2	3	-	1	1	-	1	2	1	5	-	29
	4%	9%	-	3%	-	-	3%	5%	3%	8%	7%	5%	-	2%	5%	-	3%	7%	4%	5%	-	4%
Don't know	35	-	1	6	1	-	1	3	-	3	2	4	-	3	1	-	2	3	-	6	-	33
	5%	-	22%	5%	8%	-	4%	5%	-	8%	7%	6%	-	7%	4%	-	8%	7%	-	5%	-	5%
Confident	498	7	3	99	5	4	21	49	22	19	12	48	18	28	21	-	18	23	21	80	-	525
	72%	74%	78%	71%	65%	85%	80%	68%	71%	63%	54%	80%p	92%	73%	82%	-	57%	65%	83%	71%	-	73%
Not confident	163	2	-	34	2	1	4	20	9	8	9	9	2	8	4	-	11	10	4	27	-	166
	23%	26%	-	25%	26%	15%	16%	27%	29%	28%	39%	14%	8%	20%	14%	-	35%k	28%	17%	24%	-	23%
Net confident	335	4	3	65	3	3	17	29	13	11	3	40	16	20	18	0	7	13	17	52	0	359
	48%p	48%	78%	46%p	39%	70%	65%gp	40%	43%	35%	15%	66%zcgtps	83%	52%p	68%	0%	22%	38%	66%	46%p	0%	50%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
 DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 749

Q35a-b. How confident or not were you in the accuracy of the following aspects of your audit report?

Summary

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	The estimated costs of implementing the recommendations	The predicted benefits of implementing the recommendations
Unweighted total	724	724
Weighted total	696	696
Very confident	102 15%	100 14%
Fairly confident	415 60%	399 57%
Not very confident	115 17%	134 19%
Not at all confident	31 4%	29 4%
Don't know	33 5%	35 5%
Confident	517 74%	498 72%
Not confident	146 21%	163 23%
Net confident	371 53%	335 48%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
 Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
 Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 750

Q36. Have you commissioned any further services from your ESOS assessor?

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	724	709	11	4	20	68	39	48	47	15	170	146	53	47	11	9	40	376	340	724
Weighted total	696	682	6**	9**	15**	61*	34*	53*	53*	13**	184	123	45*	41*	15**	10**	39*	361	326	724
Yes	116	116	-	-	4	10	4	6	16	1	37	16	5	6	2	1	7	70	46	119
	17%	17%	-	-	28%	17%	12%	11%	30% <i>zqkl</i>	6%	20%	13%	11%	13%	13%	14%	17%	19%	14%	16%
No	578	563	6	9	11	50	30	47	37	12	146	106	40	36	13	9	33	289	279	601
	83% <i>h</i>	83%	100%	100%	72%	83%	88%	88%	70%	94%	79%	86% <i>h</i>	89% <i>h</i>	87%	87%	86%	83%	80%	86%	83%
Don't know	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	4
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 751

Q36. Have you commissioned any further services from your ESOS assessor?

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	724	127	597	140	180	156	165	31	49	247	75	236	23	91	114	380	538	179	724
Weighted total	696	118	579	133	174	155	154	29**	46*	236	77*	231	21**	95*	120	350	510	179	724
Yes	116	13	103	14	21	24	26	14	14	33	11	40	2	10	11	76	98	18	119
	17% <i>q</i>	11%	18%	11%	12%	16%	17%	48%	30% <i>acdef</i>	14%	14%	17%	10%	11%	10%	22% <i>mn</i>	19% <i>q</i>	10%	16%
No	578	104	474	119	152	131	127	15	32	203	66	190	19	84	109	272	411	160	601
	83% <i>h</i>	88%	82%	89% <i>h</i>	87% <i>h</i>	84% <i>h</i>	82%	52%	70%	86%	86%	82%	90%	88% <i>o</i>	90% <i>o</i>	78%	81%	89% <i>p</i>	83%
Don't know	3	1	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	4
	*	1%	*	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	*	*	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 752

Q36. Have you commissioned any further services from your ESOS assessor?

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	724	164	363	75	112	119	601	686	78	64	135	330	33	205	522	231	76	142	189	724
Weighted total	696	154	340	72*	120*	116	578	661	72*	59*	128	315	29**	198	490	212	72*	130	192	724
Yes	116 17% <i>fr</i>	19 12%	63 19%	10 13%	24 20%	116 100% <i>zf</i>	-	105 16%	16 22%	9 15%	23 18%	45 14%	3 11%	43 22% <i>kl</i>	94 19% <i>er</i>	50 24% <i>zr</i>	16 22% <i>pr</i>	26 20% <i>qr</i>	16 8%	119 16%
No	578 83% <i>eo</i>	134 87%	276 81%	62 87%	96 80%	-	578 100% <i>ze</i>	554 84%	55 76%	51 85%	104 81%	270 86%	25 86%	156 78%	395 80%	161 76%	56 78%	104 80%	176 92% <i>znopaq</i>	601 83%
Don't know	3 *	1 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	1 1%	-	1 1%	1 *	1 3%	-	2 *	1 1%	-	-	-	4 1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 753

Q36. Have you commissioned any further services from your ESOS assessor?

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	724	441	27	254	724	83	144	74	124	104	206	355	147	181	399	133	724
Weighted total	696	418	25**	250	696	84*	139	71*	113	99*	199	338	142	176	379	129	724
Yes	116	85	2	27	116	11	28	10	20	22	32	52	26	27	61	24	119
	17% ^c	20% ^c	9%	11%	17%	13%	20%	14%	18%	23%	16%	16%	19%	15%	16%	19%	16%
No	578	330	23	223	578	73	111	60	92	76	166	284	115	148	317	104	601
	83%	79%	91%	89% ^z	83%	87%	80%	85%	81%	77%	84%	84%	81%	84%	83%	81%	83%
Don't know	3	2	-	1	3	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	4
	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	1%	1%	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 754

Q36. Have you commissioned any further services from your ESOS assessor?

Base: all participants who have received their audit report

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	724	9	4	157	10	7	35	60	37	24	24	46	24	58	20	-	34	31	18	126	-	724
Weighted total	696	9**	4**	140	7**	5**	26*	72*	31*	30**	22**	61*	19**	39*	26**	**	32*	36**	26**	113	**	724
Yes	116	2	2	21	2	1	4	14	6	6	2	12	6	3	8	-	5	2	6	16	-	119
	17%	16%	39%	15%	25%	17%	14%	19%	18%	19%	8%	20%	31%	7%	32%	-	17%	6%	23%	14%	-	16%
No	578	8	3	117	6	4	22	58	25	24	20	49	13	35	17	-	27	33	19	97	-	601
	83%	84%	61%	84%	75%	83%	86%	81%	82%	81%	92%	80%	69%	91%	68%	-	83%	94%	74%	86%	-	83%
Don't know	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	4
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 755

Q37a. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency within the organisation overall

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)		
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (g)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)	
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814	
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814	
Strongly agree	88 11%	86 12%	2 16%	-	3 17%	6 9%	2 5%	12 22%zff	6 11%	1 10%	21 10%	20 14%	4 8%	7 14%	-	2 11%	4 8%	45 11%	42 11%	99 12%	
Tend to agree	251 32%	239 32%	4 41%	8 27%	3 19%	16 24%	13 32%	14 26%	18 32%	5 37%	73 35%	39 28%	14 28%	19 39%	5 24%	9 62%	20 45%ek	124 31%	123 33%	255 31%	
Neither agree nor disagree	133 17%	131 18%	2 17%	-	5 30%	12 18%	8 21%	5 9%	10 19%	4 26%	32 16%	24 17%	7 14%	6 13%	7 38%	3 21%	3 14%	6 17%	6 17%	62 17%	141 17%
Tend to disagree	152 19%	140 19%	-	12 39%	3 17%	19 28%em	5 13%	11 21%	11 20%	4 27%	43 21%	31 22%	10 21%	5 11%	2 10%	-	6 14%	8 20%	6 19%	81 20%	155 19%
Strongly disagree	147 19%	142 19%	3 26%	2 7%	3 17%	12 18%	10 26%	11 20%	10 17%	-	34 17%	26 18%	15 29%j	11 22%	5 28%	1 5%	8 18%	8 20%	8 17%	64 17%	157 19%
Don't know	11 1%g	3 -	-	8 26%	-	2 3%	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	2 1%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	2 -	9 -	7 2%q	1 1%
Agree	339 43%	325 44%	6 56%	8 27%	6 36%	22 33%	15 37%	27 48%	24 43%	7 48%	94 46%	59 41%	18 36%	25 54%e	5 24%	11 74%	24 53%e	169 42%	165 44%	354 43%	
Disagree	299 38%	282 38%	3 26%	14 47%	6 34%	31 47%	16 39%	23 41%	21 38%	4 27%	77 38%	57 40%	25 50%	16 34%	7 38%	1 5%	14 33%	162 41%	135 36%	312 38%	
Net agree	40 5%eflg	42 6%	3 30%	-6 -19%	* 2%	-9 -14%	-1 -3%	4 7%fk	3 6%f	3 21%	17 8%efkl	2 1%f	-7 -14%	9 20%zefhjkl	-2 -13%	10 69%	9 21%zfhjkl	7 2%	30 8%g	42 5%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 756

Q37a. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency within the organisation overall

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Strongly agree	88	20	67	17	28	18	12	4	9	25	11	35	4	8	14	48	67	20	99
	11%	15%	10%	11%	14%f	10%	7%	13%	19%f	9%	13%	13%	16%	7%	11%	12%	12%	10%	12%
Tend to agree	251	36	215	48	56	59	58	10	18	80	35	81	7	30	41	128	178	73	255
	32%	26%	33%	31%	28%	35%	33%	34%	36%	29%	42%f	32%	27%	28%	32%	32%	31%	36%	31%
Neither agree nor disagree	133	27	106	27	32	32	34	6	3	45	17	36	1	21	24	68	99	32	141
	17%	19%	17%	17%	16%	19%h	19%h	20%	6%	16%	20%	14%	6%	19%	19%	17%	17%	16%	17%
Tend to disagree	152	27	125	32	43	33	30	5	7	57	12	53	9	23	25	72	113	38	155
	19%	20%	19%	21%	22%	19%	17%	17%	15%	21%	14%	21%	35%	22%	20%	18%	20%	19%	19%
Strongly disagree	147	24	123	26	34	29	42	4	12	60	8	49	4	22	23	77	107	37	157
	19%	17%	19%	17%	17%	17%	24%	12%	24%	22%j	10%	19%	16%	20%	18%	20%	19%	18%	19%
Don't know	11	4	7	4	4	1	-	1	-	8	-	2	-	4	2	2	9	2	7
	1%	3%	1%	3%f	2%	1%	-	4%	-	3%	-	1%	-	4%o	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Agree	339	57	282	65	84	77	69	14	27	105	46	116	11	38	55	176	244	93	354
	43%	41%	44%	42%	42%	45%	40%	47%	55%	38%	42%zi	45%	43%	35%	42%	45%	43%	46%	43%
Disagree	299	51	248	58	78	62	72	9	19	117	20	102	13	45	48	149	220	75	312
	38%j	37%	39%	38%	39%	36%	41%	30%	39%	43%j	24%	40%j	51%	42%	37%	38%	38%	37%	38%
Net agree	40	6	34	7	6	15	-3	5	8	-12	26	14	-2	-8	7	26	24	18	42
	5%flm	4%	5%	4%f	3%f	9%df	-2%	17%	15%zcdf	-4%	31%zik	5%l	-8%	-7%	5%	7%lm	4%	9%p	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 757

Q37a. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency within the organisation overall

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Strongly agree	88	23	43	10	11	25	49	67	22	20	15	47	3	26	69	25	13	21	17	99
	11%	14%	11%	12%	8%	22%zf	9%	10%	28%zg	20%zgj	10%	13%	10%	12%	13%	10%	15%	14%	8%	12%
Tend to agree	251	51	132	27	38	35	189	226	23	33	42	117	11	74	174	67	20	41	69	255
	32%	30%	34%	33%	28%	30%	33%	33%	29%	33%	30%	33%	37%	33%	32%	28%	24%	27%	33%	31%
Neither agree nor disagree	133	28	59	14	28	17	105	120	13	15	30	67	3	36	87	38	12	22	45	141
	17%	16%	15%	18%	21%	15%	18%	17%	16%	16%	21%	19%	11%	16%	16%	16%	14%	15%	21%	17%
Tend to disagree	152	35	70	15	29	17	120	143	9	12	31	65	9	41	102	48	18	30	46	155
	19%	20%	18%	18%	22%	15%	21%	21%	12%	12%	22%	19%	31%	18%	19%	20%	20%	20%	22%	19%
Strongly disagree	147	29	75	13	26	21	112	131	10	19	22	54	3	43	111	63	23	34	34	157
	19%	17%	20%	16%	20%	18%	19%	19%	13%	19%	16%	15%	11%	19%	20%	26%zr	27%r	23%	16%	19%
Don't know	11	4	5	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	2	4	-	-	2	1	7
	1%fg	2%	1%	3%	-	-	-	-	3%g	-	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	2%	-	1%
Agree	339	74	175	37	48	60	239	293	45	53	57	164	15	100	243	92	34	62	86	354
	43%	44%	45%	45%	36%	52%f	41%	43%	57%zg	53%g	40%	47%	46%	45%	44%	38%	39%	41%	40%	43%
Disagree	299	64	145	28	56	38	233	274	20	31	54	119	13	83	212	110	41	65	80	312
	38%h	38%	38%	35%	42%	33%	40%	40%h	25%	31%	38%	34%	41%	38%	39%	46%z	47%	43%	38%	38%
Net agree	40	10	29	8	-8	22	6	20	26	22	3	45	2	16	31	-19	-7	-2	6	42
	5%dfgopq	6%cd	8%cd	10%cd	-6%	19%zf	1%	3%	32%zg	22%zgj	2%	13%z	6%	7%	6%opq	-8%	-8%	-2%	3%q	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 758

Q37a. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency within the organisation overall

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Strongly agree	88 11% c	77 16% zc	2 8%	8 3%	88 11%	10 11%	22 14%	8 9%	16 12%	11 10%	15 7%	46 12%	25 15%f	15 8%	52 12%	20 13%	99 12%
Tend to agree	251 32%	181 38% c	1 5%	69 25%	251 32%	33 37%	57 37% f	27 30%	35 28%	26 24%	61 28%	132 36%	51 30%	50 26%	150 36% m	48 31%	255 31%
Neither agree nor disagree	133 17%	72 15%	5 18%	54 20%	133 17%	20 22%	29 19%	21 24% f	23 18%	13 12%	37 17%	60 16%	29 17%	30 16%	72 17%	26 17%	141 17%
Tend to disagree	152 19%	84 18%	8 31%	58 21%	152 19%	18 20%	25 17%	17 19%	23 18%	26 24%	50 23%	70 19%	26 16%	45 24%	75 18%	25 16%	155 19%
Strongly disagree	147 19% ae	58 12%	11 40%	78 29% za	147 19% e	9 10%	19 12%	13 15%	26 21% e	31 29% zdefg	52 24% k	56 15%	36 21%	50 26% zn	61 15%	34 22% n	157 19%
Don't know	11 1%	6 1%	-	5 2%	11 1%	-	1 1%	2 2%	3 2%	-	1 *	6 2%	2 1%	1 1%	6 2%	2 1%	7 1%
Agree	339 43% cjm	258 54% zc	3 12%	78 28%	339 43%	43 48%	79 51% i	35 40%	50 40%	37 35%	77 35%	178 48% j	76 45%	65 34%	201 48% m	67 44%	354 43%
Disagree	299 38% af	142 30%	19 70%	136 50% za	299 38% f	27 30%	45 29%	30 35%	49 39%	57 53% zdefgh	102 47% zk	126 34%	62 37%	94 50% zno	137 33%	59 38%	312 38%
Net agree	40 5% hijm	115 24% zc	-16 -58%	-58 -21%	40 5% hi	16 18% zdgh	34 22% zdghi	5 5%	1 1%	-20 -19%	-25 -12%	52 14% zj	14 8%	-29 -15%	65 16% zmo	8 5%	42 5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 759

Q37a. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency within the organisation overall

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security activities (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	21**	41*	26**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	782
Strongly agree	88	4	-	15	2	*	6	11	2	1	3	3	4	3	7	-	1	3	2	19	-	99
	11%	42%	-	10%	27%	8%	18%kp	14%	6%	2%	12%	4%	19%	8%	28%	-	3%	8%	8%	15%k	-	12%
Tend to agree	251	2	-	40	3	1	10	30	12	16	6	27	4	12	8	-	13	5	11	48	2	255
	32%q	18%	-	25%	33%	24%	34%q	38%q	33%q	45%	23%	41%cq	21%	30%	30%	-	35%q	13%	39%	36%cq	54%	31%
Neither agree nor disagree	133	-	4	25	-	2	5	16	5	6	5	11	4	6	2	-	6	12	3	20	-	141
	17%	-	81%	16%	-	43%	16%	20%	13%	16%	22%	16%	21%	15%	9%	-	17%	29%	12%	16%	-	17%
Tend to disagree	152	3	-	36	2	-	6	9	7	3	14	5	14	3	-	-	5	11	6	22	-	155
	19%	32%	-	23%	24%	-	19%	11%	17%	21%	13%	21%	26%	33%zgps	14%	-	13%	28%g	20%	17%	-	19%
Strongly disagree	147	1	1	41	1	1	4	13	11	3	7	12	3	6	5	-	9	7	6	15	-	157
	19%	8%	19%	26% <i>s</i>	17%	25%	13%	17%	30% <i>s</i>	9%	29%	18%	13%	14%	18%	-	26%	18%	22%	12%	-	19%
Don't know	11	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	1	2	7
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%z <i>cg</i> s	5%	-	*	46%	1%
Agree	339	6	-	56	5	2	16	41	14	16	9	30	8	15	15	-	13	8	14	68	2	354
	43%q	60%	-	35%	59%	32%	51%q	52% <i>cq</i>	40%	47%	36%	45% <i>q</i>	40%	38%	59%	-	38%	20%	46%	54% <i>zcq</i>	54%	43%
Disagree	299	4	1	77	3	1	10	22	17	10	10	26	8	20	8	-	14	18	12	37	-	312
	38%	40%	19%	48% <i>zgs</i>	41%	25%	32%	28%	47% <i>s</i>	30%	42%	39%	39%	48% <i>gs</i>	32%	-	39%	46%	42%	29%	-	38%
Net agree	40	2	-1	-21	2	-	6	19	-3	6	-2	4	-	4	7	0	-	-10	1	31	2	42
	5% <i>chmq</i>	21%	-19%	-13%	19%	7%	19% <i>zhmp</i>	24% <i>zhkmpq</i>	-7%	18%	-7%	7% <i>hm</i>	1%	-10%	-27%	0%	-1%	-25%	5%	24% <i>zchkmpq</i>	54%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 760

Q37b. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency at the Board-level within the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Strongly agree	95	89	1	5	3	6	3	12	7	1	26	22	5	2	1	4	2	52	42	102
	12%	12%	10%	17%	20%	9%	9%	22%zmp	13%	7%	13%	15%	11%	5%	4%	26%	4%	13%	11%	13%
Tend to agree	236	226	4	5	3	17	9	18	18	7	64	39	17	21	5	7	9	107	128	249
	30%	30%	40%	18%	19%	26%	24%	32%	31%	50%	31%	27%	34%	44%kp	26%	48%	20%	27%	35%q	31%
Neither agree nor disagree	130	125	2	2	4	11	6	6	12	2	32	26	4	6	6	3	7	67	60	136
	17%	17%	23%	7%	25%	17%	16%	11%	21%	12%	16%	18%	8%	13%	32%	21%	16%	17%	16%	17%
Tend to disagree	147	141	*	6	3	15	12	7	9	3	40	25	9	8	2	1	13	83	64	150
	19%	19%	4%	19%	17%	22%	30%	13%	15%	19%	19%	17%	19%	17%	10%	5%	30%	21%	17%	18%
Strongly disagree	156	150	2	4	3	15	9	11	8	2	40	27	14	9	5	-	11	84	67	162
	20%	20%	22%	13%	18%	23%	22%	20%	15%	12%	19%	19%	28%	19%	28%	-	25%	21%	18%	20%
Don't know	19	11	-	8	-	2	-	1	3	-	4	4	-	1	-	-	2	6	9	15
	2%	1%	-	26%	-	3%	-	2%	5%	-	2%	3%	-	2%	-	-	5%	2%	3%	2%
Agree	330	315	5	11	7	23	13	30	24	8	89	61	22	23	6	11	11	159	170	351
	42%p	42%	50%	35%	39%	35%	32%	54%efp	44%	57%	44%p	43%p	45%p	54%p	30%	74%	24%	40%	46%	43%
Disagree	303	291	3	10	6	30	20	18	17	4	80	52	23	17	7	1	24	168	132	312
	39%	39%	26%	32%	35%	45%	51%	33%	30%	31%	39%	47%	37%	36%	38%	5%	55%zghk	42%	36%	38%
Net agree	27	24	2	1	1	-6	-8	12	8	4	10	9	-1	6	-1	10	-14	-8	38	39
	3%eflpg	3%	24%	3%	4%	-10%	-19%	22%zefjkl	14%zefjl	27%	5%efl	6%efl	-2%	12%zl	-8%	69%	-31%	-2%	10%zq	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 761

Q37b. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency at the Board-level within the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Strongly agree	95	21	74	21	28	20	14	4	8	28	11	32	6	10	12	54	73	21	102
	12%	15%	12%	14%	14%	12%	8%	13%	16%	10%	13%	12%	23%	9%	9%	14%	13%	11%	13%
Tend to agree	236	43	193	44	63	49	54	14	10	84	31	75	5	31	45	117	174	60	249
	30%	31%	30%	29%	32%	29%	31%	47%	20%	31%	37%	29%	19%	28%	35%	30%	30%	30%	31%
Neither agree nor disagree	130	22	108	24	28	32	38	2	5	36	13	45	1	21	22	67	95	34	136
	17%	16%	17%	15%	14%	19%	22%	5%	11%	13%	15%	18%	2%	19%	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%
Tend to disagree	147	23	124	32	38	41	24	4	7	60	18	46	8	19	28	70	106	41	150
	19%	17%	19%	21%	19%	24% <i>f</i>	14%	11%	14%	22%	22%	18%	33%	18%	21%	18%	19%	20%	18%
Strongly disagree	156	25	130	26	35	26	43	6	18	60	11	54	6	23	21	85	109	42	162
	20%	18%	20%	17%	18%	15%	25% <i>e</i>	20%	37% <i>z</i>	22%	13%	21%	23%	21%	16%	22%	19%	21%	20%
Don't know	19	5	14	6	6	3	2	1	1	7	-	5	-	4	2	2	15	4	15
	2% <i>o</i>	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%	1%	4%	2%	3%	-	2%	-	4% <i>o</i>	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%
Agree	330	64	267	65	91	70	68	18	18	113	42	107	11	41	57	171	247	81	351
	42%	46%	41%	43%	46%	41%	39%	59%	36%	41%	50%	42%	42%	38%	44%	43%	43%	40%	43%
Disagree	303	49	255	58	73	67	67	10	25	119	29	100	14	42	49	155	216	84	312
	39%	35%	40%	38%	37%	39%	38%	32%	51%	43%	34%	39%	56%	39%	38%	39%	38%	41%	38%
Net agree	27	15	12	7	19	3	1	9	-7	-6	13	7	-3	-2	8	16	31	-3	39
	3% <i>f</i>	11% <i>z</i>	2%	4% <i>f</i>	9% <i>z</i>	2%	1%	28%	-14%	-2%	16% <i>z</i>	3% <i>d</i>	-13%	-1%	6% <i>m</i>	4% <i>m</i>	5% <i>q</i>	-1%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 762

Q37b. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency at the Board-level within the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Strongly agree	95	24	49	11	9	22	54	79	21	22	17	48	2	32	76	27	15	26	17	102
	12%	14%	13%	13%	7%	19% <i>f</i>	9%	11%	26% <i>zgj</i>	22% <i>zgj</i>	12%	14%	7%	14%	14% <i>r</i>	11%	17% <i>r</i>	17% <i>r</i>	8%	13%
Tend to agree	236	53	119	23	34	40	174	205	24	31	53	116	13	66	162	64	17	35	67	249
	30%	31%	31%	29%	26%	35%	30%	30%	30%	32%	38%	33%	43%	30%	30%	27%	20%	23%	32%	31%
Neither agree nor disagree	130	25	61	16	24	13	106	122	11	17	22	62	5	36	89	36	9	24	41	136
	17%	15%	16%	20%	18%	11%	18%	18%	13%	17%	15%	18%	17%	16%	16%	15%	11%	16%	19%	17%
Tend to disagree	147	31	72	12	32	19	118	135	13	7	22	62	8	40	93	41	15	31	47	150
	19% <i>f</i>	18%	19%	15%	24%	16%	20%	20% <i>f</i>	17%	7%	16% <i>f</i>	18%	26%	18%	17%	17%	18%	21%	22%	18%
Strongly disagree	156	31	76	15	32	21	119	138	9	21	27	59	2	45	121	71	29	31	34	162
	20%	18%	20%	18%	24%	18%	21%	20%	11%	21%	19%	17%	6%	20%	22%	30% <i>znr</i>	33% <i>znqr</i>	21%	16%	20%
Don't know	19	6	7	4	-	1	6	10	2	1	-	4	-	2	7	1	1	3	5	15
	2% <i>o</i>	4% <i>d</i>	2%	5% <i>d</i>	-	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	2%	2%	2%
Agree	330	77	168	34	44	62	228	284	45	53	70	164	16	98	238	91	32	61	85	351
	42%	45%	44% <i>d</i>	42%	33%	53% <i>zfi</i>	39%	41%	56% <i>zg</i>	54% <i>zg</i>	50%	47%	50%	44%	43%	38%	38%	41%	40%	43%
Disagree	303	62	147	27	64	40	238	273	22	28	49	121	10	85	213	112	44	62	82	312
	39% <i>i</i>	37%	38%	33%	49% <i>c</i>	34%	41%	40% <i>i</i>	28%	28%	35%	35%	33%	39%	39%	47% <i>z</i>	51% <i>zn</i>	41%	39%	38%
Net agree	27	14	21	7	-21	22	-9	11	23	25	21	42	5	13	24	-21	-12	-1	3	39
	3% <i>d</i> <i>fgopq</i>	8% <i>z</i>	5% <i>d</i>	9% <i>z</i>	-16%	19% <i>zfi</i>	-2%	2%	28% <i>zgj</i>	25% <i>zgj</i>	15% <i>zgj</i>	12% <i>zm</i>	18% <i>zm</i>	6%	4% <i>opq</i>	-9%	-14%	-1%	1% <i>q</i>	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 763

Q37b. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency at the Board-level within the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Strongly agree	95 12% <i>c</i>	81 17% <i>zc</i>	2 8%	11 4%	95 12%	15 17% <i>l</i>	20 13%	12 14%	17 14%	8 7%	16 8%	41 11%	37 22% <i>zjk</i>	15 8%	50 12%	29 19% <i>zmn</i>	102 13%
Tend to agree	236 30% <i>cjm</i>	174 36% <i>zc</i>	1 5%	61 22%	236 30%	30 34%	58 38% <i>h</i>	26 30%	30 24%	31 29%	45 21%	140 38% <i>zjl</i>	47 28%	40 21%	149 36% <i>m</i>	44 28%	249 31%
Neither agree nor disagree	130 17% <i>l</i>	69 15%	3 12%	55 20%	130 17% <i>l</i>	14 15%	33 22% <i>l</i>	15 18%	23 19% <i>l</i>	9 8%	35 16%	65 18%	22 13%	29 15%	76 18%	19 12%	136 17%
Tend to disagree	147 19%	77 16%	8 30%	61 22% <i>a</i>	147 19%	19 21%	23 15%	16 19%	22 18%	21 20%	62 29% <i>zkl</i>	54 15%	26 15%	55 29% <i>zno</i>	65 16%	22 14%	150 18%
Strongly disagree	156 20% <i>a</i>	67 14%	12 45%	77 28% <i>za</i>	156 20% <i>f</i>	11 13%	18 12%	15 17%	29 23% <i>f</i>	38 35% <i>zdefgh</i>	56 26% <i>k</i>	34 17%	20% <i>g</i>	49 26% <i>n</i>	67 16%	36 23%	162 20%
Don't know	19 2%	10 2%	-	9 3%	19 2%	-	1 1%	2 2%	4 3%	-	2 1%	9 2%	3 2%	1 *	10 3%	5 3%	15 2%
Agree	330 42% <i>cjm</i>	255 53% <i>zc</i>	3 12%	72 26%	330 42%	46 51%	78 51% <i>hi</i>	38 44%	48 38%	38 36%	62 28%	181 49% <i>j</i>	84 50% <i>j</i>	56 29%	198 48% <i>m</i>	73 47% <i>m</i>	351 43%
Disagree	303 39% <i>afkn</i>	143 30%	21 75%	137 50% <i>za</i>	303 39% <i>f</i>	31 34%	40 26%	31 36%	51 41% <i>f</i>	59 56% <i>zdefgh</i>	118 55% <i>zkl</i>	116 31%	61 36%	104 55% <i>zno</i>	132 32%	58 38%	312 38%
Net agree	27 3% <i>hi</i>	112 23% <i>zc</i>	-17 -63%	-65 -24%	27 3% <i>hi</i>	15 17% <i>zdh</i>	38 25% <i>zdghi</i>	7 8% <i>zdh</i>	-4 -3%	-21 -19%	-57 -26%	65 17% <i>zj</i>	24 14% <i>z</i>	-48 -25%	66 16% <i>zm</i>	15 9% <i>z</i>	39 5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 764

Q37b. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency at the Board-level within the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)			
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)		
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814		
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	8**	25**	5**	66*	21**	41*	26**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	782
Strongly agree	95	1	-	16	2	-	6	11	3	5	3	5	3	4	6	-	1	4	1	22	2	102		
	12%	10%	-	10%	27%	-	18% <i>p</i>	15%	8%	14%	12%	8%	13%	10%	24%	-	2%	10%	3%	17% <i>p</i>	24%	54%	13%	
Tend to agree	236	5	1	40	3	2	13	25	11	10	3	23	7	11	8	-	12	8	10	44	-	249		
	30%	51%	13%	25%	35%	32%	41% <i>ccq</i>	32%	31%	29%	12%	35%	33%	28%	31%	-	33%	19%	34%	35%	-	31%		
Neither agree nor disagree	130	-	-	27	-	2	4	14	7	6	8	10	6	4	-	-	5	12	3	20	-	136		
	17%	-	-	17%	-	43%	12%	18%	20%	18%	33%	15%	28%	11%	-	-	14%	31% <i>zm</i>	11%	16%	-	17%		
Tend to disagree	147	3	3	28	3	-	6	11	6	8	2	15	3	11	7	-	7	6	7	23	-	150		
	19%	32%	68%	18%	31%	-	18%	14%	16%	23%	10%	22%	14%	28%	25%	-	18%	16%	23%	18%	-	18%		
Strongly disagree	156	1	1	44	1	1	3	16	9	3	7	12	3	10	5	-	9	9	6	15	-	162		
	20% <i>s</i>	8%	19%	28% <i>zfs</i>	7%	25%	9%	20%	26% <i>ss</i>	9%	30%	19%	13%	24% <i>ss</i>	19%	-	26% <i>ss</i>	22%	22%	12%	-	20%		
Don't know	19	-	-	4	-	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	2	2	15		
	2%	-	-	3%	-	-	3%	2%	-	7%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	6%	3%	7%	2%	46%	2%		
Agree	330	6	1	56	5	2	18	37	14	15	6	29	10	16	14	-	12	12	11	66	2	351		
	42%	60%	13%	35%	61%	32%	58% <i>zccq</i>	47%	39%	43%	24%	43%	46%	38%	56%	-	35%	29%	37%	52% <i>zccq</i>	54%	43%		
Disagree	303	4	4	73	3	1	8	27	15	11	10	27	6	21	11	-	16	15	13	38	11	312		
	39%	40%	87%	45% <i>fs</i>	39%	25%	27%	34%	41%	32%	40%	41%	27%	52% <i>fs</i>	44%	-	45%	37%	45%	30%	-	38%		
Net agree	27	2	-3	-16	2	-	10	10	-1	4	-4	1	4	-6	3	0	-3	-4	-2	28	2	39		
	3% <i>chmpq</i>	21%	-74%	-10%	23%	7%	31% <i>zghkmpq</i>	13% <i>zhkmpq</i>	-2%	11%	-16%	2% <i>h</i>	19%	-14%	12%	0%	-10%	-9%	-7%	22% <i>zchkmpq</i>	54%	5%		

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 765

Q37c. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

The number of people working in the area of energy efficiency has increased within the organisation as a result of ESOS

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Strongly agree	43	39	2	3	1	4	2	7	2	-	7	8	4	2	-	3	5	20	23	47
	6%	5%	19%	9%	5%	7%	4%	12%/j	3%	-	3%	6%	7%	4%	-	19%	11%	5%	6%	6%
Tend to agree	65	63	1	2	3	6	3	4	6	1	14	13	5	6	-	2	2	29	36	72
	8%	8%	11%	5%	16%	10%	7%	8%	11%	6%	7%	9%	11%	13%	-	12%	5%	7%	10%	9%
Neither agree nor disagree	75	74	1	-	1	5	2	7	7	4	16	13	3	4	2	5	3	31	42	79
	10%	10%	12%	-	7%	8%	6%	12%	13%	25%	8%	9%	7%	9%	10%	38%	8%	8%	11%	10%
Tend to disagree	216	204	2	10	5	16	10	13	17	5	67	39	8	16	8	1	9	112	100	220
	28%	28%	22%	32%	31%	24%	25%	23%	31%	34%/l	27%	16%	34%/l	45%	5%	21%	28%	28%	27%	27%
Strongly disagree	370	356	4	10	7	30	22	25	22	5	99	68	29	19	8	3	25	204	163	385
	47%	48%	36%	33%	41%	46%	55%	45%	40%	35%	48%	48%	59%	41%	44%	18%	56%	51%	44%	47%
Don't know	13	6	-	6	-	4	1	-	1	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	5	7	11
	2%	1%	-	21%	-	6%z/k	2%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	6%	-	1%	2%	1%
Agree	109	101	3	4	4	11	4	11	8	1	21	21	9	8	-	5	7	49	59	119
	14%	14%	30%	14%	21%	16%	11%	20%	14%	6%	10%	15%	18%	16%	-	32%	15%	12%	16%	15%
Disagree	586	560	6	20	12	46	32	38	40	10	166	106	38	35	17	3	34	316	262	605
	75%	76%	58%	64%	72%	70%	80%	68%	72%	69%	81%	75%	75%	90%	24%	77%	79%r	79%r	71%	74%
Net agree	-477	-459	-3	-15	-9	-35	-27	-27	-32	-9	-145	-85	-29	-27	-17	1	-27	-267	-204	-486
	-61%	-62%	-28%	-50%	-51%	-54%	-69%	-48%	-57%	-62%	-71%	-60%	-57%	-58%	-90%	8%	-61%	-67%	-55%	-60%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 766

Q37c. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

The number of people working in the area of energy efficiency has increased within the organisation as a result of ESOS

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Strongly agree	43	6	37	9	15	8	4	2	6	13	6	14	-	3	10	27	33	11	47
	6%	5%	6%	6%	8%f	4%	2%	6%	12%f	5%	7%	6%	-	3%	8%	7%	6%	5%	6%
Tend to agree	65	12	53	12	17	14	15	2	5	25	5	23	2	9	9	32	48	17	72
	8%	9%	8%	8%	8%	8%	9%	8%	11%	9%	6%	9%	8%	9%	7%	8%	8%	8%	9%
Neither agree nor disagree	75	14	61	13	21	15	21	2	3	27	11	16	3	7	18	36	59	15	79
	10%	10%	10%	9%	10%	9%	12%	5%	6%	10%	13%	6%	11%	7%	14%	9%	10%	8%	10%
Tend to disagree	216	31	185	42	48	55	46	10	12	69	28	65	4	37	30	103	156	59	220
	28%	22%	29%	28%	24%	32%	27%	31%	24%	25%	34%	25%	17%	34%	23%	26%	27%	29%	27%
Strongly disagree	370	71	299	73	92	77	87	16	23	135	33	135	16	48	61	192	267	98	385
	47%	51%	46%	47%	47%	45%	50%	50%	47%	49%	40%	53%	63%	44%	47%	49%	47%	48%	47%
Don't know	13	5	8	5	5	2	1	-	-	7	-	2	-	3	2	4	9	3	11
	2%	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	-	1%	-	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%
Agree	109	18	90	21	32	22	19	4	11	38	11	37	2	13	19	59	81	28	119
	14%	13%	14%	13%	16%	13%	11%	14%	23%f	14%	13%	14%	8%	12%	15%	15%	14%	14%	15%
Disagree	586	102	484	115	141	132	133	25	35	204	61	201	21	85	90	295	423	156	605
	75%	73%	75%	75%	71%	77%	76%	81%	71%	74%	74%	78%	81%	79%	70%	75%	74%	77%	74%
Net agree	-477	-83	-393	-94	-109	-111	-114	-21	-24	-166	-50	-164	-18	-72	-71	-236	-342	-129	-486
	-61%	-60%	-61%	-61%	-55%	-64%	-65%	-67%	-48%	-60%	-60%	-64%	-72%	-67%	-55%	-60%	-60%	-64%	-60%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 767

Q37c. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

The number of people working in the area of energy efficiency has increased within the organisation as a result of ESOS

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Strongly agree	43	10	25	5	3	12	19	34	11	13	8	24	2	15	33	18	7	9	10	47
	6%	6%	7%	6%	2%	10% <i>f</i>	3%	5%	13% <i>zg</i>	13% <i>zg</i>	6%	7%	5%	7%	6%	8%	8%	6%	5%	6%
Tend to agree	65	13	41	2	7	12	42	54	11	13	11	35	3	15	45	16	8	13	19	72
	8%	8%	11% <i>c</i>	3%	5%	10%	7%	8%	13%	13%	8%	10%	11%	7%	8%	7%	9%	8%	9%	9%
Neither agree nor disagree	75	20	31	13	12	9	57	66	8	10	14	40	3	18	49	19	6	17	25	79
	10%	11%	8%	16% <i>b</i>	9%	8%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	11%	10%	8%	9%	8%	7%	11%	12%	10%
Tend to disagree	216	45	97	29	37	28	168	193	21	28	43	91	12	62	145	56	22	40	62	220
	28%	26%	25%	35%	28%	24%	29%	28%	27%	28%	31%	26%	39%	28%	27%	23%	26%	27%	29%	27%
Strongly disagree	370	79	182	30	74	54	288	336	26	34	63	161	51	108	268	130	43	70	95	385
	47% <i>hi</i>	47%	48%	37%	56% <i>c</i>	47%	50%	49% <i>hi</i>	33%	34%	45%	46%	35%	49%	49%	54%	50%	46%	45%	47%
Don't know	13	3	7	2	-	1	3	5	3	1	1	2	-	2	6	1	-	2	1	11
	2%	2%	2%	3%	-	1%	1%	1%	4% <i>g</i>	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	1%
Agree	109	23	66	8	10	24	61	88	21	27	20	59	5	30	78	34	14	22	29	119
	14%	14%	17% <i>d</i>	9%	8%	21% <i>f</i>	11%	13%	27% <i>zgj</i>	27% <i>zgj</i>	14%	17%	16%	14%	14%	14%	17%	15%	14%	15%
Disagree	586	124	280	59	111	82	456	529	48	62	106	251	23	170	413	186	65	109	156	605
	75% <i>hi</i>	73%	73%	72%	84% <i>ab</i>	71%	79%	77% <i>hi</i>	59%	63%	76% <i>hi</i>	71%	74%	77%	76%	78%	76%	73%	74%	74%
Net agree	-477	-101	-214	-52	-101	-58	-395	-441	-26	-36	-87	-193	-18	-141	-335	-151	-51	-87	-127	-486
	-61%	-59%	-56%	-63%	-76%	-50%	-68%	-64%	-33%	-36%	-62%	-55%	-57%	-64%	-61%	-63%	-59%	-58%	-60%	-60%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 768

Q37c. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

The number of people working in the area of energy efficiency has increased within the organisation as a result of ESOS

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Strongly agree	43	38	-	5	43	5	7	4	10	7	12	18	14	11	22	10	47
	6% ^c	8% ^c	-	2%	6%	5%	5%	4%	8%	6%	6%	5%	8%	6%	5%	7%	6%
Tend to agree	65	46	4	16	65	6	16	6	12	8	19	31	14	14	40	11	72
	8%	10%	13%	6%	8%	6%	10%	7%	10%	7%	9%	8%	8%	8%	10%	7%	9%
Neither agree nor disagree	75	50	4	21	75	13	17	10	12	9	14	35	25	16	40	19	79
	10%	11%	14%	8%	10%	14%	11%	12%	9%	8%	6%	9%	15% ^j	8%	10%	12%	10%
Tend to disagree	216	145	2	67	216	30	42	22	25	29	51	105	45	43	112	47	220
	28%	30%	6%	24%	28%	33% ^h	27%	26%	20%	28%	24%	28%	27%	23%	27%	30%	27%
Strongly disagree	370	190	18	160	370	37	70	41	63	54	118	176	68	103	196	65	385
	47% ^a	40%	66%	56% ^z	47%	41%	46%	47%	50%	51%	55% ^l	47%	40%	54% ^o	47%	42%	47%
Don't know	13	7	-	5	13	-	1	4	3	-	2	7	3	2	7	3	11
	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	1%	5% ^l	2%	-	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%
Agree	109	84	4	21	109	10	23	9	23	15	31	49	28	26	62	22	119
	14% ^c	18% ^c	13%	8%	14%	11%	15%	11%	18%	14%	14%	13%	16%	14%	15%	14%	15%
Disagree	586	335	20	226	586	67	112	64	89	83	169	281	114	146	308	111	605
	75%	70%	73%	83% ^z	75%	74%	73%	73%	70%	78%	78% ^l	76%	67%	77%	74%	72%	74%
Net agree	-477	-251	-16	-205	-477	-57	-89	-54	-66	-68	-138	-232	-86	-121	-246	-90	-486
	-61%	-53%	-59%	-75%	-61%	-63%	-58%	-62%	-52%	-64%	-64%	-63%	-51%	-64%	-59%	-58%	-60%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 769

Q37c. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

The number of people working in the area of energy efficiency has increased within the organisation as a result of ESOS

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814	
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	5**	66*	21**	41*	26**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	782
Strongly agree	43	2	-	13	-	-	2	6	1	1	2	5	1	-	2	-	1	2	-	7	-	47	
	6%	23%	-	8% <i>m</i>	-	-	6%	7%	2%	8%	8%	4%	-	8%	-	2%	8%	5%	-	6%	-	6%	
Tend to agree	65	1	-	10	-	2	4	8	1	2	1	4	3	3	4	-	3	2	1	18	-	72	
	8%	12%	-	6%	-	32%	12%	10%	4%	5%	4%	6%	13%	8%	15%	-	9%	5%	3%	14% <i>z</i> <i>c</i>	-	9%	
Neither agree nor disagree	75	2	3	10	1	-	6	7	7	4	4	5	2	2	2	-	2	5	1	12	-	79	
	10%	16%	53%	6%	15%	-	19% <i>z</i> <i>c</i> <i>m</i>	9%	19% <i>c</i>	12%	17%	7%	8%	6%	8%	-	5%	13%	4%	10%	-	10%	
Tend to disagree	216	2	1	43	5	1	7	20	7	9	5	20	5	17	6	-	7	11	14	38	-	220	
	28%	25%	13%	27%	61%	18%	23%	25%	19%	26%	21%	30%	25%	41% <i>z</i> <i>h</i> <i>p</i>	22%	-	18%	27%	47%	30%	-	27%	
Strongly disagree	370	2	2	84	2	3	13	38	2	19	17	33	11	18	12	-	21	19	13	49	2	385	
	47%	24%	34%	53% <i>s</i>	24%	50%	40%	48%	54%	48%	50%	49%	51%	43%	47%	-	59% <i>s</i>	48%	45%	39%	54%	47%	
Don't know	13	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	2	11	
	2%	-	-	*	-	-	-	2%	2%	7%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	6% <i>z</i> <i>c</i>	2%	-	2%	46%	1%	
Agree	109	3	-	22	-	2	5	13	2	2	3	9	3	3	6	-	4	4	1	25	-	119	
	14%	34%	-	14%	-	32%	17%	17%	6%	7%	12%	14%	16%	8%	23%	-	11%	10%	3%	20% <i>h</i>	-	15%	
Disagree	586	5	2	127	7	4	20	58	26	17	52	16	34	18	28	-	28	30	27	87	2	605	
	75%	49%	47%	79% <i>f</i> <i>s</i>	85%	68%	64%	73%	73%	74%	71%	79%	76%	84% <i>f</i> <i>s</i>	69%	-	78%	75%	92%	69%	54%	74%	
Net agree	-477	-1	-2	-105	-7	-2	-14	-45	-24	-23	-14	-43	-12	-31	-12	0	-24	-26	-26	-62	-2	-486	
	-61%	-15%	-47%	-66%	-85%	-36%	-46%	-56%	-67%	-68%	-58%	-65%	-59%	-75%	-46%	0%	-67%	-65%	-89%	-49%	-54%	-60%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 770

Q37d. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Changes made as a result of ESOS have already led to net cost savings in the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Strongly agree	69 9%	67 9%	1 5%	2 8%	3 20%	4 5%	4 10%	5 9%	9 15%	1 7%	14 7%	15 10%	5 10%	3 7%	2 11%	2 13%	3 7%	35 9%	34 9%	76 9%
Tend to agree	142 18%	141 19%	1 6%	-	4 22%	8 12%	10 24%	10 18%	10 18%	3 18%	38 19%	22 15%	9 19%	10 22%	2 13%	4 27%	10 23%	67 17%	74 20%	157 19%
Neither agree nor disagree	101 13%	96 13%	3 34%	2 7%	1 7%	6 9%	4 9%	12 22%	9 17%	2 13%	29 14%	16 11%	5 9%	4 8%	4 20%	4 25%	6 13%	48 12%	51 14%	102 13%
Tend to disagree	200 26%	194 26%	1 10%	5 16%	4 24%	19 28%	7 17%	14 25%	11 20%	6 44%	57 28%	37 26%	9 18%	16 35%	5 28%	2 16%	11 24%	107 27%	92 25%	206 25%
Strongly disagree	224 29%	211 28%	3 26%	10 33%	5 27%	25 37% <i>gh</i>	14 34%	11 20%	10 18%	2 17%	58 28%	47 33%	20 40% <i>gh</i>	11 23%	5 28%	-	12 26%	122 30%	99 27%	232 29%
Don't know	46 6%	34 5%	2 18%	11 36%	-	5 8%	2 6%	3 6%	7 13% <i>j</i>	-	9 5%	7 5%	2 4%	2 5%	-	3 19%	3 6%	21 5%	21 6%	41 5%
Agree	211 27%	207 28%	1 12%	2 8%	7 43%	11 17%	13 34% <i>oe</i>	15 26%	18 33%	4 25%	53 26%	36 26%	14 29%	14 29%	4 24%	6 40%	14 31%	103 26%	108 29%	233 29%
Disagree	424 54% <i>h</i>	405 55%	4 36%	15 49%	9 51%	43 66% <i>qh</i>	20 51%	25 45%	21 37%	9 61%	114 56% <i>h</i>	83 59% <i>h</i>	29 58% <i>h</i>	27 58%	10 56%	2 16%	22 50%	229 57%	191 51%	438 54%
Net agree	-213 -27%	-197 -27%	-2 -24%	-13 -41%	-1 -8%	-32 -49%	-7 -17%	-10 -19%	-2 -4%	-5 -36%	-62 -30%	-47 -33%	-15 -30%	-13 -29%	-6 -32%	3 24%	-9 -20%	-126 -31%	-82 -22%	-205 -25%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 771

Q37d. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Changes made as a result of ESOS have already led to net cost savings in the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Strongly agree	69 9%	14 10%	55 9%	13 9%	20 10%	15 8%	9 5%	6 19%	7 14% <i>f</i>	27 10%	7 8%	25 10%	-	7 6%	10 7%	44 11%	59 10% <i>q</i>	10 5%	76 9%
Tend to agree	142 18%	19 14%	122 19%	22 14%	34 17%	34 20%	37 21%	5 18%	9 19%	48 18%	14 17%	47 18%	4 14%	20 19%	25 19%	73 19%	105 18%	36 18%	157 19%
Neither agree nor disagree	101 13%	16 12%	85 13%	22 15%	21 11%	19 11%	28 16%	2 6%	9 18%	35 13%	14 17%	28 11%	2 7%	12 11%	18 14%	56 14%	73 13%	27 14%	102 13%
Tend to disagree	200 26%	35 25%	165 26%	39 26%	49 25%	47 27%	42 24%	9 27%	12 23%	65 24%	24 29%	64 25%	8 33%	30 28%	34 26%	94 24%	143 25%	54 27%	206 25%
Strongly disagree	224 29%	46 33%	177 28%	48 31%	56 28%	48 28%	53 30%	7 22%	12 24%	84 30%	19 23%	82 32%	11 42%	27 25%	39 30%	113 29%	158 28%	63 31%	232 29%
Don't know	46 6%	8 6%	38 6%	9 6%	17 9%	10 6%	7 4%	2 8%	1 2%	17 6%	4 5%	11 4%	1 4%	12 11% <i>no</i>	4 3%	15 4%	34 6%	11 6%	41 5%
Agree	211 27%	33 24%	178 28%	35 23%	55 28%	48 28%	46 26%	11 37%	16 32%	75 27%	21 26%	71 28%	4 14%	27 25%	35 27%	117 30%	163 29%	46 23%	233 29%
Disagree	424 54%	81 58%	343 53%	87 57%	105 53%	95 55%	95 54%	15 50%	23 47%	148 54%	44 52%	146 57%	19 75%	56 52%	72 56%	208 53%	302 53%	117 58%	438 54%
Net agree	-213 -27%	-48 -34%	-165 -26%	-52 -34%	-50 -25%	-46 -27%	-49 -28%	-4 -13%	-7 -15%	-73 -27%	-22 -27%	-75 -29%	-15 -61%	-29 -27%	-38 -29%	-91 -23%	-138 -24%	-71 -35%	-205 -25%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 772

Q37d. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Changes made as a result of ESOS have already led to net cost savings in the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Strongly agree	69	12	36	6	15	22	35	49	20	21	16	34	5	24	55	33	6	20	14	76
	9%	7%	9%	7%	11%	19% <i>z</i>	6%	7%	25% <i>z</i>	21% <i>z</i>	11%	10%	15%	11%	10%	14% <i>z</i>	7%	13%	7%	9%
Tend to agree	142	29	73	18	20	28	104	130	14	23	36	69	10	38	108	47	22	33	32	157
	18%	17%	19%	22%	15%	24%	18%	19%	17%	23%	26% <i>z</i>	20%	34% <i>z</i>	17%	20%	20%	26% <i>r</i>	22%	15%	19%
Neither agree nor disagree	101	20	46	11	22	14	75	89	11	13	19	50	3	25	70	31	9	18	32	102
	13%	12%	12%	13%	17%	12%	13%	13%	14%	13%	13%	14%	11%	11%	13%	13%	11%	12%	15%	13%
Tend to disagree	200	43	103	20	31	29	155	183	13	19	29	88	8	63	129	56	16	30	63	206
	26%	25%	27%	24%	23%	25%	27% <i>h</i>	16%	19%	20%	20%	25%	26%	29%	24%	23%	18%	20%	30% <i>p</i>	25%
Strongly disagree	224	57	101	19	41	20	183	200	15	19	35	96	4	62	160	71	33	46	59	232
	28% <i>e</i>	34%	26%	24%	31%	18%	32% <i>e</i>	29% <i>f</i>	19%	19%	25%	27%	14%	28%	29%	30%	38%	31%	28%	29%
Don't know	46	8	24	8	3	3	27	37	7	5	6	14	-	9	26	2	1	4	12	41
	6% <i>o</i>	5%	6%	10% <i>d</i>	2%	2%	5%	5%	9%	5%	4%	4%	-	4%	5% <i>o</i>	1%	1%	3%	6% <i>o</i>	5%
Agree	211	42	109	24	35	50	139	179	34	44	52	103	15	62	162	80	28	52	46	233
	27%	25%	28%	29%	26%	43% <i>z</i>	24%	26%	42% <i>z</i>	44% <i>z</i>	37% <i>z</i>	29%	49% <i>z</i>	28%	30% <i>r</i>	33% <i>r</i>	32%	35% <i>r</i>	22%	29%
Disagree	424	101	204	39	72	49	337	383	28	37	64	184	12	125	288	127	48	76	123	438
	54% <i>e</i>	59%	53%	48%	54%	42%	58% <i>e</i>	56% <i>h</i>	35%	38%	45%	52%	40%	56%	53%	53%	56%	50%	58%	54%
Net agree	-213	-59	-95	-15	-37	1	-199	-204	6	7	-12	-81	3	-62	-126	-47	-21	-24	-77	-205
	-27%	-35%	-25%	-19%	-28%	1%	-34%	-30%	8%	7%	-8%	-23%	8%	-28%	-23%	-20%	-24%	-16%	-36%	-25%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 773

Q37d. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Changes made as a result of ESOS have already led to net cost savings in the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Strongly agree	69	60	1	8	69	2	19	7	14	17	11	34	24	10	41	19	76
	5% <i>ce</i>	13% <i>zc</i>	4%	3%	9% <i>e</i>	2%	12% <i>e</i>	8%	11% <i>e</i>	16% <i>zde</i>	5%	9%	14% <i>zj</i>	5%	10%	12% <i>m</i>	9%
Tend to agree	142	104	4	31	142	18	31	17	23	22	35	74	30	33	78	27	157
	18% <i>c</i>	22% <i>c</i>	16%	11%	18%	20%	20%	20%	19%	20%	16%	20%	18%	17%	19%	18%	19%
Neither agree nor disagree	101	65	1	35	101	13	14	18	16	13	22	51	22	19	59	19	102
	13%	14%	4%	13%	13%	14%	9%	21% <i>zdf</i>	13%	12%	10%	14%	13%	10%	14%	12%	13%
Tend to disagree	200	123	6	71	200	29	39	20	30	23	57	96	40	48	108	38	206
	26%	26%	23%	26%	26%	32%	25%	23%	24%	22%	26%	26%	24%	25%	26%	24%	25%
Strongly disagree	224	91	15	116	224	23	41	21	36	31	83	91	44	73	104	41	232
	29% <i>a</i>	19%	53%	42% <i>za</i>	29%	26%	27%	24%	29%	29%	36% <i>zkl</i>	25%	26%	38% <i>zno</i>	25%	27%	29%
Don't know	46	34	-	12	46	5	10	4	6	1	8	25	9	8	26	11	41
	6% <i>l</i>	7%	-	4%	6% <i>l</i>	5%	7% <i>l</i>	4%	5%	1%	4%	7%	5%	4%	6%	7%	5%
Agree	211	164	5	39	211	21	49	24	37	38	46	108	55	42	120	46	233
	27% <i>c</i>	34% <i>zc</i>	20%	14%	27%	23%	32%	27%	30%	36%	21%	29%	32% <i>j</i>	22%	29%	30%	29%
Disagree	424	214	21	187	424	52	80	41	66	54	140	187	84	121	212	79	438
	54% <i>a</i>	45%	76%	68% <i>za</i>	54%	58%	52%	47%	53%	51%	65% <i>zkl</i>	50%	50%	64% <i>zno</i>	51%	51%	54%
Net agree	-213	-49	-15	-148	-213	-32	-30	-18	-29	-16	-94	-79	-30	-79	-93	-33	-205
	-27%	-10%	-56%	-54%	-27%	-35%	-20%	-20%	-23%	-15%	-43%	-21%	-17%	-41%	-22%	-21%	-25%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 774

Q37d. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Changes made as a result of ESOS have already led to net cost savings in the organisation

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security activities (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	21**	41*	26**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
Strongly agree	69	-	-	13	*	1	4	16	1	1	2	4	2	2	5	-	2	2	2	14	-	76
	9%	-	-	8%	5%	12%	12%	20% <i>zchkm</i>	2%	3%	6%	6%	8%	5%	19%	-	5%	5%	8%	11%	-	9%
Tend to agree	142	3	1	33	1	3	7	9	10	5	4	10	9	8	6	-	5	4	1	25	-	157
	18%	28%	15%	20%	9%	64%	21%	11%	28% <i>gq</i>	15%	15%	16%	41%	18%	24%	-	15%	9%	4%	20%	-	19%
Neither agree nor disagree	101	3	1	20	1	-	3	9	2	5	1	18	-	5	1	-	3	6	5	18	-	102
	13%	33%	13%	13%	15%	-	9%	12%	6%	14%	4%	28% <i>zcfghps</i>	-	13%	5%	-	7%	14%	17%	14%	-	13%
Tend to disagree	200	2	2	33	5	1	11	23	10	7	16	5	13	5	10	-	10	12	8	29	-	206
	26%	24%	40%	20%	57%	14%	37% <i>c</i>	29%	27%	30%	27%	24%	24%	31%	20%	-	28%	29%	27%	23%	-	25%
Strongly disagree	224	1	2	58	1	1	6	17	13	11	12	14	6	12	6	-	12	13	11	27	2	232
	29%	15%	32%	36% <i>fgs</i>	14%	11%	19%	21%	35%	32%	48%	22%	27%	28%	23%	-	34%	33%	37%	21%	54%	29%
Don't know	46	-	-	3	-	-	1	6	1	2	-	3	-	2	2	-	4	4	2	14	2	41
	6% <i>c</i>	-	-	2%	-	-	3%	8% <i>c</i>	2%	7%	-	5%	-	4%	9%	-	10% <i>c</i>	11% <i>c</i>	7%	11% <i>zc</i>	46%	5%
Agree	211	3	1	46	1	4	10	24	11	5	14	10	10	11	6	-	7	6	3	39	-	233
	27%	28%	15%	29%	14%	75%	33%	31%	30%	17%	21%	22%	49%	24%	43%	-	20%	14%	12%	31%	-	29%
Disagree	424	4	3	90	6	1	17	39	22	21	18	30	11	24	11	-	22	25	19	56	2	438
	54% <i>s</i>	40%	72%	57% <i>s</i>	71%	25%	55%	50%	62%	62%	75%	46%	51%	59%	43%	-	63%	61%	64%	44%	54%	54%
Net agree	-213	-1	-3	-44	-5	3	-7	-15	-12	-15	-13	-16	-	-15	*	0	-15	-19	-15	-17	-2	-205
	-27%	-12%	-58%	-28%	-57%	50%	-22%	-19%	-32%	-28%	-54%	-24%	-2%	-36%	*	0%	-43%	-48%	-52%	-14%	-54%	-25%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 775

Q37e. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Staff productivity has increased as a result of energy saving measures recommended by ESOS being implemented

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (g)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Strongly agree	13	13	-	-	-	-	*	2	3	-	1	2	1	-	-	2	2	6	7	13
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	3%	5%j	-	*	2%	2%	-	-	13%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Tend to agree	30	29	*	-	2	2	3	1	2	-	6	7	1	3	-	-	3	15	15	34
	4%	4%	5%	-	10%	3%	7%	2%	3%	-	3%	5%	3%	6%	-	-	7%	4%	4%	4%
Neither agree nor disagree	127	121	2	4	3	8	6	8	7	4	30	27	13	6	4	5	6	59	65	133
	16%	16%	19%	13%	18%	13%	14%	15%	12%	25%	14%	19%	25%	13%	20%	38%	14%	15%	17%	16%
Tend to disagree	227	219	2	6	4	22	10	16	20	7	70	37	9	15	3	2	9	111	113	245
	29%	30%	22%	19%	24%	33%	26%	29%	37%l	52%	34%l	26%	17%	32%	16%	13%	20%	28%	31%	30%
Strongly disagree	353	337	4	12	8	30	17	24	23	3	90	66	26	23	12	1	24	195	154	360
	45%	45%	42%	38%	44%	46%	43%	43%	41%	22%	44%	46%	52%	48%	64%	10%	54%	49%	41%	44%
Don't know	33	22	1	9	1	3	3	4	1	-	9	3	1	1	-	4	1	14	17	29
	4%	3%	13%	30%	3%	5%	8%	8%	1%	-	4%	2%	1%	2%	-	26%	2%	3%	5%	4%
Agree	43	42	*	-	2	2	3	3	5	-	7	9	2	3	-	2	4	21	22	47
	5%	6%	5%	-	10%	3%	8%	5%	9%	-	4%	7%	4%	6%	-	13%	10%	5%	6%	6%
Disagree	580	556	6	17	12	52	27	40	43	11	160	103	34	38	15	3	33	307	267	605
	74%	75%	64%	57%	68%	79%	70%	72%	78%	75%	78%	72%	69%	80%	80%	24%	74%	77%	72%	74%
Net agree	-538	-514	-6	-17	-10	-50	-24	-38	-38	-11	-153	-93	-32	-35	-15	-2	-28	-286	-245	-558
	-69%	-69%	-59%	-57%	-58%	-76%	-61%	-67%	-69%	-75%	-74%	-65%	-65%	-74%	-80%	-11%	-64%	-71%	-66%	-69%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 776

Q37e. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Staff productivity has increased as a result of energy saving measures recommended by ESOS being implemented

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Strongly agree	13 2%	2 1%	11 2%	-	6 3%	3 2%	2 1%	-	2 3%	5 2%	2 2%	4 2%	-	*	4 3%	6 2%	9 2%	4 2%	13 2%
Tend to agree	30 4%	2 1%	28 4%	5 3%	6 3%	5 3%	9 5%	1 4%	3 6%	8 3%	4 5%	9 3%	-	2 2%	3 2%	18 5%	25 4%	4 2%	34 4%
Neither agree nor disagree	127 16%	26 19%	101 16%	27 17%	24 12%	30 18%	31 18%	3 11%	11 23%	43 15%	16 19%	39 15%	2 10%	12 11%	21 16%	68 17%	93 16%	32 16%	133 16%
Tend to disagree	227 29%	33 24%	194 30%	42 28%	56 28%	52 30%	47 27%	10 33%	18 37%	75 27%	29 34%	74 29%	10 38%	38 35%	37 28%	114 29%	162 28%	63 31%	245 30%
Strongly disagree	353 45%	68 49%	285 44%	71 46%	96 48%h	75 44%	78 45%	14 47%	15 31%	132 48%	31 37%	119 47%	13 52%	51 47%	61 47%	170 43%	258 45%	92 45%	360 44%
Don't know	33 4%	8 6%	25 4%	8 5%	11 5%	6 3%	6 4%	2 6%	-	12 4%	1 2%	11 4%	-	4 4%	4 3%	17 4%	25 4%	7 4%	29 4%
Agree	43 5%	4 3%	39 6%	5 3%	12 6%	8 6%	12 7%	1 4%	5 10%	14 5%	6 7%	13 5%	-	3 2%	6 5%	24 6%	35 6%	8 4%	47 6%
Disagree	580 74%	101 73%	479 74%	113 74%	152 77%	128 74%	126 72%	25 79%	34 68%	207 75%	60 72%	193 75%	23 90%	89 83%o	98 75%	284 72%	420 73%	155 77%	605 74%
Net agree	-538 -69%	-97 -70%	-441 -68%	-108 -70%	-140 -71%	-120 -70%	-114 -65%	-23 -75%	-29 -58%	-193 -70%	-54 -65%	-180 -70%	-23 -90%	-86 -80%	-91 -71%	-260 -66%	-385 -67%	-147 -73%	-558 -69%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 777

Q37e. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Staff productivity has increased as a result of energy saving measures recommended by ESOS being implemented

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Strongly agree	13	2	7	1	3	3	9	7	6	2	1	4	1	5	12	5	1	6	1	13
	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	8%zgj	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	4%r	1%	2%
Tend to agree	30	7	17	4	2	9	17	24	7	7	9	16	2	6	25	11	7	13	5	34
	4%	4%	4%	5%	1%	8%f	3%	3%	9%zg	7%	6%	5%	8%	3%	4%	5%	8%r	9%zr	2%	4%
Neither agree nor disagree	127	22	64	14	23	20	90	109	14	15	32	66	5	30	85	40	12	23	41	133
	16%	13%	17%	17%	18%	17%	16%	16%	17%	15%	23%g	19%	16%	14%	16%	17%	14%	15%	19%	16%
Tend to disagree	227	55	108	25	34	28	176	204	17	33	44	110	14	63	158	63	19	44	60	245
	29%	33%	28%	31%	26%	24%	30%	30%	22%	33%	31%	31%	46%	29%	29%	26%	22%	29%	28%	30%
Strongly disagree	353	75	174	31	67	52	275	323	26	35	50	143	9	110	246	113	47	63	100	360
	45%h	44%	45%	38%	51%	45%	48%	47%hij	33%	35%	36%	41%	28%	50%kl	45%	47%	54%	42%	47%	44%
Don't know	33	8	14	7	3	4	12	21	9	8	4	12	-	6	21	8	1	3	4	29
	4%l	5%	4%	8%	2%	4%	2%	3%	11%zgj	8%g	3%	3%	-	3%	4%	3%	1%	2%	2%	4%
Agree	43	9	23	5	5	12	28	31	14	9	10	21	3	11	36	16	8	19	6	47
	5%	5%	6%	6%	3%	10%l	4%	5%	17%zgj	9%	7%	6%	10%	5%	7%	7%	9%r	12%znr	3%	6%
Disagree	580	131	282	56	101	80	450	527	44	68	94	254	23	174	404	176	65	107	161	605
	74%h	77%	73%	69%	77%	69%	78%e	77%h	55%	68%	67%	72%	74%	79%	74%	73%	76%	71%	76%	74%
Net agree	-538	-122	-259	-51	-97	-68	-424	-486	-30	-59	-85	-233	-20	-163	-368	-159	-58	-88	-154	-558
	-69%	-72%	-67%	-63%	-73%	-58%	-73%	-72%	-37%	-60%	-60%	-66%	-64%	-74%	-67%	-67%	-67%	-58%	-73%	-69%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 778

Q37e. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Staff productivity has increased as a result of energy saving measures recommended by ESOS being implemented

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Strongly agree	13	10	1	2	13	-	1	1	5	1	2	5	6	1	5	7	13
	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	5%zmn	2%
Tend to agree	30	24	2	4	30	3	4	4	8	3	3	15	11	2	17	11	34
	4%	5% c	6%	1%	4%	3%	3%	5%	6%	3%	1%	4%	7% f	1%	4% m	7% m	4%
Neither agree nor disagree	127	89	2	35	127	15	23	17	14	24	33	63	24	26	73	21	133
	16%	19% c	6%	13%	16%	16%	15%	20%	11%	22% h	15%	17%	14%	14%	18%	14%	16%
Tend to disagree	227	140	5	82	227	30	48	23	37	26	61	111	49	52	121	49	245
	29%	29%	20%	30%	29%	33%	31%	26%	30%	24%	28%	30%	29%	28%	29%	32%	30%
Strongly disagree	353	189	18	144	353	43	69	35	57	48	114	161	69	104	184	56	360
	45%	40%	65%	53% za	45%	47%	45%	41%	46%	45%	53% kl	43%	41%	55% zno	44%	36%	44%
Don't know	33	25	-	8	33	-	8	7	5	5	4	17	11	4	17	10	29
	4%	5%	-	3%	4%	-	5% e	8% e	4%	4%	2%	5%	6% j	2%	4%	7%	4%
Agree	43	35	2	6	43	3	5	5	13	4	5	20	18	3	21	18	47
	5% cm	7% c	9%	2%	5%	3%	4%	6%	10% zdf	4%	2%	5%	10% zjk	1%	5% m	12% zmn	6%
Disagree	580	330	23	225	580	73	117	58	95	74	175	272	118	157	305	105	605
	74%	69%	85%	82% za	74%	80%	76%	67%	75%	69%	81% l	73%	69%	83% zno	73%	68%	74%
Net agree	-538	-295	-21	-220	-538	-69	-111	-53	-82	-70	-169	-252	-100	-154	-283	-86	-558
	-69%	-62%	-76%	-80%	-69%	-77%	-73%	-61%	-65%	-65%	-78%	-68%	-59%	-81%	-68%	-56%	-69%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 779

Q37e. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Staff productivity has increased as a result of energy saving measures recommended by ESOS being implemented

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	21**	41*	26**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
Strongly agree	13	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	3	-	13
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	4%	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	8%	-	-	2%	-	2%	-	2%
Tend to agree	30	-	-	5	*	-	3	3	2	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	2	-	1	7	-	34
	4%	-	-	3%	5%	-	10%zq	3%	6%	-	6%	2%	4%	4%	4%	-	4%	-	4%	6%	-	4%
Neither agree nor disagree	127	3	1	28	1	3	8	7	3	5	5	19	1	5	3	-	3	4	6	22	-	133
	16%	33%	13%	17%	9%	64%	26%gh	8%	9%	15%	20%	29%zghmpq	4%	11%	12%	-	9%	10%	21%	18%	-	16%
Tend to disagree	227	2	1	41	5	-	10	24	14	12	7	14	9	15	5	-	10	14	9	37	-	245
	29%	18%	15%	26%	57%	-	32%	31%	38%	34%	27%	21%	42%	37%	18%	-	29%	35%	31%	29%	-	30%
Strongly disagree	353	4	3	81	2	2	10	34	14	15	11	31	10	20	13	-	17	21	13	51	2	360
	45%	40%	72%	51%f	29%	36%	32%	43%	38%	44%	45%	46%	46%	48%	51%	-	48%	51%	44%	41%	54%	44%
Don't know	33	1	-	2	-	-	-	3	2	2	1	2	-	9	2	-	4	1	-	6	2	29
	4%	10%	-	1%	-	-	-	11%zcm	7%c	7%	3%	3%	-	8%	-	-	10%cm	2%	-	4%	46%	4%
Agree	43	-	-	8	*	-	3	6	3	-	1	1	2	1	3	-	2	1	1	10	-	47
	5%	-	-	5%	5%	-	10%	7%	8%	-	6%	2%	8%	4%	11%	-	4%	2%	4%	8%	-	6%
Disagree	580	5	4	122	7	2	20	58	28	27	18	44	18	35	18	-	27	35	22	88	2	605
	74%	58%	87%	76%	86%	36%	64%	74%	76%	78%	72%	67%	88%	85%lks	69%	-	77%	86%f	74%	70%	54%	74%
Net agree	-538	-5	-4	-114	-7	-2	-17	-53	-25	-27	-16	-43	-17	-33	-15	0	-26	-34	-20	-78	-2	-558
	-69%	-58%	-87%	-71%	-81%	-36%	-53%	-67%	-68%	-78%	-66%	-65%	-80%	-82%	-58%	0%	-72%	-84%	-70%	-62%	-54%	-69%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 780

Q37f. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Complying with ESOS has enhanced our reputation with clients/customers

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (g)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	781	781	-	-	23	69	44	51	48	16	178	166	57	52	14	10	44	409	363	781
Weighted total	742	742	**	**	17**	62*	38*	56*	53*	14**	189	137	47*	46*	19**	12**	43*	386	344	781
Strongly agree	35	35	-	-	-	2	3	2	4	-	10	8	2	1	-	-	3	20	15	37
	5%	5%	-	-	-	4%	7%	4%	7%	-	6%	6%	3%	2%	-	-	6%	5%	4%	5%
Tend to agree	94	94	-	-	4	8	6	8	6	2	27	14	4	6	6	2	2	52	41	104
	13%	13%	-	-	21%	13%	15%	15%	11%	13%	14%	10%	9%	13%	31%	16%	6%	14%	12%	13%
Neither agree nor disagree	125	125	-	-	3	7	5	9	9	3	33	24	6	11	4	5	6	62	64	131
	17%	17%	-	-	15%	11%	13%	16%	17%	19%	17%	18%	13%	25%	23%	47%	15%	16%	18%	17%
Tend to disagree	193	193	-	-	4	19	7	15	18	5	49	39	8	8	3	1	12	101	89	200
	26%	26%	-	-	26%	30%	17%	27%	34%	33%	26%	28%	18%	18%	7%	28%	26%	26%	26%	26%
Strongly disagree	267	267	-	-	6	24	17	19	15	4	62	47	24	18	5	1	19	140	123	281
	36%	36%	-	-	33%	39%	45%	33%	28%	26%	33%	35%	52% <i>zhjk</i>	40%	28%	13%	45%	36%	36%	36%
Don't know	27	27	-	-	1	2	1	2	2	1	7	3	3	1	-	2	-	11	13	28
	4%	4%	-	-	4%	4%	2%	4%	4%	9%	4%	2%	5%	2%	-	18%	-	3%	4%	4%
Agree	129	129	-	-	4	10	8	11	9	2	37	23	6	7	6	2	5	72	56	141
	17%	17%	-	-	21%	17%	22%	19%	17%	13%	20%	17%	12%	15%	31%	16%	12%	19%	16%	18%
Disagree	460	460	-	-	10	43	24	34	33	8	111	86	33	27	8	2	31	241	212	481
	62%	62%	-	-	59%	62%	60%	62%	62%	59%	59%	63%	70%	58%	46%	19%	73%	62%	62%	62%
Net agree	-330	-330	0	0	-6	-33	-16	-23	-24	-7	-74	-63	-27	-20	-3	*	-26	-168	-156	-340
	-45%	-45%	0%	0%	-38%	-53%	-41%	-41%	-45%	-46%	-39%	-46%	-57%	-43%	-15%	-3%	-62%	-44%	-45%	-44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 781

Q37f. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Complying with ESOS has enhanced our reputation with clients/customers

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	781	140	641	150	195	167	179	33	53	270	81	253	25	94	120	417	581	193	781
Weighted total	742	131	611	140	186	162	169	31**	49*	253	81*	246	23**	98*	124	379	545	188	781
Strongly agree	35 5%	8 6%	27 4%	7 5%	8 4%	6 4%	9 6%	1 2%	4 8%	6 3%	5 6%	15 6%	1 4%	3 3%	5 4%	22 6%	24 4%	11 6%	37 5%
Tend to agree	94 13%	14 11%	80 13%	18 13%	25 13%	17 10%	21 12%	7 24%	7 13%	31 12%	11 13%	32 13%	1 4%	7 7%	17 14%	55 14%	71 13%	23 12%	104 13%
Neither agree nor disagree	125 17%	17 13%	109 18%	19 13%	27 15%	37 23 ^c	30 18%	6 20%	6 13%	40 16%	10 12%	42 17%	3 13%	13 13%	19 15%	66 17%	94 17%	29 15%	131 17%
Tend to disagree	193 26%	35 27%	158 26%	46 33%	42 23%	45 28%	44 26%	2 7%	15 30%	65 26%	33 40% ^z	55 22%	2 8%	29 29%	30 24%	103 27%	139 26%	51 27%	200 26%
Strongly disagree	267 36%	49 37%	218 36%	47 33%	75 40%	52 32%	63 37%	12 39%	16 32%	103 41%	23 28%	89 36%	16 71%	40 41%	47 38%	126 33%	197 36%	67 36%	281 36%
Don't know	27 4%	8 6%	19 3%	4 3%	8 5%	6 4%	2 1%	3 8%	2 4%	7 3%	- -	13 5% ^j	- -	7 7% ^o	6 5%	8 2%	19 4%	7 4%	28 4%
Agree	129 17%	22 17%	107 18%	25 18%	33 18%	22 14%	30 18%	8 26%	11 22%	38 15%	16 20%	47 19%	2 8%	10 10%	22 18%	76 20% ^m	95 17%	34 18%	141 18%
Disagree	460 62%	84 64%	376 61%	92 66%	117 63%	97 60%	106 63%	14 45%	31 62%	168 66%	56 68%	143 58%	18 79%	68 70%	77 62%	229 60%	336 62%	118 63%	481 62%
Net agree	-330 -45%	-62 -47%	-269 -44%	-67 -48%	-84 -45%	-75 -46%	-76 -45%	-6 -20%	-20 -40%	-130 -51%	-39 -48%	-96 -39%	-16 -71%	-59 -60%	-55 -44%	-153 -40%	-241 -44%	-84 -45%	-340 -44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 782

Q37f. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Complying with ESOS has enhanced our reputation with clients/customers

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	781	172	394	82	120	119	586	688	80	109	140	359	33	217	562	259	93	161	203	781
Weighted total	742	160	366	79*	124	116	563	662	74*	96*	131	337	27**	209	520	235	84*	143	205	781
Strongly agree	35	8	18	3	6	10	20	28	9	11	8	23	1	9	26	10	6	11	6	37
	5%	5%	5%	3%	5%	9% <i>f</i>	4%	4%	12% <i>zg</i>	12% <i>zg</i>	6%	7%	2%	5%	5%	4%	7%	8%	3%	5%
Tend to agree	94	28	43	12	12	18	66	78	16	23	23	48	6	24	64	34	13	24	28	104
	13%	17%	12%	15%	10%	15%	12%	12%	21% <i>g</i>	24% <i>zg</i>	17%	14%	22%	11%	12%	14%	15%	17%	14%	13%
Neither agree nor disagree	125	25	58	19	22	19	92	111	10	16	28	61	3	28	98	45	15	24	26	131
	17%	15%	16%	25%	18%	16%	16%	17%	13%	17%	22%	18%	13%	14%	19%	19%	17%	17%	13%	17%
Tend to disagree	193	42	100	18	29	23	161	177	17	18	26	83	12	61	135	52	18	35	57	200
	26%	26%	27%	23%	24%	20%	29%	27%	23%	19%	20%	25%	43%	29%	26%	22%	21%	24%	28%	26%
Strongly disagree	267	52	133	23	52	41	208	245	20	22	43	110	5	79	182	89	33	46	80	281
	36% <i>f</i>	32%	36%	30%	42%	36%	37%	37% <i>f</i>	27%	23%	33%	33%	20%	38%	35%	38%	39%	32%	39%	36%
Don't know	27	6	15	4	2	5	16	24	3	5	3	12	-	7	15	5	-	3	8	28
	4%	4%	4%	5%	2%	4%	3%	4%	4%	5%	2%	3%	-	4%	3%	2%	-	2%	4%	4%
Agree	129	36	61	14	18	28	86	105	24	34	31	71	7	33	90	44	19	35	35	141
	17%	22%	17%	18%	15%	24% <i>f</i>	15%	16%	33% <i>zg</i>	36% <i>zgj</i>	23% <i>g</i>	21%	24%	16%	17%	18%	22%	24%	17%	18%
Disagree	460	94	233	41	81	64	370	422	37	41	69	193	17	140	317	141	51	81	137	481
	62% <i>h</i>	59%	64%	52%	65%	56%	66%	64% <i>hij</i>	50%	43%	53%	57%	63%	67% <i>k</i>	61%	60%	60%	56%	67%	62%
Net agree	-330	-59	-172	-27	-63	-36	-284	-317	-13	-6	-38	-122	-11	-107	-227	-98	-32	-46	-102	-340
	-45%	-36%	-47%	-34%	-51%	-31%	-50%	-48%	-17%	-7%	-29%	-36%	-39%	-51%	-44%	-42%	-38%	-32%	-50%	-44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 783

Q37f. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Complying with ESOS has enhanced our reputation with clients/customers

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	781	480	30	269	781	86	154	85	134	112	215	378	168	189	424	153	781
Weighted total	742	450	27**	260	742	85*	146	83*	121	104*	204	358	157	180	402	142	781
Strongly agree	35	26	1	8	35	1	8	7	8	3	2	13	20	2	20	13	37
	5% <i>m</i>	6%	5%	3%	5%	1%	5%	8% <i>e</i>	6% <i>e</i>	3%	1%	4%	12% <i>zjk</i>	1%	5% <i>m</i>	9% <i>zm</i>	5%
Tend to agree	94	68	5	21	94	13	17	10	9	18	20	46	27	19	50	25	104
	13%	15% <i>c</i>	17%	8%	13%	15%	12%	12%	8%	17% <i>h</i>	10%	13%	17% <i>l</i>	10%	13%	17%	13%
Neither agree nor disagree	125	76	4	43	125	17	23	13	26	18	25	65	29	21	72	28	131
	17%	17%	15%	17%	17%	19%	16%	16%	21%	17%	12%	18%	19%	11%	18%	20% <i>m</i>	17%
Tend to disagree	193	126	2	65	193	24	43	27	23	24	59	104	23	50	114	25	200
	26% <i>o</i>	28%	6%	25%	26%	29%	30%	32% <i>h</i>	19%	23%	29% <i>l</i>	29% <i>l</i>	15%	28% <i>o</i>	28% <i>o</i>	17%	26%
Strongly disagree	267	134	16	115	267	27	47	25	53	37	93	114	52	84	130	46	281
	36% <i>a</i>	30%	57%	44% <i>z</i> <i>a</i>	36%	31%	32%	30%	44%	36%	45% <i>zkl</i>	32%	33%	47% <i>zno</i>	32%	32%	36%
Don't know	27	20	-	7	27	5	8	2	2	4	4	15	5	5	15	5	28
	4%	4%	-	3%	4%	5%	6%	2%	2%	4%	2%	4%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%
Agree	129	94	6	29	129	13	25	17	17	21	22	59	47	20	70	38	141
	17% <i>c</i>	21% <i>c</i>	22%	11%	17%	15%	17%	20%	14%	20%	11%	17%	30% <i>zjk</i>	11%	17%	27% <i>zmn</i>	18%
Disagree	460	260	17	181	460	51	90	51	76	61	152	218	76	134	245	71	481
	62% <i>o</i>	58%	62%	69% <i>z</i> <i>a</i>	62%	60%	62%	62%	63%	59%	74% <i>zkl</i>	61% <i>l</i>	48%	74% <i>zno</i>	61% <i>o</i>	50%	62%
Net agree	-330	-166	-11	-152	-330	-38	-65	-34	-59	-40	-130	-159	-29	-114	-175	-33	-340
	-45%	-37%	-40%	-58%	-45%	-44%	-45%	-42%	-49%	-38%	-64%	-44%	-18%	-63%	-43%	-23%	-44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 784

Q37f. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Complying with ESOS has enhanced our reputation with clients/customers

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)			
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)		
Unweighted total	781	9	5	178	11	8	42	62	42	26	27	47	25	59	20	-	31	34	18	137	-	781		
Weighted total	742	9**	5**	156	8**	5**	31*	74*	35*	32**	8**	25**	5**	63*	18**	39*	26**	**	30**	40*	25**	122	**	781
Strongly agree	35	1	-	7	-	-	-	3	1	-	2	5	1	3	4	-	-	1	2	5	-	37	-	37
	5%	12%	-	4%	-	-	-	4%	2%	-	9%	8%	5%	8%	15%	-	-	3%	9%	4%	-	5%	-	5%
Tend to agree	94	2	2	16	*	3	7	5	2	4	3	10	4	9	4	-	2	-	-	22	-	104	-	104
	13% q	21%	40%	10%	6%	55%	22% gq	6%	6%	11%	11%	16% q	19%	23% zcghq	16%	-	7%	-	-	18% gq	-	13%	-	13%
Neither agree nor disagree	125	2	1	21	1	-	8	16	7	6	3	14	3	5	2	-	4	3	3	25	-	131	-	131
	17%	17%	28%	14%	19%	8%	27% coq	22%	21%	18%	14%	22%	14%	13%	7%	-	14%	8%	12%	21%	-	17%	-	17%
Tend to disagree	193	1	1	41	4	-	5	22	11	5	3	16	7	11	1	-	9	14	12	29	-	200	-	200
	26%	10%	13%	26%	50%	-	18%	30%	32%	16%	14%	26%	39%	28%	6%	-	28%	35%	49%	24%	-	26%	-	26%
Strongly disagree	267	4	1	66	2	2	10	24	12	17	12	15	4	11	12	-	14	20	7	33	-	281	-	281
	36%	40%	19%	43% ks	25%	36%	33%	33%	34%	51%	47%	24%	22%	28%	48%	-	46%	51% kms	29%	27%	-	36%	-	36%
Don't know	27	-	-	5	-	-	-	4	2	1	2	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	8	-	28	-	28
	4%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	-	9%	-	-	4%	2%	-	6%	-	4%	-	4%
Agree	129	3	2	23	*	3	7	7	3	4	5	15	4	12	8	-	2	1	2	27	-	141	-	141
	17% q	33%	40%	14%	6%	55%	22% q	10%	9%	11%	20%	24% q	25%	32% zcghq	31%	-	7%	3%	9%	22% q	-	18%	-	18%
Disagree	460	5	2	108	6	2	16	46	23	15	31	11	22	14	14	-	22	34	19	62	-	481	-	481
	62% s	50%	32%	69% fks	76%	36%	51%	63%	66%	67%	61%	50%	61%	56%	53%	-	75%	86% zcfghkms	79%	51%	-	62%	-	62%
Net agree	-330	-2	-	-85	-6	1	-9	-39	-20	-18	-10	-16	-7	-10	-6	0	-20	-33	-17	-35	0	-340	-	-340
	-45%	-17%	8%	-55%	-70%	19%	-29%	-53%	-57%	-56%	-42%	-25%	-37%	-24%	-22%	0%	-67%	-83%	-70%	-29%	0%	-44%	-	-44%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 785

Q37a-f. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Summary

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency within the organisation overall	ESOS has increased the level of interest in the issue of energy efficiency at the Board-level within the organisation	The number of people working in the area of energy efficiency has increased within the organisation as a result of ESOS	Changes made as a result of ESOS have already led to net cost savings in the organisation	Staff productivity has increased as a result of energy saving measures recommended by ESOS being implemented	Complying with ESOS has enhanced our reputation with clients/ customers
Unweighted total	814	814	814	814	814	781
Weighted total	782	782	782	782	782	742
Strongly agree	88 11%	95 12%	43 6%	69 9%	13 2%	35 5%
Tend to agree	251 32%	236 30%	65 8%	142 18%	30 4%	94 13%
Neither agree nor disagree	133 17%	130 17%	75 10%	101 13%	127 16%	125 17%
Tend to disagree	152 19%	147 19%	216 28%	200 26%	227 29%	193 26%
Strongly disagree	147 19%	156 20%	370 47%	224 29%	353 45%	267 36%
Don't know	11 1%	19 2%	13 2%	46 6%	33 4%	27 4%
Agree	339 43%	330 42%	109 14%	211 27%	43 5%	129 17%
Disagree	299 38%	303 39%	586 75%	424 54%	580 74%	460 62%
Net agree	40 5%	27 3%	-477 -61%	-213 -27%	-538 -69%	-330 -45%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 786

Q38a. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing New more efficient boiler or burner since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	130	126	2	2	4	9	11	7	10	3	30	27	11	11	1	2	3	61	69	130
Weighted total	125	120	1**	4**	3**	9**	11**	7**	11**	2**	33**	23**	9**	11**	2**	1**	2**	64*	62*	130
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	9	9	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	4	1	-	2	-	-	-	2	6	10
	7%	7%	-	-	-	9%	-	11%	-	-	12%	4%	-	20%	-	-	-	4%	10%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	15	15	-	-	1	1	-	2	3	1	4	2	1	1	-	-	-	6	9	17
	12%	13%	-	-	18%	7%	-	31%	26%	26%	12%	8%	17%	10%	-	-	-	10%	14%	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	102	96	1	4	3	8	11	4	8	2	25	21	7	8	2	1	2	55	47	103
	81%	80%	100%	100%	82%	85%	100%	58%	74%	74%	75%	88%	83%	70%	100%	100%	100%	86%	76%	79%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 787

Q38a. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing New more efficient boiler or burner since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 130	15	115	15	41	28	34	6	5	53	10	35	3	15	24	68	98	32	130
Weighted total 125	13**	113	13**	43*	26**	33**	5**	4**	51*	10**	33*	3**	15**	25**	63*	97*	29**	130
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 9 7%	-	9	-	3	2	3	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	2	5	7	2	10
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 15 12%	3	12	1	5	4	3	2	1	4	2	5	-	1	3	12	10	5	17
This was not influenced by ESOS 102 81%	10	92	12	35	20	27	3	4	45	5	26	3	15	20	47	79	22	103
	75%	82%	91%	82%	77%	82%	55%	88%	88%	55%	79%	100%	96%	80%	74%	82%	77%	79%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 788

Q38a. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing New more efficient boiler or burner since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	130	19	78	18	12	15	101	116	10	24	25	58	8	44	102	43	10	24	23	130
Weighted total	125	16**	76*	18**	12**	16**	97*	110	12**	21**	22**	55*	8**	42*	99*	40*	9**	23**	21**	130
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	9	3	4	1	-	-	7	8	1	1	1	4	1	2	6	1	1	-	3	10
	7%	21%	6%	4%	-	-	7%	7%	7%	4%	3%	7%	15%	4%	6%	4%	9%	-	14%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	15	1	8	2	4	5	10	13	3	4	5	6	1	9	12	5	-	3	2	17
	12%	7%	11%	11%	29%	30%	11%	12%	23%	20%	21%	10%	15%	20%	12%	12%	-	14%	10%	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	102	11	63	15	9	11	80	89	9	16	17	45	5	32	81	33	8	20	16	103
	81%	71%	83%	85%	71%	70%	82%	81%	71%	76%	76%	83%	69%	75%	82%	84%	91%	86%	77%	79%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 789

Q38a. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing New more efficient boiler or burner since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	130	91	2	36	130	9	30	16	29	24	34	68	26	26	81	21	130
Weighted total	125	82*	2**	40*	125	9**	30**	16**	28**	23**	32**	66*	25**	25**	78*	20**	130
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	9 7%	9 11%	-	-	9 7%	2 23%	3 12%	-	*	-	3 10%	4 6%	1 5%	2 6%	7 9%	* 2%	10 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	15 12%	13 15%	-	3 7%	15 12%	2 20%	4 14%	-	5 18%	3 14%	4 14%	5 8%	6 23%	3 14%	8 10%	4 19%	17 13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	102 81%	61 74%	2 100%	37 93% ^a	102 81%	5 57%	22 74%	16 100%	22 80%	20 86%	25 77%	57 86%	18 72%	20 80%	63 81%	16 78%	103 79%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 790

Q38a. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

New more efficient boiler or burner

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing New more efficient boiler or burner since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	130	4	-	22	1	-	6	10	10	6	6	7	5	8	2	-	6	6	9	21	1	130
Weighted total	125	4**	**	19**	1**	**	4**	9**	9**	8**	5**	10**	6**	5**	3**	**	6**	6**	10**	17**	2**	130
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	9 7%	1 21%	-	-	-	-	1 29%	-	1 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 33%	-	10 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	15 12%	1 25%	-	-	-	-	1 14%	1 6%	1 16%	-	1 32%	-	1 18%	2 35%	2 60%	-	-	2 26%	1 12%	3 15%	-	17 13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	102 81%	2 54%	-	19 100%	1 100%	-	3 57%	9 94%	7 76%	8 100%	3 68%	10 100%	5 82%	3 65%	1 40%	-	6 100%	4 74%	9 88%	9 52%	2 100%	103 79%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 791

Q38b. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Building management system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	86	82	2	2	4	4	6	3	6	2	26	17	8	5	1	-	4	40	46	86
Weighted total	85*	79*	1**	4**	3**	5**	5**	3**	6**	1**	28**	14**	6**	6**	2**	**	5**	42*	43*	86*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3 4%	3 4%	-	-	-	1 17%	-	-	-	-	2 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	2 5%	3 3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	14 17%	14 18%	-	-	-	-	1 26%	2 71%	1 16%	1 100%	2 8%	3 20%	1 14%	3 44%	-	-	-	7 18%	7 16%	14 16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	67 80%	62 78%	1 100%	4 100%	3 100%	4 83%	4 74%	1 29%	5 84%	-	24 84%	11 80%	6 86%	3 56%	2 100%	-	5 100%	33 80%	34 79%	69 80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 792

Q38b. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Building management system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 86	13	73	12	27	17	18	5	6	33	5	25	3	12	14	43	60	26	86
Weighted total 85*	11**	73*	10**	30**	15**	18**	5**	6**	35**	5**	23**	3**	10**	16**	43*	61*	24**	86*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 3 4%	-	3	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	3	-	3
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 14 17%	1	13	1	7	2	3	1	1	3	3	6	1	2	2	8	10	4	14
This was not influenced by ESOS 67 80%	10	57	9	22	13	13	4	6	31	2	17	1	8	14	33	47	20	69
	90%	78%	88%	74%	87%	71%	87%	91%	90%	46%	73%	51%	83%	89%	77%	78%	83%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 793

Q38b. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Building management system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECS (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total 86	10	52	15	8	11	64	76	4	19	24	42	5	30	74	35	5	18	10	86
Weighted total 85*	8**	52*	16**	8**	10**	64*	73*	6**	18**	23**	41*	5**	28**	73*	35**	5**	18**	9**	86*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 3 4%	2	1	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	1	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	3
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 14 17%	1	8	5	1	1	11	14	-	4	6	7	3	4	14	4	2	4	-	14
This was not influenced by ESOS 67 80%	6	43	11	7	8	49	56	6	14	16	34	2	22	57	31	4	14	8	69
	68%	82%	71%	89%	85%	78%	76%	100%	80%	70%	83%	45%	78%	78%	88%	70%	77%	90%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 794

Q38b. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Building management system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	86	62	1	23	86	2	19	12	25	17	16	47	22	12	56	18	86
Weighted total	85*	57*	1**	27**	85*	2**	19**	13**	24**	17**	16**	47*	21**	13**	55*	17**	86*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3	3	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	2	-	3
	4%	5%	-	-	4%	69%	4%	-	-	-	5%	3%	4%	6%	4%	-	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	14	12	-	3	14	1	4	3	5	2	4	8	3	2	11	1	14
	17%	20%	-	10%	17%	31%	19%	24%	20%	13%	25%	16%	13%	17%	20%	6%	16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	67	42	1	25	67	-	14	10	19	15	11	38	18	10	41	16	69
	80%	74%	100%	90%	80%	-	76%	76%	80%	87%	70%	81%	83%	77%	76%	94%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 795

Q38b. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Building management system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Building management system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	86	3	-	14	-	-	2	3	2	6	6	5	5	5	2	-	6	5	7	14	1	86
Weighted total	85*	3**	-**	12**	-**	-**	1**	2**	2**	9**	5**	6**	6**	3**	3**	-**	5**	5**	7**	11**	2**	86*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3 4%	-	-	-	-	-	1 61%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 19%	-	3 3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	14 17%	3 77%	-	2 12%	-	-	-	-	-	1 32%	-	1 18%	2 63%	1 40%	-	-	-	2 50%	1 16%	1 7%	-	14 16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	67 80%	1 23%	-	11 88%	-	-	1 39%	2 100%	2 100%	9 100%	3 68%	6 100%	5 82%	1 37%	2 60%	-	5 100%	2 50%	6 84%	8 73%	2 100%	69 80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 796

Q38c. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	24	23	-	1	-	2	1	-	5	-	7	4	2	2	-	-	1	14	10	24
Weighted total	25**	23**	-**	2**	-**	2**	1**	-**	5**	-**	8**	4**	2**	3**	-**	-**	1**	16**	9**	24**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	4
This was not influenced by ESOS	22%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	59%	-	12%	41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	22%	17%
This was not influenced by ESOS	19	17	-	2	-	2	1	-	2	-	7	2	2	3	-	-	1	13	7	20
	78%	76%	-	100%	-	100%	100%	-	41%	-	88%	59%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	78%	78%	83%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 797

Q38c. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 24	2	22	2	8	4	8	1	1	12	-	3	1	4	5	12	15	9	24
Weighted total 25**	2**	23**	1**	11**	3**	8**	1**	1**	12**	**	3**	**	3**	6**	13**	17**	8**	24**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6 22%	2 82%	4 16%	-	4 37%	-	2 20%	-	3 26%	-	2 44%	-	1 29%	1 17%	4 26%	3 15%	3 35%	4 17%
This was not influenced by ESOS	19 78%	* 18%	19 84%	1 100%	7 63%	3 100%	6 80%	1 100%	9 74%	-	2 56%	* 100%	2 71%	5 83%	10 74%	14 85%	6 65%	20 83%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 798

Q38c. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	24	3	13	5	2	4	18	22	3	4	4	10	3	8	23	10	3	8	1	24
Weighted total	25**	3**	12**	6**	3**	4**	19**	22**	4**	5**	5**	10**	3**	8**	24**	11**	3**	9**	1**	24**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	-	2	1	3	2	2	4	2	2	2	3	-	2	6	2	-	4	-	4
	22%	-	13%	18%	100%	49%	11%	16%	46%	34%	32%	25%	-	24%	23%	13%	-	40%	-	17%
This was not influenced by ESOS	19	3	11	5	-	2	17	18	2	3	3	8	3	6	19	10	3	5	1	20
	78%	100%	87%	82%	-	51%	89%	84%	54%	66%	68%	75%	100%	76%	77%	87%	100%	60%	100%	83%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 799

Q38c. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	24	17	2	5	24	-	6	3	7	6	4	14	6	1	16	7	24
Weighted total	25**	17**	2**	6**	25**	-**	6**	4**	7**	6**	6**	14**	6**	2**	16**	6**	24**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	6	-	-	6	-	1	2	2	-	2	2	2	-	4	2	4
	22%	32%	-	-	22%	-	16%	36%	30%	-	36%	11%	34%	-	21%	32%	17%
This was not influenced by ESOS	19	12	2	6	19	-	5	3	5	6	4	12	4	2	13	4	20
	78%	68%	100%	100%	78%	-	84%	64%	70%	100%	64%	89%	66%	100%	79%	68%	83%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 800

Q38c. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Connect to existing district heating

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Connect to existing district heating since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	24	1	-	6	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	2	1	1	-	3	1	-	3	-	24
Weighted total	25**	2**	**	5**	**	**	**	2**	1**	**	1**	1**	3**	**	2**	**	3**	1**	**	3**	**	24**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	4
	22%	-	-	31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	35%	-	17%
This was not influenced by ESOS	19	2	-	3	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	3	*	-	-	3	-	-	2	-	20	
	78%	100%	-	69%	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	65%	-	83%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 801

Q38d. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	109	108	1	-	3	7	8	10	10	2	27	21	8	6	1	1	3	50	59	109
Weighted total	107*	106*	***	-.*	3**	6**	9**	11**	11**	1**	29**	16**	7**	6**	2**	1**	3**	50*	57*	109
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	8 8%	8 8%	-	-	-	2 26%	-	1 10%	1 7%	-	4 14%	1 5%	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	6 11%	9 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	14 13%	14 13%	-	-	-	-	2 27%	3 28%	1 9%	1 100%	1 3%	3 17%	1 12%	1 19%	-	1 100%	-	6 12%	8 15%	15 14%
This was not influenced by ESOS	84 79%	84 79%	*	-	3 100%	5 74%	7 73%	7 62%	9 84%	-	24 83%	13 78%	6 88%	5 81%	2 100%	-	3 100%	42 84%	42 74%	85 78%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 802

Q38d. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)		
Unweighted total	109	15	94	12	39	25	25	2	5	37	8	35	4	16	19	55	83	26	109
Weighted total	107*	14**	92*	10**	39*	23**	27**	2**	5**	37*	8**	34*	4**	16**	19**	53*	83*	24**	109
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	8	-	8	-	2	3	3	-	-	2	1	3	1	1	1	4	8	1	9
	8%	-	9%	-	6%	11%	13%	-	-	5%	15%	10%	28%	5%	4%	8%	9%	3%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	14	1	14	2	6	2	4	-	1	5	2	4	1	2	3	6	13	2	15
	13%	5%	15%	15%	16%	9%	14%	-	11%	12%	24%	13%	35%	10%	16%	11%	15%	7%	14%
This was not influenced by ESOS	84	14	70	9	30	18	20	2	4	31	5	27	1	14	15	43	63	21	85
	79%	95%	76%	85%	78%	79%	73%	100%	89%	83%	61%	78%	37%	85%	80%	81%	76%	90%	78%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 803

Q38d. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total 109	12	67	17	10	16	84	101	7	19	24	49	6	37	79	28	5	17	27	109
Weighted total 107*	10**	66*	17**	11**	16**	82*	97*	8**	19**	23**	48*	5**	37*	77*	28**	4**	16**	27**	109
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 8 8%	2	4	1	1	-	7	8	1	1	1	3	1	3	3	1	-	-	5	9
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 14 13%	-	10	3	1	2	11	14	1	4	6	8	1	5	12	2	-	4	2	15
This was not influenced by ESOS 84 79%	7	52	13	9	14	63	75	7	15	16	37	3	29	62	25	4	13	19	85
	78%	78%	76%	83%	90%	77%	77%	80%	77%	68%	77%	62%	80%	81%	90%	100%	77%	72%	78%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 804

Q38d. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 109	81	2	26	109	8	27	13	21	17	25	59	24	19	73	17	109
Weighted total 107*	76*	2**	29**	107*	8**	26**	13**	21**	17**	24**	59*	23**	18**	72*	16**	109
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 8 8%	8	-	-	8	1	4	-	-	-	3	3	2	2	5	1	9
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 14 13%	12	1	1	14	1	5	2	4	1	4	8	2	2	11	1	15
This was not influenced by ESOS 84 79%	55	1	28	84	5	16	11	17	17	17	48	19	14	56	15	85
	73%	52%	96%	79%	65%	63%	83%	81%	97%	71%	81%	83%	76%	77%	89%	78%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 805

Q38d. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	109	1	1	18	-	5	7	8	5	4	9	4	6	2	-	7	6	6	20	-	109
Weighted total	107*	1**	1**	17**	-**	4**	7**	7**	7**	3**	12**	4**	3**	3**	**	7**	6**	6**	17**	-**	109
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	8	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6	-	9
	8%	-	-	-	-	20%	-	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	33%	-	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	14	1	-	3	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	15
	13%	100%	-	18%	-	-	29%	10%	-	-	-	-	54%	40%	-	-	41%	-	11%	-	14%
This was not influenced by ESOS	84	-	1	14	-	3	5	5	7	3	12	4	1	2	-	7	3	6	10	-	85
	79%	-	100%	82%	-	80%	71%	78%	100%	100%	100%	100%	46%	60%	-	100%	42%	100%	56%	-	78%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 806

Q38e. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Plant replacement /upgrade since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	83	78	1	4	3	5	4	6	4	2	19	22	6	4	-	1	6	47	36	83
Weighted total	83*	76*	1**	7**	3**	6**	3**	6**	4**	2**	21**	19**	5**	3**	**	2**	8**	46*	37*	83*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3 3%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	1 12%	-	-	-	2 10%	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	1 3%	3 4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	18 22%	17 22%	-	2 23%	1 27%	1 19%	1 40%	-	-	2 100%	3 16%	4 19%	* 8%	1 18%	-	2 100%	4 47%	8 17%	11 29%	19 23%
This was not influenced by ESOS	62 75%	56 74%	1 100%	5 77%	2 73%	4 81%	2 60%	5 88%	4 100%	-	18 84%	13 71%	5 92%	3 82%	-	-	4 53%	37 80%	25 69%	61 73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 807

Q38e. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Plant replacement /upgrade since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 83	7	76	9	20	19	21	3	11	31	4	31	1	7	11	53	71	10	83
Weighted total 83*	7**	76*	8**	21**	19**	20**	3**	12**	34**	3**	29**	2**	8**	12**	49*	69*	11**	83*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 3	-	3	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	2	2	1	3
3%	-	3%	10%	-	9%	-	-	-	3%	23%	-	-	-	6%	4%	3%	7%	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 18	2	17	1	4	6	4	-	3	12	1	4	-	-	4	11	16	3	19
22%	23%	22%	12%	20%	30%	22%	-	26%	34%	22%	15%	-	-	32%	23%	23%	23%	23%
This was not influenced by ESOS 62	6	57	7	17	12	15	3	9	21	2	25	2	8	8	36	52	8	61
75%	77%	75%	78%	80%	61%	78%	100%	74%	63%	55%	85%	100%	100%	62%	73%	75%	70%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 808

Q38e. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Plant replacement /upgrade since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		
Unweighted total	83	15	44	10	14	18	59	72	11	13	18	30	3	36	62	32	10	22	19	83
Weighted total	83*	14**	46*	9**	14**	18**	58*	72*	10**	11**	18**	27**	2**	40*	61*	32**	9**	21**	18**	83*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3	-	1	1	1	-	3	3	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	3
	3%	-	2%	8%	7%	-	4%	4%	-	-	5%	3%	-	2%	3%	-	-	-	5%	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	18	1	14	2	1	5	13	16	2	1	4	3	*	13	16	7	1	9	3	19
	22%	9%	30%	22%	7%	29%	22%	23%	18%	9%	23%	12%	23%	32%	26%	22%	16%	42%	14%	23%
This was not influenced by ESOS	62	13	31	6	12	13	42	53	8	10	13	23	1	26	43	25	7	12	15	61
	75%	91%	68%	69%	86%	71%	73%	74%	82%	91%	72%	85%	77%	65%	71%	78%	84%	58%	81%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 809

Q38e. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Plant replacement /upgrade since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	83	56	-	27	83	6	14	7	18	20	22	43	18	17	53	13	83
Weighted total	83*	54*	-**	29**	83*	5**	13**	8**	19**	21**	22**	44*	17**	17**	53*	13**	83*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3	3	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	3	-	3
	3%	5%	-	-	3%	14%	-	-	-	5%	7%	2%	-	-	5%	-	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	18	15	-	3	18	-	3	2	5	1	2	13	4	2	15	2	19
	22%	28%	-	11%	22%	-	25%	28%	28%	6%	9%	29%	22%	11%	28%	14%	23%
This was not influenced by ESOS	62	37	-	25	62	5	10	6	14	18	18	31	13	15	36	12	61
	75%	67%	-	89%	75%	86%	75%	72%	72%	89%	84%	69%	78%	89%	67%	86%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 810

Q38e. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Plant replacement /upgrade

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Plant replacement /upgrade since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	83	1	1	26	-	1	3	7	4	3	-	6	3	6	1	-	4	1	1	14	1	83
Weighted total	83*	1**	1**	25**	-**	***	2**	8**	4**	4**	-**	8**	2**	5**	1**	-**	5**	1**	1**	12**	2**	83*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 13%	-	3 4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	18 22%	-	-	6 26%	-	1 100%	3 73%	3 35%	-	-	-	-	1 11%	1 100%	-	-	2 33%	-	-	4 35%	-	19 23%
This was not influenced by ESOS	62 75%	1 100%	1 100%	18 74%	-	-	1 27%	4 53%	4 100%	4 100%	-	8 100%	2 100%	4 89%	-	-	3 67%	1 100%	1 100%	6 52%	2 100%	61 73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 811

Q38f. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Control system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	75	72	-	3	3	3	3	5	4	1	16	20	6	4	-	1	7	43	32	75
Weighted total	75*	70*	-**	5**	3**	3**	3**	5**	4**	1**	19**	18**	5**	3**	-**	2**	8**	42*	33**	75*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	6	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	1	2	4	6
	8%	8%	-	-	27%	-	-	-	-	-	10%	5%	-	41%	-	-	12%	4%	12%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	13	11	-	2	-	1	1	1	-	1	3	4	*	-	-	2	1	4	9	14
	17%	16%	-	32%	-	38%	29%	19%	-	100%	14%	20%	8%	-	-	100%	11%	10%	26%	19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	57	53	-	3	2	2	2	4	4	-	15	13	5	2	-	-	6	36	21	55
	75%	76%	-	68%	73%	62%	71%	81%	100%	-	77%	75%	92%	59%	-	-	77%	86%	62%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 812

Q38f. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Control system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 75	8	67	8	18	15	19	4	11	25	2	30	1	8	9	46	64	9	75
Weighted total 75*	8**	67*	8**	18**	17**	18**	3**	12**	27**	2**	29**	2**	11**	10**	43*	62*	10**	75*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 6 8%	-	6	1	2	1	1	-	1	2	-	3	-	1	-	4	5	1	6
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 13 17%	1	12	-	3	3	3	1	2	6	1	3	-	-	1	9	11	2	14
This was not influenced by ESOS 57 75%	7	49	7	12	13	13	3	9	19	1	23	2	10	9	30	46	8	55
	91%	73%	89%	68%	76%	76%	79%	74%	70%	65%	79%	100%	87%	89%	70%	74%	76%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 813

Q38f. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Control system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	75	13	41	11	10	20	50	65	10	11	16	26	3	32	56	30	11	18	18	75
Weighted total	75*	12**	43*	10**	10**	19**	51*	66*	9**	10**	17**	25**	2**	36**	56*	30**	9**	17**	18**	75*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	6	-	5	1	-	3	3	4	2	-	1	-	-	3	4	2	-	-	2	6
	8%	-	12%	8%	-	17%	5%	6%	21%	-	5%	-	-	8%	7%	6%	-	-	10%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	13	1	10	2	-	4	8	12	2	3	3	4	1	7	12	4	1	5	1	14
	17%	6%	23%	24%	-	22%	16%	18%	17%	27%	21%	18%	61%	20%	22%	14%	16%	32%	4%	19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	57	12	29	7	10	11	40	50	6	7	12	20	1	26	40	24	8	11	15	55
	75%	94%	66%	68%	100%	60%	79%	76%	62%	73%	75%	82%	39%	71%	71%	80%	84%	68%	86%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 814

Q38f. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Control system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	75	53	-	22	75	4	11	5	17	19	20	40	15	15	49	11	75
Weighted total	75*	53*	-**	22**	75*	4**	11**	5**	17**	19**	20**	40*	15**	16**	48*	12**	75*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	6	3	-	2	6	-	2	-	1	-	2	2	2	-	5	1	6
	8%	7%	-	11%	8%	-	20%	-	6%	-	11%	4%	12%	-	10%	8%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	13	11	-	2	13	-	2	1	4	2	2	7	4	2	8	3	14
	17%	21%	-	7%	17%	-	15%	20%	27%	10%	9%	18%	26%	12%	17%	24%	19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	57	39	-	18	57	4	7	4	11	17	16	32	9	14	35	8	55
	75%	72%	-	83%	75%	100%	65%	80%	67%	90%	79%	78%	61%	88%	73%	68%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 815

Q38f. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Control system

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Control system since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	
Unweighted total	75	1	1	21	-	1	3	7	4	3	-	5	3	6	1	-	5	-	1	13	-	75
Weighted total	75*	1**	1**	20**	**	***	2**	8**	4**	4**	**	7**	2**	5**	1**	**	6**	**	1**	12**	**	75*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	6 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 39%	-	1 100%	-	-	-	-	1 100%	3 22%	-	6 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	13 17%	-	-	4 21%	-	*	1 43%	2 22%	-	1 26%	-	-	1 11%	-	-	-	2 25%	-	-	3 22%	-	14 19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	57 75%	1 100%	1 100%	16 79%	-	-	1 57%	7 78%	4 100%	3 74%	-	7 100%	1 61%	4 89%	-	-	5 75%	-	-	7 56%	-	55 73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 816

Q38g. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	41	38	-	3	2	5	1	6	2	-	8	7	4	1	-	-	4	26	15	41
Weighted total	43*	38*	-**	5**	2**	6**	1**	6**	2**	-**	9**	6**	4**	1**	-**	-**	5**	27**	15**	41*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	2%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	*	1	-	-	1	2	3	6
	10%	11%	-	-	48%	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	11%	100%	-	-	16%	6%	16%	15%
This was not influenced by ESOS	38	32	-	5	1	6	1	5	2	-	8	6	4	-	-	-	5	26	12	34
	88%	86%	-	100%	52%	100%	100%	84%	100%	-	83%	100%	89%	-	-	-	84%	94%	77%	83%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 817

Q38g. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 41	4	37	4	12	8	11	1	5	18	3	13	1	4	7	26	38	3	41
Weighted total 43*	4**	39*	4**	14**	8**	10**	1**	6**	20**	3**	14**	2**	5**	9**	25**	39*	3**	41*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 1 2%	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 4 10%	-	4	1	1	1	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	1	-	3	3	1	6
This was not influenced by ESOS 38 88%	4	34	3	12	8	9	1	5	18	2	12	2	4	9	20	35	3	34
	100%	87%	82%	86%	91%	91%	100%	86%	90%	81%	87%	100%	84%	100%	82%	89%	79%	83%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 818

Q38g. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	41	6	22	5	8	7	27	32	5	9	8	17	2	16	32	19	6	12	7	41
Weighted total	43*	6**	24**	5**	8**	8**	28**	34**	5**	8**	9**	17**	1**	18**	33**	19**	5**	12**	7**	41*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	21%	-	-	4%	3%	-	12%	-	-	-	5%	3%	-	20%	-	-	2%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	*	3	3	2	*	2	1	6
	10%	12%	9%	16%	7%	11%	9%	10%	15%	21%	17%	4%	37%	14%	10%	9%	9%	17%	14%	15%
This was not influenced by ESOS	38	5	22	3	7	7	24	30	4	5	7	16	1	15	28	18	4	10	6	34
	88%	88%	91%	64%	93%	89%	88%	88%	85%	67%	83%	96%	63%	81%	87%	91%	71%	83%	86%	83%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 819

Q38g. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	41	25	-	16	41	4	7	5	8	10	8	18	15	7	26	8	41
Weighted total	43*	25**	-**	18**	43*	4**	6**	6**	10**	11**	9**	21**	14**	7**	28**	8**	41*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
	2%	4%	-	-	2%	-	-	17%	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	12%	2%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	3	-	1	4	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	3	-	6
	10%	13%	-	5%	10%	13%	12%	-	-	7%	10%	10%	10%	12%	12%	-	15%
This was not influenced by ESOS	38	21	-	17	38	3	6	5	10	10	8	19	11	6	24	7	34
	88%	83%	-	95%	88%	87%	88%	83%	100%	93%	90%	90%	83%	88%	88%	88%	83%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 820

Q38g. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	41	1	1	11	-	1	4	4	1	-	3	1	3	1	-	1	-	-	7	1	41
Weighted total	43*	1**	1**	11**	**	1**	4**	4**	2**	**	4**	1**	3**	1**	**	1**	**	**	7**	2**	41*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	6
	10%	-	-	7%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	-	15%
This was not influenced by ESOS	38	1	1	9	-	-	4	4	2	-	4	-	3	1	-	1	-	-	5	2	34
	88%	100%	100%	84%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	-	75%	100%	83%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 821

Q38h. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Distribution improvements since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	45	43	2	-	2	5	1	2	4	-	11	8	2	7	1	-	2	23	22	45
Weighted total	41*	40*	1**	-**	2**	4**	1**	2**	4**	-**	11**	7**	1**	7**	1**	-**	2**	20**	21**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	3
	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	13%	52%	-	-	-	-	4%	13%	7%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	4	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	6
	10%	11%	-	-	45%	17%	-	-	18%	-	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	3%	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	33	32	1	-	1	3	1	2	3	-	7	6	1	7	1	-	2	16	17	36
	81%	80%	100%	-	55%	83%	100%	100%	82%	-	61%	87%	48%	100%	100%	-	100%	78%	84%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 822

Q38h. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Distribution improvements since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 45	9	36	3	17	8	13	-	4	20	1	12	2	8	9	18	35	10	45
Weighted total 41*	8**	33*	2**	18**	7**	11**	**	3**	19**	1**	11**	2**	8**	10**	15**	31*	10**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 4 9%	-	4	-	3	-	1	-	-	3	-	1	-	3	-	1	1	3	3
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 4 10%	1	3	-	1	-	2	-	1	1	-	2	-	1	-	2	3	1	6
This was not influenced by ESOS 33 81%	6	27	2	14	7	8	-	2	16	1	8	2	5	10	12	27	6	36
	83%	81%	100%	81%	100%	72%	-	59%	82%	100%	77%	100%	60%	100%	81%	87%	63%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 823

Q38h. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Distribution improvements since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	45	9	27	3	5	6	37	41	5	5	9	18	4	17	39	17	9	15	5	45
Weighted total	41*	7**	25**	3**	5**	6**	34*	37*	6**	4**	9**	16**	4**	15**	35*	15**	8**	13**	5**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4	2	2	-	-	-	4	4	3	1	1	2	-	2	2	-	1	1	2	3
	9%	22%	8%	-	-	-	11%	10%	45%	23%	10%	12%	-	10%	5%	-	11%	7%	37%	7%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	-	4	-	-	2	2	4	1	-	-	1	-	2	4	3	2	3	-	6
	10%	-	17%	-	-	30%	7%	10%	9%	-	-	8%	-	15%	12%	20%	23%	23%	-	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	33	6	18	3	5	4	27	29	3	3	8	13	4	11	29	12	5	9	3	36
	81%	78%	75%	100%	100%	70%	82%	80%	46%	77%	90%	80%	100%	75%	83%	80%	66%	70%	63%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 824

Q38h. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Distribution improvements since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	45	31	2	12	45	2	10	7	9	10	10	23	11	9	24	11	45
Weighted total	41*	26**	2**	13**	41*	2**	9**	8**	8**	8**	10**	21**	9**	8**	23**	9**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4	1	1	2	4	-	-	-	3	-	2	2	-	3	-	1	3
	9%	3%	47%	16%	9%	-	-	-	34%	-	20%	8%	-	32%	-	10%	7%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	3	-	1	4	-	-	-	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	6
	10%	11%	-	10%	10%	-	-	-	16%	23%	22%	3%	15%	27%	3%	15%	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	33	23	1	9	33	2	9	8	4	6	6	19	7	3	22	6	36
	81%	86%	53%	74%	81%	100%	100%	100%	50%	77%	59%	89%	85%	41%	97%	74%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 825

Q38h. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Distribution improvements

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Distribution improvements since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	45	1	-	7	-	-	4	3	3	2	-	1	2	3	3	-	5	2	1	8	-	45
Weighted total	41*	2**	-**	6**	-**	-**	3**	3**	3**	2**	-**	1**	2**	2**	4**	**	5**	2**	1**	6**	-**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3
	9%	-	-	-	-	-	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	7%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	10%	-	-	21%	-	-	-	-	30%	-	-	-	70%	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	33	2	-	5	-	-	2	3	3	2	-	1	2	1	-	4	2	1	6	-	36	
	81%	100%	-	79%	-	-	67%	100%	100%	70%	-	100%	100%	30%	23%	-	86%	100%	100%	100%	-	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 826

Q38i. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Point of use heaters since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	40	39	1	-	2	6	2	1	4	2	9	6	2	4	-	-	2	20	20	40
Weighted total	35*	35*	1**	-**	2**	5**	1**	**	4**	2**	9**	5**	1**	4**	**	**	2**	18**	18**	40*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	7%	7%	-	-	-	12%	-	-	15%	-	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	8%
This was not influenced by ESOS	2	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
	6%	6%	-	-	45%	-	57%	-	-	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	8%
This was not influenced by ESOS	31	30	1	-	1	4	1	*	3	1	8	5	1	4	-	-	2	18	13	34
	87%	87%	100%	-	55%	88%	43%	100%	85%	60%	86%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	74%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 827

Q38i. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Point of use heaters since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	40	3	37	2	13	8	14	-	3	15	2	9	1	5	3	25	30	10	40
Weighted total	35*	2**	33*	1**	13**	7**	12**	**	2**	16**	2**	7**	1**	5**	3**	21**	27**	9**	40*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2 7%	-	2 7%	-	-	1 8%	2 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 5%	2 9%	-	3 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	2 6%	-	2 6%	-	1 5%	-	1 7%	-	1 33%	-	-	-	-	1 12%	-	1 7%	1 3%	1 16%	3 8%
This was not influenced by ESOS	31 87%	2 100%	28 86%	1 100%	12 95%	7 92%	9 77%	-	1 67%	16 100%	2 100%	7 100%	1 100%	4 88%	3 100%	18 88%	24 88%	7 84%	34 85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 828

Q38i. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Point of use heaters since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	40	6	23	5	6	5	33	36	5	5	11	16	4	14	33	14	6	10	6	40
Weighted total	35*	6**	19**	5**	5**	4**	30**	32*	5**	4**	10**	14**	4**	12**	29*	11**	5**	9**	6**	40*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	2	1	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	3
	7%	34%	3%	-	-	-	8%	8%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	7%	5%	-	-	10%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	3
	6%	14%	7%	-	-	-	7%	6%	-	-	6%	14%	-	-	7%	-	-	16%	-	8%
This was not influenced by ESOS	31	3	18	5	5	4	26	28	5	4	10	12	4	12	25	11	5	8	5	34
	87%	52%	91%	100%	100%	100%	85%	86%	100%	100%	94%	81%	100%	100%	86%	95%	100%	84%	90%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/a/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 829

Q381. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Point of use heaters since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	40	29	1	10	40	5	5	5	9	9	9	22	7	9	23	7	40
Weighted total	35*	25**	1**	9**	35*	4**	5**	5**	9**	7**	9**	20**	5**	9**	20**	6**	40*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	2	-	1	2	2	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	2	-	3
	7%	8%	-	6%	7%	46%	-	-	7%	-	6%	10%	-	-	12%	-	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	2	2	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	3
	6%	8%	-	-	6%	15%	-	15%	-	10%	16%	-	13%	16%	3%	-	8%
This was not influenced by ESOS	31	21	1	9	31	2	5	4	8	6	7	18	5	7	17	6	34
	87%	84%	100%	94%	87%	40%	100%	85%	93%	90%	78%	90%	87%	84%	84%	100%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 830

Q38i. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Point of use heaters

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Point of use heaters since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Unweighted total	40	1	-	7	-	2	-	3	1	-	2	1	5	3	-	5	1	-	9	-	40
Weighted total	35*	2**	**	6**	**	2**	**	2**	1**	**	2**	1**	3**	4**	**	5**	1**	**	7**	**	40*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3
	7%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	-	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	6%	-	-	14%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%
This was not influenced by ESOS	31	2	-	4	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	1	2	4	-	5	1	-	6	-	34
	87%	100%	-	77%	-	100%	-	100%	-	-	100%	100%	80%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	75%	-	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 831

Q38]. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	241	232	5	4	8	19	11	17	13	5	52	49	24	18	4	4	14	120	119	241
Weighted total	227	215	3**	9**	6**	17**	9**	18**	13**	5**	54*	40*	21**	16**	5**	6**	13**	112	113	241
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	20 9%	19 9%	1 18%	-	1 16%	1 4%	-	1 6%	3 25%	-	9 16%	3 7%	-	3 16%	-	-	-	13 11%	7 6%	20 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	44 20%	44 20%	1 22%	-	-	4 24%	1 8%	4 21%	2 12%	2 33%	13 25%	6 16%	4 20%	3 19%	2 45%	3 42%	1 6%	19 17%	24 21%	52 22%
This was not influenced by ESOS	162 72%	152 71%	2 61%	9 100%	5 84%	12 72%	8 92%	13 73%	8 64%	4 67%	32 59%	31 77%	16 80%	10 65%	3 55%	4 58%	12 94%	80 71%	81 72%	169 70%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 832

Q38j. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 241	36	205	47	55	61	53	9	16	83	18	76	5	31	29	133	173	66	241
Weighted total 227	30*	196	45*	49*	62*	48*	7**	15**	79*	18**	75*	3**	31**	30**	124	162	62*	241
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 20 9%	4	16	5	3	5	6	-	1	6	4	8	-	2	1	16	14	4	20
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 44 20%	5	40	6	10	12	12	1	3	16	4	12	1	4	8	21	32	12	52
This was not influenced by ESOS 162 72%	22	140	34	35	45	30	6	12	58	10	55	3	25	20	87	116	46	169
	73%	71%	75%	72%	73%	63%	81%	76%	73%	56%	74%	78%	81%	69%	70%	71%	73%	70%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 833

Q38j. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	241	50	131	27	30	47	169	215	30	40	47	111	14	68	185	72	25	45	53	241
Weighted total	227	49*	119	27**	28**	42*	158	204	28**	34*	47*	106*	12**	61*	170	63*	22**	38*	54*	241
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	20	4	10	2	3	10	9	18	2	2	3	8	1	4	11	4	1	4	9	20
	9%	9%	9%	7%	12%	24% <i>zf</i>	6%	9%	7%	6%	6%	8%	10%	7%	7%	6%	5%	10%	16%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	44	12	26	2	4	14	27	39	10	6	11	26	3	8	32	15	4	6	12	52
	20%	25%	22%	9%	15%	34% <i>zf</i>	17%	19%	37%	19%	24%	24%	27%	13%	19%	24%	18%	16%	22%	22%
This was not influenced by ESOS	162	33	82	22	20	18	122	147	16	26	33	72	7	48	127	44	17	28	33	169
	72% <i>e</i>	66%	70%	84%	73%	42%	77% <i>e</i>	72%	56%	75%	71%	68%	62%	79%	74%	70%	77%	73%	62%	70%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 834

Q38]. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 241	167	9	64	241	28	66	32	42	29	61	125	51	55	137	45	241
Weighted total 227	157	9**	59*	227	24**	66*	29**	37*	27**	56*	118	47*	52*	129	40*	241
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 20 9%	15 9%	1 14%	4 7%	20 9%	5 20%	11 17% <i>h</i>	1 3%	1 2%	-	4 7%	11 9%	5 10%	4 7%	13 10%	4 10%	20 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 44 20%	38 24% <i>c</i>	-	6 10%	44 20%	5 19%	12 17%	6 20%	8 21%	4 15%	13 24%	22 19%	9 19%	15 28% <i>o</i>	26 21%	3 8%	52 22%
This was not influenced by ESOS 162 72%	104 66%	8 86%	49 83% <i>a</i>	162 72%	15 61%	44 66%	22 77%	29 76%	22 85%	38 69%	85 72%	33 71%	34 65%	90 70%	33 83%	169 70%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 835

Q38j. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	241	5	1	53	5	4	9	27	13	2	12	12	9	20	6	-	12	9	8	34	-	241
Weighted total	227	5**	1**	45*	4**	2**	6**	34**	11**	2**	11**	13**	7**	13**	7**	**	12**	9**	13**	32**	**	241
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	20 9%	-	-	5 11%	-	-	-	2 6%	-	-	1 7%	-	1 14%	1 7%	3 39%	-	-	1 9%	2 15%	5 16%	-	20 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	44 20%	1 19%	-	6 14%	2 41%	* 18%	3 52%	8 25%	-	-	4 33%	-	2 32%	7 51%	3 39%	-	2 14%	1 14%	-	5 17%	-	52 22%
This was not influenced by ESOS	162 72%	4 81%	1 100%	34 75%	2 59%	2 82%	3 48%	23 70%	11 100%	2 100%	7 60%	13 100%	4 54%	6 42%	2 22%	-	11 86%	7 76%	11 85%	21 67%	-	169 70%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 836

Q38k. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	151	147	3	1	7	11	8	14	8	3	28	35	14	12	1	2	5	80	70	151
Weighted total	138	135	2**	2**	5**	8**	6**	14**	9**	2**	29**	31**	13**	10**	1**	1**	4**	74*	63*	151
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	13	12	1	-	-	-	-	2	3	-	5	1	-	-	-	1	-	11	2	12
	9%	9%	36%	-	-	-	-	16%	30%	-	18%	3%	-	-	-	49%	-	14% <i>r</i>	3%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	24	24	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	*	7	8	1	3	1	-	-	8	14	28
	17%	17%	-	-	-	8%	12%	17%	-	23%	24%	25%	8%	25%	100%	-	-	11%	23%	19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	102	99	1	2	5	8	6	9	6	2	17	22	12	8	-	1	4	55	47	111
	74%	74%	64%	100%	100%	92%	88%	67%	70%	77%	58%	73%	92%	75%	-	51%	100%	74%	74%	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 837

Q38k. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 151	31	120	36	36	43	24	3	9	50	8	48	4	18	26	75	111	38	151
Weighted total 138	26**	112	31*	32*	42*	22**	2**	8**	45*	8**	45*	3**	18**	23**	70*	101*	35*	151
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 13 9%	2	11	3	2	2	5	-	1	7	1	4	-	-	2	9	11	2	12
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 24 17%	3	21	5	5	7	7	-	-	7	3	4	-	1	4	13	19	4	28
This was not influenced by ESOS 102 74%	21	80	24	25	33	11	2	7	31	3	38	3	17	18	48	72	29	111
	83%	72%	77%	77%	79%	48%	100%	85%	69%	44%	84%	100%	94%	75%	68%	71%	83%	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 838

Q38k. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	151	35	78	14	22	33	105	138	18	23	35	74	8	41	114	42	16	30	34	151
Weighted total	138	33*	70*	12**	23**	31**	94*	128	15**	21**	33*	68*	7**	37*	101	36*	15**	24**	34**	151
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	13	3	7	-	2	6	6	13	1	1	3	5	1	2	5	1	1	2	8	12
	9%	11%	10%	-	9%	20%	7%	10%	7%	3%	8%	8%	17%	4%	5%	2%	8%	8%	23%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	24	10	9	2	2	9	13	21	2	2	4	13	2	4	14	6	1	3	9	28
	17%	29% ^b	13%	21%	9%	28%	13%	17%	16%	7%	11%	19%	31%	10%	14%	15%	7%	14%	27%	19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	102	20	54	9	19	16	75	94	12	19	27	49	4	32	83	30	13	19	17	111
	74%	60%	77%	79%	82%	52%	80%	73%	77%	89%	81%	73%	53%	86%	82%	83%	85%	78%	50%	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 839

Q38k. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	151	101	7	42	151	15	45	22	26	12	33	82	30	32	89	26	151
Weighted total	138	90*	8**	38*	138	14**	43*	20**	24**	10**	31**	76*	25**	30**	82*	21**	151
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	13	8	1	4	13	3	5	4	-	-	3	7	2	3	8	2	12
	9%	8%	15%	11%	9%	22%	12%	18%	-	-	9%	10%	8%	9%	10%	9%	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	24	20	-	3	24	-	10	3	3	-	6	14	3	6	15	2	28
	17%	22%	-	9%	17%	-	22%	13%	11%	-	18%	18%	13%	19%	19%	9%	19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	102	63	7	30	102	11	28	14	21	10	23	55	20	22	59	18	111
	74%	69%	85%	80%	74%	78%	66%	69%	89%	100%	73%	72%	79%	72%	72%	82%	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 840

Q38k. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	151	5	1	40	4	-	7	13	7	1	4	6	5	12	2	-	8	5	5	26	-	151
Weighted total	138	5**	1**	35*	3**	**	5**	15**	6**	1**	3**	6**	3**	8**	3**	**	8**	5**	8**	23**	**	151
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	13	-	-	2	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	4	-	12
	9%	-	-	6%	24%	-	19%	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	70%	-	9%	-	-	16%	-	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	24	1	-	6	-	-	1	4	-	-	2	-	1	3	-	-	1	-	-	4	-	28
	17%	19%	-	17%	-	-	22%	29%	-	-	50%	-	37%	33%	-	-	14%	-	-	20%	-	19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	102	4	1	27	2	-	3	8	6	1	2	6	2	5	1	-	6	5	8	15	-	111
	74%	81%	100%	77%	76%	-	59%	53%	100%	100%	50%	100%	63%	67%	30%	-	78%	100%	100%	64%	-	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 841

Q381. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	291	281	5	5	12	24	17	22	19	9	55	60	24	21	4	5	16	151	137	291
Weighted total	278	264	3**	11**	8**	22**	14**	25**	22**	9**	59*	49*	21**	18**	5**	7**	15**	142	132	291
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	30	27	1	2	*	-	-	4	9	-	8	3	-	3	-	1	1	20	10	28
	11%	10%	19%	15%	6%	-	-	17%	39%	-	13%	6%	-	19%	-	19%	5%	14%	7%	10%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	51	51	-	-	-	5	2	3	3	2	17	7	5	3	1	1	2	26	25	57
	19%	19%	-	-	-	22%	12%	13%	14%	29%	29%	15%	22%	17%	24%	10%	16%	18%	19%	20%
This was not influenced by ESOS	197	185	2	9	7	17	13	18	10	6	34	39	17	11	4	5	12	96	97	206
	71%	70%	81%	85%	94%	78%	88%	70%	47%	71%	57%	79%j	78%	63%	76%	71%	79%	68%	74%	71%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 842

Q381. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 291	48	243	61	66	74	61	13	16	110	20	91	8	37	41	157	210	78	291
Weighted total 278	41*	237	59*	60*	75*	56*	12**	15**	108*	21**	87*	6**	38*	42*	147	201	74*	291
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 30 11%	2	27	5	3	8	11	2	1	15	3	8	-	1	4	23	24	4	28
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 51 19%	6	45	12	9	16	9	1	4	17	3	17	1	6	8	27	37	14	57
This was not influenced by ESOS 197 71%	32	165	42	48	51	36	9	10	75	15	63	5	31	29	98	139	55	206
	79%	69%	71%	81%	68%	64%	74%	65%	70%	72%	72%	87%	81%	70%	67%	69%	75%	71%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 843

Q381. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	291	61	157	30	39	52	209	261	34	46	55	139	13	73	223	94	31	57	66	291
Weighted total	278	61*	145	30**	36*	49*	198	251	32**	39*	53*	135	11**	66*	208	84*	27**	49*	69*	291
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	30	4	19	1	6	14	13	26	4	1	3	13	2	7	16	6	2	5	14	28
	11%	7%	13%	2%	18%	30% <i>z</i>	7%	10%	13%	3%	7%	9%	19%	11%	8%	7%	6%	10%	20% <i>no</i>	10%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	51	13	29	6	3	11	39	48	9	5	9	32	2	7	40	18	5	6	11	57
	19%	21%	20%	19%	9%	23%	20%	19%	29%	13%	17%	24% <i>m</i>	21%	10%	19%	22%	18%	12%	16%	20%
This was not influenced by ESOS	197	44	97	24	27	23	146	178	19	33	40	90	7	52	152	60	21	38	44	206
	71% <i>e</i>	72%	67%	79%	74%	47%	74% <i>e</i>	71%	59%	85%	77%	67%	60%	79%	73%	72%	76%	78%	64%	71%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/a/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 844

Q381. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 291	187	12	91	291	28	83	42	48	32	75	148	60	73	156	55	291
Weighted total 278	178	12**	86*	278	26**	82*	39*	43*	30**	70*	143	54*	70*	152	48*	291
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 30 11%	21	1	7	30	6	12	5	1	2	8	17	4	8	18	4	28
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 51 19% c	44	1	6	51	5	16	4	9	5	15	30	6	16	31	4	57
This was not influenced by ESOS 197 71%	112	10	73	197	15	54	29	32	23	47	96	45	46	103	40	206
	63%	81%	85%za	71%	58%	65%	76%	76%	78%	67%	67%	82%kl	66%	68%	84%mn	71%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 845

Q381. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	291	5	1	73	6	5	10	28	14	4	14	13	9	20	7	-	15	11	9	47	-	291
Weighted total	278	5**	1**	66*	4**	3**	6**	35**	12**	5**	13**	15**	7**	13**	9**	**	15**	10**	15**	44*	**	291
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	30	-	-	7	*	1	1	4	-	1	1	2	2	-	3	-	-	-	2	7	-	28
	11%	-	-	10%	10%	29%	9%	11%	-	21%	6%	11%	24%	-	33%	-	-	-	13%	16%	-	10%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	51	1	-	8	2	*	3	9	2	2	3	2	1	7	3	-	1	1	-	7	-	57
	19%	19%	-	12%	37%	13%	50%	27%	18%	38%	23%	11%	12%	51%	33%	-	7%	8%	-	17%	-	20%
This was not influenced by ESOS	197	4	1	52	2	2	3	22	10	2	9	12	4	6	3	-	14	10	13	29	-	206
	71%	81%	100%	78%	53%	58%	42%	62%	82%	41%	71%	79%	64%	49%	34%	-	93%	92%	87%	67%	-	71%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 846

Q38m. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	214	207	2	5	6	19	13	14	14	8	35	45	19	17	2	5	13	106	107	214
Weighted total	207	195	1**	11**	4**	17**	11**	16**	15**	8**	38*	38*	18**	15**	3**	7**	11**	102*	104*	214
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	21 10%	20 10%	-	2 15%	-	-	1 9%	2 12%	5 37%	-	6 15%	2 4%	-	4 23%	-	1 19%	-	17 16% <i>r</i>	5 5%	18 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	33 16%	33 17%	-	-	-	4 23%	1 7%	1 9%	1 9%	2 25%	12 31%	6 16%	3 18%	2 12%	-	1 10%	1 5%	11 11%	22 22% <i>q</i>	38 18%
This was not influenced by ESOS	152 74% <i>f</i>	142 73%	1 100%	9 85%	4 100%	13 77%	10 84%	13 78%	8 55%	6 75%	21 55%	30 80% <i>j</i>	15 82%	10 65%	3 100%	5 71%	11 95%	75 73%	76 74%	158 74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 847

Q38m. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 214	33	181	41	49	57	49	7	11	74	18	49	7	30	32	112	150	63	214
Weighted total 207	29*	178	40*	45*	59*	45*	6**	10**	74*	18**	70*	5**	31**	32**	106*	143	63*	214
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 21 10%	2	19	1	2	6	9	1	1	9	2	8	-	-	5	15	18	2	18
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 33 16%	2	31	7	5	10	6	-	4	9	2	11	1	4	5	16	23	11	38
This was not influenced by ESOS 152 74%	25	128	32	38	42	31	5	5	57	13	52	4	28	21	75	102	50	158
	85%	72%	80%	83%	72%	68%	77%	45%	77%	74%	73%	85%	88%	67%	70%	72%	79%	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 848

Q38m. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	214	47	117	22	25	38	152	191	24	32	39	105	10	63	159	64	23	43	53	214
Weighted total	207	47*	110	21**	24**	36*	144	186	23**	27**	39*	105*	9**	58*	151	57*	20**	38*	55*	214
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	21	2	15	1	4	9	11	20	-	-	2	10	3	4	8	1	2	3	13	18
	10%	5%	13%	3%	15%	25% <i>z</i>	7%	11%	-	-	6%	9%	30%	7%	6%	2%	11%	9%	24% <i>z</i>	8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	33	11	18	2	3	9	23	31	7	1	7	23	*	7	27	12	5	6	6	38
	16%	23%	16%	10%	11%	26%	16%	16%	32%	5%	19%	22%	5%	12%	18%	20%	25%	15%	11%	18%
This was not influenced by ESOS	152	34	78	19	18	18	110	135	15	26	30	72	6	47	115	44	13	29	36	158
	74% <i>e</i>	72%	71%	87%	73%	49%	78% <i>e</i>	73%	68%	95%	75%	69%	65%	81%	76%	78%	64%	76%	65%	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 849

Q38m. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 214	144	9	60	214	22	59	36	35	24	55	105	50	54	111	43	214
Weighted total 207	141	9**	55*	207	20**	62*	34*	31*	23**	51*	103*	48*	50*	110*	39*	214
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 21 10%	15	2	4	21	5	9	3	1	1	5	15	1	8	12	1	18
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 33 16%	28	-	5	33	5	11	5	5	3	12	17	4	11	19	2	38
This was not influenced by ESOS 152 74%	97	7	46	152	10	42	26	25	19	34	70	42	31	79	35	158
	69%	77%	84% ^a	74%	47%	68%	77%	81%	84%	67%	69%	88% ^{zjk}	62%	72%	91% ^{zmn}	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 850

Q38m. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	214	3	1	51	4	5	7	22	11	3	11	9	6	12	6	-	12	10	8	33	-	214
Weighted total	207	3**	1**	46*	3**	3**	5**	28**	9**	4**	9**	11**	4**	7**	8**	**	12**	9**	13**	31**	**	214
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	21 10%	-	-	6 13%	-	-	1 27%	4 14%	-	-	1 8%	2 15%	-	-	2 25%	-	-	-	2 15%	4 12%	-	18 8%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	33 16%	1 33%	-	4 9%	3 82%	* 13%	2 30%	6 20%	1 14%	-	3 32%	2 15%	1 19%	2 31%	3 37%	-	1 8%	1 10%	-	4 13%	-	38 18%
This was not influenced by ESOS	152 74%	2 67%	1 100%	36 77%	1 18%	3 87%	2 43%	18 66%	8 86%	4 100%	6 60%	8 71%	4 81%	5 69%	3 38%	-	11 92%	8 90%	11 85%	23 75%	-	158 74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 851

Q38n. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	199	194	2	3	8	20	16	16	12	7	23	43	19	15	4	5	8	99	99	199
Weighted total	185	178	1**	7**	5**	18**	13**	17**	13**	6**	23**	36*	18**	14**	5**	7**	8**	92*	92*	199
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	21	21	-	-	*	3	1	2	5	-	1	4	-	3	-	1	-	11	10	21
	11%	12%	-	-	9%	18%	8%	13%	40%	-	4%	11%	-	21%	-	19%	-	12%	11%	11%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	25	25	-	-	-	2	1	3	2	2	7	2	2	2	1	1	-	9	16	29
	14%	14%	-	-	-	13%	6%	19%	16%	36%	30%	6%	13%	11%	24%	10%	-	10%	18%	15%
This was not influenced by ESOS	139	131	1	7	4	12	11	11	6	4	15	29	15	10	4	5	8	71	66	149
	75%	74%	100%	100%	91%	69%	86%	68%	43%	64%	66%	83%	87%	69%	76%	71%	100%	78%	72%	75%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 852

Q38n. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 199	34	165	36	51	55	40	7	10	90	12	44	6	26	30	108	150	48	199
Weighted total 185	28*	157	35**	45*	57*	34*	6**	9**	86*	10**	39*	4**	28**	28**	101*	140	44*	199
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 21 11%	2	19	1	6	8	5	-	1	12	1	3	-	1	4	14	18	2	21
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 25 14%	2	23	4	7	6	6	-	2	10	1	6	-	2	4	13	19	7	29
This was not influenced by ESOS 139 75%	23	116	29	32	43	22	6	6	64	9	31	4	24	20	74	103	36	149
	83%	74%	84%	72%	75%	67%	100%	67%	74%	83%	78%	100%	87%	72%	73%	74%	81%	75%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 853

Q38n. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		(s)
Unweighted total	199	41	118	18	21	41	134	175	27	33	42	103	9	49	161	70	21	46	36	199
Weighted total	185	39*	108	17**	20**	39*	123	164	27**	27**	40*	98*	8**	44*	151	60*	17**	40*	32*	199
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	21	4	13	1	4	10	10	20	4	*	7	10	-	6	15	5	3	6	6	21
	11%	9%	12%	3%	19%	26%zf	8%	12%	13%	2%	17%	10%	-	15%	10%	9%	15%	14%	18%	11%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	25	9	13	3	*	10	14	23	6	1	5	15	2	6	20	10	2	4	5	29
	14%	22%	12%	16%	2%	26%f	11%	14%	21%	5%	13%	15%	28%	13%	13%	17%	13%	10%	16%	15%
This was not influenced by ESOS	139	27	82	14	16	18	100	122	17	25	28	73	6	32	116	44	12	30	21	149
	75%e	68%	75%	80%	79%	48%	81%e	74%	66%	93%	70%	75%	72%	72%	77%	74%	71%	75%	65%	75%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 854

Q38n. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 199	123	11	64	199	14	58	34	40	24	43	108	45	41	113	42	199
Weighted total 185	113	11**	59*	185	14**	58*	31*	34*	22**	38*	103*	42*	37*	106*	39*	199
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 21 11%	15	2	4	21	2	8	5	3	1	3	15	4	4	14	3	21
	13%	20%	7%	11%	17%	15%	16%	9%	4%	7%	14%	9%	10%	14%	7%	11%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 25 14%	21	-	4	25	3	10	2	4	2	9	13	4	8	15	3	29
	19% ^c	-	7%	14%	21%	17%	7%	13%	9%	23%	12%	10%	22%	14%	7%	15%
This was not influenced by ESOS 139 75%	77	9	51	139	9	39	24	27	19	26	75	34	25	77	33	149
	68%	80%	87% ^d	75%	62%	68%	77%	78%	87%	70%	73%	82%	68%	73%	85%	75%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 855

Q38n. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replace external lighting with LED

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replace external lighting with LED since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	199	4	1	61	4	5	6	20	17	4	7	2	5	10	3	-	14	8	6	22	-	199
Weighted total	185	4**	1**	56*	3**	3**	4**	23**	15**	5**	6**	2**	4**	6**	4**	**	14**	8**	9**	20**	**	199
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	21	-	-	8	-	-	1	4	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	21
	11%	-	-	14%	15%	-	32%	16%	5%	21%	11%	-	23%	-	-	-	7%	-	23%	8%	-	11%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	25	1	-	4	1	1	1	4	2	-	1	-	1	2	2	-	1	1	-	3	-	29
	14%	22%	-	8%	26%	37%	19%	17%	15%	-	22%	-	21%	35%	56%	-	8%	11%	-	15%	-	15%
This was not influenced by ESOS	139	3	1	44	2	2	2	15	12	4	4	2	2	4	2	-	12	7	7	16	-	149
	75%	78%	100%	78%	59%	63%	50%	67%	80%	79%	67%	100%	55%	65%	44%	-	86%	89%	77%	78%	-	75%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 856

Q380. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing PC power management since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	89	86	2	1	2	8	5	5	4	3	27	17	3	7	-	2	6	47	40	89
Weighted total	86*	83*	1**	2**	1**	8**	4**	7**	5**	2**	29**	13**	4**	7**	**	2**	6**	44*	40*	89*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	5 5%	4 5%	1 52%	-	-	-	1 23%	-	1 17%	-	2 7%	-	-	1 16%	-	-	-	3 8%	1 3%	5 6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	8 10%	8 10%	-	-	-	3 32%	-	-	-	-	3 10%	1 9%	-	1 8%	-	-	1 21%	4 9%	5 12%	9 10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	73 85%	70 85%	* 48%	2 100%	1 100%	6 68%	3 77%	7 100%	4 83%	2 100%	24 83%	12 91%	4 100%	5 76%	-	2 100%	4 79%	37 84%	34 85%	75 84%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 857

Q38o. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing PC power management since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 89	16	73	19	15	23	22	6	4	29	10	34	2	9	14	47	63	26	89
Weighted total 86*	16**	70*	16**	16**	25**	20**	5**	3**	28**	11**	35**	2**	9**	16**	40*	60*	26**	89*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 5 5%	3	2	-	3	1	1	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	1	1	2	3	5
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 8 10%	2	7	5	1	2	1	-	-	1	4	2	1	2	-	3	6	2	9
This was not influenced by ESOS 73 85%	12	61	11	12	22	19	5	3	26	7	30	1	7	15	37	52	21	75
	72%	88%	70%	79%	88%	92%	100%	100%	91%	65%	86%	50%	77%	95%	91%	86%	81%	84%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 858

Q38o. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing PC power management since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	89	19	50	8	12	10	69	74	18	19	21	43	7	22	56	26	8	13	30	89
Weighted total	86*	22**	45*	8**	12**	8**	68*	71*	17**	17**	20**	40*	5**	23**	51*	24**	9**	14**	31**	89*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	5	1	4	-	-	-	4	4	1	2	-	2	-	2	3	1	3	3	2	5
	5%	2%	9%	-	-	-	6%	5%	3%	13%	-	5%	-	10%	6%	4%	33%	21%	6%	6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	8	4	3	-	2	2	7	8	1	1	2	5	-	2	2	1	1	1	6	9
	10%	17%	6%	-	18%	22%	10%	12%	5%	3%	9%	12%	-	8%	5%	5%	13%	8%	19%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	73	18	38	8	9	6	57	59	16	14	18	33	5	19	45	22	5	10	23	75
	85%	81%	85%	100%	82%	78%	84%	83%	92%	84%	91%	83%	100%	83%	89%	91%	54%	71%	75%	84%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 859

Q380. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing PC power management since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	89	61	1	26	89	11	29	7	12	8	26	41	20	22	51	15	89
Weighted total	86*	57*	1**	26**	86*	11**	26**	8**	13**	6**	26**	36*	21**	22**	46*	16**	89*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	5	4	-	1	5	-	5	-	-	-	1	1	3	-	4	1	5
	5%	7%	-	2%	5%	-	18%	-	-	-	2%	4%	13%	-	8%	5%	6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	8	4	-	2	8	1	5	-	1	-	2	3	1	1	4	1	9
	10%	8%	-	8%	10%	9%	21%	-	9%	-	8%	9%	4%	6%	9%	6%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	73	49	1	23	73	10	16	8	12	6	23	31	18	21	38	14	75
	85%	85%	100%	90%	85%	91%	61%	100%	91%	100%	90%	87%	82%	94%	83%	89%	84%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 860

Q380. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

PC power management

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing PC power management since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	89	1	-	16	2	2	6	-	3	4	5	6	3	9	7	-	3	3	-	19	-	89
Weighted total	86*	1**	-**	13**	1**	1**	4**	-**	2**	6**	4**	8**	2**	6**	10**	-**	3**	3**	-**	19**	10**	89*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	5
	5%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	-	6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	8	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	9
	10%	-	-	-	-	-	20%	-	-	-	21%	14%	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	27%	-	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	73	1	-	12	1	1	3	-	2	6	3	5	2	6	10	-	3	3	-	12	-	75
	85%	100%	-	94%	100%	100%	80%	-	100%	100%	79%	62%	100%	93%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	63%	-	84%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 861

Q38p. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	122	115	4	3	5	11	4	7	6	4	35	18	9	7	-	5	8	67	53	122
Weighted total	119	110	2**	7**	3**	10**	3**	7**	8**	3**	38**	14**	8**	5**	**	7**	8**	64*	53*	122
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	5 4%	4 4%	1 23%	-	1 25%	-	-	-	1 10%	-	2 5%	-	1 9%	1 10%	-	-	-	3 4%	2 4%	5 4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6 5%	6 5%	-	-	-	2 25%	-	-	-	-	3 7%	-	-	1 10%	-	-	-	2 3%	4 8%	6 5%
This was not influenced by ESOS	109 91%	99 91%	2 77%	7 100%	3 75%	7 75%	3 100%	7 100%	7 90%	3 100%	33 87%	14 100%	7 91%	4 79%	-	7 100%	8 100%	60 93%	47 88%	111 91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 862

Q38p. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees							Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	122	27	95	28	23	29	29	6	7	45	13	45	5	15	16	65	88	34	122
Weighted total	119	26**	93*	31**	19**	31**	25**	6**	7**	44*	13**	46*	5**	16**	18**	61*	83*	36**	122
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	5	2	3	1	3	1	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	1	1	1	2	3	5
	4%	8%	3%	3%	14%	3%	2%	-	-	5%	-	4%	-	4%	5%	1%	3%	7%	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	2	3	4	1	1	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	2	-	2	5	1	6
	5%	9%	4%	14%	3%	3%	-	-	-	3%	29%	-	-	14%	-	3%	6%	3%	5%
This was not influenced by ESOS	109	22	87	26	16	29	25	6	7	40	9	44	5	13	17	58	76	32	111
	91%	83%	93%	83%	83%	94%	98%	100%	100%	91%	71%	96%	100%	82%	95%	96%	92%	90%	91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 863

Q38p. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	122	28	68	8	18	15	91	105	17	24	27	63	5	30	87	40	12	23	32	122
Weighted total	119	32**	64*	7**	17**	14**	88*	102*	19**	21**	25**	58*	5**	28**	82*	36*	13**	22**	33**	122
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	5	1	4	-	-	1	4	5	-	2	-	2	-	3	4	-	2	2	1	5
	4%	2%	7%	-	-	6%	5%	5%	-	11%	-	3%	-	10%	4%	-	16%	9%	4%	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	3	2	-	1	1	5	6	-	1	1	3	-	1	1	-	-	1	5	6
	5%	9%	3%	-	6%	4%	6%	6%	-	3%	3%	5%	-	3%	2%	-	-	3%	14%	5%
This was not influenced by ESOS	109	28	58	7	16	12	79	91	19	18	24	52	5	25	77	36	11	20	27	111
	91%	89%	90%	100%	94%	90%	89%	90%	100%	87%	97%	91%	100%	87%	94%	100%	84%	88%	82%	91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 864

Q38p. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		(p)
Unweighted total	122	82	3	36	122	15	36	10	18	11	31	63	26	33	66	21	122
Weighted total	119	82*	2**	33*	119	14**	35**	11**	17**	11**	28**	61*	28**	30**	63*	23**	122
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	5 4%	5 6%	-	-	5 4%	-	3 10%	-	1 4%	-	1 2%	2 4%	2 7%	1 2%	4 7%	-	5 4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6 5%	2 3%	-	2 5%	6 5%	1 7%	4 12%	-	-	-	1 3%	1 2%	2 6%	1 3%	1 2%	2 7%	6 5%
This was not influenced by ESOS	109 91%	75 91%	2 100%	32 95%	109 91%	13 93%	27 78%	11 100%	16 96%	11 100%	26 95%	58 94%	24 87%	29 95%	58 91%	21 93%	111 91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 865

Q38p. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Upgrade to more efficient screens

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Upgrade to more efficient screens since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	122	-	-	26	2	2	7	4	4	5	5	12	3	12	6	-	6	3	2	23	-	122
Weighted total	119	**	**	22**	1**	1**	5**	7**	3**	7**	4**	16**	2**	8**	7**	**	7**	3**	3**	23**	**	122
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	5
	4%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	10%	-	-	6%	-	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	6
	5%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	-	5%
This was not influenced by ESOS	109	-	-	20	1	1	5	7	3	7	3	14	2	8	7	-	6	3	3	18	-	111
	91%	-	-	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	76%	87%	100%	100%	100%	-	90%	100%	100%	76%	-	91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 866

Q38q. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	111	104	4	3	2	8	4	6	6	4	37	17	6	6	1	5	6	55	53	111
Weighted total	109*	99*	2**	7**	1**	8**	3**	6**	8**	3**	37*	13**	6**	6**	1**	8**	6**	54*	52*	111
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	3
	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	7%	-	9%	-	-	-	4%	3%	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	7	7	-	-	-	1	-	1	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	7
	7%	7%	-	-	-	10%	-	16%	35%	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	7%	6%
This was not influenced by ESOS	98	89	2	7	1	7	3	5	5	3	32	12	6	5	1	8	6	49	47	101
	90%	89%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	84%	65%	100%	86%	93%	100%	91%	100%	100%	100%	91%	90%	91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 867

Q38q. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 111	24	87	23	22	26	27	6	7	41	13	39	2	19	18	56	78	33	111
Weighted total 109*	24**	85*	24**	20**	27**	25**	6**	7**	41*	12**	40*	2**	20**	18**	53*	75*	34**	111
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 3 3%	2	1	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	2	3
	8%	2%	-	13%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	7%	-	-	2%	6%	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 7 7%	4	4	4	1	2	1	-	-	4	2	-	1	4	2	1	6	2	7
	15%	4%	15%	5%	6%	5%	-	-	11%	14%	-	50%	18%	11%	2%	7%	5%	6%
This was not influenced by ESOS 98 90%	19	80	21	17	26	23	6	7	37	11	38	1	15	16	52	68	30	101
	77%	94%	85%	83%	94%	91%	100%	100%	89%	86%	95%	50%	75%	89%	98%	91%	89%	91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 868

Q38q. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	111	27	55	8	21	9	86	96	17	18	23	59	6	26	77	33	8	15	31	111
Weighted total	109*	28**	53*	7**	21**	9**	81*	93*	18**	15**	19**	54*	5**	27**	73*	30**	9**	16**	32**	111
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3	-	3	1	-	1	3	3	-	1	1	3	-	-	3	-	2	2	-	3
	3%	-	5%	12%	-	6%	4%	4%	-	3%	5%	6%	-	-	5%	-	23%	12%	-	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	7	1	6	-	1	-	7	7	2	3	3	2	-	2	4	1	-	-	3	7
	7%	3%	11%	-	4%	-	9%	8%	11%	19%	15%	4%	-	9%	5%	4%	-	-	11%	6%
This was not influenced by ESOS	98	27	45	6	20	8	71	82	16	12	16	48	5	25	65	29	7	14	29	101
	90%	97%	85%	88%	96%	94%	87%	88%	89%	78%	81%	90%	100%	91%	90%	96%	77%	88%	89%	91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 869

Q38q. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	111	74	4	33	111	17	32	10	15	10	34	53	22	32	62	16	111
Weighted total	109*	75*	3**	31**	109*	16**	30**	11**	14**	8**	32**	51*	24**	29**	61*	18**	111
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3	3	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	1	1	2	1	3	-	3
	3%	5%	-	-	3%	-	8%	-	-	-	3%	1%	8%	3%	4%	-	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	7	4	-	3	7	2	2	-	1	-	1	5	1	1	5	1	7
	7%	6%	-	10%	7%	11%	5%	-	9%	-	3%	10%	5%	3%	9%	5%	6%
This was not influenced by ESOS	98	68	3	28	98	14	26	11	13	8	30	46	21	28	53	17	101
	90%	90%	100%	90%	90%	89%	86%	100%	91%	100%	94%	89%	87%	94%	87%	95%	91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 870

Q38q. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Energy efficient file storage or server replacement

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Energy efficient file storage or server replacement since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)	(r)	(s)	(t)		
Unweighted total	111	-	-	19	1	2	7	6	5	4	3	10	3	14	5	-	5	4	2	21	-	111
Weighted total	109*	**	**	16**	1**	1**	4**	9**	4**	5**	2**	13**	2**	9**	7**	**	6**	5**	3**	20**	**	111
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3
	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	4	-	7
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	27%	-	21%	-	6%
This was not influenced by ESOS	98	-	-	16	1	1	4	9	4	4	2	11	2	8	7	-	6	3	3	15	-	101
	90%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	85%	63%	91%	100%	-	100%	73%	100%	76%	-	91%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 871

Q38r. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Wall insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	39	37	2	-	2	9	-	1	1	1	8	5	4	2	1	1	2	16	23	39	
Weighted total	36*	35*	1**	-.*	2**	8**	-.*	***	2**	1**	6**	5**	4**	3**	1**	2**	2**	16**	21**	39*	
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	*	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	3	5	5
	10%	10%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	8%	-	21%	-	100%	-	46%	5%	14%	13%	13%	
This was not influenced by ESOS	32	30	1	-	2	7	-	*	2	1	5	4	3	3	-	2	1	15	17	33	
	88%	87%	100%	-	100%	91%	-	100%	100%	100%	92%	83%	79%	100%	-	100%	54%	95%	82%	85%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 872

Q38r. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Wall insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 39	9	30	6	9	11	9	1	3	23	2	7	1	5	9	20	33	5	39
Weighted total 36*	8**	29**	5**	8**	12**	9**	1**	2**	20**	2**	7**	1**	5**	10**	17**	30**	5**	39*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 1 2%	-	1 3%	-	1 11%	-	-	-	-	1 4%	-	-	-	-	1 9%	-	1 3%	-	1 3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 4 10%	3 42%	* 2%	2 48%	1 11%	* 4%	-	-	-	3 14%	-	1 12%	-	-	2 17%	1 7%	3 10%	* 10%	5 13%
This was not influenced by ESOS 32 88%	4 58%	27 95%	3 52%	6 78%	11 96%	9 100%	1 100%	2 100%	17 82%	2 100%	6 88%	1 100%	5 100%	8 74%	16 93%	26 87%	4 90%	33 85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 873

Q38r. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Wall insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	39	9	14	6	10	6	28	35	3	5	10	17	1	14	30	15	6	9	8	39
Weighted total	36*	9**	12**	6**	9**	5**	27**	32*	4**	4**	8**	16**	1**	13**	29**	14**	4**	6**	7**	39*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	-	-	-	9%	-	3%	3%	-	-	11%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	2	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	1	1	3	-	1	4	1	2	2	-	5
	10%	18%	17%	-	-	-	9%	7%	-	29%	11%	18%	-	6%	13%	9%	46%	31%	-	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	32	7	10	6	9	5	24	29	4	3	7	12	1	12	25	12	2	4	6	33
	88%	82%	83%	100%	91%	100%	88%	90%	100%	71%	78%	76%	100%	94%	87%	91%	54%	69%	87%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 874

Q38r. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Wall insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 39	24	2	13	39	2	5	4	10	10	10	19	9	10	22	6	39
Weighted total 36*	20**	1**	15**	36*	2**	5**	3**	10**	8**	10**	16**	9**	8**	22**	6**	39*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 1 2%	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	-	-	6%	2%	-	16%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	4%	-	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 4 10%	3	-	1	4	-	-	-	1	2	-	2	2	-	2	2	5
	14%	-	5%	10%	-	-	-	7%	28%	-	13%	16%	-	10%	27%	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS 32 88%	17	1	13	32	2	5	3	9	6	10	13	8	8	19	4	33
	86%	100%	89%	88%	100%	84%	100%	93%	72%	100%	82%	84%	100%	86%	73%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 875

Q38r. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Wall insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Wall insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	39	-	-	7	1	-	2	4	3	1	-	2	3	2	1	-	5	1	1	6	-	39
Weighted total	36*	**	**	6**	1**	**	1**	6**	3**	1**	**	2**	2**	1**	2**	**	4**	1**	2**	6**	**	39*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%	-	-	-	-	3%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5
	10%	-	-	26%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	32	-	-	4	-	-	1	6	3	1	-	2	1	1	2	-	2	1	2	6	-	33
	88%	-	-	74%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	72%	100%	100%	-	57%	100%	100%	100%	-	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 876

Q38s. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	46	44	2	-	3	8	1	3	3	-	8	4	5	3	1	2	3	18	28	46
Weighted total	43*	42*	1**	-**	2**	7**	1**	2**	4**	-**	6**	4**	5**	5**	1**	3**	3**	18**	25**	46*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 4%	1 2%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4 9%	4 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 22%	-	1 19%	-	1 100%	-	1 32%	1 5%	3 12%	5 11%	
This was not influenced by ESOS	38 89%	37 89%	1 100%	-	2 100%	7 100%	1 100%	1 56%	4 100%	-	4 78%	4 100%	4 81%	5 100%	-	3 100%	2 68%	17 95%	21 84%	40 87%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 877

Q38s. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	46	7	39	7	7	14	14	1	3	23	2	9	3	5	10	22	40	5	46
Weighted total	43*	6**	37*	5**	6**	16**	12**	1**	2**	20**	2**	10**	2**	5**	12**	19**	37*	5**	46*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
	2%	-	3%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	11%	48%	-	-	-	3%	-	2%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	2	1	2	1	*	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	2	1	3	*	5
	9%	40%	3%	44%	14%	3%	-	-	-	15%	-	8%	-	-	15%	7%	9%	9%	11%
This was not influenced by ESOS	38	4	35	3	5	15	12	1	2	17	2	8	1	5	10	18	32	5	40
	89%	60%	94%	56%	86%	91%	100%	100%	100%	85%	100%	81%	52%	100%	85%	93%	88%	91%	87%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 878

Q38s. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	46	8	16	8	13	9	33	42	4	5	10	22	2	16	34	19	6	8	11	46
Weighted total	43*	7**	15**	7**	13**	9**	30**	39*	5**	4**	8**	22**	1**	16**	32**	17**	4**	6**	10**	46*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	2%	-	-	14%	-	-	3%	3%	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	2%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	2	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	1	1	3	-	1	3	1	2	1	1	5
	9%	22%	15%	-	-	-	8%	6%	-	29%	11%	14%	-	5%	9%	8%	46%	22%	8%	11%
This was not influenced by ESOS	38	6	13	6	13	9	27	36	5	3	7	18	1	15	29	16	2	4	9	40
	89%	78%	85%	86%	100%	100%	88%	91%	100%	71%	89%	81%	100%	95%	91%	92%	54%	78%	82%	87%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 879

Q38s. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	46	31	2	13	46	2	6	8	11	10	12	23	11	12	26	8	46
Weighted total	43*	28**	1**	14**	43*	2**	7**	7**	11**	8**	12**	20**	12**	10**	25**	7**	46*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
	2%	4%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	14%	2%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4	4	-	-	4	-	1	-	1	2	-	3	1	-	3	1	5
	9%	14%	-	-	9%	-	11%	-	7%	28%	-	15%	7%	-	11%	11%	11%
This was not influenced by ESOS	38	23	1	14	38	2	6	7	10	6	12	17	10	10	23	5	40
	89%	83%	100%	100%	89%	100%	89%	100%	93%	72%	100%	85%	84%	100%	89%	75%	87%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 880

Q38s. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Roof / loft insulation

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Roof / loft insulation since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	46	-	-	9	2	-	3	3	2	2	-	2	4	1	1	-	6	3	2	6	-	46
Weighted total	43*	**	**	8**	2**	**	2**	4**	2**	2**	**	2**	2**	**	2**	**	5**	3**	4**	6**	**	46*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 32%	-	-	-	1 2%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	4 9%	-	-	2 20%	1 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 22%	-	-	-	1 20%	-	-	-	-	5 11%
This was not influenced by ESOS	38 89%	-	-	6 80%	1 50%	-	2 100%	4 100%	2 100%	2 100%	-	2 100%	2 78%	* 100%	2 100%	-	4 80%	2 66%	4 100%	6 100%	-	40 87%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 881

Q38t. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Draught-proofing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	37	36	1	-	3	9	-	4	1	1	5	4	4	1	-	1	2	17	20	37
Weighted total	36*	35*	1**	-**	3**	7**	-**	4**	2**	1**	4**	4**	4**	2**	-**	2**	2**	17**	19**	37*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	2	-	-	-	*	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	4%	4%	-	-	-	6%	-	27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	7	7	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	*	1	3	-	-	-	1	3	4	8
	20%	20%	-	-	-	10%	-	39%	-	-	11%	19%	68%	-	-	-	46%	17%	22%	22%
This was not influenced by ESOS	27	26	1	-	3	6	-	1	2	1	4	3	1	2	-	2	1	14	13	27
	76%	75%	100%	-	100%	83%	-	35%	100%	100%	89%	81%	32%	100%	-	100%	54%	83%	70%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 882

Q38t. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Draught-proofing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 37	7	30	6	6	13	9	1	2	17	2	10	2	4	9	18	30	6	37
Weighted total 36*	6**	29**	5**	5**	14**	9**	1**	2**	15**	2**	10**	2**	4**	10**	16**	28**	6**	37*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 2 4%	-	2	*	-	1	-	-	-	*	-	1	1	-	-	*	2	-	2
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 7 20%	4	3	3	1	*	2	-	-	3	-	4	-	1	2	3	6	1	8
This was not influenced by ESOS 27 76%	3	24	1	4	13	7	1	2	12	2	5	1	3	8	13	21	5	27
	40%	84%	26%	72%	89%	76%	100%	100%	79%	100%	47%	40%	85%	76%	80%	74%	82%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 883

Q38t. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Draught-proofing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECS (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	37	6	17	8	6	4	29	34	2	5	9	21	1	12	31	15	4	10	5	37
Weighted total	36*	6**	16**	8**	6**	3**	29**	32**	3**	5**	9**	20**	1**	13**	30**	14**	3**	7**	5**	37*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	*	-	-	-	1	2
	4%	-	-	18%	-	-	5%	5%	-	-	-	8%	-	-	2%	3%	-	-	20%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	7	1	4	2	-	-	6	6	1	3	3	6	-	2	7	3	1	3	-	8
	20%	25%	27%	18%	-	-	20%	18%	43%	51%	36%	28%	-	12%	24%	24%	48%	37%	-	22%
This was not influenced by ESOS	27	4	11	5	6	3	21	25	2	3	6	13	1	11	22	10	1	5	4	27
	76%	75%	73%	64%	100%	100%	75%	78%	57%	49%	64%	64%	100%	88%	75%	72%	52%	63%	80%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/a/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 884

Q38t. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Draught-proofing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	37	25	1	11	37	2	6	5	10	8	10	19	8	10	21	6	37
Weighted total	36*	22**	1**	12**	36*	2**	6**	4**	11**	7**	10**	16**	9**	9**	20**	6**	37*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	1	-	*	2	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	1	-	*	1	2
	4%	5%	-	4%	4%	-	-	12%	-	-	-	3%	12%	-	2%	18%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	7	6	1	1	7	1	3	-	-	2	2	3	2	2	4	2	8
	20%	25%	100%	6%	20%	58%	44%	-	-	32%	20%	21%	17%	16%	20%	27%	22%
This was not influenced by ESOS	27	16	-	11	27	1	4	3	11	5	8	12	6	8	16	3	27
	76%	70%	-	91%	76%	42%	56%	88%	100%	68%	80%	76%	71%	84%	78%	55%	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 885

Q38t. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Draught-proofing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Draught-proofing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	37	-	-	8	-	-	2	2	2	2	-	2	3	2	2	-	3	3	1	5	-	37
Weighted total	36*	**	**	7**	**	**	1**	3**	2**	2**	**	2**	2**	1**	3**	**	3**	4**	2**	5**	**	37*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2
	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28%	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	-	-	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	7	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	8
	20%	-	-	21%	-	-	-	41%	45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36%	43%	-	12%	-	22%
This was not influenced by ESOS	27	-	-	6	-	-	1	2	1	2	-	2	1	3	-	2	1	2	4	-	27	
	76%	-	-	79%	-	-	100%	59%	55%	100%	-	100%	43%	100%	100%	-	64%	27%	100%	88%	-	73%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 886

Q38u. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	42	38	3	1	3	7	2	2	2	1	11	4	4	1	-	2	1	15	27	42
Weighted total	36*	33*	2**	2**	2**	6**	2**	1**	2**	1**	9**	4**	4**	1**	**	3**	1**	13**	24**	42*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	* 1%	* 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*2%	1 2%
This was not influenced by ESOS	36 99%	33 99%	2 100%	2 100%	2 100%	6 100%	2 100%	1 100%	2 100%	1 100%	8 95%	4 100%	4 100%	1 100%	-	3 100%	1 100%	13 100%	23 98%	41 98%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 887

Q38u. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)		
Unweighted total 42	2	40	5	8	12	14	2	1	23	1	4	2	4	9	20	33	8	42	
Weighted total 36*	2**	34*	4**	8**	11**	11**	2**	1**	20**	1**	3**	1**	4**	10**	15**	26*	9**	42*	
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	1%	1%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	5%	2%	
This was not influenced by ESOS	36	2	34	4	8	11	11	2	1	20	1	3	1	4	10	15	26	8	41
	99%	100%	99%	100%	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	95%	98%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 888

Q38u. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	42	8	13	4	15	8	29	39	2	2	12	17	2	16	28	13	4	6	12	42
Weighted total	36*	8**	10**	3**	13**	7**	25**	34*	2**	1**	9**	15**	1**	15**	24**	10**	4**	4**	11**	42*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	*	*	-	-	1
This was not influenced by ESOS	1%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%	-	3%	-	-	2%	5%	12%	12%	-	2%
	36	8	10	3	13	7	25	34	2	*	9	15	1	15	24	9	3	3	11	41
	99%	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	97%	100%	100%	98%	95%	88%	88%	100%	98%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/a/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 889

Q38u. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	42	30	2	10	42	1	2	7	11	9	15	18	7	14	20	5	42
Weighted total	36*	24**	1**	11**	36*	1**	2**	6**	10**	7**	15**	14**	7**	13**	17**	4**	42*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	1
This was not influenced by ESOS	1%	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	7%	-	3%	-	-	3%	-	2%
	36	24	1	11	36	1	2	6	10	6	15	13	7	13	16	4	41
	99%	98%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93%	100%	97%	100%	100%	97%	100%	98%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 890

Q38u. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Replacement with double/triple glazing

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Replacement with double/triple glazing since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	42	-	-	10	1	-	2	4	2	3	-	1	4	1	1	-	5	2	-	6	-	42
Weighted total	36*	**	**	9**	1**	**	1**	4**	2**	3**	**	1**	3**	**	1**	**	4**	2**	**	6**	**	42*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
This was not influenced by ESOS	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%
	36	-	-	9	1	-	1	4	2	3	-	1	2	*	1	-	4	2	-	6	-	41
	99%	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	82%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	98%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 891

Q38v. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Automatic / revolving doors since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	28	28	-	-	1	5	2	2	1	-	2	7	4	1	-	1	2	13	15	28
Weighted total	26**	26**	-**	-**	1**	4**	2**	2**	1**	-**	1**	7**	4**	1**	-**	2**	2**	12**	14**	28**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	1 4%	1 4%	-	-	-	1 19%	-	-	-	-	* 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 6%	* 3%	2 7%
This was not influenced by ESOS	25 96%	25 96%	-	-	1 100%	3 81%	2 100%	2 100%	1 100%	-	1 69%	7 100%	4 100%	1 100%	-	2 100%	2 100%	12 94%	13 97%	26 93%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 892

Q38v. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Automatic / revolving doors since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 28	4	24	5	6	5	10	-	2	17	-	8	-	2	7	16	21	6	28
Weighted total 26**	4**	22**	4**	6**	5**	10**	-**	2**	15**	-**	8**	-**	2**	7**	14**	19**	6**	28**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	1 4%	1 18%	* 2%	1 18%	-	* 10%	-	-	1 8%	-	-	-	-	-	1 8%	1 4%	* 7%	2 7%
This was not influenced by ESOS	25 96%	3 82%	22 98%	3 82%	6 100%	4 90%	10 100%	- 100%	14 92%	-	8 100%	-	2 100%	7 100%	13 92%	18 96%	6 93%	26 93%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 893

Q38v. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Automatic / revolving doors since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	28	6	12	3	6	3	20	25	3	4	7	14	-	9	22	13	2	9	5	28
Weighted total	26**	7**	10**	3**	5**	3**	19**	24**	3**	4**	7**	12**	-**	8**	20**	12**	1**	7**	5**	28**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	*	-	1	-	-	1	*	*	1	-	2
This was not influenced by ESOS	4%	-	11%	-	-	-	4%	3%	-	13%	-	9%	-	-	6%	4%	31%	16%	-	7%
	25	7	9	3	5	3	18	23	3	3	7	11	-	8	19	11	1	6	5	26
	96%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	96%	97%	100%	87%	100%	91%	-	100%	94%	96%	69%	84%	100%	93%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 894

Q38v. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Automatic / revolving doors since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	28	14	3	11	28	1	4	4	8	6	8	13	7	7	14	7	28
Weighted total	26**	13**	3**	11**	26**	1**	3**	4**	8**	5**	7**	13**	7**	6**	14**	6**	26**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	1	*	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	1	-	*	1	2
	4%	4%	-	6%	4%	-	-	-	-	8%	-	4%	11%	-	3%	11%	7%
This was not influenced by ESOS	25	12	3	10	25	1	3	4	8	5	7	12	6	6	13	6	26
	96%	96%	100%	94%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	96%	89%	100%	97%	89%	93%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 895

Q38v. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Automatic / revolving doors

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Automatic / revolving doors since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	28	-	-	10	-	-	-	4	2	2	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	1	1	3	-	28
Weighted total	26**	**	**	9**	**	**	**	5**	2**	2**	**	1**	2**	**	**	**	**	1**	1**	4**	**	28**
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	4%	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
This was not influenced by ESOS	25	-	-	8	-	-	-	5	2	2	-	1	1	*	-	-	-	1	1	4	-	26
	96%	-	-	92%	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	75%	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	-	93%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 896

Q38w. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	45	44	-	1	3	3	3	2	3	-	9	13	5	1	1	-	2	24	21	45
Weighted total	42*	40*	-**	2**	3**	3**	2**	2**	5**	-**	11**	9**	4**	1**	1**	-**	1**	23**	19**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	4%	4%	-	-	28%	-	-	46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	6	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	3	7
	14%	14%	-	-	-	-	45%	-	20%	-	6%	16%	22%	100%	-	-	-	11%	16%	16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	35	32	-	2	2	3	1	1	4	-	10	7	3	-	1	-	1	20	14	36
	82%	81%	-	100%	72%	100%	55%	54%	80%	-	94%	84%	78%	-	100%	-	100%	89%	74%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 897

Q38w. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	45	7	38	5	13	7	9	2	9	16	6	19	3	4	9	26	35	9	45
Weighted total	42*	8**	34*	5**	12**	8**	7**	2**	9**	14**	5**	20**	3**	5**	8**	23**	31**	9**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	-	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	4%	-	5%	-	8%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	8%	6%	-	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	2	3	1	2	1	1	-	1	3	2	1	1	-	1	3	4	1	7
	14%	31%	10%	21%	17%	12%	16%	-	7%	19%	40%	3%	34%	-	16%	15%	14%	15%	16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	35	5	29	4	9	6	6	2	9	11	3	18	2	5	7	18	25	8	36
	82%	69%	85%	79%	74%	78%	84%	100%	93%	81%	60%	88%	66%	100%	84%	78%	81%	85%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 898

Q38w. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECS (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	45	10	22	5	7	12	28	37	5	7	14	19	2	15	39	22	11	17	5	45
Weighted total	42*	9**	19**	4**	9**	13**	26**	35*	5**	5**	14**	15**	3**	16**	37*	20**	11**	16**	4**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	1	1	-	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	2
	4%	-	-	46%	-	-	7%	5%	-	22%	5%	-	-	11%	5%	-	9%	-	-	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	3	3	-	*	3	3	5	1	-	3	4	-	1	5	2	3	2	1	7
	14%	31%	13%	-	5%	22%	11%	13%	21%	-	18%	26%	-	4%	14%	11%	28%	10%	17%	16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	35	6	17	2	8	10	22	29	4	4	11	11	3	14	30	18	7	15	3	36
	82%	69%	87%	54%	95%	78%	82%	82%	79%	78%	77%	74%	100%	85%	82%	89%	63%	90%	83%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 899

Q38w. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	45	38	-	7	45	5	3	8	9	14	10	23	12	9	22	14	45
Weighted total	42*	35*	-**	7**	42*	5**	2**	8**	8**	15**	9**	20**	13**	7**	20**	15**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2	2	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	2
	4%	5%	-	-	4%	-	32%	13%	-	-	-	4%	8%	-	4%	7%	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6	6	-	-	6	1	-	-	2	2	1	4	1	1	4	1	7
	14%	16%	-	-	14%	19%	-	-	32%	11%	8%	20%	8%	10%	20%	7%	16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	35	28	-	7	35	4	2	7	5	13	9	15	11	6	15	13	36
	82%	79%	-	100%	82%	81%	68%	87%	68%	89%	92%	77%	84%	90%	77%	86%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 900

Q38w. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	45	-	1	13	-	-	-	3	-	1	3	2	2	5	2	-	3	-	2	8	-	45
Weighted total	42*	**	1**	10**	**	**	**	4**	**	1**	2**	3**	2**	3**	3**	**	2**	**	4**	7**	**	45*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	2 4%	-	-	1 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 11%	-	2 4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	6 14%	-	-	2 16%	-	-	-	1 28%	-	-	-	-	-	1 15%	-	-	1 37%	-	-	2 23%	-	7 16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	35 82%	-	1 100%	8 75%	-	-	-	3 72%	-	1 100%	2 100%	3 100%	2 100%	2 85%	3 100%	-	2 63%	-	4 100%	5 66%	-	36 80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 901

Q38x. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	54	52	1	1	3	4	3	5	5	1	7	10	6	4	1	2	3	28	26	54
Weighted total	51*	48*	1**	2**	3**	4**	2**	5**	7**	1**	8**	8**	5**	2**	1**	2**	2**	27**	24**	54*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4 8%	4 8%	-	-	1 28%	1 38%	1 34%	-	1 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 5%	3 11%	4 7%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	11 21%	11 22%	-	-	-	-	1 45%	1 18%	2 28%	1 100%	1 8%	2 27%	1 20%	1 29%	-	-	1 39%	5 18%	6 24%	10 19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	36 71%	34 70%	1 100%	2 100%	2 72%	2 62%	* 21%	4 82%	4 58%	-	7 92%	6 73%	4 80%	2 71%	1 100%	2 100%	1 61%	21 76%	16 66%	40 74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 902

Q38x. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 54	9	45	6	17	11	11	1	8	23	4	16	2	6	12	33	44	10	54
Weighted total 51*	9**	42*	5**	17**	11**	9**	1**	8**	20**	5**	17**	2**	7**	12**	30**	40*	11**	54*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 4 8%	1	3	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	3	4	-	4
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 11 21%	4	6	1	5	3	1	-	1	5	2	4	-	-	5	5	6	5	10
This was not influenced by ESOS 36 71%	3	33	3	12	8	6	1	7	15	2	11	2	7	5	22	30	7	40
	37%	79%	58%	70%	69%	66%	100%	91%	77%	39%	61%	100%	100%	45%	74%	75%	59%	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 903

Q38x. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	54	17	24	5	7	11	38	44	9	8	15	28	4	14	45	26	13	20	8	54
Weighted total	51*	16**	21**	4**	9**	12**	35*	42*	9**	6**	14**	26**	5**	14**	41*	22**	12**	19**	9**	54*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4	1	2	1	-	3	1	4	-	-	1	2	-	1	4	2	3	1	-	4
	8%	7%	11%	20%	-	20%	4%	10%	-	-	10%	8%	-	5%	10%	8%	21%	8%	-	7%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	11	3	4	1	2	4	6	7	3	2	3	6	-	5	8	2	3	4	2	10
	21%	20%	19%	26%	26%	31%	17%	16%	36%	32%	20%	22%	-	36%	19%	9%	23%	24%	29%	19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	36	12	15	2	7	6	28	31	5	4	10	18	5	8	29	19	7	13	6	40
	71%	73%	71%	54%	74%	49%	79%	75%	64%	68%	70%	70%	100%	59%	71%	83%	55%	69%	71%	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 904

Q38x. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 54	43	-	11	54	1	6	13	8	18	8	28	18	6	29	19	54
Weighted total 51*	40*	-**	11**	51*	1**	6**	12**	7**	18**	9**	25**	17**	6**	26**	19**	54*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 4 8%	4 10%	-	-	4 8%	1 100%	1 12%	-	2 26%	-	1 16%	1 6%	1 6%	-	1 6%	3 13%	4 7%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 11 21%	9 23%	-	1 11%	11 21%	-	1 20%	3 23%	3 50%	2 14%	1 8%	6 25%	4 22%	1 12%	6 23%	4 20%	10 19%
This was not influenced by ESOS 36 71%	26 67%	-	10 89%	36 71%	-	4 68%	9 77%	2 24%	15 86%	7 76%	17 69%	13 72%	5 88%	19 71%	13 66%	40 74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 905

Q38x. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Addition of heat recovery

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Addition of heat recovery since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	
Unweighted total	54	-	1	20	-	-	7	2	1	3	2	3	3	1	-	3	1	3	4	-	54
Weighted total	51*	**	1**	16**	**	**	8**	1**	1**	3**	3**	3**	2**	2**	**	2**	1**	5**	3**	**	54*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4
	8%	-	-	13%	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%	-	7%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	11	-	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	10
	21%	-	-	21%	-	-	21%	-	-	47%	-	-	-	22%	100%	36%	-	-	24%	-	19%
This was not influenced by ESOS	36	-	1	11	-	-	5	1	1	1	3	3	2	-	-	2	1	5	1	-	40
	71%	-	100%	65%	-	-	66%	100%	100%	53%	100%	100%	78%	-	-	64%	100%	100%	49%	-	74%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 906

Q38y. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Process re-engineering since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	102	100	1	1	2	5	12	5	10	1	17	18	9	9	3	1	9	55	45	102
Weighted total	91*	89*	1**	2**	1**	4**	10**	5**	10**	1**	17**	14**	8**	7**	3**	1**	9**	47*	42*	102
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4 5%	4 5%	-	-	-	1 26%	1 10%	-	-	-	2 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	2 6%	4 4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	16 18%	16 18%	-	-	* 40%	-	1 14%	2 37%	1 8%	-	3 19%	4 25%	1 10%	1 8%	-	1 100%	3 30%	6 12%	9 21%	20 20%
This was not influenced by ESOS	71 77%	68 77%	1 100%	2 100%	1 60%	3 74%	8 76%	3 63%	9 92%	1 100%	12 68%	11 75%	8 90%	6 92%	3 100%	-	6 70%	39 83%	31 73%	78 76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 907

Q38y. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Process re-engineering since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 102	17	85	26	13	27	23	4	9	48	2	21	3	7	13	62	76	25	102
Weighted total 91*	17**	74*	25**	13**	22**	19**	3**	9**	44*	2**	18**	2**	7**	15**	53*	67*	23**	102
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 4 5%	1	3	1	3	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	2	2	3	1	4
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 16 18%	2	14	4	1	6	2	-	3	5	-	4	-	2	2	8	11	6	20
This was not influenced by ESOS 71 77%	14	57	19	9	16	17	3	6	36	2	14	2	5	11	42	53	16	78
	82%	77%	78%	69%	74%	90%	100%	64%	81%	100%	74%	100%	72%	76%	80%	79%	71%	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 908

Q38y. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Process re-engineering since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		
Unweighted total	102	20	62	11	9	20	70	85	12	21	14	54	9	21	90	44	25	42	12	102
Weighted total	91*	20**	52*	11**	9**	18**	63*	77*	10**	17**	13**	50*	7**	18**	78*	37*	22**	36*	13**	102
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4	2	2	-	-	2	2	3	1	-	1	4	-	-	3	-	1	1	1	4
	5%	12%	4%	-	-	13%	3%	4%	10%	-	8%	9%	-	-	4%	-	4%	3%	8%	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	16	5	9	-	2	6	9	13	3	3	2	10	2	2	13	7	2	3	3	20
	18%	27%	18%	-	18%	34%	14%	17%	32%	18%	19%	20%	24%	9%	17%	20%	10%	9%	22%	20%
This was not influenced by ESOS	71	12	41	11	7	9	53	60	6	14	10	36	6	16	61	30	19	32	9	78
	77%	62%	78%	100%	82%	52%	83%	78%	58%	82%	74%	72%	76%	91%	79%	80%	86%	89%	70%	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 909

Q38y. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Process re-engineering since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	102	64	5	33	102	4	18	6	19	32	24	54	24	20	48	31	102
Weighted total	91*	58*	5**	28**	91*	4**	16**	5**	16**	29**	21**	49*	22**	17**	43*	28**	102
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4 5%	1 2%	1 19%	2 8%	4 5%	-	1 8%	-	2 13%	-	2 10%	2 5%	-	2 12%	2 5%	-	4 4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	16 18%	12 21%	-	4 13%	16 18%	-	4 22%	2 34%	4 23%	3 11%	4 17%	8 17%	4 19%	1 8%	10 24%	4 14%	20 20%
This was not influenced by ESOS	71 77%	45 77%	4 81%	22 78%	71 77%	4 100%	11 70%	3 66%	10 64%	26 89%	15 73%	38 78%	18 81%	14 80%	30 71%	24 86%	78 76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 910

Q38y. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Process re-engineering

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Process re-engineering since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	102	2	4	51	-	4	4	1	7	1	-	4	5	4	-	-	3	1	1	10	-	102
Weighted total	91*	2**	4**	45*	-**	3**	3**	1**	6**	1**	-**	5**	3**	3**	-**	-**	3**	1**	1**	8**	-**	102
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	4	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4
	5%	-	-	5%	-	-	31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	16	1	1	6	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	20
	18%	53%	17%	13%	-	-	24%	-	28%	-	-	28%	58%	-	-	-	32%	-	-	23%	-	20%
This was not influenced by ESOS	71	1	3	37	-	3	1	1	4	1	-	4	1	3	-	-	2	1	1	5	-	78
	77%	47%	83%	82%	-	100%	46%	100%	72%	100%	-	72%	42%	100%	-	-	68%	100%	100%	64%	-	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 911

Q38z. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	118	115	2	1	2	8	16	6	9	1	25	21	8	6	3	1	10	58	59	118
Weighted total	108	104	1**	2**	1**	7**	13**	6**	10**	2**	24**	17**	8**	4**	3**	1**	10**	49*	57*	118
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	6	6	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	4	2	7
	6%	6%	-	-	-	15%	8%	-	-	-	4%	13%	-	-	-	-	11%	8%	4%	6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	17	16	1	-	*	1	3	2	-	-	4	2	1	1	-	1	2	7	10	21
	16%	16%	50%	-	40%	8%	20%	28%	-	-	18%	14%	8%	14%	-	100%	19%	15%	17%	18%
This was not influenced by ESOS	84	82	1	2	1	6	9	4	10	2	19	12	7	3	3	-	7	38	45	90
	78%	78%	50%	100%	60%	78%	72%	72%	100%	100%	78%	74%	92%	86%	100%	-	70%	77%	79%	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 912

Q38z. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)		
Unweighted total	118	14	104	21	19	29	30	7	12	47	7	31	3	10	17	71	89	28	118
Weighted total	108	13**	95*	19**	18**	25**	27**	6**	13**	42*	6**	29**	2**	11**	19**	62*	82*	24**	118
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	6	1	5	-	4	-	1	-	1	2	-	3	-	1	2	3	5	2	7
	6%	8%	6%	-	21%	-	5%	-	8%	5%	-	11%	-	7%	10%	6%	5%	7%	6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	17	1	16	3	3	6	2	1	2	9	1	4	-	1	1	14	12	5	21
	16%	7%	17%	14%	16%	23%	9%	13%	19%	22%	10%	12%	-	7%	5%	22%	14%	21%	18%
This was not influenced by ESOS	84	11	73	17	11	19	23	5	9	31	6	23	2	9	16	44	66	17	90
	78%	86%	77%	86%	63%	77%	86%	87%	73%	73%	90%	77%	100%	86%	85%	72%	80%	71%	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 913

Q38z. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total 118	23	70	12	13	22	87	101	16	21	21	58	9	34	104	51	25	41	14	118
Weighted total 108	22**	60*	13**	13**	20**	81*	93*	14**	18**	21**	55*	8**	30*	93*	44*	22**	36*	15**	118
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 6 6%	2	4	-	1	1	5	5	2	1	2	5	-	1	5	*	2	2	2	7
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 17 16%	6	9	1	1	7	9	16	3	4	3	7	2	5	16	6	4	8	1	21
This was not influenced by ESOS 84 78%	15	47	12	11	12	67	72	9	13	16	42	6	24	73	37	16	27	12	90
	65%	78%	94%	87%	60%	83%	78%	64%	74%	77%	77%	70%	80%	78%	85%	71%	74%	78%	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 914

Q38z. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	118	81	4	33	118	7	14	7	28	37	26	62	30	23	56	38	118
Weighted total	108	75*	4**	29**	108	7**	12**	6**	24**	36*	22**	56*	30**	19**	51*	37*	118
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	6	3	2	1	6	-	-	-	2	*	3	3	*	3	2	1	7
	6%	4%	43%	5%	6%	-	-	-	9%	1%	13%	5%	2%	15%	4%	4%	6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	17	14	-	3	17	1	5	2	3	4	5	10	2	4	11	2	21
	16%	19%	-	11%	16%	17%	38%	31%	14%	10%	23%	18%	6%	23%	22% ^o	5%	18%
This was not influenced by ESOS	84	58	2	24	84	6	8	4	18	32	14	43	28	12	38	34	90
	78%	77%	57%	84%	78%	83%	62%	69%	78%	89%	64%	77%	92%	63%	74%	92% ⁿ	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 915

Q38z. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	118	2	3	44	1	4	5	5	4	3	1	9	6	4	1	-	5	1	3	17	-	118
Weighted total	108	2**	3**	38*	1**	3**	4**	6**	3**	4**	1**	11**	4**	3**	1**	**	5**	1**	5**	14**	**	108
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	6	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	7
	6%	-	-	6%	-	-	49%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	17	1	1	8	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	21
	16%	53%	22%	22%	-	-	16%	-	26%	-	-	14%	29%	-	-	-	39%	-	-	8%	-	18%
This was not influenced by ESOS	84	1	3	27	1	3	1	6	3	4	1	9	3	3	1	-	3	1	5	10	-	90
	78%	47%	78%	73%	100%	100%	35%	100%	74%	100%	100%	86%	71%	100%	100%	-	61%	100%	100%	75%	-	76%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 916

Q38aa. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	312	303	4	5	12	27	20	31	25	6	53	64	24	23	3	6	15	161	147	312
Weighted total	297	283	2**	12**	9**	25**	18**	34**	28**	6**	55*	56*	18**	19**	6**	9**	12**	146	147	312
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	16	16	-	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	1	4	1	2	-	-	3	9	7	18
	5%	6%	-	-	12%	4%	-	7%	5%	-	1%	7%	5%	12%	-	-	22%	6%	5%	6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	37	37	-	-	1	2	3	8	3	1	8	2	4	1	-	2	1	11	26	40
	12%	13%	-	-	15%	7%	17%	24%	9%	16%	14%	4%	21%	8%	-	21%	12%	7%	18% q	13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	244	230	2	12	6	22	15	23	24	5	47	50	14	15	6	7	8	126	114	254
	82%	81%	100%	100%	73%	89%	83%	69%	86%	84%	85%	89%	74%	80%	100%	79%	66%	87%	77%	81%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 917

Q38aa. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 312	31	281	42	72	70	86	16	25	105	28	84	4	28	44	191	312	-	312
Weighted total 297	30**	268	40*	73*	70*	77*	15**	21**	101*	27**	78*	3**	29**	46*	175	297	-**	312
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 16 5%	3	13	2	3	5	4	-	2	2	3	5	-	2	3	7	16	-	18
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 37 12%	3	33	4	9	11	10	-	3	11	6	14	-	3	5	25	37	-	40
This was not influenced by ESOS 244 82%	23	221	33	61	55	63	15	17	88	18	59	3	24	38	144	244	-	254
	79%	83%	84%	83%	78%	82%	100%	79%	87%k	66%	75%	100%	82%	83%	82%	82%	-	81%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 918

Q38aa. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total 312	55	177	37	40	53	224	267	48	54	67	150	21	89	236	109	37	77	71	312
Weighted total 297	51*	161	38*	45*	49*	216	259	45*	45*	62*	140	18**	86*	223	99*	31*	69*	68*	312
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 16 5%	3	8	4	1	2	13	13	5	4	3	8	1	4	11	3	2	4	5	18
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 37 12%	7	20	4	6	10	24	32	7	8	9	15	4	14	24	13	4	8	11	40
This was not influenced by ESOS 244 82%	41	132	30	38	37	179	214	34	33	50	117	13	67	188	83	26	57	52	254
	80%	82%	80%	86%	75%	83%	83%	75%	74%	80%	84%	72%	78%	84%	84%	81%	83%	76%	81%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 919

Q38aa. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	312	208	12	92	312	32	63	39	55	62	68	162	79	53	181	77	312
Weighted total	297	197	10**	89*	297	32**	62*	38*	49*	57*	64*	149	79*	50*	168	78*	312
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	16 5%	13 6%	1 8%	2 3%	16 5%	4 11%	4 6%	1 2%	1 3%	1 2%	6 9%	9 6%	1 2%	4 8%	9 6%	2 3%	18 6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	37 12% ^c	33 17% ^c	1 7%	3 3%	37 12%	2 5%	13 21%	3 8%	6 11%	5 8%	7 10%	18 12%	12 15%	8 16%	17 10%	12 15%	40 13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	244 82%	152 77%	9 85%	84 94% ^z	244 82%	27 84%	46 73%	34 90%	42 86%	52 90% ^f	52 81%	123 82%	65 83%	38 75%	142 84%	64 82%	254 81%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 920

Q38aa. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support services (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	312	8	3	81	4	6	20	34	25	11	7	9	10	11	7	-	6	13	7	49	1	312
Weighted total	297	8**	3**	70*	3**	4**	15**	40**	21**	14**	6**	12**	8**	7**	8**	**	6**	15**	11**	44*	2**	312
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	16 5%	-	-	4 6%	* 16%	-	1 6%	-	2 9%	1 7%	1 15%	-	-	1 7%	2 30%	-	-	-	-	4 9%	-	18 6%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	37 12%	1 11%	-	7 10%	-	* 10%	1 10%	8 20%	2 11%	1 8%	1 17%	2 16%	2 25%	1 8%	1 13%	-	-	2 10%	-	8 18%	-	40 13%
This was not influenced by ESOS	244 82%	7 89%	3 100%	59 84%	2 84%	4 90%	12 84%	32 80%	17 80%	12 85%	4 66%	10 84%	6 75%	6 85%	5 57%	-	6 100%	14 90%	11 100%	32 74%	2 100%	254 81%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 921

Q38ab. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea,
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	81	80	1	-	4	9	6	8	4	2	13	15	4	8	-	2	5	53	24	81
Weighted total	75*	74*	1**	-**	3**	7**	5**	8**	4**	2**	16**	12**	2**	6**	**	3**	4**	47*	24**	81*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	9	9	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	2	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	8	8
	12%	12%	-	-	28%	8%	-	12%	19%	54%	13%	7%	-	-	-	61%	-	2%	34%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	65	64	1	-	2	7	5	7	3	1	14	10	2	6	-	1	4	45	16	72
	87%	87%	100%	-	72%	92%	100%	88%	81%	46%	87%	85%	100%	100%	-	39%	100%	96%	66%	89%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 922

Q38ab. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea,
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	81	9	72	8	22	21	22	2	6	29	7	21	1	3	10	55	81	-	81
Weighted total	75*	8**	67*	7**	22**	20**	18**	1**	5**	27**	6**	18**	1**	3**	10**	48*	75*	-**	81*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	2%	1%	-	1%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	9	-	9	-	3	5	1	-	-	5	3	2	-	-	1	6	9	-	8
	12%	-	13%	-	14%	26%	3%	-	-	17%	45%	10%	-	-	8%	13%	12%	-	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	65	8	57	7	19	15	17	1	5	22	3	16	1	3	9	41	65	-	72
	87%	100%	85%	100%	86%	74%	92%	100%	100%	83%	55%	86%	100%	100%	92%	85%	87%	-	89%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 923

Q38ab. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea,
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	81	16	44	8	12	12	62	72	7	13	16	42	3	21	62	26	15	31	19	81
Weighted total	75*	14**	40*	8**	12**	12**	59*	68*	7**	11**	15**	37*	2**	21**	57*	23**	13**	29**	18**	81*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1
	1%	6%	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	13%	8%	6%	-	-	4%	2%	-	7%	3%	-	1%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	9	1	3	2	3	4	5	9	-	2	1	2	-	7	4	2	1	3	4	8
	12%	6%	8%	23%	24%	30%	9%	13%	-	17%	5%	4%	-	35%	8%	8%	8%	9%	25%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	65	13	36	6	9	8	52	59	6	8	13	35	2	13	52	22	11	26	13	72
	87%	88%	92%	77%	76%	70%	89%	86%	87%	75%	89%	96%	100%	61%	91%	92%	86%	88%	75%	89%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 924

Q38ab. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea,
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	81	51	3	27	81	10	16	9	17	15	13	43	23	13	47	21	81
Weighted total	75*	47*	3**	26**	75*	8**	16**	8**	16**	13**	12**	39*	20**	12**	43*	19**	81*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
	1%	-	34%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	5%	1%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	9	9	-	-	9	1	5	1	-	-	2	4	3	2	4	3	8
	12%	19%	-	-	12%	7%	35%	13%	-	-	16%	10%	14%	16%	9%	15%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	65	38	2	26	65	8	10	7	16	13	10	34	18	10	39	15	72
	87%	81%	66%	100%	87%	93%	65%	87%	100%	100%	84%	87%	86%	84%	91%	80%	89%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 925

Q38ab. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea,
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	(u)
Unweighted total	81	2	26	1	1	4	8	5	3	1	4	1	6	-	-	-	-	2	15	-	81
Weighted total	75*	2**	22**	1**	1**	3**	10**	4**	4**	1**	5**	1**	5**	**	**	**	**	3**	13**	**	81*
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	1%	-	-	-	-	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	9	1	-	1	-	-	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	8
	12%	45%	-	5%	-	-	47%	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	65	1	1	21	1	2	5	4	4	1	5	1	5	-	-	-	-	3	11	-	72
	87%	55%	100%	95%	100%	68%	53%	85%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	88%	-	89%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 926

Q38ac. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure,
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	245	238	3	4	13	21	17	26	21	4	34	51	15	21	4	2	12	131	111	245
Weighted total	226	216	2**	8**	9**	18**	14**	28**	23**	3**	35**	42*	11**	17**	7**	3**	10**	119	102*	245
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	9 4%	9 4%	-	-	1 7%	1 5%	-	-	-	-	1 3%	4 9%	-	1 3%	-	-	2 17%	7 6%	2 2%	10 4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35 15%	35 16%	-	-	1 15%	3 18%	2 12%	4 16%	2 9%	-	8 23%	4 8%	2 14%	2 12%	3 42%	2 57%	2 19%	13 11%	22 21% q	39 16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	182 81%	173 80%	2 100%	8 100%	7 78%	14 77%	13 88%	23 84%	21 91%	3 100%	26 74%	35 83%	10 86%	14 84%	4 58%	1 43%	6 64%	100 84%	79 77%	196 80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 927

Q38ac. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	245	20	225	24	55	61	69	12	23	85	19	68	3	20	34	158	245	-	245
Weighted total	226	19**	206	21**	51*	61*	62*	11**	19**	81*	15**	62*	3**	19**	33**	142	226	-**	245
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	9	1	8	2	1	2	2	-	1	1	3	3	-	1	1	3	9	-	10
	4%	5%	4%	9%	2%	4%	4%	-	6%	1%	21%	5%	-	3%	3%	2%	4%	-	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35	3	32	3	5	10	12	-	4	11	3	12	-	5	6	21	35	-	39
	15%	15%	15%	14%	10%	17%	19%	-	23%	13%	18%	19%	-	25%	17%	15%	15%	-	16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	182	15	167	16	46	48	48	11	13	69	9	48	3	14	26	118	182	-	196
	81%	80%	81%	77%	88%	79%	77%	100%	71%	85%	61%	77%	100%	72%	80%	83%	81%	-	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 928

Q38ac. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	245	57	129	28	29	41	175	207	38	44	44	116	12	79	179	82	31	51	61	245
Weighted total	226	51*	117	26**	30**	40*	161	194	32*	36*	41*	105	11**	70*	161	72*	27**	47*	58*	245
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	9	2	4	1	2	1	8	8	3	3	2	4	-	3	5	2	2	3	4	10
	4%	5%	3%	2%	6%	1%	5%	4%	10%	8%	5%	4%	-	4%	3%	2%	6%	5%	6%	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35	8	21	5	1	9	20	28	7	6	5	14	2	11	21	9	1	7	12	39
	15%	15%	18%	18%	3%	23%	13%	15%	23%	16%	13%	13%	22%	16%	13%	12%	4%	16%	21%	16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	182	41	92	21	27	30	134	158	21	28	33	87	9	55	135	62	25	37	43	196
	81%	80%	79%	80%	91%	75%	83%	81%h	66%	76%	82%	83%	78%	79%	84%	86%	91%	79%	73%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 929

Q38ac. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	245	165	11	69	245	23	52	28	44	44	52	135	57	51	139	55	245
Weighted total	226	152	10**	64*	226	22**	48*	29**	36*	40*	49*	121	53*	49*	125	52*	245
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	9	7	1	1	9	1	2	1	-	1	3	6	-	2	6	2	10
	4%	4%	9%	2%	4%	3%	3%	2%	-	3%	6%	5%	-	3%	5%	3%	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35	31	3	-	35	2	9	1	6	5	9	16	9	10	18	7	39
	15% c	21% c	30%	-	15%	10%	19%	5%	16%	12%	19%	13%	18%	20%	15%	13%	16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	182	113	6	63	182	20	38	27	30	35	37	99	44	37	101	44	196
	81%	75%	61%	98% z	81%	88%	78%	93%	84%	86%	75%	82%	82%	77%	81%	85%	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 930

Q38ac. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure,
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	(u)	
Unweighted total	245	9	2	55	3	5	21	25	23	4	7	6	8	14	5	-	5	7	4	42	-	245
Weighted total	226	9**	3**	47*	2**	4**	16**	27**	19**	4**	5**	8**	7**	10**	6**	**	5**	8**	7**	38*	**	245
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	9	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	10
	4%	-	-	4%	-	-	5%	-	3%	4%	26%	21%	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	4%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35	1	2	6	-	-	2	4	4	1	1	-	2	3	2	-	-	2	-	6	-	39
	15%	10%	75%	12%	-	-	12%	13%	23%	17%	17%	-	23%	29%	32%	-	-	31%	-	15%	-	16%
This was not influenced by ESOS	182	8	1	40	2	4	13	24	14	2	3	8	5	7	3	-	5	5	7	30	-	196
	81%	90%	25%	85%	100%	100%	82%	87%	74%	57%	61%	100%	77%	71%	46%	-	100%	69%	100%	80%	-	80%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 931

Q38ad. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	325	314	5	6	13	34	17	24	26	7	56	67	20	31	5	5	16	176	145	325
Weighted total	304	288	3**	13**	9**	31**	14**	27**	28**	5**	60*	54*	16**	27**	6**	9**	13**	163	138	325
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	14 5%	14 5%	1 20%	-	* 5%	1 3%	-	2 7%	-	-	2 3%	4 7%	-	4 14%	-	-	2 13%	8 5%	6 4%	17 5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	31 10%	31 11%	-	-	2 18%	1 2%	1 4%	3 11%	3 11%	2 35%	8 14%	3 5%	1 9%	2 6%	3 45%	2 21%	1 7%	13 8%	18 13%	32 10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	259 85%	244 85%	2 80%	13 100%	7 77%	29 95%	13 96%	22 82%	25 89%	4 65%	50 83%	48 88%	14 91%	21 79%	4 55%	7 79%	10 80%	141 87%	114 83%	276 85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 932

Q38ad. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 325	34	291	44	73	74	89	18	27	110	30	88	3	23	45	209	325	-	325
Weighted total 304	34*	270	41*	70*	72*	82*	15**	24**	107*	28**	78*	2**	22**	45*	193	304	-**	325
This was a result of going through the ESOS process 14 5%	1	13	3	4	1	5	-	1	4	3	3	-	1	2	7	14	-	17
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme 10 10%	4	27	5	4	9	9	-	4	10	6	7	-	1	5	23	31	-	32
This was not influenced by ESOS 259 85%	29	230	34	63	62	67	15	19	93	19	68	2	21	38	163	259	-	276
	85%	85%	81%	89%	86%	82%	100%	78%	87%	68%	87%	100%	95%	85%	85%	85%	-	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 933

Q38ad. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	325	61	176	35	49	57	234	276	50	49	57	154	17	94	238	119	38	73	79	325
Weighted total	304	55*	160	33**	52*	54*	217	260	46*	39*	53*	143	15**	88*	220	106	34*	69*	75*	325
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	14	2	9	2	1	1	12	11	4	4	2	4	1	7	9	2	1	3	5	17
	5%	4%	5%	6%	2%	2%	5%	4%	8%	11%	4%	3%	4%	8%	4%	2%	4%	5%	7%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	31	7	18	4	2	8	21	26	7	4	3	9	3	10	20	11	4	6	11	32
	10%	12%	11%	12%	5%	15%	10%	10%	14%	10%	6%	6%	22%	11%	9%	10%	12%	9%	15%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	259	46	134	27	48	45	185	222	36	30	48	130	11	72	191	93	28	60	59	276
	85%	84%	84%	82%	93%	83%	85%	86%	77%	79%	91%	91% <i>m</i>	74%	81%	87%	88%	84%	86%	79%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/a/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 934

Q38ad. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	325	204	15	106	325	30	78	35	56	56	71	170	82	61	187	75	325
Weighted total	304	188	13**	103*	304	30**	75*	33*	47*	52*	68*	152	82*	58*	168	76*	325
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	14	10	2	2	14	2	3	-	*	3	2	12	1	1	13	1	17
	5%	5%	14%	2%	5%	7%	4%	-	1%	6%	3%	8% <i>l</i>	1%	1%	8%	1%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	31	29	2	-	31	2	12	-	6	4	10	12	9	10	13	9	32
	10% <i>c</i>	15% <i>c</i>	14%	-	10%	7%	16% <i>g</i>	-	13% <i>g</i>	8%	14%	8%	11%	17%	8%	11%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	259	149	10	100	259	26	60	33	41	44	56	128	72	48	142	66	276
	85%	79%	72%	98% <i>za</i>	85%	86%	80%	100% <i>zdfhi</i>	86%	86%	83%	84%	88%	83%	85%	88%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 935

Q38ad. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.) since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	325	9	3	77	6	5	29	32	29	4	6	9	8	17	11	-	3	11	4	60	2	325
Weighted total	304	9**	3**	68*	4**	4**	21**	38**	25**	4**	6**	12**	7**	12**	14**	**	2**	12**	6**	52*	4**	325
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	14 5%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	3 13%	1 2%	1 2%	-	1 21%	-	-	1 5%	1 10%	-	-	-	-	5 10% ^c	-	17 5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	31 10%	2 21%	2 59%	3 5%	-	-	3 15%	6 15%	3 12%	-	-	-	-	3 28%	3 21%	-	-	2 12%	-	4 8%	-	32 10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	259 85%	7 79%	1 41%	64 94%	4 90%	4 100%	15 72%	32 83%	21 85%	4 100%	4 79%	12 100%	7 100%	8 68%	10 69%	-	2 100%	11 88%	6 100%	43 82%	4 100%	276 85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 936

Q38ae. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	257	251	3	3	14	21	17	24	21	4	46	57	14	13	4	3	17	152	103	257
Weighted total	241	233	2**	6**	10**	21**	14**	25**	21**	3**	48*	48*	11**	12**	7**	5**	15**	143	96*	257
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	11 5%	11 5%	-	-	1 12%	2 8%	1 9%	-	-	-	3 6%	4 7%	-	1 4%	-	-	-	6 4%	5 5%	13 5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	25 10%	25 11%	-	-	1 9%	1 5%	1 7%	4 16%	-	-	5 11%	3 6%	1 12%	3 25%	1 15%	2 41%	3 18%	12 9%	11 12%	25 10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	205 85%	197 84%	2 100%	6 100%	8 79%	18 87%	12 83%	21 84%	21 100%	3 100%	40 83%	41 87%	10 88%	9 70%	6 85%	3 59%	12 82%	125 87%	79 83%	219 85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 937

Q38ae. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	257	31	226	30	58	62	70	11	26	93	24	68	3	17	39	165	257	-	257
Weighted total	241	28**	213	26**	57*	61*	65*	10**	23**	87*	22**	64*	3**	18**	40*	150	241	-**	257
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	11	3	9	2	2	3	4	-	-	2	4	3	1	1	2	2	11	-	13
	5%	9%	4%	6%	4%	5%	7%	-	-	2%	17%	5%	48%	6%	6%	1%	5%	-	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	25	3	22	5	3	8	7	-	2	8	2	10	-	2	3	14	25	-	25
	10%	10%	10%	18%	6%	13%	11%	-	8%	9%	9%	16%	-	12%	8%	9%	10%	-	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	205	22	182	19	51	50	54	10	21	77	17	51	1	14	34	134	205	-	219
	85%	81%	86%	75%	90%	83%	82%	100%	92%	89%	73%	79%	52%	82%	86%	89%	85%	-	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 938

Q38ae. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	257	47	140	29	37	51	177	218	39	50	54	124	16	73	205	105	28	56	49	257
Weighted total	241	41*	131	28**	37*	47*	167	206	34*	45*	50*	118	12**	69*	190	95*	23**	51*	48*	257
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	11	4	5	1	1	1	10	11	2	2	3	5	-	4	8	2	1	2	3	13
	5%	9%	4%	5%	3%	2%	6%	5%	7%	4%	6%	4%	-	5%	4%	2%	6%	4%	6%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	25	4	17	3	-	6	14	19	6	7	3	12	3	8	19	7	3	5	6	25
	10%	10%	13% ^d	12%	-	12%	9%	9%	17%	16%	7%	10%	24%	11%	10%	7%	12%	10%	12%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	205	33	108	24	36	41	143	176	26	36	44	101	9	58	163	86	19	44	39	219
	85%	81%	83%	83%	97% ^{ab}	86%	86%	85%	77%	80%	88%	86%	76%	84%	86%	91%	82%	86%	82%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 939

Q38ae. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	257	172	10	75	257	22	58	32	50	51	58	127	66	51	144	59	257
Weighted total	241	159	8**	74*	241	21**	56*	31**	45*	46*	54*	120	61*	47*	135	55*	257
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	11	10	2	-	11	1	3	1	2	-	1	10	-	1	9	1	13
	5%	6% <i>c</i>	20%	-	5%	6%	5%	2%	4%	-	3%	8% <i>f</i>	-	3%	7%	2%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	25	24	-	1	25	2	9	1	6	2	5	12	7	4	16	5	25
	10% <i>c</i>	15% <i>c</i>	-	2%	10%	12%	15%	3%	12%	4%	9%	10%	11%	8%	12%	10%	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	205	126	6	72	205	17	45	30	38	44	47	98	54	42	110	49	219
	85%	79%	80%	98% <i>z</i>	85%	82%	80%	95%	84%	96% <i>zdl</i>	88%	82%	89%	89%	82%	89%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 940

Q38ae. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	257	6	1	64	5	4	22	24	21	6	8	10	8	12	5	-	8	7	7	37	2	257
Weighted total	241	6**	1**	54*	3**	3**	16**	28**	17**	8**	7**	14**	7**	8**	6**	**	7**	9**	10**	32*	4**	257
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	11	-	-	-	+	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	4	-	13
	5%	-	-	-	13%	-	6%	-	4%	13%	16%	-	-	-	44%	-	8%	-	-	12% c	-	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	25	3	-	6	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	2	2	5	-	25
	10%	55%	-	10%	-	-	8%	11%	-	-	-	19%	14%	15%	-	-	-	17%	21%	14%	-	10%
This was not influenced by ESOS	205	3	1	49	3	3	14	25	16	7	6	14	6	7	3	-	7	7	8	24	4	219
	85%	45%	100%	90%	87%	100%	86%	89%	96%	87%	84%	100%	81%	86%	41%	-	92%	83%	79%	74%	100%	85%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 941

Q38af. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	412	398	7	7	20	36	23	34	26	9	82	85	28	29	8	5	23	235	172	412
Weighted total	394	375	4**	15**	14**	31*	20**	38*	30**	8**	88*	71*	21**	27**	12**	8**	22**	219	170	412
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	17	17	-	-	1	2	-	2	1	-	3	4	*	3	-	2	1	10	8	19
	4%	5%	-	-	8%	5%	-	5%	3%	-	3%	5%	2%	9%	-	23%	5%	4%	5%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35	35	-	-	2	3	1	6	1	1	6	6	5	1	-	-	4	18	17	39
	9%	9%	-	-	12%	8%	3%	15%	4%	12%	7%	9%	23%	5%	-	-	16%	8%	10%	9%
This was not influenced by ESOS	341	322	4	15	11	27	19	30	28	7	79	61	15	23	12	6	18	191	145	354
	87%	86%	100%	100%	81%	86%	97%	80%	94%	88%	90%	86%	74%	86%	100%	77%	79%	87%	86%	86%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 942

Q38af. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	412	47	365	60	90	94	110	23	34	135	35	119	5	32	66	255	412	-	412
Weighted total	394	47*	347	56*	90*	94*	102*	21**	30*	130	33*	115*	5**	35**	70*	232	394	-**	412
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	17	2	15	2	2	7	5	1	1	6	3	8	-	2	2	10	17	-	19
	4%	4%	4%	3%	2%	7%	5%	4%	3%	4%	8%	7%	-	5%	3%	4%	4%	-	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35	3	32	6	6	8	12	-	2	13	3	12	1	4	7	21	35	-	39
	9%	7%	9%	11%	7%	9%	12%	-	6%	10%	10%	10%	20%	11%	10%	9%	9%	-	9%
This was not influenced by ESOS	341	41	300	48	81	78	85	21	27	112	27	95	4	30	61	200	341	-	354
	87%	89%	86%	86%	90%	84%	83%	96%	91%	86%	82%	83%	80%	84%	88%	86%	87%	-	86%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 943

Q38af. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	412	70	226	44	66	76	291	353	54	62	83	189	22	117	319	158	53	99	83	412
Weighted total	394	65*	207	47*	68*	71*	278	341	51*	55*	78*	179	19**	112	299	144	46*	92*	83*	412
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	17	2	12	2	1	3	13	15	4	6	2	6	2	8	13	5	3	5	5	19
	4%	4%	6%	4%	1%	4%	5%	4%	8%	10%	3%	4%	9%	7%	4%	4%	6%	5%	6%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35	11	20	3	1	10	18	28	7	7	8	16	3	8	28	13	5	10	5	39
	9%	16% <i>d</i>	10% <i>d</i>	7%	1%	15% <i>f</i>	7%	8%	14%	13%	10%	9%	14%	7%	10%	9%	12%	11%	6%	9%
This was not influenced by ESOS	341	52	175	42	67	58	247	297	40	42	68	156	15	95	257	125	37	77	73	354
	87% <i>f</i>	80%	84%	89%	98% <i>zab</i>	81%	89%	87% <i>f</i>	79%	76%	87%	87%	77%	86%	86%	87%	82%	84%	88%	86%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 944

Q38af. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	412	261	14	137	412	45	86	47	67	79	102	209	92	83	238	87	412
Weighted total	394	250	13**	131	394	46*	83*	45*	63*	73*	96*	196	92*	75*	225	89*	412
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	17	15	1	2	17	1	6	2	1	1	3	10	4	2	12	4	19
	4%	6% <i>c</i>	7%	1%	4%	1%	7%	5%	2%	1%	3%	5%	5%	2%	5%	5%	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35	31	1	4	35	4	10	3	7	2	5	22	7	4	23	7	39
	9% <i>c</i>	12% <i>c</i>	6%	3%	9%	8%	12%	7%	10%	3%	6%	11%	8%	6%	10%	8%	9%
This was not influenced by ESOS	341	204	11	126	341	42	68	40	55	70	87	163	81	69	190	77	354
	87%	82%	87%	96% <i>z</i> <i>d</i>	87%	91%	81%	88%	88%	96% <i>z</i> <i>d</i>	91%	83%	88%	92%	85%	87%	86%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 945

Q38af. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working

Base: all participants who have installed or considered installing Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys
Base: since early 2015 and have complied or intend to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	(u)	
Unweighted total	412	7	2	101	6	6	29	36	29	14	11	18	10	28	10	-	11	17	9	66	2	412
Weighted total	394	7**	3**	86*	4**	4**	20**	47*	24**	18**	10**	24**	8**	19**	11**	**	11**	20**	14**	60*	4**	412
This was a result of going through the ESOS process	17	-	-	3	*	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	2	5	-	19
	4%	-	-	3%	11%	-	4%	4%	6%	3%	-	-	6%	3%	13%	-	-	-	14%	8%	-	5%
This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	35	2	-	9	-	*	3	5	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	-	1	2	-	8	-	39
	9%	24%	-	10%	-	11%	16%	11%	3%	-	-	3%	8%	9%	9%	-	9%	7%	-	13%	-	9%
This was not influenced by ESOS	341	5	3	75	4	4	16	40	21	17	10	23	7	17	9	-	10	19	12	47	4	354
	87%	76%	100%	86%	89%	89%	80%	85%	91%	94%	100%	97%	86%	88%	79%	-	91%	93%	86%	79%	100%	86%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 946

Q38. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Summary

Base: all participants

	Unweighted total	Weighted total	This was a result of going through the ESOS process	This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	This was not influenced by ESOS
New more efficient boiler or burner	130	125	9 7%	15 12%	102 81%
Building management system	86	85	3 4%	14 17%	67 80%
Connect to existing district heating	24	25	-	6 22%	19 78%
Local controls e.g. Thermostatic Radiator Valves (TRVs), zone control	109	107	8 8%	14 13%	84 79%
Plant replacement / upgrade	83	83	3 3%	18 22%	62 75%
Control system	75	75	6 8%	13 17%	57 75%
Replacement of air conditioning with free / evaporative cooling	41	43	1 2%	4 10%	38 88%
Distribution improvements	45	41	4 9%	4 10%	33 81%
Point of use heaters	40	35	2 7%	2 6%	31 87%
Lighting controls, time switches, discrete or centralised controls	241	227	20 9%	44 20%	162 72%
Replace internal lighting with T5 fluorescent	151	138	13 9%	24 17%	102 74%
Replace internal fluorescent lighting with LED	291	278	30 11%	51 19%	197 71%
Replace internal incandescent/tungsten halogen lighting with LED	214	207	21 10%	33 16%	152 74%
Replace external lighting with LED	199	185	21 11%	25 14%	139 75%
PC power management	89	86	5 5%	8 10%	73 85%
Upgrade to more efficient screens	122	119	5 4%	6 5%	109 91%
Energy efficient file storage or server replacement	111	109	3 3%	7 7%	98 90%
Wall insulation	39	36	1 2%	4 10%	32 88%
Roof / loft insulation	46	43	1 2%	4 9%	38 89%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 946

Q38. I'd now like to review the energy efficiency improvements that you previously mentioned your business has made recently. Please can you tell me, for each measure, whether this was influenced by ESOS or not?

Summary

Base: all participants

	Unweighted total	Weighted total	This was a result of going through the ESOS process	This was influenced by both the ESOS process and other factors outside of the scheme	This was not influenced by ESOS
Draught-proofing	37	36	2 4%	7 20%	27 76%
Replacement with double/triple glazing	42	36	-	*	36 99%
Automatic / revolving doors	28	26	-	1 4%	25 96%
Variable Speed Drivers (VSDs)	45	42	2 4%	6 14%	35 82%
Addition of heat recovery	54	51	4 8%	11 21%	36 71%
Process re-engineering	102	91	4 5%	16 18%	71 77%
Changes to equipment such as fans, drives, pumps	118	108	6 6%	17 16%	84 78%
Adjustments to journeys or loading practices, to reduce mileage, time spent on the road, or load weights	312	297	16 5%	37 12%	244 82%
Switching freight operations from HGVs to more efficient modes of transport, or from air to sea, or from road to rail	81	75	1 1%	9 12%	65 87%
Adjustments to existing fleet vehicles, e.g. improving aerodynamics, adjusting tyre pressure, speed restrictors or driver monitoring technology	245	226	9 4%	35 15%	182 81%
Driver awareness training (eco-driving training, idling practices, etc.)	325	304	14 5%	31 10%	259 85%
Switching some or all vehicles to lower fuel consumption electric, hybrids, or alternatively fuelled vehicles	257	241	11 5%	25 10%	205 85%
Installation of infrastructure or policies that support alternative or reduced journeys e.g. better cycling facilities, vehicle charging points, car sharing policy, video conferencing, home working	412	394	17 4%	35 9%	341 87%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 947

Q39. Were there any other additional energy related improvements, which include those which could've been mentioned in your ESOS report, that have not already been mentioned during this interview?

Base: all participants who had added energy efficiency processes influenced by ESOS process or by both the process and other factors

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
No	626	587	10	29	11	54	33	45	35	12	167	115	42	40	12	11	37	319	298	638
	80%h	79%	94%	95%	65%	82%h	84%h	81%	63%	88%	81%h	81%h	84%h	85%h	64%	75%	83%h	80%	80%	78%
Yes - already implemented	94	92	1	2	2	6	4	3	8	1	25	19	6	6	6	2	3	50	43	110
	12%	12%	6%	5%	14%	10%	11%	6%	15%	6%	12%	13%	12%	14%	30%	17%	7%	13%	12%	14%
Yes - being considered	60	60	-	-	4	6	4	4	11	1	11	8	2	2	2	1	4	31	28	64
	8%	8%	-	-	25%	9%	9%	7%	20%zjklm	6%	5%	6%	4%	5%	11%	8%	10%	8%	7%	8%
Yes but not currently being considered	14	14	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	2	3	1	-	1	-	1	5	9	15
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	7%zej	3%	-	1%	2%	2%	-	6%	-	3%	1%	2%	2%
Don't know	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
Yes	155	152	1	2	6	12	6	11	21	2	36	27	8	7	7	4	8	80	73	175
	20%	21%	6%	5%	35%	18%	16%	19%	37%zejklmp	12%	18%	19%	16%	15%	36%	25%	17%	20%	20%	21%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 948

Q39. Were there any other additional energy related improvements, which include those which could've been mentioned in your ESOS report, that have not already been mentioned during this interview?

Base: all participants who had added energy efficiency processes influenced by ESOS process or by both the process and other factors

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
No	626	110	516	131	157	134	152	20	29	206	75	215	20	92	104	302	454	164	638
	80%h	80%	80%	85%h	79%h	78%h	87%zh	63%	58%	75%	89%i	84%j	78%	86%	80%	76%	79%	81%	78%
Yes - already implemented	94	16	78	16	19	21	17	8	13	43	5	23	*	9	15	57	74	19	110
	12%	11%	12%	10%	10%	12%	10%	25%	26%zcdef	16%jk	6%	9%	2%	8%	12%	15%	13%	10%	14%
Yes - being considered	60	13	48	7	24	14	5	3	7	26	4	15	4	9	10	30	44	16	64
	8%f	9%	7%	5%	12%zcf	8%f	3%	9%	14%cf	10%	5%	6%	17%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
Yes but not currently being considered	14	3	11	1	2	6	1	1	2	6	1	5	1	1	2	8	9	5	15
	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	4%	1%	3%	4%	2%	1%	2%	5%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Don't know	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	*
Yes	155	28	126	23	41	37	21	11	21	69	9	39	5	16	26	91	116	38	175
	20%f	20%	20%	15%	21%f	22%f	12%	37%	42%zcdef	25%jk	11%	15%	22%	14%	20%	23%	20%	19%	21%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 949

Q39. Were there any other additional energy related improvements, which include those which could've been mentioned in your ESOS report, that have not already been mentioned during this interview?

Base: all participants who had added energy efficiency processes influenced by ESOS process or by both the process and other factors

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
No	626	140	294	65	113	73	476	555	59	85	110	279	18	181	430	188	65	114	175	638
	80%ef	82%	77%	79%	85%	63%	82%e	81%	74%	86%	78%	79%l	57%	82%l	79%	79%	75%	75%	82%	78%
Yes - already implemented	94	19	56	10	8	24	58	77	14	12	23	44	7	24	71	34	15	21	20	110
	12%	11%	15% <i>d</i>	12%	6%	21% <i>z</i> f	10%	11%	17%	12%	17%	13%	23%	11%	13%	14%	18%	14%	9%	14%
Yes - being considered	60	6	34	9	11	17	42	52	10	4	7	28	7	17	44	16	8	16	16	64
	8%	4%	9% <i>a</i>	11% <i>a</i>	8%	15% <i>z</i> f	7%	7%	12% <i>f</i>	4%	5%	8%	23% <i>z</i> km	8%	8%	7%	9%	11%	8%	8%
Yes but not currently being considered	14	7	5	1	1	1	13	13	1	-	1	4	1	1	10	4	1	3	4	15
	2%	4% <i>b</i>	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	-	*	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%
Don't know	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
	*	-	-	-	2% <i>b</i>	2% <i>z</i> f	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1% <i>n</i>	*
Yes	155	30	90	17	18	41	102	131	20	14	30	72	13	40	116	51	21	37	35	175
	20%	18%	23% <i>d</i>	21%	13%	35% <i>z</i> f	18%	19%	26%	14%	22%	21%	43% <i>z</i> km	18%	21%	21%	25%	25%	17%	21%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 950

Q39. Were there any other additional energy related improvements, which include those which could've been mentioned in your ESOS report, that have not already been mentioned during this interview?

Base: all participants who had added energy efficiency processes influenced by ESOS process or by both the process and other factors

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
No	626	369	21	233	626	72	120	64	99	75	180	296	127	162	329	115	638
	80% <i>f</i>	77%	75%	85% <i>a</i>	80% <i>f</i>	80%	78%	74%	79%	71%	83%	80%	75%	85% <i>o</i>	79%	74%	78%
Yes - already implemented	94	65	6	23	94	8	17	10	14	25	16	44	31	13	53	27	110
	12%	14% <i>c</i>	20%	8%	12%	9%	11%	11%	11%	24% <i>zdefgh</i>	8%	12%	18% <i>zj</i>	7%	13% <i>m</i>	17% <i>m</i>	14%
Yes - being considered	60	45	*	14	60	11	15	12	11	4	18	29	14	11	34	15	64
	8%	10% <i>c</i>	2%	5%	8%	12%	10%	14% <i>f</i>	9%	4%	8%	8%	8%	6%	8%	10%	8%
Yes but not currently being considered	14	7	1	5	14	3	1	2	4	2	4	8	2	3	9	2	15
	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%	4%	1%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%
Don't know	2	-	-	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	1
	*	-	-	1%	*	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1% <i>n</i>	-	-	-
Yes	155	109	7	39	155	18	32	23	27	31	35	75	42	26	87	40	175
	20%	23% <i>c</i>	25%	14%	20%	20%	21%	26%	21%	29% <i>zd</i>	16%	20%	25% <i>j</i>	14%	21% <i>m</i>	26% <i>m</i>	21%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 951

Q39. Were there any other additional energy related improvements, which include those which could've been mentioned in your ESOS report, that have not already been mentioned during this interview?

Base: all participants who had added energy efficiency processes influenced by ESOS process or by both the process and other factors

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814	
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	21**	41*	26**	-**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
No	626	5	3	121	5	5	27	66	28	30	57	15	31	16	-	28	34	26	104	4	638	
	80%	59%	60%	76%	65%	84%	85%	84%	78%	88%	83%	85%	74%	75%	61%	-	79%	83%	88%	83%	100%	78%
Yes - already implemented	94	2	2	18	2	1	4	9	4	2	3	6	5	7	5	5	5	1	14	-	110	
	12%	26%	40%	12%	23%	16%	12%	11%	10%	6%	10%	8%	26%	18%	19%	-	13%	11%	4%	11%	-	14%
Yes - being considered	60	3	-	17	1	-	2	2	3	2	2	2	-	1	4	-	4	5	3	9	-	64
	8%	31%	-	11%	13%	-	5%	3%	9%	5%	7%	4%	-	3%	15%	-	11%	11%	12%	7%	-	8%
Yes but not currently being considered	14	-	-	5	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	15
	2%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	2%	2%	-	4%	3%	-	6%zs	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%
Don't know	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Yes	155	4	2	39	3	1	5	13	8	4	4	10	5	10	8	-	7	7	3	21	-	175
	20%	41%	40%	24%	35%	16%	15%	16%	22%	12%	17%	15%	26%	25%	31%	-	21%	17%	12%	17%	-	21%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 952

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Lack of funding/finance	336	317	5	13	8	32	21	24	25	6	79	57	22	26	10	5	17	158	174	355
	43%	43%	50%	44%	47%	48%	54%	43%	45%	42%	39%	40%	43%	56% <i>j</i>	52%	36%	39%	39%	47%	44%
Too much uncertainty about long term benefits and costs	110	108	*	2	2	9	2	9	8	4	28	27	2	5	6	1	6	67	42	113
	14%	15%	5%	5%	14%	14%	6%	16%	14%	26%	14%	19% <i>fl</i>	5%	11%	30%	5%	15%	17% <i>r</i>	17%	14%
Limitations of the premises	62	60	2	-	3	9	2	2	3	3	15	13	4	5	-	1	4	32	30	69
	8%	8%	16%	-	16%	14%	4%	3%	6%	20%	7%	9%	7%	11%	-	6%	9%	8%	8%	8%
Personnel resources not available to take forward	47	46	1	-	-	4	1	3	6	1	11	7	3	5	-	-	4	23	22	51
	6%	6%	5%	-	-	7%	2%	5%	10%	5%	5%	5%	7%	11%	-	-	9%	6%	6%	6%
We don't stand to benefit from taking action	42	41	1	-	1	5	3	4	1	-	11	4	3	4	1	2	3	21	21	50
	5%	6%	11%	-	4%	8%	7%	7%	3%	-	5%	3%	6%	9%	6%	13%	6%	5%	6%	6%
They would require action on the part of the landlord/landlord won't be willing to make the changes	32	32	-	-	-	2	1	5	3	2	8	4	1	-	-	-	3	18	12	29
	4%	4%	-	-	-	2%	3%	8%	5%	13%	4%	3%	2%	-	-	-	6%	5%	3%	4%
Energy efficiency not an organisational priority	26	26	-	-	*	5	1	1	-	-	4	10	1	-	-	-	1	15	10	27
	3%	3%	-	-	3%	8% <i>j</i>	1%	2%	-	-	2%	7% <i>zj</i>	3%	-	-	-	3%	4%	3%	3%
There are no further cost effective technologies available to us at the moment	25	24	-	2	-	3	1	1	1	1	7	6	2	2	-	-	2	15	11	27
	3%	3%	-	6%	-	5%	3%	2%	2%	6%	3%	4%	4%	3%	-	-	4%	4%	3%	3%
Validity / practicality of the recommendation/s	19	19	-	-	*	2	1	1	1	-	5	3	2	3	-	-	-	9	10	21
	2%	3%	-	-	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	4%	7%	-	-	-	2%	3%	3%
Lack of support from board/senior management	19	19	-	-	*	2	1	-	2	1	6	5	-	-	-	-	2	7	11	20
	2%	3%	-	-	3%	3%	1%	-	3%	6%	3%	4%	-	-	-	-	5%	2%	3%	2%
Can cause disruption to the business	16	16	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	4	-	-	2	-	3	7	9	18
	2%	2%	-	-	9%	1%	3%	-	-	-	1%	3%	-	-	10%	-	7% <i>zj</i>	2%	2%	2%
Lack of trusted information - We are aware of options, but advice isn't sufficiently tailored or we get conflicting advice	16	16	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	7	1	2	2	-	-	-	4	11	15
	2%	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	3%	2%	-	4%	1%	4%	4%	-	-	-	1%	3%	2%
Lack of support from the workforce	13	13	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	4	3	2	-	-	-	-	6	7	15
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	4%	-	2%	2%	3%	-	-	-	-	1%	2%	2%
Payback time / period is too long	11	11	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	2	-	1	-	2	8	3	11
	1%	1%	-	-	4%	-	2%	2%	3%	-	1%	1%	4%	-	3%	-	4%	2%	1%	1%
Impacts on quality of our goods and services/ ability to meet customers' expectations	9	9	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	5	1	-	1	-	-	2	9	*	10
	1%	1%	6%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	5%	2%	1%	-	1%	-	-	4%	2% <i>r</i>	*	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 952

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Leasing issues / lease length	7 1%	6 1%	1 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	2	6	1	8
Return on investment	7 1%	7 1%	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	4	2	6
Lack of information - We don't know what's possible	6 1%	5 1%	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	6
The site is closing down / we are moving site	5 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	-	1	-	*	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	1	5
Legislation / regulation	5 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	2	5
Reluctance to take action in market that isn't well established - don't want to take action yet in case new and better (cheaper or more effective) options will be available in future	5 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	2	5
Technological limitations	5 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	3	4
Changes have already been implemented	5 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	3%zjk	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	10%	6%	-	-	1	1	3
Accuracy of payback / 2 year payback period	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	3
No recommendations were suggested	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	*	3
Lack of understanding about energy efficiency	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
None	157 20%	147 20%	3 28%	7 22%	2 13%	12 18%	11 28%	8 15%	10 18%	3 19%	48 23%	30 21%	9 18%	6 13%	2 8%	3 23%	8 18%	79 20%	75 20%	159 20%
Other	13 2%	13 2%	-	-	1 5%	3 4%	-	-	-	-	2 1%	3 2%	2 4%	-	2 11%	1 10%	-	7 2%	6 2%	13 2%
Don't know	22 3%	14 2%	1 5%	7 23%	-	3 4%	1 1%	2 4%	2 3%	-	5 2%	4 3%	2 4%	-	-	3 19%	-	9 2%	11 3%	20 2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 953

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Lack of funding/finance	336	55	281	53	89	68	84	17	21	125	40	101	9	50	57	169	259	75	355
	43%	39%	44%	34%	45%	40%	48% <i>c</i>	56%	42%	45%	48%	39%	36%	46%	44%	43%	45%	37%	44%
Too much uncertainty about long term benefits and costs	110	17	94	19	20	21	31	9	11	29	14	37	3	9	18	67	82	27	113
	14%	12%	15%	12%	10%	12%	18% <i>d</i>	27%	21% <i>d</i>	11%	16%	14%	13%	9%	14%	17%	14%	13%	14%
Limitations of the premises	62	7	55	11	23	13	11	2	3	19	6	25	3	16	6	28	46	16	69
	8%	5%	9%	7%	12%	7%	6%	6%	5%	7%	7%	10%	14%	15% <i>zno</i>	4%	7%	8%	8%	8%
Personnel resources not available to take forward	47	8	39	7	12	6	9	5	8	16	1	15	4	7	7	19	36	10	51
	6%	6%	6%	5%	6%	4%	5%	17%	16% <i>ccdef</i>	6%	1%	6%	15%	7%	5%	5%	6%	5%	6%
We don't stand to benefit from taking action	42	9	33	7	11	10	10	1	2	16	4	15	-	8	8	15	33	9	50
	5%	6%	5%	4%	6%	6%	6%	3%	5%	6%	5%	6%	-	7%	6%	4%	6%	5%	6%
They would require action on the part of the landlord/landlord won't be willing to make the changes	32	5	27	3	12	9	5	1	1	-	5	20	2	4	6	15	26	6	29
	4% <i>f</i>	4%	4%	2%	6%	5%	3%	3%	1%	-	6% <i>f</i>	8% <i>z</i>	9%	3%	4%	4%	5%	3%	4%
Energy efficiency not an organisational priority	26	8	18	8	6	5	6	1	1	9	1	8	2	5	7	10	26	-	27
	3% <i>q</i>	6%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	6%	4%	5%	3%	4% <i>q</i>	-	3%
There are no further cost effective technologies available to us at the moment	25	4	22	5	2	6	8	2	2	7	3	9	2	*	4	15	21	4	27
	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	4%	4%	6%	4%	3%	3%	4%	9%	*	3%	4%	4%	2%	3%
Validity / practicality of the recommendation/s	19	2	17	4	5	3	5	-	2	3	3	7	1	2	2	12	15	4	21
	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	-	5%	1%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	3%
Lack of support from board/senior management	19	1	18	3	3	4	4	1	3	6	1	5	-	2	4	10	17	2	20
	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	6%	2%	1%	2%	-	2%	3%	3%	3%	1%	2%
Can cause disruption to the business	16	4	12	5	2	2	4	2	-	5	2	8	-	1	6	9	10	6	18
	2%	3%	2%	4%	1%	1%	2%	5%	-	2%	2%	3%	-	1%	5%	2%	2%	3%	2%
Lack of trusted information - We are aware of options, but advice isn't sufficiently tailored or we get conflicting advice	16	2	14	4	1	6	3	-	1	7	1	4	1	2	2	8	11	4	15
	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	4%	2%	-	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Lack of support from the workforce	13	4	8	4	2	3	2	-	1	3	1	4	1	3	1	6	12	1	15
	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	3%	1%	1%	2%	4%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Payback time / period is too long	11	1	10	-	1	4	1	2	2	2	1	6	-	2	1	6	6	4	11
	1%	1%	2%	-	*	2%	1%	8%	4% <i>cd</i>	1%	2%	3%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%
Impacts on quality of our goods and services/ ability to meet customers' expectations	9	-	9	2	-	4	3	1	-	2	1	4	-	2	-	7	4	5	10
	1%	-	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	3%	-	1%	2%	2%	-	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 953

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites			Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Total (a)	Single (b)	Multi (c)	Less than 250 (d)	250-499 (e)	500-999 (f)	1,000-4,999 (g)	5,000-9,999 (h)	10,000+ (i)	Owned (j)	Rented (k)	Leased (l)	Up to £5m (m)	£5m-£25m (n)	£25m-£50m (o)	More than £50m (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Leasing issues / lease length	7 1%	1 1%	6 1%	1 *	1 *	1 1%	4 2%	* 1%	-	-	-	7 3%z	-	-	-	4 1%	5 1%	2 1%	8 1%
Return on investment	7 1%	1 1%	6 1%	-	1 1%	1 1%	4 2%	-	1 2%	6 2%	-	1 *	-	-	-	6 2%	6 1%	1 *	6 1%
Lack of information - We don't know what's possible	6 1%	4 3%zb	2 *	5 3%zd	-	1 1%	1 *	-	-	3 1%	-	3 1%	-	4 3%zo	2 1%	1 *	3 1%	3 2%	6 1%
The site is closing down / we are moving site	5 1%	2 1%	4 1%	-	2 1%	2 1%	-	-	1 2%	2 1%	-	3 1%	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 *	3 1%	2 1%	5 1%
Legislation / regulation	5 1%	3 2%b	2 *	1 *	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	1 *	-	-	-	5 1%	3 1%	2 1%	5 1%
Reluctance to take action in market that isn't well established - don't want to take action yet in case new and better (cheaper or more effective) options will be available in future	5 1%	-	5 1%	-	1 1%	-	3 1%	-	1 2%	3 1%	-	1 *	-	-	1 1%	4 1%	5 1%	-	5 1%
Technological limitations	5 1%	3 2%b	2 *	1 1%	1 1%	1 *	2 1%	-	-	5 2%k	-	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	2 *	4 1%	1 *	4 *
Changes have already been implemented	5 1%	-	5 1%	2 1%	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	5 2%l	-	-	3 2%o	1 *	-	3 2%p	3 *
Accuracy of payback / 2 year payback period	4 *	1 1%	3 *	-	1 1%	-	3 1%	-	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	-	1 1%	3 1%	4 1%	-	3 *
No recommendations were suggested	2 *	* *	2 *	* *	1 *	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	2 1%o	-	1 *	1 1%	3 *
Lack of understanding about energy efficiency	1 *	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 *	1 *	-	2 *
None	157 20%	28 20%	129 20%	36 23%	41 21%	30 17%	40 23%	2 7%	8 15%	46 17%	26 31%zik	47 18%	6 24%	16 15%	30 23%	74 19%	107 19%	49 24%	159 20%
Other	13 2%	3 2%	10 2%	2 2%	1 1%	7 4%df	-	1 3%	1 3%f	7 3%	-	5 2%	2 6%	1 1%	1 1%	9 2%	11 2%	2 1%	13 2%
Don't know	22 3%	3 2%	18 3%	9 6%f	6 3%	3 2%	2 1%	-	2 2%	11 4%	1 1%	4 2%	-	2 2%	-	11 3%	16 3%	5 3%	20 2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 954

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)		
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Lack of funding/finance	336 43% <i>cl</i>	75 44% <i>cc</i>	182 47% <i>cd</i>	24 29%	48 36%	59 51%	245 42%	302 44% <i>fl</i>	30 38%	32 32%	67 48% <i>fl</i>	141 40%	12 40%	118 54% <i>zk</i>	243 45%	112 47%	36 42%	65 43%	87 41%	355 44%
Too much uncertainty about long term benefits and costs	110 14%	27 16%	49 13%	16 19%	18 14%	17 15%	80 14%	99 14%	9 11%	17 17%	21 15%	57 16%	4 12%	33 15%	82 15%	40 17%	12 14%	23 15%	28 13%	113 14%
Limitations of the premises	62 8%	13 8%	30 8%	9 11%	8 6%	11 10%	48 8%	59 9%	9 11%	7 7%	14 10%	34 10% <i>mm</i>	3 11%	11 5%	39 7%	13 5%	9 10%	7 5%	22 10%	69 8%
Personnel resources not available to take forward	47 6%	9 5%	22 6%	5 6%	10 8%	7 6%	35 6%	39 6%	8 10%	6 6%	10 7%	20 6%	3 11%	12 6%	38 7%	25 10% <i>zr</i>	4 4%	8 6%	9 4%	51 6%
We don't stand to benefit from taking action	42 5%	10 6%	23 6%	5 6%	4 3%	6 5%	33 6%	39 6%	2 2%	5 5%	6 4%	18 5%	2 7%	14 6%	32 6%	14 6%	6 7%	13 9%	10 5%	50 6%
They would require action on the part of the landlord/landlord won't be willing to make the changes	32 4% <i>l</i>	5 3%	7 2%	10 12% <i>zab</i>	7 5% <i>b</i>	2 2%	30 5%	29 4% <i>l</i>	3 4%	- -	5 3%	14 4%	- -	8 4%	21 4%	6 2%	1 2%	1 1%	8 4%	29 4%
Energy efficiency not an organisational priority	26 3%	3 2%	17 4%	3 4%	3 2%	21 4%	22 3%	4 5%	2 2%	6 4%	10 3%	1 5%	8 4%	19 3%	8 3%	1 1%	6 4%	7 3%	27 3%	
There are no further cost effective technologies available to us at the moment	25 3%	6 4%	12 3%	1 1%	6 5%	3 3%	20 3%	23 3%	1 1%	- *	3 2%	11 3%	2 5%	6 3%	16 3%	8 3%	3 3%	4 3%	7 3%	27 3%
Validity / practicality of the recommendation/s	19 2%	3 1%	9 2%	1 1%	6 5%	5 4%	11 2%	17 2%	2 3%	2 2%	1 1%	5 1%	1 3%	8 4%	9 2%	5 2%	2 2%	2 2%	9 4% <i>n</i>	21 3%
Lack of support from board/senior management	19 2%	4 2%	10 3%	1 1%	4 3%	5 5%	11 2%	17 2%	3 4%	3 3%	7 5%	11 3%	- 2%	6 2%	13 2%	7 3%	- 3%	4 3%	6 3%	20 2%
Can cause disruption to the business	16 2%	6 4%	5 1%	1 2%	4 3%	3 2%	12 2%	12 2%	3 3%	2 3%	3 2%	8 2%	1 5%	3 1%	11 2%	4 2%	- 1%	1 1%	5 2%	18 2%
Lack of trusted information - We are aware of options, but advice isn't sufficiently tailored or we get conflicting advice	16 2%	4 2%	4 1%	4 4%	4 3%	2 2%	13 2%	15 2%	1 1%	3 3%	1 1%	8 2%	- -	5 2%	9 2%	5 2%	- 2%	3 2%	5 2%	15 2%
Lack of support from the workforce	13 2%	3 2%	7 2%	1 1%	1 1%	3 2%	10 2%	11 2%	2 3%	1 1%	3 2%	4 1%	- 1%	3 1%	10 2%	3 1%	1 2%	2 1%	2 1%	15 2%
Payback time / period is too long	11 1%	1 *	8 2%	1 2%	- -	- *	9 2%	9 1%	- 1%	1 1%	4 3%	9 2%	1 4%	1 *	8 2%	4 2%	1 1%	2 1%	2 1%	11 1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 954

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Impacts on quality of our goods and services/ ability to meet customers' expectations	9 1%	2 1%	5 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	7 1%	9 1%	1 1%	* *	1 1%	5 2%	- -	3 1%	7 1%	5 2%	* 1%	1 1%	2 1%	10 1%
Leasing issues / lease length	7 1%	2 1%	4 1%	- -	1 1%	1 1%	4 1%	7 1%	- -	2 2%	3 2%	4 1%	- -	2 1%	7 1%	4 2%	* 1%	2 1%	- -	8 1%
Return on investment	7 1%	- -	6 2%	1 1%	- -	3 3%	4 1%	6 1%	1 1%	- -	2 2%	2 1%	- -	2 1%	5 1%	4 2%	1 2%	3 2%	2 1%	6 1%
Lack of information - We don't know what's possible	6 1%	4 3% b	1 *	1 2%	- -	- -	4 1%	4 1%	- -	1 1%	- -	4 1%	- -	1 *	1 *	- -	- -	1 *	2 1%	6 1%
The site is closing down / we are moving site	5 1%	2 1%	1 *	2 2%	* *	1 1%	4 1%	5 1%	- -	- -	1 1%	* 4% k	1 1%	5 1%	3 1%	3 3% zr	2 2%	- -	5 1%	
Legislation / regulation	5 1%	1 *	1 *	- -	3 2% b	3 2% f	2 *	3 *	2 2% g	1 1%	2 2%	3 1%	- -	2 1%	4 1%	2 1%	- -	2 1%	1 *	5 1%
Reluctance to take action in market that isn't well established - don't want to take action yet in case new and better (cheaper or more effective) options will be available in future	5 1%	- -	4 1%	- -	1 1%	- -	3 1%	3 *	- -	1 1%	- -	4 1%	1 2% m	- -	5 1%	2 1%	2 2% r	1 1%	- -	5 1%
Technological limitations	5 1%	- -	5 1%	- -	- -	- 3	3 1%	5 1%	1 1%	1 1%	3 2%	2 1%	- -	1 *	3 1%	3 1%	1 1%	2 2%	1 1%	4 *
Changes have already been implemented	5 1%	- -	3 1%	1 2%	- -	- 5	5 1%	- -	- -	3 2%	- -	- -	1 1%	3 1%	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 1%	3 *
Accuracy of payback / 2 year payback period	4 *	- -	4 1%	- -	- -	- *	4 1%	- -	2 2%	2 1%	2 1%	4 1%	- -	- -	4 1%	2 1%	1 1%	4 2% zr	- -	3 *
No recommendations were suggested	2 *	- -	* *	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 *	2 *	- -	* *	- -	* *	- *	1 *	2 *	1 *	1 1%	1 1%	* *	3 *
Lack of understanding about energy efficiency	1 *	1 *	1 *	- -	- -	- -	1 *	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 2% zk	1 *	1 *	1 *	- -	- -	1 *	2 *
None	157 20% em	35 21%	71 18%	18 22%	30 22%	12 10%	120 21% e	130 19%	20 26%	30 31% zgj	26 19%	70 20% m	5 18%	27 12%	102 19%	45 19%	20 24%	30 20%	51 24%	159 20%
Other	13 2%	3 2%	6 2%	2 2%	2 1%	2 2%	11 2%	12 2%	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	8 2%	- 1%	2 1%	8 1%	5 2%	3 3%	1 1%	6 3%	13 2%
Don't know	22 3% q	2 1%	11 3%	5 6%	4 3%	2 2%	9 2%	16 2%	4 5%	4 4%	2 1%	12 3%	1 2%	3 1%	14 3%	4 2%	- -	- -	2 1%	20 2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 955

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Lack of funding/finance	336	219	13	104	336	39	64	45	49	46	89	173	65	72	196	57	355
	43%	46%	46%	38%	43%	44%	41%	52%	39%	43%	41%	47%	38%	38%	47% <i>m</i>	37%	44%
Too much uncertainty about long term benefits and costs	110	66	2	41	110	16	21	14	25	19	36	48	22	29	59	17	113
	14%	14%	6%	15%	14%	18%	14%	16%	20%	18%	16%	13%	13%	15%	14%	11%	14%
Limitations of the premises	62	44	*	17	62	10	16	8	7	6	19	32	10	16	36	9	69
	8%	9%	2%	6%	8%	12%	11%	9%	5%	5%	9%	9%	6%	8%	9%	6%	8%
Personnel resources not available to take forward	47	25	5	17	47	9	5	4	2	11	21	20	4	16	4	27	51
	6% <i>h</i>	5%	17%	6%	6% <i>h</i>	10% <i>h</i>	3%	4%	2%	10% <i>h</i>	10% <i>l</i>	5%	2%	8% <i>o</i>	6%	2%	6%
We don't stand to benefit from taking action	42	23	1	18	42	3	9	2	5	4	11	18	10	10	21	9	50
	5%	5%	4%	7%	5%	4%	6%	2%	4%	4%	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%	6%
They would require action on the part of the landlord/landlord won't be willing to make the changes	32	17	-	15	32	6	5	-	3	2	15	10	4	12	15	4	29
	4%	4%	-	5%	4%	7% <i>g</i>	4%	-	2%	2%	7% <i>kl</i>	3%	2%	6%	4%	3%	4%
Energy efficiency not an organisational priority	26	16	2	7	26	6	2	3	3	1	17	8	*	16	8	1	27
	3% <i>l</i>	3%	8%	3%	3%	6% <i>f</i>	1%	4%	2%	1%	8% <i>zkl</i>	2%	*	9% <i>zno</i>	2%	1%	3%
There are no further cost effective technologies available to us at the moment	25	18	-	7	25	2	8	1	4	4	8	13	4	6	12	6	27
	3%	4%	-	3%	3%	2%	5%	1%	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%
Validity / practicality of the recommendation/s	19	11	1	7	19	-	3	-	4	4	9	6	3	8	6	3	21
	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	-	2%	-	3%	4%	4%	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%	3%
Lack of support from board/senior management	19	13	1	5	19	3	4	3	3	1	11	7	2	10	8	1	20
	2%	3%	5%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	5% <i>kl</i>	2%	1%	5% <i>no</i>	2%	1%	2%
Can cause disruption to the business	16	10	3	3	16	2	2	2	*	3	5	6	4	5	8	3	18
	2%	2%	10%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	*	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Lack of trusted information - We are aware of options, but advice isn't sufficiently tailored or we get conflicting advice	16	11	-	5	16	-	3	1	5	2	8	8	-	5	9	2	15
	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	4%	2%	4% <i>l</i>	2%	-	3%	2%	1%	2%
Lack of support from the workforce	13	10	1	2	13	2	4	1	1	1	2	10	1	2	9	2	15
	2%	2%	4%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Payback time / period is too long	11	4	2	4	11	1	*	3	3	-	2	7	1	2	8	1	11
	1%	1%	7%	2%	1%	2%	*	3%	2%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	*	1%
Impacts on quality of our goods and services/ ability to meet customers' expectations	9	8	1	1	9	1	3	-	2	2	2	6	1	1	9	-	10
	1%	2%	3%	*	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	1%	2%	*	*	2%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 955

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Leasing issues / lease length	7 1%	4 1%	-	3	7	1	*	2	1	2	4	3	1	2	5	-	8
Return on investment	7 1%	5 1%	-	2	7	-	1	-	1	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	6
Lack of information - We don't know what's possible	6 1%	3 1%	-	3	6	1	1	-	1	-	-	6	-	1	3	3	6
The site is closing down / we are moving site	5 1%	2 1%	-	3	5	1	*	-	-	1	5	-	1	5	-	1	5
Legislation / regulation	5 1%	5 1%	-	1	5	1	-	-	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	5
Reluctance to take action in market that isn't well established - don't want to take action yet in case new and better (cheaper or more effective) options will be available in future	5 1%	2 *	1 3%	2 1%	5 1%	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	-	2 1%	3 2%	-	2 *	3 2%	5 1%
Technological limitations	5 1%	3 1%	-	2 1%	5 1%	-	1 1%	3 3%zcd	-	1	1	1	1	1	2	-	4
Changes have already been implemented	5 1%	1 *	-	3 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	5 1%	-	-	1 2%n	3 *	3
Accuracy of payback / 2 year payback period	4 *	3 1%	1 4%	-	4 *	-	1 1%	2 2%	1 1%	-	-	4 1%	-	-	4 1%	-	3
No recommendations were suggested	2 *	1 *	-	1 *	2 *	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 *	-	2 1%	1 *	1 *	*	3
Lack of understanding about energy efficiency	1 *	1 *	1 3%	-	1 *	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	1 *	1 *	-	1 1%	-	-	2
None	157 20%fj	84 18%	6 21%	65 24%a	157 20%	17 19%	31 20%	17 20%	28 22%	23 22%	29 13%	72 19%	50 30%zjk	31 17%	77 18%	44 29%zmn	159 20%
Other	13 2%	6 1%	2 6%	5 2%	13 2%	2 2%	3 2%	1 2%	2 2%	3 3%	6 3%	4 1%	3 2%	6 3%	5 1%	2 1%	13 2%
Don't know	22 3%	13 3%	-	8 3%	22 3%	1 1%	5 4%	3 3%	3 2%	1	8 4%	6 2%	6 4%	5 3%	8 2%	7 5%	20 2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 956

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814	
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	21**	41*	26**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
Lack of funding/finance	336	5	1	65	5	2	11	43	13	10	7	29	7	15	14	-	17	23	14	51	2	355
	43%	52%	28%	41%	58%	37%	35%	55%	36%	29%	29%	44%	32%	36%	56%	-	49%	58%	48%	40%	54%	44%
Too much uncertainty about long term benefits and costs	110	1	-	30	2	1	1	13	7	6	3	13	4	8	1	-	2	5	-	11	-	113
	14%	15%	-	19% <i>fps</i>	29%	27%	4%	17%	20% <i>fp</i>	16%	12%	20% <i>f</i>	20%	20% <i>fps</i>	4%	-	5%	13%	-	9%	-	14%
Limitations of the premises	62	3	-	8	1	-	3	4	4	2	6	3	2	3	5	-	4	2	3	8	-	69
	8%	28%	-	5%	16%	-	11%	5%	12%	7%	24%	5%	11%	6%	18%	-	12%	5%	11%	6%	-	8%
Personnel resources not available to take forward	47	-	1	11	-	2	5	4	1	1	-	3	2	-	5	-	4	3	-	6	-	51
	6%	-	13%	7%	-	31%	17% <i>zckms</i>	5%	3%	3%	-	4%	7%	1%	18%	-	10%	6%	-	5%	-	6%
We don't stand to benefit from taking action	42	-	1	11	-	1	2	3	1	3	1	-	3	4	-	-	1	4	-	8	-	50
	5%	-	19%	7%	-	14%	5%	4%	2%	9%	4%	-	14%	9% <i>k</i>	-	-	2%	10% <i>k</i>	-	7%	-	6%
They would require action on the part of the landlord/landlord won't be willing to make the changes	32	-	-	*	-	-	-	2	2	-	4	9	1	3	2	-	-	2	4	4	-	29
	4% <i>c</i>	-	-	*	-	-	-	2%	4% <i>c</i>	-	14%	14% <i>zcfgps</i>	4%	6% <i>c</i>	8%	-	-	5% <i>c</i>	14%	3%	-	4%
Energy efficiency not an organisational priority	26	2	-	9	-	1	1	3	1	1	-	1	2	2	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	27
	3%	18%	-	6%	-	11%	3%	3%	3%	3%	-	2%	8%	4%	-	-	4%	3%	-	1%	-	3%
There are no further cost effective technologies available to us at the moment	25	2	-	3	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	2	*	4	3	-	1	1	-	3	-	27
	3%	24%	-	2%	-	-	-	2%	4%	3%	9%	2%	2%	9% <i>zcs</i>	11%	-	3%	3%	-	3%	-	3%
Validity / practicality of the recommendation/s	19	1	-	2	-	-	2	3	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	21
	2%	9%	-	1%	-	-	8% <i>zck</i>	4%	6% <i>ck</i>	-	-	-	3%	2%	9%	-	3%	3%	-	2%	-	3%
Lack of support from board/senior management	19	-	-	6	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	2	4	-	-	-	3	-	-	20
	2%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	1%	3%	3%	-	-	8%	5%	14%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	2%
Can cause disruption to the business	16	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	1	3	-	-	-	2	1	-	4	-	18
	2%	-	40%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	-	-	8%	-	4%	6% <i>zck</i>	-	-	5%	2%	-	3%	-	2%
Lack of trusted information - We are aware of options, but advice isn't sufficiently tailored or we get conflicting advice	16	-	-	1	-	1	1	3	1	1	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	15
	2%	-	-	1%	-	14%	2%	3%	3%	-	4%	3%	-	4% <i>c</i>	4%	-	4%	3%	-	1%	-	2%
Lack of support from the workforce	13	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	7	-	15
	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	5% <i>g</i>	-	-	-	-	3%	3%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	5% <i>zcc</i>	-	2%
Payback time / period is too long	11	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	11
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	3%	1%	4%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	1%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 956

Q40. What barriers, if any, do you think your organisation might face in implementing recommendations you received through ESOS which aim to improve your firm's energy efficiency?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)			
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)	
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	8**	25**	66*	21**	41*	26**	**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
Impacts on quality of our goods and services/ ability to meet customers' expectations	9 1%	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	2	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	10 1%
Leasing issues / lease length	7 1%	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	4%zs	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	8 1%
Return on investment	7 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	6 1%
Lack of information - We don't know what's possible	6 1%	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6 1%
The site is closing down / we are moving site	5 1%	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 1%
Legislation / regulation	5 1%	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	8%	-	-	-	-	*	-	5 1%
Reluctance to take action in market that isn't well established - don't want to take action yet in case new and better (cheaper or more effective) options will be available in future	5 1%	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	5 1%
Technological limitations	5 1%	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 *
Changes have already been implemented	5 1%	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3 *
Accuracy of payback / 2 year payback period	4 *	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 *
No recommendations were suggested	2 *	-	1	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 *
Lack of understanding about energy efficiency	1 *	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *
None	157 20%	1	-	30	2	1	7	9	8	11	17	5	5	2	9%	-	7	6	5	34	-	-	159 20%
Other	13 2%	-	-	6	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	13 2%
Don't know	22 3%	-	-	2	-	-	3	9	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	2	-	20 2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 957

Q41. Will the budget for any energy efficiency improvements, including changes to transport, be entirely new investment or will it fully or partially displace other intended investments?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	781	18	15	24	73	46	51	49	16	190	171	60	54	14	11	45	422	382	814
Weighted total	782	742	10**	30**	17**	66*	40*	56*	56*	14**	205	142	50*	47*	19**	14**	44*	400	371	814
Entirely new investment	351	337	2	12	6	30	18	27	21	5	87	63	24	23	11	8	25	181	166	369
	45%	45%	23%	40%	33%	45%	46%	48%	38%	35%	42%	44%	48%	48%	62%	55%	56%	45%	45%	45%
Partially displace other intended investments	225	212	5	8	8	20	16	18	4	52	42	15	13	1	5	9	112	112	238	
	29%	29%	49%	25%	44%	30%	42% <i>fp</i>	32%	32%	32%	25%	29%	31%	27%	4%	35%	21%	28%	30%	29%
Fully replace other intended investments	41	35	2	4	1	2	-	1	4	2	10	11	3	-	-	5	23	18	43	
	5%	5%	17%	13%	6%	3%	-	2%	8%	15%	5%	8%	2%	6%	-	-	12% <i>fg</i>	6%	5%	5%
Don't know	92	87	1	5	2	8	1	6	9	3	36	11	5	7	3	2	1	50	37	92
	12% <i>f</i>	12%	6%	15%	12%	12%	2%	10%	15% <i>fp</i>	19%	18% <i>zfkp</i>	8%	10%	15% <i>fp</i>	14%	11%	2%	12%	10%	11%
Not applicable	73	70	1	2	1	6	4	5	4	-	21	15	5	2	4	-	4	35	38	72
	9%	9%	4%	7%	5%	9%	11%	8%	7%	-	10%	11%	9%	3%	21%	-	9%	9%	10%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 958

Q41. Will the budget for any energy efficiency improvements, including changes to transport, be entirely new investment or will it fully or partially displace other intended investments?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owmed (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	814	147	667	160	205	173	186	33	53	286	84	263	27	102	123	430	603	204	814
Weighted total	782	139	644	154	198	172	175	31**	49*	276	83*	256	25**	108*	129	394	572	202	814
Entirely new investment	351	59	293	66	91	89	66	14	25	124	37	116	8	46	60	191	264	87	369
	45%	42%	45%	43%	46%	52% <i>f</i>	38%	46%	50%	45%	44%	45%	32%	43%	46%	48%	46%	43%	45%
Partially displace other intended investments	225	35	190	39	55	42	66	11	11	85	23	71	5	35	34	124	167	55	238
	29%	25%	30%	26%	28%	25%	38% <i>zcde</i>	34%	23%	31%	28%	28%	21%	33%	26%	32%	29%	27%	29%
Fully replace other intended investments	41	1	40	3	11	11	11	1	5	15	1	14	3	5	7	19	33	9	43
	5% <i>a</i>	1%	6% <i>a</i>	2%	5%	6%	6%	2%	10% <i>c</i>	6%	2%	5%	11%	5%	5%	5%	6%	4%	5%
Don't know	92	21	71	19	27	16	18	2	6	26	18	22	2	8	19	34	59	30	92
	12%	15%	11%	13%	14%	9%	10%	5%	13%	10%	21% <i>zlk</i>	9%	8%	7%	15%	9%	10%	15%	11%
Not applicable	73	23	49	26	13	13	14	4	2	25	4	34	7	13	9	27	49	22	72
	9%	17% <i>zb</i>	8%	17% <i>zdefh</i>	7%	8%	8%	13%	4%	9%	5%	13%	28%	12%	7%	7%	9%	11%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 959

Q41. Will the budget for any energy efficiency improvements, including changes to transport, be entirely new investment or will it fully or partially displace other intended investments?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	814	180	411	84	125	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	584	263	95	165	210	814
Weighted total	782	170	384	82*	133	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	546	239	86*	151	212	814
Entirely new investment	351 <i>45%lm</i>	79 <i>47%</i>	171 <i>45%</i>	40 <i>49%</i>	57 <i>43%</i>	45 <i>39%</i>	270 <i>47%</i>	311 <i>45%</i>	38 <i>48%</i>	55 <i>55%j</i>	59 <i>42%</i>	351 <i>100%zlm</i>	-	-	249 <i>46%</i>	110 <i>46%</i>	42 <i>48%</i>	72 <i>48%</i>	94 <i>44%</i>	369 <i>45%</i>
Partially displace other intended investments	225 <i>25%k</i>	48 <i>28%</i>	124 <i>32%</i>	19 <i>23%</i>	33 <i>25%</i>	39 <i>34%</i>	165 <i>29%</i>	198 <i>29%</i>	20 <i>25%</i>	27 <i>28%</i>	50 <i>36%</i>	-	29 <i>94%zk</i>	184 <i>84%zk</i>	166 <i>30%</i>	74 <i>31%</i>	26 <i>30%</i>	42 <i>28%</i>	54 <i>26%</i>	238 <i>29%</i>
Fully replace other intended investments	41 <i>5%k</i>	6 <i>4%</i>	17 <i>5%</i>	4 <i>5%</i>	13 <i>10%ab</i>	9 <i>8%</i>	24 <i>4%</i>	34 <i>5%</i>	8 <i>10%</i>	5 <i>5%</i>	8 <i>6%</i>	-	2 <i>6%k</i>	36 <i>16%zk</i>	32 <i>6%</i>	17 <i>7%</i>	3 <i>3%</i>	6 <i>4%</i>	7 <i>3%</i>	43 <i>5%</i>
Don't know	92 <i>12%klm</i>	18 <i>10%</i>	44 <i>11%</i>	11 <i>13%</i>	14 <i>11%</i>	12 <i>11%</i>	61 <i>11%</i>	77 <i>11%</i>	7 <i>9%</i>	11 <i>11%</i>	16 <i>11%</i>	-	-	-	60 <i>11%</i>	27 <i>11%</i>	8 <i>10%</i>	18 <i>12%</i>	25 <i>12%</i>	92 <i>11%</i>
Not applicable	73 <i>9%ikmo</i>	19 <i>11%</i>	28 <i>7%</i>	8 <i>10%</i>	15 <i>12%</i>	10 <i>9%</i>	58 <i>10%</i>	67 <i>10%l</i>	6 <i>7%l</i>	1 <i>1%</i>	7 <i>5%</i>	-	-	-	40 <i>7%</i>	12 <i>5%</i>	7 <i>9%</i>	12 <i>8%</i>	31 <i>15%zno</i>	72 <i>9%</i>

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 960

Q41. Will the budget for any energy efficiency improvements, including changes to transport, be entirely new investment or will it fully or partially displace other intended investments?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	814	502	30	280	814	91	159	91	137	114	226	391	175	197	439	160	814
Weighted total	782	477	27**	274	782	90*	153	87*	126	107*	216	371	170	190	416	155	814
Entirely new investment	351	226	12	114	351	37	77	44	71	49	94	166	91	79	192	78	369
	45%	47%	42%	42%	45%	41%	50%	51%	56% <i>zde</i>	46%	43%	45%	54%	42%	46%	51%	45%
Partially displace other intended investments	225	150	7	67	225	19	50	29	36	34	60	111	48	57	125	37	238
	29%	32%	26%	25%	29%	21%	32%	33%	29%	31%	28%	30%	28%	30%	30%	24%	29%
Fully replace other intended investments	41	24	1	16	41	7	7	3	5	7	18	17	5	11	24	5	43
	5%	5%	5%	6%	5%	7%	4%	4%	4%	6%	8% <i>f</i>	5%	3%	6%	6%	3%	5%
Don't know	92	53	1	35	92	18	7	6	8	11	16	44	16	14	43	22	92
	12% <i>f</i>	11%	4%	13%	12% <i>f</i>	19% <i>fgh</i>	5%	7%	7%	10%	8%	12% <i>f</i>	10%	8%	10%	14%	11%
Not applicable	73	24	6	43	73	10	13	5	5	7	28	33	9	28	32	12	72
	9% <i>cd</i>	5%	22%	16% <i>za</i>	9%	11%	9%	5%	4%	6%	13% <i>f</i>	9%	5%	15% <i>zn</i>	8%	8%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 961

Q41. Will the budget for any energy efficiency improvements, including changes to transport, be entirely new investment or will it fully or partially displace other intended investments?

Base: all participants who said their organisation has complied or intends to comply with ESOS, or don't know their status

Total (z)	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	814	9	5	181	12	8	43	65	44	27	27	51	27	60	20	-	36	36	20	141	2	814
Weighted total	782	9**	5**	160	8**	5**	31*	79*	36*	35**	25**	66*	21**	41*	26**	-**	35*	40*	29**	126	4**	814
Entirely new investment	351	6	1	85	3	3	15	39	17	14	34	13	20	7	-	6	15	12	45	-	-	369
	45%ps	68%	15%	53%ps	38%	54%	47%p	49%p	48%p	48%	56%	51%p	61%	49%p	28%	-	18%	38%	41%	35%	-	45%
Partially displace other intended investments	225	3	1	39	5	2	7	22	12	3	12	5	8	10	-	17	15	11	42	2	238	
	29%	32%	13%	24%	55%	35%	24%	28%	32%	28%	13%	18%	23%	19%	40%	-	47%zckm	38%k	37%	33%k	46%	29%
Fully replace other intended investments	41	-	-	9	-	1	1	3	1	-	1	4	1	2	4	-	3	4	1	5	2	43
	5%	-	-	5%	-	11%	3%	4%	4%	-	5%	5%	3%	4%	16%	-	8%	9%	3%	4%	54%	5%
Don't know	92	-	1	18	-	-	4	9	3	6	5	1	7	1	-	2	2	4	23	-	92	
	12%	-	13%	11%	-	-	13%	12%	9%	18%	20%	8%	7%	17%	5%	-	5%	6%	15%	18%z	-	11%
Not applicable	73	-	3	10	1	-	4	6	3	2	1	12	2	4	3	-	8	4	1	11	-	72
	9%	-	59%	6%	7%	-	13%	7%	7%	6%	6%	18%c	7%	10%	11%	-	22%zcgs	9%	5%	9%	-	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 962

Q42. And will this displacement be from investment intended for other energy efficiency projects, or from investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency?

Base: all participants whose budget for energy efficiency improvements will displace other intended investments

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	281	263	12	6	11	23	21	18	19	7	60	61	19	16	1	5	17	144	136	281
Weighted total	266	248	7**	12**	9**	22**	16**	19**	22**	7**	62*	53*	16**	16**	1**	5**	15**	135	131	281
Displace investment intended for other energy efficiency projects	31	27	1	2	2	1	3	2	7	-	8	2	2	3	-	1	1	18	13	36
	12%	11%	16%	21%	19%	3%	17%	9%	31%	-	13%	3%	12%	21%	-	30%	4%	13%	10%	13%
Displace investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency	221	209	5	7	7	20	14	16	15	7	51	44	14	12	1	3	13	108	113	230
	83%	84%	74%	63%	81%	89%	83%	86%	69%	100%	82%	83%	88%	76%	100%	70%	89%	80%	87%	82%
Don't know	14	12	1	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	3	7	-	1	-	-	1	10	5	15
	5%	5%	10%	17%	-	9%	-	4%	-	-	5%	14%z	-	3%	-	-	7%	7%	4%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 963

Q42. And will this displacement be from investment intended for other energy efficiency projects, or from investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency?

Base: all participants whose budget for energy efficiency improvements will displace other intended investments

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)	
Unweighted total	281	40	241	49	68	54	81	11	17	106	26	89	9	41	39	157	214	65	281	
Weighted total	266	35*	231	42*	66*	53*	77*	11**	16**	101*	42*	25**	84*	8**	41*	41*	143	199	64*	281
Displace investment intended for other energy efficiency projects	31	4	27	6	8	8	7	1	1	14	2	7	2	3	7	14	26	5	36	
	12%	11%	12%	13%	12%	15%	10%	12%	6%	14%	9%	9%	20%	7%	18%	10%	13%	8%	13%	
Displace investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency	221	31	189	33	53	44	67	9	14	83	20	73	6	36	32	122	163	55	230	
	83%	89%	82%	79%	80%	82%	87%	81%	88%	82%	83%	86%	80%	89%	78%	85%	81%	87%	82%	
Don't know	14	-	14	3	5	2	2	1	1	4	2	4	-	1	2	7	11	3	15	
	5%	-	6%	8%	8%	3%	3%	7%	6%	4%	8%	5%	-	3%	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 964

Q42. And will this displacement be from investment intended for other energy efficiency projects, or from investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency?

Base: all participants whose budget for energy efficiency improvements will displace other intended investments

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	281	61	153	24	41	47	201	243	31	40	58	-	36	230	210	96	34	52	66	281
Weighted total	266	54*	141	23**	46*	48*	189	232	26**	32*	58*	**	31*	221	198	91*	29*	49*	62*	281
Displace investment intended for other energy efficiency projects	31 12% <i>m</i>	4 7%	18 13%	4 17%	5 11%	3 6%	25 13%	25 11%	7 26%	4 12%	8 13%	-	31 100% <i>zm</i>	-	26 13%	9 10%	3 12%	10 20%	5 8%	36 13%
Displace investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency	221 83% <i>n</i>	46 84%	117 83%	19 83%	38 84%	43 88%	156 83%	196 84%	20 69%	25 78%	46 79%	-	-	221 100% <i>zn</i>	164 83%	79 87%	24 85%	37 77%	52 85%	230 82%
Don't know	14 5% <i>m</i>	5 8%	6 4%	-	2 5%	3 5%	8 4%	11 5%	1 5%	3 9%	5 8%	-	-	-	8 4%	3 3%	1 4%	2 3%	5 7%	15 5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 965

Q42. And will this displacement be from investment intended for other energy efficiency projects, or from investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency?

Base: all participants whose budget for energy efficiency improvements will displace other intended investments

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	281	183	10	88	281	29	59	33	46	42	78	142	53	69	164	42	281
Weighted total	266	175	9**	83*	266	26**	56*	32**	42*	40*	78*	128	53*	68*	150	42*	281
Displace investment intended for other energy efficiency projects	31	20	3	8	31	4	9	4	3	8	4	20	6	6	19	5	36
	12%	11%	30%	10%	12%	17%	16%	13%	7%	21%	6%	16% <i>j</i>	10%	9%	13%	13%	13%
Displace investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency	221	146	5	70	221	21	43	25	37	32	73	98	46	62	120	35	230
	83%	84%	55%	85%	83%	81%	76%	79%	90%	79%	93% <i>zk</i>	76%	87%	91%	80%	83%	82%
Don't know	14	9	1	4	14	1	4	3	1	-	1	10	2	-	11	2	15
	5%	5%	15%	5%	5%	2%	7%	8%	3%	-	1%	8%	3%	-	7% <i>m</i>	4%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 966

Q42. And will this displacement be from investment intended for other energy efficiency projects, or from investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency?

Base: all participants whose budget for energy efficiency improvements will displace other intended investments

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	(u)
Unweighted total	281	3	1	57	7	4	12	23	16	8	5	12	8	13	11	-	19	18	8	54	2	281
Weighted total	266	3**	1**	48*	5**	3**	8**	25**	13**	10**	5**	15**	5**	10**	15**	**	19**	19**	11**	47*	4**	281
Displace investment intended for other energy efficiency projects	31	2	-	9	1	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	1	1	4	5	-	36
	12%	79%	-	18%	28%	41%	19%	-	19%	-	-	-	50%	6%	-	-	7%	3%	31%	10%	-	13%
Displace investment intended for other types of project, not related to energy efficiency	221	-	1	38	3	1	7	25	10	10	3	15	3	9	14	-	17	17	6	41	2	230
	83%	-	100%	79%	72%	59%	81%	97%	75%	100%	74%	100%	50%	94%	93%	-	88%	90%	51%	86%	54%	82%
Don't know	14	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	2	2	2	15
	5%	21%	-	3%	-	-	-	3%	6%	-	26%	-	-	-	7%	-	5%	7%	18%	4%	46%	5%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 967

Q43. Would you be able to provide contact details for a colleague who would be best placed to speak about ESOS?

Base: all participants who don't know their organisation's compliance status

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	9	1	-	8	1	1	2	-	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	5	9
Weighted total	16**	1**	-.**	15**	1**	1**	3**	-.**	-.**	-.**	7**	2**	2**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	6**	9**	9**
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	16	1	-	15	1	1	3	-	-	7	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	6	9	9
	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 968

Q43. Would you be able to provide contact details for a colleague who would be best placed to speak about ESOS?

Base: all participants who don't know their organisation's compliance status

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 9	3	6	4	1	2	-	-	-	-	5	2	1	1	1	1	7	2	9
Weighted total 16**	6**	9**	8**	2**	3**	-**	-**	-**	-**	10**	3**	2**	1**	2**	2**	12**	4**	9**
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	6	9	8	2	3	-	-	-	-	10	3	2	1	2	2	12	4	9
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 969

Q43. Would you be able to provide contact details for a colleague who would be best placed to speak about ESOS?

Base: all participants who don't know their organisation's compliance status

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	
Unweighted total	9	4	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	1	4	9
Weighted total	16**	6**	7**	2**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	8**	-**	-**	2**	7**	9**
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	16	6	7	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	2	7	9
	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 970

Q43. Would you be able to provide contact details for a colleague who would be best placed to speak about ESOS?

Base: all participants who don't know their organisation's compliance status

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 9	4	-	4	9	6	-	-	-	-	2	6	1	3	4	1	9
Weighted total 16**	7**	-**	7**	16**	10**	-**	-**	-**	-**	2**	11**	2**	4**	8**	2**	9**
Yes -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No 16	7	-	7	16	10	-	-	-	-	2	11	2	4	8	2	9
100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 971

Q43. Would you be able to provide contact details for a colleague who would be best placed to speak about ESOS?

Base: all participants who don't know their organisation's compliance status

	Sector																			Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	9	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	9
Weighted total	16**	2**	3**	3**	3**	3**	3**	3**	3**	2**	2**	2**	2**	2**	2**	2**	1**	1**	1**	1**	9**
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	16	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	9
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 972

S1. Are you....

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total 871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total 871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Internal to the organisation (e.g. an employee, manager, director) 871	762	11	98	23	76	46	58	66	17	228	146	60	55	19	18	46	433	426	871
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
An external party nominated to respond on behalf of the organisation -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 973

S1. Are you....

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 871	163	708	169	211	184	169	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total 871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Internal to the organisation (e.g. an employee, manager, director) 871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33	55	303	104	279	41	123	146	408	628	235	871
An external party nominated to respond on behalf of the organisation 100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 974

S1. Are you....

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)	
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871	
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871	
Internal to the organisation (e.g. an employee, manager, director)	871	195	423	89	148	116	578	688	80	100	140	351	31	221	598	251	90	159	248	871	
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
An external party nominated to respond on behalf of the organisation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 975

S1. Are you....

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total 871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total 871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Internal to the organisation (e.g. an employee, manager, director) 871	522	30	313	871	120	168	88	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
An external party nominated to respond on behalf of the organisation -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 976

S1. Are you....

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Internal to the organisation (e.g. an employee, manager, director)	871	11	5	171	10	5	31	81	36	38	28	75	30	45	34	5	45	47	29	135	8	871
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
An external party nominated to respond on behalf of the organisation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 977

S2.2 Department

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Energy	47	40	1	5	3	2	3	3	3	1	14	5	3	5	-	2	2	27	20	52
	5%	5%	10%	5%	12%	3%	5%	5%	5%	6%	3%	6%	8%	-	11%	6%	4%	6%	5%	6%
Facilities	179	153	3	24	3	18	4	14	9	3	65	23	14	5	4	4	9	78	96	166
	21%	20%	24%	25%	14%	24%	9%	24%	14%	20%	29% <i>zfhkm</i>	16%	23%	10%	20%	23%	20%	18%	23%	19%
Finance	104	91	3	10	6	11	6	5	3	2	26	26	7	3	3	-	4	41	62	97
	12%	12%	27%	10%	26%	14%	12%	8%	5%	10%	11%	18% <i>zhm</i>	12%	5%	14%	-	9%	9%	15% <i>q</i>	11%
Compliance	46	42	1	3	1	4	1	1	3	1	12	11	3	4	-	1	4	25	22	49
	5%	6%	6%	3%	3%	6%	3%	1%	4%	7%	5%	8%	6%	7%	-	5%	8%	6%	5%	6%
Procurement	25	25	*	-	-	1	2	6	-	-	10	3	-	2	-	-	1	17	8	23
	3%	3%	4%	-	-	1%	4%	10% <i>zehkl</i>	-	-	4%	2%	-	4%	-	-	3%	4%	2%	3%
Health and safety	137	133	1	3	3	10	8	14	17	1	20	26	9	12	4	2	8	88	47	153
	16% <i>cjr</i>	17% <i>c</i>	9%	3%	12%	14%	17%	24% <i>j</i>	25% <i>j</i>	8%	9%	18% <i>j</i>	15%	22% <i>j</i>	20%	12%	18%	20% <i>r</i>	11%	18%
Organisational board-level (no department)	47	28	1	19	1	3	2	1	8	4	11	6	3	2	-	4	1	19	27	37
	5%	4%	6%	19% <i>za</i>	6%	4%	3%	2%	12%	24%	5%	4%	6%	4%	-	24%	2%	4%	6%	4%
Other	285	250	2	34	6	26	21	15	23	4	70	44	19	22	8	4	17	139	144	294
	33%	33%	14%	34%	27%	34%	45%	26%	35%	25%	31%	30%	32%	41%	45%	24%	36%	32%	34%	34%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 978

S2.2 Department

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Energy	47	4	42	4	6	8	12	5	12	21	-	16	-	3	7	29	38	5	52
	5%j	3%	6%	2%	3%	4%	6%c	15%zcde	21%zdef	7%j	-	6%j	-	2%	5%	7%	6%q	2%	6%
Facilities	179	28	151	27	46	44	42	11	8	64	16	59	5	19	29	71	120	58	166
	21%	17%	21%	14%	22%c	23%c	23%c	33%c	15%	21%	15%	21%	13%	16%	20%	17%	19%	25%	19%
Finance	104	21	83	29	33	26	11	2	1	36	24	32	8	30	24	33	72	32	97
	12%fh	12%	12%	14%fh	16%fh	14%fh	6%	7%	1%	12%	23%zik	12%	20%	25%zo	17%o	8%	11%	14%	11%
Compliance	46	13	33	23	3	10	7	1	2	10	4	21	2	7	7	26	33	13	49
	5%d	8%	5%	12%zdef	2%	5%	4%	2%	4%	3%	4%	7%j	5%	6%	5%	6%	5%	6%	6%
Procurement	25	3	23	6	6	1	9	2	1	6	2	11	1	2	5	14	20	5	23
	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	1%	5%e	6%e	2%	2%	2%	4%	2%	1%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%
Health and safety	137	24	113	29	27	34	37	4	6	50	15	40	3	10	20	87	106	31	153
	16%h	14%	16%	15%	13%	18%	20%	12%	11%	16%	15%	14%	7%	8%	14%	21%zm	17%	13%	18%
Organisational board-level (no department)	47	17	29	26	10	5	3	-	2	17	12	10	7	14	3	18	32	14	37
	5%l	10%zb	4%	13%zdefg	5%	3%	2%	-	4%	6%	12%zk	4%	18%	11%zno	2%	4%	5%	6%	4%
Other	285	56	229	54	74	62	61	8	23	101	30	90	14	38	51	130	206	77	294
	33%	34%	33%	27%	36%	32%	34%	25%	41%	33%	29%	32%	34%	31%	35%	32%	33%	33%	34%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 979

S2.2 Department

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Energy	47	10	22	9	5	10	26	26	13	11	5	17	4	13	44	26	10	11	3	52
	5% <i>r</i>	5%	5%	11% <i>d</i>	3%	8%	4%	4%	17% <i>zgj</i>	12% <i>zgj</i>	4%	5%	12%	6%	7% <i>r</i>	10% <i>zr</i>	11% <i>zr</i>	7% <i>r</i>	1%	6%
Facilities	179	34	99	19	25	23	118	150	9	21	40	69	3	53	125	52	14	29	49	166
	21% <i>h</i>	17%	23%	21%	17%	20%	20%	22% <i>h</i>	11%	21%	25% <i>zh</i>	20%	8%	24%	21%	21%	15%	18%	20%	19%
Finance	104	31	40	10	21	12	74	88	8	6	13	44	2	22	61	12	4	8	39	97
	12% <i>opq</i>	16% <i>b</i>	9%	11%	15%	10%	13%	13%	9%	6%	9%	13%	7%	10%	10% <i>oq</i>	5%	4%	5%	16% <i>nopq</i>	11%
Compliance	46	12	25	2	6	4	34	37	6	5	9	24	-	12	27	11	7	7	16	49
	5%	6%	6%	3%	4%	3%	6%	5%	7%	5%	6%	7%	-	5%	4%	4%	8%	4%	7%	6%
Procurement	25	6	14	2	4	2	22	24	-	2	5	7	-	9	20	11	2	4	6	23
	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	4%	4%	-	2%	3%	2%	-	4%	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%
Health and safety	137	34	67	12	22	23	94	112	16	22	21	63	8	41	97	40	16	28	36	153
	16%	17%	16%	14%	15%	20%	16%	16%	19%	22%	15%	18%	27%	19%	16%	16%	18%	17%	15%	18%
Organisational board-level (no department)	47	12	19	3	12	4	18	25	6	2	4	11	1	7	22	3	2	3	25	37
	5% <i>c</i>	6%	4%	3%	8%	4%	3%	4%	8%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	4%	1%	2%	2%	10% <i>znopq</i>	4%
Other	285	57	137	33	51	37	190	225	23	29	43	117	13	63	204	97	35	69	73	294
	33%	29%	32%	37%	35%	32%	33%	33%	29%	30%	31%	33%	44%	29%	34%	39%	38%	44% <i>znr</i>	30%	34%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 980

S2.2 Department

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
		Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Energy	47	30	1	15	47	4	4	6	8	17	3	28	16	3	26	18	52
	5% <i>m</i>	6%	5%	5%	5%	3%	2%	7%	6%	15% <i>zdefh</i>	1%	7% <i>j</i>	8% <i>j</i>	2%	6% <i>m</i>	10% <i>zm</i>	6%
Facilities	179	110	2	66	179	17	33	21	25	21	35	88	44	31	99	42	166
	21% <i>j</i>	21%	5%	21%	21%	14%	20%	24%	19%	18%	14%	21% <i>j</i>	23% <i>j</i>	14%	22% <i>m</i>	24% <i>m</i>	19%
Finance	104	70	2	32	104	19	15	12	15	7	39	48	12	34	55	9	97
	12% <i>o</i>	13%	7%	10%	12%	15% <i>l</i>	9%	14%	12%	6%	16% <i>l</i>	12%	6%	16% <i>o</i>	12% <i>o</i>	5%	11%
Compliance	46	23	-	23	46	6	14	4	3	4	18	20	8	14	22	8	49
	5%	4%	-	7%	5%	5%	8% <i>h</i>	5%	2%	4%	7%	5%	4%	6%	5%	5%	6%
Procurement	25	12	-	13	25	2	6	6	2	4	8	16	2	9	12	4	23
	3%	2%	-	4%	3%	1%	4%	7% <i>h</i>	1%	3%	3%	4%	1%	4%	3%	3%	3%
Health and safety	137	84	7	46	137	19	31	15	29	11	37	72	26	35	79	23	153
	16%	16%	23%	15%	16%	16%	19% <i>j</i>	17%	22% <i>l</i>	9%	15%	18%	14%	16%	17%	13%	18%
Organisational board-level (no department)	47	30	-	17	47	8	15	1	5	2	17	19	10	15	18	12	37
	5%	6%	-	6%	5%	7%	5% <i>g</i>	1%	4%	2%	7%	5%	5%	7%	4%	7%	4%
Other	285	163	18	101	285	45	50	23	44	50	87	122	70	75	146	56	294
	33%	31%	60%	32%	33%	38%	30%	26%	34%	43% <i>fg</i>	35%	30%	37%	35%	32%	33%	34%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 981

S2.2 Department

Base: all participants

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	28**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Energy	47	1	-	10	3	2	4	6	*	3	1	-	2	2	1	3	5	1	-	3	-	52
	5%	8%	-	6%	26%	40%	11%ks	7%	1%	7%	3%	-	7%	4%	3%	62%	11%ks	2%	-	2%	-	6%
Facilities	179	1	1	18	1	-	2	18	3	11	6	28	7	11	5	-	15	8	11	27	6	166
	21%cfh	12%	13%	11%	11%	-	5%	22%cf	7%	29%	22%	37%zcfhqs	23%	24%cfh	15%	-	34%cfh	17%	37%	20%cf	72%	19%
Finance	104	2	-	10	-	-	2	17	4	6	3	10	2	2	2	-	9	12	3	20	-	97
	12%kc	14%	-	6%	-	-	8%	21%cm	10%	16%	11%	13%	6%	5%	7%	-	20%cm	25%zcm	10%	15%c	-	11%
Compliance	46	-	1	13	-	1	1	1	4	1	3	7	1	4	-	-	1	-	2	8	-	49
	5%	-	15%	8%g	-	13%	3%	1%	10%gq	3%	11%	9%	2%	9%g	-	-	2%	-	7%	6%	-	6%
Procurement	25	-	-	4	1	-	1	5	1	2	-	2	-	1	1	-	-	4	1	3	-	23
	3%	-	-	2%	8%	-	3%	6%	4%	6%	-	3%	-	2%	3%	-	-	8%	3%	2%	-	3%
Health and safety	137	1	1	48	4	*	8	8	10	4	3	4	2	7	7	-	-	4	3	22	-	153
	16%kp	13%	19%	26%zgzkppqs	41%	8%	37%zgzkmpqs	10%	27%zgzkppq	3%	9%	5%	5%	16%p	21%	-	-	8%	11%	16%kp	-	18%
Organisational board-level (no department)	47	3	-	5	-	-	-	8	1	2	1	5	1	6	6	-	1	2	1	11	-	37
	5%	28%	-	3%	-	-	-	10%lm	2%	4%	3%	7%	4%	-	19%	-	2%	3%	5%	8%lm	-	4%
Other	285	3	3	62	1	2	10	19	13	12	11	20	16	18	11	2	14	17	8	41	2	294
	33%	25%	53%	36%	15%	38%	33%	24%	37%	31%	40%	26%	54%	40%	32%	38%	32%	36%	26%	30%	28%	34%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 982

S2.1 Job title

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Board member	40	28	1	11	1	6	1	3	4	3	11	4	2	1	2	-	3	20	20	36
	5%	4%	11%	11%za	3%	7%	1%	5%	6%	19%	5%	3%	3%	2%	11%	-	7%	5%	5%	4%
Director / senior management (non-Board member)	472	431	6	35	10	41	31	39	35	8	119	89	28	26	13	8	22	237	228	474
	54%c	57%c	50%	36%	43%	54%	67%f	66%	54%	48%	52%	61%	47%	47%	70%	48%	46%	55%	54%	54%
Other employee of the organisation	359	303	4	52	13	30	15	17	26	6	98	52	30	28	4	9	22	176	178	361
	41%	40%	39%	53%	54%	39%	32%	29%	40%	33%	43%	36%	50%g	51%g	20%	52%	47%	41%	42%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 983

S2.1 Job title

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total 871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total 871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Board member 40 5% <i>f</i>	8	32	19	8	9	1	-	3	15	6	14	8	10	5	17	22	18	36
Director / senior management (non-Board member) 472 54% <i>g</i>	86	386	97	123	106	100	18	26	166	48	163	20	74	89	230	365	105	474
Other employee of the organisation 359 41%	72	287	83	76	76	80	15	26	122	50	102	13	39	52	161	241	113	361
	43%	41%	42%	37%	40%	44%	45%	47%	40%	48%	36%	32%	32%	35%	39%	38%	48% <i>p</i>	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 984

S2.1 Job title

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Board member	40	14	14	5	7	1	26	27	3	4	7	19	1	3	18	8	2	5	21	36
	5%	7%	3%	6%	5%	1%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	6%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	6%	4%
Director / senior management (non-Board member)	472	91	243	52	79	74	316	385	43	57	85	195	18	133	322	131	46	96	138	474
	54%	47%	58%	58%	54%	64%	55%	56%	54%	58%	61%	55%	59%	60%	54%	52%	51%	60%	56%	54%
Other employee of the organisation	359	90	166	33	61	41	235	276	33	38	48	137	12	84	258	111	42	59	89	361
	41%	46%	39%	37%	41%	35%	41%	40%	42%	39%	34%	39%	39%	38%	43%	44%	47%	37%	36%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 985

S2.1 Job title

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Board member	40	15	-	25	40	7	4	3	5	5	23	11	5	23	6	10	36
	5% <i>n</i>	3%	-	8% <i>z</i>	5%	6%	3%	4%	4%	5%	9% <i>zkl</i>	3%	3%	10% <i>zn</i>	1%	6% <i>n</i>	4%
Director / senior management (non-Board member)	472	296	15	159	472	69	100	56	79	55	118	237	104	107	260	95	474
	54%	57%	48%	51%	54%	58%	60%	63% <i>i</i>	60%	47%	48%	58% <i>j</i>	56%	49%	57%	55%	54%
Other employee of the organisation	359	210	16	130	359	43	64	30	46	56	104	163	78	88	191	68	361
	41%	40%	52%	41%	41%	36%	38%	33%	36%	48% <i>g</i>	42%	40%	42%	40%	42%	39%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 986

S2.1 Job title

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Board member	40	-	-	8	-	-	-	4	3	1	2	6	2	1	4	-	1	4	-	5	-	36
5%		-	-	5%	-	-	-	5%	9%	3%	8%	6%	2%	12%	-	2%	7%	-	4%	-	-	4%
Director / senior management (non-Board member)	472	6	3	98	3	2	24	49	16	28	13	33	17	21	16	2	22	30	16	71	2	474
54%		60%	53%	57%	28%	33%	78% <i>zchkmps</i>	61%	45%	73%	45%	44%	58%	46%	47%	35%	49%	63%	55%	52%	23%	54%
Other employee of the organisation	359	4	2	65	7	4	7	28	17	9	13	36	11	24	14	3	22	14	13	59	6	361
41% <i>f</i>		40%	47%	38%	72%	67%	22%	35%	47% <i>f</i>	24%	47%	48% <i>f</i>	36%	52% <i>fq</i>	41%	65%	49% <i>f</i>	30%	45%	44% <i>f</i>	77%	41%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 987

S3. Region

Base: all participants

	Compliance				Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Scotland	55 6% <i>ejk</i>	47 6%	1 9%	7 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55*	-	-	-	27	28	59
Wales	19 2%	19 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	-	-	6%	7%	7%
Northern Ireland	18 2%	12 2%	1 4%	6 6% <i>a</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	10	9	14
England - North East	24 3% <i>jk</i>	18 2%	1 4%	6 6%	23 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	-	3	14	13
England - North West	76 9% <i>ghjklmp</i>	63 8%	2 15%	11 12%	-	76 100% <i>zfhjklmp</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	38	79
England - Yorkshire and the Humber	46 5% <i>jk</i>	42 5%	1 9%	3 4%	-	-	46 100% <i>zghjklmp</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	26	51
England - East Midlands	58 7% <i>ejkl</i>	56 7%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	58 100% <i>zefhjklmp</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28	29	53
England - West Midlands	66 8% <i>egjklm</i>	55 7%	1 6%	9 10%	-	-	-	-	66 100% <i>zefgjklmp</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	32	55
England - East of England	18 2%	16 2%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	17 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	6	19
England - London	229 26% <i>efghklmp</i>	197 26%	4 35%	29 30%	-	-	-	-	-	228 100% <i>zefghklmp</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	110	117	203
England - South East	146 17% <i>efghjlm</i>	138 18% <i>c</i>	1 9%	6 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	146 100% <i>zefghjlm</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	79	66	174
England - South West	60 7% <i>ejk</i>	47 6%	1 9%	12 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60 100% <i>zefghjklmp</i>	-	-	-	-	-	24	35	66
Outside UK	48 6% <i>ejkr</i>	47 6%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46 100% <i>zefghjklm</i>	37 9% <i>r</i>	10	49
Other	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Don't know	5 1%	3 *	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	4
Not stated	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 988

S3. Region

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Scotland	55	5	50	8	14	19	11	-	4	25	3	16	2	8	7	25	45	10	59
	6%	3%	7%	4%	7%	10% c	6%	-	7%	8%	3%	6%	4%	7%	5%	6%	7%	4%	7%
Wales	19	9	10	4	3	6	2	3	-	10	2	3	-	2	5	8	15	4	14
	2%	5% zb	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	8% zdfh	-	3%	1%	1%	-	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Northern Ireland	18	3	14	6	3	8	1	-	-	12	4	1	-	3	3	5	14	4	13
	2% k	2%	2%	3%	1%	4% f	-	-	-	4% k	4% k	-	-	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%
England - North East	24	3	21	5	6	7	2	2	1	11	4	5	-	2	6	13	23	2	30
	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	1%	7% f	1%	4%	3%	2%	1%	2%	4%	3%	4% q	1%	3%
England - North West	76	19	57	17	20	20	15	2	-	29	9	22	7	14	14	33	59	17	79
	9% h	11%	8%	9% h	9% h	11% h	8% h	6%	-	9%	8%	8%	17%	11%	9%	8%	9%	7%	9%
England - Yorkshire and the Humber	46	10	37	8	10	12	14	2	-	21	5	10	5	8	8	17	36	10	51
	5%	6%	5%	4%	5%	6%	8% h	5%	-	7%	5%	4%	11%	6%	6%	4%	6%	4%	6%
England - East Midlands	58	7	52	7	20	12	15	2	-	18	5	22	2	10	8	33	53	6	53
	7% q	4%	7%	3%	10% c	6%	8% c	6%	5%	6%	5%	8%	5%	8%	5%	8%	8% q	2%	6%
England - West Midlands	66	15	51	8	15	21	15	4	3	34	7	9	3	8	11	35	48	15	55
	8% k	9%	7%	4%	7%	11% c	9%	13% c	5%	11% k	7%	3%	8%	7%	8%	8%	8%	6%	6%
England - East of England	18	3	15	4	7	1	5	-	-	3	1	11	-	7	3	5	12	6	19
	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	3%	-	-	1%	1%	4% i	-	5% o	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%
England - London	229	45	185	64	47	28	54	8	27	53	32	89	13	24	41	107	130	96	203
	26% eip	27%	26%	32% e	23% e	14%	30% e	24%	49% zcdelfg	18%	31% f	32% i	32%	19%	28%	26%	21%	41% azp	23%
England - South East	146	29	117	41	37	27	25	5	9	45	22	49	4	18	22	80	115	30	174
	17%	17%	17%	21%	18%	14%	14%	16%	17%	15%	21%	17%	10%	14%	15%	20%	18%	13%	20%
England - South West	60	14	46	18	16	15	8	1	-	24	3	21	2	13	10	22	43	16	66
	7%	8%	7%	9% h	8% h	8% h	4%	4%	-	8%	3%	8%	4%	11%	7%	5%	7%	7%	8%
Outside UK	48	6	42	7	6	13	10	3	10	16	7	19	3	4	6	25	33	16	49
	6%	4%	6%	3%	3%	7%	5%	10%	18% zcdelf	5%	7%	7%	7%	3%	4%	6%	5%	7%	6%
Other	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*
Don't know	5	1	5	2	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	3	-	2	-	1	1	5	4
	1%	*	1%	1%	*	*	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	2%	-	*	*	2% p	*
Not stated	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 989

S3. Region

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Scotland	55	10	30	6	8	6	36	41	4	7	9	23	3	12	42	17	6	9	12	59
	6%	5%	7%	7%	5%	5%	6%	6%	6%	7%	6%	6%	11%	5%	7%	7%	7%	5%	5%	7%
Wales	19	4	8	2	5	2	13	17	2	5	3	11	-	1	14	10	3	4	5	14
	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	5%z	2%	3% <i>m</i>	-	*	2%	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%
Northern Ireland	18	5	8	-	4	1	9	13	4	1	3	8	1	3	9	3	-	4	8	13
	2%	2%	2%	-	3%	1%	1%	2%	5%	1%	2%	2%	5%	2%	2%	1%	-	2%	3%	1%
England - North East	24	7	14	1	3	4	11	15	1	5	4	7	2	7	16	10	2	4	8	30
	3%	4%	3%	1%	2%	4%	2%	2%	2%	5%	3%	2%	5%	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	3%
England - North West	76	22	49	2	3	10	50	61	4	4	11	30	1	20	49	20	6	16	24	79
	9% <i>d</i>	11% <i>cd</i>	11% <i>cd</i>	2%	2%	9%	9%	9%	5%	4%	8%	9%	2%	9%	8%	8%	7%	10%	10%	9%
England - Yorkshire and the Humber	46	7	29	5	5	4	30	33	3	8	7	18	3	14	38	13	9	14	9	51
	5%	4%	7%	5%	3%	4%	5%	5%	4%	8%	5%	5%	9%	6%	6%	5%	10% <i>r</i>	9% <i>r</i>	3%	6%
England - East Midlands	58	15	24	12	7	6	47	53	4	7	3	27	2	16	41	15	4	8	16	53
	7%	8%	6%	13% <i>zbd</i>	5%	5%	8%	8% <i>j</i>	5%	7%	2%	8%	6%	7%	7%	6%	5%	5%	6%	6%
England - West Midlands	66	13	29	10	13	16	37	48	6	5	6	21	7	15	43	19	8	10	22	55
	8%	7%	7%	11%	9%	14% <i>zf</i>	6%	7%	8%	5%	4%	6%	22% <i>zkm</i>	7%	7%	8%	9%	6%	9%	6%
England - East of England	18	2	9	4	3	1	12	14	-	1	6	5	-	7	11	4	-	1	7	19
	2%	1%	2%	5%	2%	1%	2%	2%	-	1%	4%	2%	-	3%	2%	2%	-	1%	3%	2%
England - London	229	48	95	22	60	37	147	180	25	23	38	88	8	51	145	73	27	34	74	203
	26%	25%	22%	25%	41% <i>zabc</i>	32%	25%	26%	31%	24%	27%	25%	26%	23%	24%	29%	30%	21%	30%	23%
England - South East	146	41	62	19	21	16	106	124	14	21	30	63	2	44	99	30	11	25	40	174
	17%	21%	15%	21%	14%	14%	18%	18%	17%	22%	21%	18%	6%	20%	17%	12%	12%	15%	16%	20%
England - South West	60	10	41	4	5	5	40	46	4	5	14	24	2	14	46	14	3	9	13	66
	7%	5%	10% <i>d</i>	4%	4%	4%	7%	7%	5%	5%	10%	7%	6%	6%	8%	6%	4%	5%	5%	8%
Outside UK	48	10	23	2	10	7	35	40	5	7	7	25	1	15	39	23	10	19	8	49
	6%	5%	6%	3%	7%	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%	5%	7%	2%	7%	6%	9% <i>zr</i>	11% <i>r</i>	12% <i>znr</i>	3%	6%
Other	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	1%	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	*
Don't know	5	2	2	1	1	-	3	3	2	-	-	2	-	-	4	-	-	2	2	4
	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	-	1%	*	3% <i>zcg</i>	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	1%	*
Not stated	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	2% <i>zcg</i>	-	-	-	-	1%	*	-	-	-	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 990

S3. Region

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Scotland	55	34	2	19	55	5	16	4	6	9	14	29	10	10	36	8	59
	6%	7%	6%	6%	6%	4%	9%	4%	5%	8%	6%	7%	5%	5%	8%	5%	7%
Wales	19	8	2	9	19	2	-	5	3	6	2	7	8	1	8	8	14
	2%	1%	6%	3%	2%	2%	-	6%zdf	2%	5%f	1%	2%	4%j	*	2%	5%mn	2%
Northern Ireland	18	15	-	2	18	3	4	4	-	2	2	7	9	3	6	9	13
	2%	3%	-	1%	2%	2%	2%	4%h	-	2%	1%	2%	5%zj	1%	1%	5%zmn	1%
England - North East	24	15	*	9	24	4	4	4	6	2	5	15	4	5	18	2	30
	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	5%	5%	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%	4%	1%	3%
England - North West	76	35	4	36	76	16	18	9	4	10	34	26	14	33	25	17	79
	9%hn	7%	15%	12%a	9%h	13%h	11%h	10%h	3%	8%	14%zk	6%	8%	15%zn	5%	10%	9%
England - Yorkshire and the Humber	46	25	4	17	46	7	9	7	12	3	4	35	7	6	30	10	51
	5%j	5%	14%	6%	5%	6%	5%	8%	9%i	3%	2%	9%zjl	3%	3%	7%m	6%	6%
England - East Midlands	58	40	2	17	58	9	8	8	10	7	13	26	17	12	27	17	53
	7%	8%	6%	5%	7%	7%	5%	9%	7%	6%	5%	6%	9%	6%	6%	10%	6%
England - West Midlands	66	41	3	22	66	8	14	7	13	13	14	27	22	12	33	20	55
	8%	8%	9%	7%	8%	7%	8%	8%	10%	11%	6%	6%	12%jk	5%	7%	12%	6%
England - East of England	18	12	1	5	18	7	6	1	1	1	5	11	2	4	10	4	19
	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	6%zdhi	4%	1%	1%	*	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%
England - London	229	133	3	91	229	34	36	13	34	34	71	103	44	64	121	36	203
	26%g	26%	11%	29%	26%g	28%g	21%	15%	26%	29%g	29%	25%	24%	29%	26%	21%	23%
England - South East	146	88	6	50	146	13	32	17	22	15	40	74	26	34	87	17	174
	17%o	17%	19%	16%	17%	11%	19%	19%	17%	13%	17%	18%	14%	16%	19%o	10%	20%
England - South West	60	41	2	16	60	6	13	4	16	6	19	28	12	16	30	12	66
	7%	8%	6%	5%	7%	5%	8%	5%	12%zd	5%	8%	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%	8%
Outside UK	48	31	*	17	48	6	9	3	4	9	17	20	10	15	23	10	49
	6%	6%	1%	6%	6%	5%	6%	4%	3%	8%	7%	5%	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%
Other	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Don't know	5	2	1	2	5	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	2	1	3	2	4
	1%	*	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	*	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	*
Not stated	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	*	-	-	*	*	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 991

S3. Region

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)			
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)		
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871	
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871	
Scotland	55	4	1	7	-	1	5	2	5	2	1	-	-	3	4	2	3	1	3	10	2	59	
	6%	39%	19%	4%	-	14%	16%zcgkq	2%	14%cgkq	4%	4%	-	-	6%k	12%	35%	6%	2%	12%	8%k	22%	7%	
Wales	19	-	2	6	1	-	1	-	1	3	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	14	
	2%	-	40%	3% s	7%	-	4% s	-	2%	9%	-	3%	-	3%	-	-	-	4% s	-	-	-	2%	
Northern Ireland	18	-	-	4	2	-	-	5	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	-	2	-	13	
	2%	-	-	2%	15%	-	-	6%	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	9% zks	-	1%	-	1%	
England - North East	24	-	-	7	-	-	1	1	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	4	1	2	-	30	
	3%	-	-	4%	4%	-	5%	1%	6%	2%	-	5%	-	-	-	27%	3%	9% ks	4%	2%	-	3%	
England - North West	76	-	-	18	-	-	1	6	3	6	6	3	1	5	4	2	4	2	1	13	2	79	
	9%	-	-	11%	-	-	3%	8%	8%	17%	20%	3%	3%	11%	11%	38%	8%	4%	4%	10%	23%	9%	
England - Yorkshire and the Humber	46	-	1	14	1	-	1	2	3	-	-	5	1	2	3	-	2	4	2	7	-	51	
	5%	-	28%	8%	11%	-	3%	2%	9%	-	-	6%	-	3%	9%	-	4%	9%	7%	5%	-	6%	
England - East Midlands	58	1	-	13	-	-	2	12	3	3	-	3	3	2	-	-	1	8	-	8	-	53	
	7%	12%	-	7%	-	-	7%	15% z p	9%	9%	-	4%	9%	4%	-	-	2%	17% z k <p>England - West Midlands</p>	66	-	-	-	6%
	8%	-	-	9%	-	34%	5%	11%	7%	3%	-	2%	8%	4%	15%	-	14% k	4%	15%	8%	-	6%	
England - East of England	18	-	-	-	1	-	1	3	1	-	3	1	-	2	3	-	1	1	-	2	-	19	
	2%	-	-	-	5%	-	4% c	3% c	2% c	-	11%	2%	-	4% c	9%	-	2%	2%	-	1%	-	2%	
England - London	229	-	-	19	3	-	6	25	4	13	5	42	15	13	8	-	10	11	6	43	5	203	
	26% ch	-	-	11%	34%	-	20%	31% ch	10%	34%	18%	56% z ctg <h>pqs9%</h>	9%	30% ch	24%	-	22%	24%	20%	32% ch	55%	23%	
England - South East	146	5	1	38	-	2	9	13	7	4	4	10	2	7	2	-	8	7	7	21	-	174	
	17%	42%	13%	22%	-	44%	30% z ks	16%	18%	10%	15%	13%	5%	15%	7%	-	17%	15%	24%	15%	-	20%	
England - South West	60	1	-	13	2	-	1	3	3	2	4	2	4	4	3	-	6	1	2	9	-	66	
	7%	7%	-	8%	22%	8%	2%	3%	7%	4%	15%	2%	13%	9%	10%	-	14% g k	3%	7%	6%	-	8%	
Outside UK	48	-	-	17	-	-	-	2	2	3	3	5	2	4	1	-	-	-	2	7	-	49	
	6%	-	-	10% z fgpq	-	-	-	2%	5%	8%	12%	7%	8%	9% p q	3%	-	-	-	7%	5%	-	6%	
Other	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2% z	-	-	-	-	-	*	
Don't know	5	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	
	1%	-	-	-	-	3% cs	-	-	-	6%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	5% z cs	-	-	-	-	*	
Not stated	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2% z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 992

S4. Does your organisation operate on a single site or multiple sites?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Single site	167 19%	138 18%	2 20%	27 27%	2 8%	19 25% <i>m</i>	10 21%	7 12%	15 22%	3 15%	45 20%	29 20%	14 23%	5 9%	9 46%	3 18%	6 13%	78 18%	87 20%	163 19%
Multiple sites	704 81%	624 82%	9 80%	71 73%	21 92%	57 75%	37 79%	52 88%	51 78%	15 85%	184 80%	117 80%	46 77%	50 91% <i>e</i>	10 54%	14 82%	40 87%	355 82%	339 80%	708 81%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 993

S4. Does your organisation operate on a single site or multiple sites?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Single site	167	167	-	97	44	13	12	-	-	67	30	58	19	34	34	41	97	69	163
		<i>19%b</i>	<i>100%zb</i>		<i>49%zdefgh</i>	<i>21%efgh</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>1%</i>	<i>22%</i>	<i>29%z</i>	<i>21%</i>	<i>46%</i>	<i>28%o</i>	<i>23%o</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>15%</i>	<i>29%zp</i>	<i>19%</i>
Multiple sites	704	-	704	102	162	178	168	33	54	236	73	222	22	89	112	367	530	167	708
		<i>81%acjq</i>	<i>100%za</i>	<i>51%</i>	<i>79%c</i>	<i>93%zcd</i>	<i>93%zcd</i>	<i>100%zcd</i>	<i>99%zcd</i>	<i>78%</i>	<i>71%</i>	<i>79%</i>	<i>54%</i>	<i>72%</i>	<i>77%</i>	<i>90%zmn</i>	<i>85%q</i>	<i>71%</i>	<i>81%</i>
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 994

S4. Does your organisation operate on a single site or multiple sites?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Single site	167 19% ^{ho}	42 22%	79 19%	16 18%	25 17%	13 11%	104 18%	116 17%	7 9%	15 15%	22 16%	59 17%	4 13%	31 14%	98 16%	33 13%	20 22%	34 21% ^o	59 24% ^{no}	163 19%
Multiple sites	704 81%	153 78%	344 81%	73 82%	123 83%	103 89%	474 82%	572 83%	73 91% ^z	85 85%	118 84%	293 83%	27 87%	189 86%	500 84% ^r	218 87% ^{zqr}	71 78%	125 79%	188 76%	708 81%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 995

S4. Does your organisation operate on a single site or multiple sites?

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	(p)	
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Single site	167	97	9	61	167	32	30	16	19	9	48	82	32	44	85	31	163
	19%	19%	28%	20%	19% <i>l</i>	27% <i>hi</i>	18% <i>l</i>	18% <i>l</i>	15%	7%	19%	20%	17%	20%	19%	18%	19%
Multiple sites	704	425	22	252	704	88	138	73	111	108	197	329	155	174	372	141	708
	81%	81%	72%	80%	81%	73%	82%	82%	85% <i>ee</i>	93% <i>zdefg</i>	81%	80%	83%	80%	81%	82%	81%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 996

S4. Does your organisation operate on a single site or multiple sites?

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		(u)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Single site	167	1	2	49	3	1	5	4	5	8	4	21	4	10	10	-	7	2	4	26	2	163
	19% <i>gq</i>	7%	40%	26% <i>zqg</i>	33%	21%	17% <i>gq</i>	4%	14%	22%	13%	28% <i>gq</i>	13%	21% <i>gq</i>	31%	-	15%	3%	12%	20% <i>gq</i>	28%	19%
Multiple sites	704	10	3	122	7	4	26	77	31	30	25	54	26	36	23	5	38	46	26	109	6	708
	81% <i>c</i>	93%	60%	72%	67%	79%	83%	96% <i>zcfkms</i>	86%	78%	87%	72%	87%	79%	69%	100%	85%	97% <i>zcfkms</i>	88%	80%	72%	81%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 997

S5. And which of the following best describes the scope of your responsibility for, or knowledge about, energy management and energy efficiency?
Do you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency as at least part of your role at...

Base: all participants from a multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	708	655	16	37	26	59	41	47	44	16	167	139	51	53	7	10	40	362	337	708
Weighted total	704	624	9**	71*	21**	57*	37*	52*	51*	15**	184	117	46*	50*	10**	14**	40*	355	339	708
A single site in a multi-site organisation	69	58	1	10	2	4	5	6	2	-	16	10	4	5	-	-	11	51	17	67
	10% <i>r</i>	9%	14%	14%	11%	7%	14%	11%	4%	-	9%	8%	9%	11%	-	-	27% <i>z</i>	14% <i>zr</i>	5%	9%
Some, but not all sites in a multi-site organisation	108	98	2	9	4	13	6	6	5	5	30	18	4	6	1	3	5	57	51	117
	15%	16%	19%	12%	18%	23%	17%	11%	11%	37%	16%	16%	9%	13%	7%	18%	13%	16%	15%	17%
All sites in a multi- site organisation	509	450	6	53	15	40	25	38	42	9	133	83	37	36	9	12	22	233	266	504
	72% <i>pq</i>	72%	67%	74%	70%	69%	69%	74%	83% <i>p</i>	58%	72%	71%	81% <i>p</i>	73%	93%	82%	56%	66%	78% <i>zq</i>	71%
Don't know / Refused	19	19	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	1	5	6	-	2	-	-	1	14	5	20
	3%	3%	-	-	-	1%	-	4%	2%	5%	3%	5%	-	3%	-	-	4%	4% <i>r</i>	1%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 998

**S5. And which of the following best describes the scope of your responsibility for, or knowledge about, energy management and energy efficiency?
Do you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency as at least part of your role at...**

Base: all participants from a multi-site organisation

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	708	-	708	102	161	169	179	35	56	231	71	226	20	83	102	391	541	161	708
Weighted total	704	-**	704	102*	162	178	168	33*	54*	236	73*	222	22**	89*	112*	367	530	167	708
A single site in a multi-site organisation	69	-	69	19	17	17	10	-	4	34	9	20	4	8	11	31	42	26	67
	10%	-	10%	19% <i>zfg</i>	10%	10%	6%	-	7%	15%	12%	9%	16%	10%	9%	8%	8%	16% <i>zpp</i>	9%
Some, but not all sites in a multi-site organisation	108	-	108	20	23	23	22	5	14	33	13	29	3	14	15	53	82	26	117
	15%	-	15%	20%	14%	13%	13%	15%	26% <i>ef</i>	14%	17%	13%	12%	16%	13%	15%	15%	16%	17%
All sites in a multi-site organisation	509	-	509	61	116	138	128	28	35	161	49	166	16	66	87	266	392	111	504
	72% <i>cd</i>	-	72%	59%	71%	77% <i>cd</i>	76% <i>cd</i>	85% <i>cd</i>	65%	68%	67%	75%	72%	74%	77%	73%	74%	67%	71%
Don't know / Refused	19	-	19	2	6	1	8	-	1	7	3	7	-	1	-	16	15	3	20
	3%	-	3%	2%	4% <i>e</i>	*	5% <i>e</i>	-	2%	3%	4%	3%	-	1%	-	4% <i>n</i>	3%	2%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 999

**S5. And which of the following best describes the scope of your responsibility for, or knowledge about, energy management and energy efficiency?
Do you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency as at least part of your role at...**

Base: all participants from a multi-site organisation

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	708	155	353	76	114	105	489	585	78	96	121	303	31	195	513	233	79	134	180	708
Weighted total	704	153	344	73*	123*	103*	474	572	73*	85*	118	293	27**	189	500	218	71*	125	188	708
A single site in a multi-site organisation	69	15	35	3	14	7	49	60	5	4	8	29	1	19	51	14	9	19	14	67
	10%	10%	10%	4%	12%	7%	10%	10%	7%	5%	7%	10%	6%	10%	10%	7%	13%	15%or	8%	9%
Some, but not all sites in a multi-site organisation	108	26	56	9	15	14	79	96	7	17	24	44	7	30	74	34	12	26	33	117
	15%	17%	16%	12%	12%	13%	17%	17%	10%	20%	20%	15%	25%	16%	15%	16%	17%	20%	18%	17%
All sites in a multi-site organisation	509	105	246	62	89	80	329	399	57	63	85	214	19	137	365	165	46	75	133	504
	72%q	69%	72%	84%zab	73%	78%	69%	70%	79%	75%	72%	73%	69%	72%	73%q	76%q	65%	60%	71%	71%
Don't know / Refused	19	7	7	-	5	2	17	17	3	-	1	5	-	4	11	4	4	5	8	20
	3%	4%	2%	-	4%	2%	4%	3%	5%	-	1%	2%	-	2%	2%	5%	4%	4%	4%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1000

**S5. And which of the following best describes the scope of your responsibility for, or knowledge about, energy management and energy efficiency?
Do you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency as at least part of your role at...**

Base: all participants from a multi-site organisation

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	708	433	24	248	708	83	137	74	118	111	198	334	156	172	380	141	708
Weighted total	704	425	22**	252	704	88*	138	73*	111	108*	197	329	155	174	372	141	708
A single site in a multi-site organisation	69	41	2	22	69	13	9	9	10	3	23	34	10	19	35	11	67
	10% <i>f</i>	10%	9%	9%	10% <i>f</i>	15% <i>f</i>	6%	13% <i>f</i>	9%	3%	12%	10%	6%	11%	10%	8%	9%
Some, but not all sites in a multi-site organisation	108	70	5	31	108	15	25	8	16	18	28	56	16	28	52	21	117
	15%	16%	24%	12%	15%	17%	18%	11%	14%	16%	14%	17%	11%	16%	14%	15%	17%
All sites in a multi-site organisation	509	306	14	189	509	56	104	55	84	86	140	232	123	123	273	105	504
	72%	72%	63%	75%	72%	63%	75%	76%	75%	79% <i>e</i>	71%	70%	79%	71%	73%	75%	71%
Don't know / Refused	19	8	1	10	19	4	1	1	2	2	5	7	6	4	11	4	20
	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	5%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	4%	2%	3%	3%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1001

**S5. And which of the following best describes the scope of your responsibility for, or knowledge about, energy management and energy efficiency?
Do you have responsibility for energy management and energy efficiency as at least part of your role at...**

Base: all participants from a multi-site organisation

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)	Other (t)		
Unweighted total	708	9	4	137	9	6	36	63	37	23	26	41	28	51	18	3	35	39	17	123	3	708
Weighted total	704	10**	3**	122	7**	4**	26*	77*	31*	30**	25**	54*	26**	36*	23**	5**	38*	46*	26**	109	6**	708
A single site in a multi-site organisation	69	-	1	23	2	-	1	4	1	3	4	6	1	2	5	-	3	2	-	10	2	67
	10%	-	24%	19% <i>z</i>	24% <i>q</i>	-	2%	6%	3%	10%	17%	11%	4%	5%	21%	-	9%	4%	-	9%	32%	9%
Some, but not all sites in a multi-site organisation	108	4	-	16	1	1	3	5	7	6	5	6	11	1	-	5	7	1	1	21	2	117
	15%	43%	-	13%	20%	15%	11%	7%	21% <i>g</i>	20%	19%	11%	21%	30% <i>z</i>	4% <i>g</i>	-	14%	15%	4%	20% <i>g</i>	38%	17%
All sites in a multi-site organisation	509	6	2	78	4	4	19	64	23	21	16	41	20	22	17	5	30	36	25	75	2	504
	72%	57%	76%	64%	56%	85%	75%	83% <i>cm</i>	72%	70%	65%	75%	75%	61%	74%	100%	77%	79%	96%	69%	30%	71%
Don't know / Refused	19	-	-	5	-	-	3	3	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	20
	3%	-	-	4%	-	-	11% <i>z</i>	4%	4%	-	-	3%	-	4%	-	-	-	3%	-	2%	-	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1002

S6.a What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total energy spend is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Energy spend (excluding transport fuel)

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	184	169	5	10	7	17	12	12	6	6	46	31	11	12	1	3	17	116	67	184
Weighted total	177	155	3**	18**	6**	17**	11**	12**	7**	5**	45*	28**	9**	12**	1**	3**	16**	108	68*	184
Less than 10%	26	26	-	-	1	2	4	1	1	-	4	4	1	1	-	-	6	22	5	23
10-20%	15	17%	-	-	15%	14%	31%	12%	16%	-	9%	13%	7%	13%	100%	-	37%	20% <i>r</i>	7%	13%
20-30%	15	13	1	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	4	3	2	-	-	1	1	11	4	16
30-40%	8%	8%	17%	9%	-	11%	-	-	20%	-	8%	11%	28%	-	-	29%	8%	10%	6%	9%
40-50%	10	10	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	*	3	4	-	-	-	1	1	5	4	12
50-60%	5%	6%	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	9%	6%	14%	-	-	-	28%	6%	5%	6%	7%
60-70%	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	5
70-80%	2%	3%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	1%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	2%	3%
80-90%	14	11	-	4	-	2	-	-	1	1	5	2	-	1	-	-	2	11	3	13
90-100%	8%	7%	-	19%	7%	11%	-	-	11%	23%	11%	7%	-	8%	-	-	13%	11%	4%	7%
40-50%	6	6	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	2	3	3	7
50-60%	3%	4%	-	-	-	8%	8%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	6%	-	-	10%	3%	4%	4%
60-70%	14	13	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1	4	2	2	3	-	-	-	10	5	14
70-80%	8%	8%	-	9%	-	-	-	18%	-	16%	9%	8%	24%	25%	-	-	-	9%	7%	8%
80-90%	15	8	-	7	1	1	1	-	2	-	7	-	1	1	-	-	-	3	12	13
90-100%	9%	5%	-	37%	14%	5%	10%	-	24%	-	15%	-	6%	9%	-	-	-	3%	7%	7%
40-50%	13	13	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	5	2	1	-	-	-	-	7	6	15
60-70%	7%	8%	-	-	13%	15%	-	9%	-	-	11%	6%	7%	-	-	-	-	6%	9%	8%
80-90%	36	32	1	3	3	5	4	3	1	2	5	6	1	3	-	1	1	21	15	40
90-100%	20%	20%	40%	17%	51%	32%	36%	28%	16%	34%	12%	20%	9%	23%	-	44%	5%	19%	22%	22%
Don't know/Refused	24	21	1	2	-	1	1	3	1	1	7	4	2	2	-	-	4	13	11	26
	13%	13%	43%	9%	-	4%	8%	23%	13%	18%	14%	13%	19%	16%	-	-	21%	12%	16%	14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1003

S6.a What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total energy spend is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Energy spend (excluding transport fuel)

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	184	-	184	39	40	42	37	5	19	66	23	56	6	23	24	89	131	53	184
Weighted total	177	-**	177	39*	40*	40*	32*	5**	18**	68*	22**	49*	6**	22**	25**	85*	124	53*	184
Less than 10%	26	-	26	5	4	6	5	1	6	7	3	9	1	3	3	15	20	6	23
10-20%	15	-	15	13%	10%	14%	15%	15%	32%	10%	13%	19%	21%	15%	12%	18%	16%	11%	13%
20-30%	15	-	15	5	3	3	2	1	1	7	1	7	2	3	6	4	7	7	16
30-40%	8%	-	8%	12%	7%	7%	7%	29%	5%	11%	4%	13%	28%	12%	24%	4%	6%	14%	9%
40-50%	10	-	10	2	-	*	5	-	2	2	2	2	-	-	1	7	8	2	12
50-60%	5%	-	5%	6%	-	1%	15%de	-	12%	3%	9%	3%	-	-	3%	8%	6%	3%	7%
60-70%	4	-	4	1	2	-	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	-	4	2	1	5
70-80%	2%	-	2%	2%	4%	-	2%	-	4%	1%	3%	5%	-	-	-	5%	2%	3%	3%
80-90%	14	-	14	3	3	1	5	-	1	7	4	2	-	-	1	6	10	4	13
90-100%	8%	-	8%	8%	7%	4%	16%	-	8%	10%	20%	5%	-	-	5%	7%	8%	8%	7%
40-50%	6	-	6	1	2	1	2	-	1	3	1	1	-	1	1	2	4	2	7
50-60%	3%	-	3%	2%	5%	2%	5%	-	4%	4%	3%	2%	-	6%	3%	2%	3%	4%	4%
60-70%	14	-	14	5	7	-	*	2	-	5	-	7	-	1	3	6	11	3	14
70-80%	8%	-	8%	13%e	18%ef	-	1%	32%	-	8%	-	5%	-	3%	11%	7%	9%	5%	8%
80-90%	15	-	15	5	-	7	3	-	15	9	-	2	-	2	-	9	7	9	13
90-100%	9%	-	9%	14%d	-	17%d	9%	-	-	13%	-	5%	-	10%	-	11%	5%	16%p	7%
40-50%	13	-	13	1	1	5	2	-	3	7	1	4	-	2	2	10	10	3	15
50-60%	7%	-	7%	3%	3%	13%	7%	-	15%	11%	3%	8%	-	-	7%	11%	8%	6%	8%
60-70%	36	-	36	3	10	14	7	1	1	12	4	10	-	8	4	18	29	7	40
70-80%	20%	-	20%	9%	24%	34%c	23%	24%	5%	18%	20%	21%	-	34%	15%	21%	24%	13%	22%
80-90%	24	-	24	8	8	3	-	-	2	8	6	7	3	4	5	4	15	9	26
90-100%	13%f	-	13%	20%f	20%f	8%	-	-	14%	11%	25%	15%	51%	19%	20%	5%	12%	17%	14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1004

S6.a What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total energy spend is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Energy spend (excluding transport fuel)

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	184	42	92	15	31	21	136	166	12	24	34	81	9	53	131	56	23	47	48	184
Weighted total	177	41*	91*	12**	29**	20**	128	156	12**	22**	32*	74*	8**	48*	124	49*	21**	45*	47*	184
Less than 10%	26	2	17	1	6	6	19	25	3	2	6	14	2	4	23	11	4	9	4	23
	15%	4%	19% ^a	7%	21%	31%	15%	16%	22%	10%	17%	18%	24%	9%	18%	22%	19%	20%	8%	13%
10-20%	15	1	11	1	2	2	11	13	1	*	5	5	1	6	10	2	2	3	5	16
	8%	3%	12%	7%	5%	9%	9%	8%	5%	2%	14%	6%	11%	13%	8%	5%	7%	6%	10%	9%
Around a fifth (20%)	10	1	4	1	1	-	10	10	-	3	1	3	1	2	8	2	2	3	2	12
	5%	4%	5%	9%	4%	-	7%	6%	-	12%	4%	5%	14%	4%	6%	4%	7%	7%	4%	7%
Around a quarter (25%)	4	2	1	1	-	1	2	3	-	2	1	1	-	2	2	-	1	1	1	5
	2%	4%	1%	9%	-	4%	1%	2%	-	8%	3%	2%	-	5%	1%	-	5%	2%	3%	3%
Around a third (33%)	14	5	9	1	-	1	10	10	2	2	2	3	1	4	8	5	2	3	4	13
	8%	11%	10%	4%	-	5%	8%	6%	19%	8%	7%	5%	10%	9%	7%	9%	9%	7%	9%	7%
40-50%	6	3	2	-	1	1	5	6	1	1	1	5	-	1	4	2	1	1	2	7
	3%	7%	2%	-	3%	6%	4%	4%	6%	4%	2%	7%	-	2%	3%	5%	4%	2%	5%	4%
Around a half (50%)	14	4	7	1	1	1	11	13	2	4	4	5	2	2	10	3	2	2	4	14
	8%	11%	8%	10%	3%	4%	9%	8%	15%	20%	14%	7%	23%	4%	8%	7%	10%	5%	8%	8%
Around two thirds (66%)	15	5	5	-	5	1	8	12	2	2	1	7	-	4	11	4	1	5	4	13
	9%	13%	5%	-	18%	7%	6%	8%	19%	7%	4%	10%	-	9%	9%	8%	3%	11%	8%	7%
Around three quarters (75%)	13	2	8	1	2	2	10	12	1	1	2	7	1	4	9	5	2	3	4	15
	7%	5%	9%	7%	6%	9%	8%	8%	9%	4%	6%	10%	9%	8%	7%	10%	7%	7%	8%	8%
More than 75%	36	12	17	4	4	3	28	32	1	4	7	17	1	12	27	11	5	9	10	40
	20%	29%	19%	32%	12%	14%	22%	20%	5%	18%	21%	22%	8%	26%	21%	23%	24%	20%	20%	22%
Don't know/Refused	24	4	10	2	8	2	14	21	-	1	3	6	-	5	13	4	1	5	9	26
	13%	9%	11%	15%	29%	11%	11%	13%	-	6%	8%	9%	-	11%	11%	8%	4%	12%	18%	14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1005

S6.a What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total energy spend is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Energy spend (excluding transport fuel)

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	184	121	9	51	184	27	36	18	28	24	58	90	29	52	89	34	184
Weighted total	177	111	7**	53*	177	28**	34*	17**	26**	21**	51*	90*	26**	47*	88*	32**	184
Less than 10%	26	15	1	8	26	7	5	2	4	2	6	14	4	6	14	4	23
10-20%	15%	14%	17%	15%	15%	24%	14%	12%	14%	12%	11%	16%	16%	12%	16%	13%	13%
20-30%	15	8	-	7	15	2	4	-	2	3	5	8	1	5	6	4	16
30-40%	8%	7%	-	13%	8%	8%	13%	-	9%	12%	10%	9%	5%	10%	7%	12%	9%
Around a fifth (20%)	10	10	-	-	10	1	4	2	1	2	3	6	-	3	5	-	12
40-50%	5%	9% ^c	-	-	5%	2%	12%	9%	2%	10%	5%	6%	-	6%	5%	-	7%
Around a quarter (25%)	4	4	-	-	4	-	1	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	1	2	5
50-60%	2%	4%	-	-	2%	-	4%	11%	-	-	-	2%	7%	-	2%	6%	3%
Around a third (33%)	14	7	1	4	14	1	4	3	-	2	*	11	1	*	11	1	13
60-70%	8%	7%	17%	7%	8%	2%	12%	19%	-	9%	1%	13% ^j	2%	1%	13% ^m	2%	7%
70-80%	6	3	1	2	6	-	1	1	-	1	2	4	1	2	4	1	7
80-90%	3%	3%	12%	4%	3%	-	2%	5%	-	4%	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	2%	4%
Around a half (50%)	14	9	2	3	14	2	1	2	4	1	4	9	-	4	9	1	14
90-100%	8%	8%	22%	6%	8%	9%	3%	12%	17%	6%	8%	10%	-	9%	10%	2%	8%
Around two thirds (66%)	15	11	-	5	15	4	2	-	2	-	6	7	3	7	6	3	13
100%	9%	10%	-	9%	9%	14%	7%	-	8%	-	11%	7%	11%	14%	7%	9%	7%
Around three quarters (75%)	13	11	-	2	13	3	2	3	1	3	6	5	2	6	5	2	15
75-85%	7%	10%	-	4%	7%	11%	6%	17%	3%	16%	11%	5%	9%	12%	6%	6%	8%
85-95%	36	18	1	16	36	4	6	3	7	6	12	13	9	11	13	13	40
95-100%	20%	16%	20%	31%	20%	14%	17%	15%	27%	28%	23%	14%	36%	23%	14%	41%	22%
Don't know/Refused	24	16	1	5	24	4	4	-	5	1	8	11	3	5	14	2	26
100% (Total)	13%	14%	11%	10%	13%	15%	11%	-	20%	3%	16%	13%	11%	10%	16%	7%	14%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1006

S6.a What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total energy spend is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Energy spend (excluding transport fuel)

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	184	4	1	43	4	1	5	8	8	7	9	9	9	19	5	-	6	7	1	36	2	184
Weighted total	177	4**	1**	40*	3**	1**	3**	10**	7**	9**	12**	7**	13**	6**	-**	9**	8**	1**	31*	4**	184	
Less than 10%	26	-	-	8	20%	-	-	24%	29%	33%	-	14%	27%	6%	22%	-	-	20%	-	10%	-	23
10-20%	15	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	2	1	-	4	-	16	
8%	8%	-	-	6%	26%	100%	-	-	-	-	17%	20%	5%	-	-	28%	6%	-	13%	-	9%	
Around a fifth (20%)	10	-	-	4	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	12	
5%	5%	-	-	10%	25%	-	15%	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	-	-	17%	-	6%	-	7%	
Around a quarter (25%)	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	5	
2%	2%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	3%	
Around a third (33%)	14	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	4	-	13	
8%	8%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	12%	-	15%	13%	-	4%	40%	-	-	-	-	14%	46%	7%	
40-50%	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	7	
3%	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	12%	15%	9%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	4%	
Around a half (50%)	14	2	-	3	1	-	1	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	14	
8%	8%	55%	-	6%	29%	-	24%	-	26%	22%	-	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	-	8%	
Around two thirds (66%)	15	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	2	2	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	13	
9%	9%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	34%	-	17%	15%	-	4%	-	-	26%	-	-	4%	54%	7%	
Around three quarters (75%)	13	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	5	-	15	
7%	7%	-	-	3%	-	-	18%	9%	-	12%	-	13%	6%	-	-	11%	-	-	15%	-	8%	
More than 75%	36	1	1	9	-	-	1	2	-	1	3	-	5	-	-	3	3	1	4	-	40	
20%	20%	30%	100%	23%	-	-	43%	23%	21%	-	11%	22%	-	41%	-	34%	36%	100%	13%	-	22%	
Don't know/Refused	24	1	-	6	-	-	-	1	-	1	4	1	2	2	-	-	1	-	4	-	26	
13%	13%	15%	-	15%	-	-	-	10%	-	10%	48%	6%	24%	15%	38%	-	-	12%	-	11%	14%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1007

S6.b What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total floor area is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Overall floor area

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	184	169	5	10	7	17	12	12	6	6	46	31	11	12	1	3	17	116	67	184
Weighted total	177	155	3**	18**	6**	17**	11**	12**	7**	5**	45*	28**	9**	12**	1**	3**	16**	108	68*	184
Less than 10%	24	24	-	-	-	2	4	1	1	-	5	2	1	-	-	-	7	19	5	22
10-20%	14%	15%	-	-	-	13%	31%	12%	16%	-	12%	7%	7%	-	-	-	41%	18%	7%	12%
20-30%	5	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	2	5
30-40%	3%	2%	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	15%	-	-	-	29%	-	2%	4%	3%
Around a fifth (20%)	6	6	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	3	3	7
40-50%	3%	4%	-	-	-	5%	7%	9%	-	-	3%	-	9%	-	-	-	6%	2%	5%	4%
Around a quarter (25%)	6	5	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	5	1	8
50-75%	3%	3%	17%	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	2%	7%	13%	-	-	-	-	5%	1%	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	6	-	4	-	2	-	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	9	-	6
75-90%	5%	4%	-	19%	-	11%	-	-	-	23%	11%	-	-	-	-	-	6%	8% ^r	-	3%
90-95%	5	5	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	4	1	6
95-100%	3%	3%	-	-	13%	4%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	24%	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	3%
Around a half (50%)	8	7	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	4	4	10
50-60%	5%	4%	-	9%	-	8%	-	7%	-	24%	4%	8%	-	-	-	-	4%	3%	6%	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	10	7	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	1	1	1	4	7	12
60-70%	6%	5%	22%	12%	14%	5%	-	-	-	5%	2%	-	17%	-	28%	5%	3%	10%	7%	7%
Around three quarters (75%)	12	12	-	-	*	3	1	-	1	-	4	1	1	-	-	-	-	7	5	14
70-80%	7%	8%	-	-	7%	16%	10%	-	13%	-	8%	3%	14%	-	-	-	-	6%	7%	8%
80-90%	45	38	1	5	3	4	4	6	3	2	12	5	1	3	-	1	1	22	23	44
90-95%	25%	25%	40%	30%	51%	26%	31%	52%	39%	34%	28%	17%	9%	23%	-	44%	5%	20%	33%	24%
Don't know/Refused	47	43	1	4	1	2	1	2	2	1	11	13	3	4	1	-	6	30	17	50
20-30%	27%	27%	22%	21%	15%	13%	5%	21%	31%	18%	25%	47%	32%	36%	100%	-	34%	28%	25%	27%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1008

S6.b What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total floor area is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Overall floor area

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	184	-	184	39	40	42	37	5	19	66	23	56	6	23	24	89	131	53	184
Weighted total	177	-**	177	39*	40*	40*	32*	5**	18**	68*	22**	49*	6**	22**	25**	85*	124	53*	184
Less than 10%	24	-	24	2	6	3	7	-	7	8	4	9	1	2	3	16	18	6	22
10-20%	5	-	5	1	-	2	2	-	-	4	-	*	-	2	1	2	3	2	5
Around a fifth (20%)	3%	-	3%	3%	-	4%	5%	-	-	6%	-	1%	-	10%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%
Around a quarter (25%)	6	-	6	2	1	-	1	-	2	-	1	3	1	-	1	4	4	2	7
Around a third (33%)	3%	-	3%	4%	2%	-	4%	-	10%	-	4%	5%	13%	-	3%	5%	3%	4%	4%
40-50%	6	-	6	1	1	2	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	1	1	5	4	2	8
Around a half (50%)	3%	-	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%	-	4%	4%	3%	2%	-	2%	2%	6%	3%	3%	4%
Around two thirds (66%)	9	-	9	1	4	-	4	-	-	8	-	1	-	-	3	4	6	3	6
Around three quarters (75%)	5%	-	5%	3%	10%	-	12%e	-	-	11%	-	3%	-	-	13%	5%	5%	5%	3%
More than 75%	5	-	5	1	2	2	-	-	-	3	1	2	-	-	-	2	3	2	6
Don't know/Refused	3%	-	3%	2%	5%	4%	-	-	-	4%	3%	-	-	-	-	2%	2%	5%	3%
	8	-	8	2	2	1	2	1	1	8	1	2	-	-	-	4	8	-	10
	5%	-	5%	6%	4%	3%	5%	17%	3%	-	3%	5%	-	-	-	5%	7%	-	5%
	10	-	10	5	1	1	3	-	1	5	1	3	-	2	2	4	5	5	12
	6%	-	6%	14%	1%	3%	8%	-	4%	8%	3%	7%	-	10%	6%	5%	4%	10%	7%
	12	-	12	1	2	5	2	1	1	7	-	4	1	2	1	7	9	2	14
	7%	-	7%	2%	6%	13%	6%	15%	5%	10%	-	7%	15%	8%	4%	8%	7%	5%	8%
	45	-	45	9	11	15	6	1	2	19	7	10	1	8	5	21	30	15	44
	25%	-	25%	24%	28%	37%	20%	24%	9%	28%	32%	20%	15%	34%	18%	25%	24%	29%	24%
	47	-	47	13	10	10	5	2	5	12	7	15	2	6	9	16	34	14	50
	27%	-	27%	33%	26%	25%	16%	44%	27%	17%	31%	31%	36%	28%	37%	19%	27%	26%	27%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1009

S6.b What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total floor area is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Overall floor area

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	184	42	92	15	31	21	136	166	12	24	34	81	9	53	131	56	23	47	48	184
Weighted total	177	41*	91*	12**	29**	20**	128	156	12**	22**	32*	74*	8**	48*	124	49*	21**	45*	47*	184
Less than 10%	24	4	15	-	4	5	19	23	4	2	7	14	2	8	22	8	5	7	2	22
	14%	11%	16%	-	15%	23%	15%	15%	33%	10%	21%	19%	27%	16%	18% <i>r</i>	16% <i>r</i>	23%	16%	4%	12%
10-20%	5	1	3	-	1	1	3	4	-	-	2	1	-	4	3	-	-	1	2	5
	3%	2%	3%	-	3%	4%	3%	3%	-	2%	5%	1%	-	8%	2%	-	-	2%	4%	3%
Around a fifth (20%)	6	1	4	1	-	1	4	5	1	1	-	1	1	2	4	2	2	2	1	7
	3%	2%	4%	9%	-	5%	3%	3%	8%	5%	-	1%	10%	5%	4%	4%	9%	5%	2%	4%
Around a quarter (25%)	6	1	3	1	1	2	3	5	-	1	1	6	-	-	4	2	1	2	2	8
	3%	2%	3%	7%	4%	8%	2%	3%	-	3%	3%	8%	-	-	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	1	8	-	-	-	6	6	-	3	1	4	-	1	6	1	1	2	2	6
	5%	3%	8%	-	-	-	4%	4%	-	15%	4%	5%	-	3%	4%	3%	6%	5%	3%	3%
40-50%	5	3	2	-	-	-	4	4	1	3	2	2	1	2	4	2	-	1	2	6
	3%	8%	2%	-	-	-	3%	2%	9%	12%	6%	2%	14%	4%	3%	3%	-	3%	3%	3%
Around a half (50%)	8	-	6	1	1	1	6	7	-	1	2	2	-	2	6	4	1	1	2	10
	5%	-	6%	8%	5%	4%	4%	4%	-	5%	6%	3%	-	4%	5%	8%	4%	3%	5%	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	10	2	6	1	1	1	5	8	3	2	1	6	-	1	9	2	1	5	2	12
	6%	6%	7%	5%	5%	7%	4%	5%	25%	8%	4%	9%	-	2%	7%	5%	4%	12%	4%	7%
Around three quarters (75%)	12	4	5	2	1	1	11	12	1	2	3	9	1	2	7	3	1	3	4	14
	7%	9%	6%	15%	3%	3%	9%	8%	6%	9%	10%	12%	11%	3%	6%	7%	5%	8%	9%	8%
More than 75%	45	17	20	3	4	4	35	40	2	4	5	19	1	15	29	14	7	8	15	44
	25%	42% <i>b</i>	22%	27%	14%	18%	28%	25%	19%	16%	16%	25%	8%	31%	24%	28%	33%	18%	32%	24%
Don't know/Refused	47	6	20	3	15	6	32	44	-	3	9	10	3	12	30	11	3	11	14	50
	27% <i>k</i>	15%	21%	29%	51%	28%	25%	28%	-	15%	26%	14%	30%	25%	24%	23%	12%	25%	30%	27%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1010

S6.b What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total floor area is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Overall floor area

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
		Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	184	121	9	51	184	27	36	18	28	24	58	90	29	52	89	34	184
Weighted total	177	111	7**	53*	177	28**	34*	17**	26**	21**	51*	90*	26**	47*	88*	32**	184
Less than 10%	24	17	1	6	24	3	6	1	5	4	5	15	5	4	15	5	22
10-20%	14%	15%	17%	11%	14%	11%	17%	7%	18%	19%	9%	16%	18%	9%	17%	15%	12%
20-30%	5	3	-	2	5	-	4	-	-	-	2	3	-	2	3	-	5
30-40%	3%	3%	-	3%	3%	-	11%zd	-	-	-	3%	3%	-	4%	3%	-	3%
40-50%	6	6	-	-	6	1	1	2	1	1	1	4	1	1	3	2	7
50-60%	3%	5%	-	-	3%	3%	2%	11%	3%	4%	2%	5%	4%	2%	3%	6%	4%
60-70%	6	4	1	1	6	-	1	2	2	-	1	3	2	1	4	1	8
70-80%	3%	4%	12%	1%	3%	-	4%	10%	9%	-	2%	4%	6%	1%	5%	4%	4%
80-90%	9	4	-	5	9	-	2	2	2	1	-	9	-	-	9	-	6
90-100%	5%	4%	-	10%	5%	-	7%	11%	8%	6%	-	10%j	-	-	10%m	-	3%
Don't know/Refused	5	4	1	-	5	-	2	2	2	-	1	4	-	1	4	-	6
	3%	4%	16%	-	3%	-	6%	10%	-	-	2%	4%	-	2%	4%	-	3%
	8	6	*	1	8	3	1	-	2	1	4	4	-	4	4	-	10
	5%	6%	6%	2%	5%	11%	3%	-	7%	5%	8%	5%	-	9%	5%	-	5%
	10	8	-	2	10	1	1	1	1	1	3	6	1	3	6	1	12
	6%	7%	-	4%	6%	5%	3%	4%	2%	4%	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%	4%	7%
	12	8	*	3	12	1	2	4	1	3	6	4	1	5	5	1	14
	7%	7%	6%	6%	7%	2%	5%	26%	3%	16%	12%	5%	5%	11%	6%	4%	8%
	45	21	1	20	45	7	9	3	8	6	15	17	9	13	17	12	44
	25%	19%	20%	38%g	25%	24%	25%	15%	30%	28%	29%	19%	36%	29%	20%	38%	24%
	47	29	2	13	47	12	6	1	5	4	14	22	7	13	17	9	50
	27%	26%	22%	25%	27%	43%	16%	4%	20%	18%	27%	24%	26%	29%	20%	29%	27%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1011

S6.b What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total floor area is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Overall floor area

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	184	4	1	43	4	1	5	8	8	7	9	9	9	19	5	-	6	7	1	36	2	184
Weighted total	177	4**	1**	40*	3**	1**	3**	10**	7**	9**	9**	12**	7**	13**	6**	**	9**	8**	1**	31*	4**	184
Less than 10%	24	-	-	13%	46%	-	-	34%	19%	33%	-	14%	16%	-	3	-	-	-	-	4	-	22
	14%	-	-	13%	46%	-	-	34%	19%	33%	-	14%	16%	-	46%	-	-	-	-	14%	-	12%
10-20%	5	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	5
	3%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	3%
Around a fifth (20%)	6	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	7
	3%	18%	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	16%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	4%
Around a quarter (25%)	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	8
	3%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	12%	7%	-	-	12%	5%	-	-	-	-	6%	-	2%	-	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	6
	5%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	22%	15%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	46%	3%
40-50%	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6
	3%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	27%	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	3%
Around a half (50%)	8	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	10
	5%	37%	-	3%	29%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	7%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	10	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	12
	6%	-	-	4%	25%	-	-	9%	7%	-	26%	6%	4%	-	-	-	26%	-	-	3%	-	7%
Around three quarters (75%)	12	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	5	-	14
	7%	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	13%	-	-	-	11%	12%	-	15%	-	8%
More than 75%	45	1	1	8	-	1	1	5	1	1	6	1	4	-	-	-	3	3	1	8	-	44
	25%	30%	100%	21%	-	100%	43%	48%	13%	10%	11%	50%	11%	28%	-	-	34%	36%	100%	25%	-	24%
Don't know/Refused	47	1	-	11	-	2	1	1	11	4	2	2	4	2	-	-	4	4	-	9	2	50
	27%	15%	-	28%	-	57%	10%	10%	27%	48%	17%	35%	30%	38%	-	-	46%	-	28%	54%	27%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1012

S6.c What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total annual turnover within Britain is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Annual turnover

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (t)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	184	169	5	10	7	17	12	12	6	6	46	31	11	12	1	3	17	116	67	184
Weighted total	177	155	3**	18**	6**	17**	11**	12**	7**	5**	45*	28**	9**	12**	1**	3**	16**	108	68*	184
Less than 10%	28	28	-	-	1	2	4	-	3	1	8	4	1	-	-	1	3	20	7	30
10-20%	11	10	-	2	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	4	*	1	-	-	2	6	6	10
Around a fifth (20%)	6	6	-	9%	-	5%	7%	-	20%	-	2%	16%	6%	8%	-	-	10%	5%	8%	5%
Around a quarter (25%)	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	3	4
Around a third (33%)	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	2%	-	10%	-	-	-	3%	-	4%	2%
Around a half (50%)	3	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	3
40-50%	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	2	3
Around two thirds (66%)	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	14%	10%	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
Around three quarters (75%)	11	7	-	4	1	1	-	-	1	6	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	7	10
More than 75%	6	5	-	21%	13%	-	8%	-	-	16%	13%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	10%	5%
Don't know/Refused	9	6	-	2	6	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	7	8
	5	4	-	12%	-	5%	7%	-	-	5%	-	7%	9%	-	-	28%	5%	1%	11%q	4%
	7	7	-	-	*	2	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	5	2	9
	4	5	-	-	7%	10%	10%	-	-	2%	6%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	3%	5%
	29	22	3	4	3	3	2	3	-	1	7	5	2	1	-	1	1	18	11	33
	16	14	100%	20%	51%	21%	18%	26%	-	21%	15%	17%	21%	8%	-	44%	5%	16%	16%	18%
	67	63	-	3	1	6	2	8	3	1	18	10	2	8	1	-	10	43	24	69
	38%	41%	-	19%	14%	37%	14%	66%	40%	13%	39%	34%	19%	66%	100%	-	58%	40%	35%	38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1013

S6.c What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total annual turnover within Britain is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Annual turnover

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	184	-	184	39	40	42	37	5	19	66	23	56	6	23	24	89	131	53	184
Weighted total	177	-**	177	39*	40*	40*	32*	5**	18**	68*	22**	49*	6**	22**	25**	85*	124	53*	184
Less than 10%	28	-	28	7	5	5	5	-	6	11	4	8	3	3	5	14	19	9	30
10-20%	11	-	11	2	1	3	2	1	2	3	1	4	1	*	1	8	7	5	10
20-30%	6	-	6	6%	2%	7%	7%	29%	9%	5%	4%	9%	13%	2%	6%	9%	5%	9%	5%
Around a fifth (20%)	3	-	3	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	2	2	2	1	4
25-30%	2	-	2	-	4%	2%	-	-	3%	2%	-	4%	-	-	6%	2%	2%	1%	2%
Around a quarter (25%)	3	-	3	-	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	3	2	1	3
30-35%	2	-	2	-	2%	-	-	7%	-	3%	-	1%	-	-	-	3%	2%	1%	2%
Around a third (33%)	6	-	6	3	2	-	1	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	3	1	3	3	5
35-40%	3	-	3	7%	5%	-	4%	-	-	5%	-	4%	-	-	11%	2%	3%	5%	3%
40-50%	3	-	3	-	2	*	-	-	-	1	-	*	-	-	-	1	3	-	3
50-60%	2	-	2	-	6%	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	2%
Around a half (50%)	11	-	11	5	4	1	2	-	-	5	-	2	-	-	2	8	8	3	10
55-60%	6	-	6	12%	9%	2%	6%	-	-	8%	-	4%	-	-	8%	10%	7%	5%	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	9	-	9	3	-	2	1	-	2	4	-	3	-	2	2	2	2	6	8
65-70%	5	-	5	8%	-	6%	3%	-	13%	6%	-	7%	-	10%	10%	3%	2%	12%p	4%
Around three quarters (75%)	7	-	7	2	1	4	*	1	-	4	1	3	-	1	1	5	6	2	9
70-75%	4	-	4	4%	2%	10%	1%	15%	-	5%	3%	6%	-	3%	4%	6%	5%	3%	5%
More than 75%	29	-	29	2	9	10	6	-	1	11	3	8	1	8	1	17	24	5	33
75-80%	16	-	16	6%	23%	26% c	20%	-	4%	17%	12%	16%	15%	38%	2%	20%	19%	9%	18%
Don't know/Refused	67	-	67	15	14	13	12	3	7	21	13	16	1	7	9	25	47	20	69
80-85%	38%	-	38%	39%	35%	33%	38%	55%	39%	31%	61%	33%	21%	33%	34%	29%	38%	37%	38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1014

S6.c What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total annual turnover within Britain is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Annual turnover

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	184	42	92	15	31	21	136	166	12	24	34	81	9	53	131	56	23	47	48	184
Weighted total	177	41*	91*	12**	29**	20**	128	156	12**	22**	32**	74*	8**	48*	124	49*	21**	45*	47*	184
Less than 10%	28	6	15	1	5	2	24	28	1	1	6	13	4	7	18	6	3	5	10	30
	16%	16%	16%	10%	17%	11%	19%	18%	12%	7%	19%	18%	44%	14%	14%	13%	16%	12%	20%	16%
10-20%	11	2	8	-	2	4	7	11	-	-	4	6	-	3	8	2	-	2	3	10
	6%	4%	8%	-	7%	17%	6%	7%	-	2%	13%	9%	-	6%	7%	3%	-	6%	6%	5%
Around a fifth (20%)	3	1	-	2	1	1	2	3	-	1	-	1	-	2	2	1	2	1	1	4
	2%	2%	-	13%	3%	4%	2%	2%	-	5%	-	2%	-	4%	2%	1%	7%	3%	2%	2%
Around a quarter (25%)	3	1	2	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	3
	2%	1%	2%	-	-	-	1%	1%	5%	-	-	2%	-	2%	1%	1%	-	-	3%	2%
Around a third (33%)	6	1	4	-	1	-	4	4	-	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	5
	3%	3%	4%	-	2%	-	3%	3%	-	6%	4%	3%	10%	3%	3%	3%	6%	5%	1%	3%
40-50%	3	2	-	-	-	-	3	3	1	1	2	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	3
	2%	6% ^b	-	-	2%	-	2%	2%	9%	5%	7%	2%	14%	-	1%	1%	-	-	3%	2%
Around a half (50%)	11	-	7	1	4	1	7	9	-	3	2	5	-	2	10	1	1	1	2	10
	6%	-	7%	4%	13%	4%	6%	6%	-	13%	5%	7%	-	3%	8%	3%	4%	2%	3%	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	9	3	5	-	-	-	6	6	3	1	1	5	-	1	7	3	2	4	2	8
	5%	8%	6%	-	-	-	5%	4%	25%	4%	2%	7%	-	1%	6%	6%	11%	10%	4%	4%
Around three quarters (75%)	7	3	3	1	1	-	7	7	1	2	3	4	-	3	5	2	1	2	2	9
	4%	7%	3%	7%	3%	-	6%	5%	6%	9%	9%	6%	-	5%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%
More than 75%	29	7	17	-	5	3	18	25	1	2	4	10	1	14	19	7	2	9	10	33
	16%	17%	19%	-	17%	14%	14%	16%	5%	11%	12%	14%	8%	29%	15%	14%	8%	20%	21%	18%
Don't know/Refused	67	15	30	8	11	10	47	58	5	8	9	23	2	16	50	25	9	17	15	69
	38%	37%	33%	66%	36%	49%	37%	38%	38%	39%	28%	31%	24%	32%	40%	50%	42%	39%	31%	38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1015

S6.c What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total annual turnover within Britain is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Annual turnover

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)		Medium (n)	High (o)
Unweighted total	184	121	9	51	184	27	36	18	28	24	58	90	29	52	89	34	184
Weighted total	177	111	7**	53*	177	28**	34*	17**	26**	21**	51*	90*	26**	47*	88*	32**	184
Less than 10%	28	22	2	4	28	9	6	1	6	3	9	15	4	9	14	4	30
	16%	20%	23%	7%	16%	31%	17%	7%	22%	15%	17%	17%	16%	19%	16%	13%	16%
10-20%	11	8	-	2	11	4	3	2	-	-	2	6	1	2	6	1	10
	6%	7%	-	3%	6%	15%	8%	9%	-	-	4%	7%	3%	5%	7%	3%	5%
Around a fifth (20%)	3	1	-	2	3	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	2	2	-	2	4
	2%	1%	-	4%	2%	-	3%	6%	-	3%	3%	-	6%	3%	-	5%	2%
Around a quarter (25%)	3	2	-	1	3	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	3
	2%	1%	-	2%	2%	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	2%	2%	-	3%	2%	2%
Around a third (33%)	6	3	-	3	6	-	2	1	1	1	1	5	-	-	4	1	5
	3%	2%	-	6%	3%	-	4%	11%	5%	6%	1%	6%	-	-	5%	4%	3%
40-50%	3	2	1	-	3	-	2	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	3
	2%	2%	16%	-	2%	-	5%	7%	-	-	3%	1%	-	4%	1%	-	2%
Around a half (50%)	11	6	1	4	11	2	-	2	4	-	6	5	-	6	5	-	10
	6%	5%	12%	8%	6%	9%	-	10%	15%	-	12%	6%	-	13%	6%	-	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	9	8	-	1	9	1	-	1	-	3	2	5	1	2	5	1	8
	5%	7%	-	1%	5%	3%	-	4%	-	14%	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	2%	4%
Around three quarters (75%)	7	4	*	3	7	1	1	3	-	2	4	4	-	4	2	1	9
	4%	3%	6%	6%	4%	5%	3%	19%	-	9%	7%	4%	-	8%	3%	4%	5%
More than 75%	29	14	1	13	29	6	7	3	4	5	7	13	8	6	12	10	33
	16%	13%	20%	26%	16%	22%	20%	15%	14%	25%	13%	15%	32%	13%	14%	30%	18%
Don't know/Refused	67	43	2	19	67	4	13	2	10	6	17	33	9	14	34	12	69
	38%	38%	22%	36%	38%	16%	39%	10%	41%	28%	34%	37%	36%	29%	39%	37%	38%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1016

S6.c What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total annual turnover within Britain is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Annual turnover

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	184	4	1	43	4	1	5	8	8	7	9	9	9	19	5	-	6	7	1	36	2	184
Weighted total	177	4**	1**	40*	3**	1**	3**	10**	7**	9**	12**	7**	13**	6**	-**	9**	8**	1**	31*	4**	184	
Less than 10%	28	-	-	6	20%	-	-	3	-	1	2	2	2	2	-	-	2	-	6	-	30	
	16%	-	-	16%	20%	-	-	32%	-	12%	9%	15%	35%	12%	38%	-	-	29%	-	19%	16%	
10-20%	11	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	10	
	6%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	7%	-	-	-	28%	-	-	10%	-	5%	
Around a fifth (20%)	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4	
	2%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	2%	
Around a quarter (25%)	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	
	2%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	2%	
Around a third (33%)	6	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	5	
	3%	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	46%	3%	
40-50%	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	
	2%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	
Around a half (50%)	11	2	-	1	1	-	1	2	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10	
	6%	37%	-	2%	29%	-	15%	23%	12%	22%	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	5%	
Around two thirds (66%)	9	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	8	
	5%	-	-	1%	25%	-	-	9%	-	20%	20%	-	-	-	-	26%	-	-	-	-	4%	
Around three quarters (75%)	7	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	9	
	4%	-	-	3%	-	-	18%	-	-	-	-	11%	6%	-	11%	-	-	-	10%	-	5%	
More than 75%	29	-	-	7	1	-	1	2	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	4	2	33	
	16%	-	-	18%	26%	-	43%	11%	32%	18%	6%	21%	18%	-	-	-	23%	100%	14%	54%	18%	
Don't know/Refused	67	2	1	17	-	-	1	2	3	4	4	2	3	6	4	-	3	4	-	11	69	
	38%	45%	100%	42%	-	-	24%	25%	40%	48%	51%	17%	47%	46%	62%	-	34%	48%	-	36%	38%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1017

S6.d What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total number of UK employees is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Number of UK employees

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	184	169	5	10	7	17	12	12	6	6	46	31	11	12	1	3	17	116	67	184
Weighted total	177	155	3**	18**	6**	17**	11**	12**	7**	5**	45*	28**	9**	12**	1**	3**	16**	108	68*	184
Less than 10%	18	18	-	-	1	2	2	1	3	-	4	2	1	1	-	1	*	15	3	19
10-20%	10*	12%	-	-	15%	13%	20%	9%	36%	-	9%	6%	7%	8%	-	29%	3%	14%	5%	10%
20-30%	18	16	-	2	-	-	1	-	2	-	5	6	*	-	1	-	4	12	6	16
30-40%	10*	10%	-	9%	-	-	7%	-	24%	-	10%	20%	6%	-	100%	-	22%	11%	8%	9%
40-50%	6	6	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	5	1	7
50-60%	3%	4%	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	2%	7%	17%	-	-	-	-	4%	1%	4%
60-70%	5	5	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	4	2	6
70-80%	3%	3%	-	-	-	5%	-	-	11%	23%	-	2%	9%	-	-	-	6%	3%	2%	3%
80-90%	9	7	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	2	-	-	3	6	2	8
90-100%	5%	5%	-	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	3%	-	15%	-	-	20%	6%	4%	4%
40-50%	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	1	1	-	1	1	3	5	8
50-60%	4%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	3%	14%	10%	-	28%	4%	2%	7%	4%
60-70%	10	8	-	2	-	3	-	2	-	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	5	5	11
70-80%	6%	5%	-	9%	-	19%	-	16%	-	34%	2%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	8%	6%
80-90%	10	7	-	2	-	1	1	2	-	4	-	-	-	2	-	-	4	4	5	11
90-100%	5%	5%	-	12%	-	4%	10%	16%	-	9%	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	4%	8%	6%
More than 75%	8	7	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	5	9
75-90%	5%	5%	17%	-	14%	10%	10%	-	-	2%	7%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	8%	5%
90-100%	55	48	3	4	5	4	3	4	2	19	6	1	2	-	1	5	34	20	59	
Don't know/Refused	31	24	-	8	-	4	1	3	-	5	6	2	4	-	-	3	18	13	30	
	18%	15%	-	42%	-	23%	13%	27%	-	11%	22%	26%	38%	-	-	16%	17%	20%	16%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1018

S6.d What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total number of UK employees is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Number of UK employees

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	184	-	184	39	40	42	37	5	19	66	23	56	6	23	24	89	131	53	184
Weighted total	177	-**	177	39*	40*	40*	32*	5**	18**	68*	22**	49*	6**	22**	25**	85*	124	53*	184
Less than 10%	18	-	18	5	3	-	4	1	5	7	4	7	1	2	4	9	14	5	19
	10%e	-	10%	14%e	7%	-	13%e	29%	27%	11%	16%	14%	15%	11%	18%	11%	11%	9%	10%
10-20%	18	-	18	3	2	5	5	1	2	7	1	4	-	*	4	10	9	9	16
	10%	-	10%	8%	4%	11%	15%	15%	14%	11%	7%	8%	-	2%	15%	12%	7%	17%	9%
Around a fifth (20%)	6	-	6	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	-	1	2	5	1	7
	3%	-	3%	2%	5%	2%	2%	15%	5%	2%	6%	4%	21%	-	6%	2%	4%	1%	4%
Around a quarter (25%)	5	-	5	2	-	1	2	-	1	2	1	1	1	-	2	2	2	3	6
	3%	-	3%	4%	-	2%	7%	-	4%	3%	7%	3%	13%	-	8%	2%	2%	5%	3%
Around a third (33%)	9	-	9	2	2	-	2	-	2	5	-	2	-	-	-	7	6	3	8
	5%	-	5%	5%	4%	-	7%	-	14%	7%	-	5%	-	-	-	8%	5%	6%	4%
40-50%	8	-	8	1	3	2	-	-	2	4	1	2	-	1	2	4	5	3	8
	4%	-	4%	2%	8%	6%	-	-	9%	5%	3%	5%	-	4%	6%	4%	4%	6%	4%
Around a half (50%)	10	-	10	2	2	3	3	1	-	2	*	3	-	-	-	7	10	-	11
	6%	-	6%	4%	5%	7%	9%	17%	-	2%	2%	6%	-	-	-	8%	8%	-	6%
Around two thirds (66%)	10	-	10	*	1	7	1	-	-	4	1	2	-	1	1	5	7	2	11
	5%	-	5%	1%	4%	18%zcf	2%	-	-	6%	3%	5%	-	3%	3%	6%	6%	4%	6%
Around three quarters (75%)	8	-	8	1	1	3	3	-	1	4	-	3	-	1	2	5	7	1	9
	5%	-	5%	2%	1%	7%	10%	-	4%	5%	-	6%	-	2%	7%	6%	5%	3%	5%
More than 75%	55	-	55	14	15	13	10	1	1	20	9	15	2	10	6	26	40	15	59
	31%	-	31%	36%	38%	32%	32%	24%	5%	29%	40%	31%	30%	45%	24%	31%	32%	28%	32%
Don't know/Refused	31	-	31	8	10	6	1	-	3	13	3	7	1	7	3	8	20	11	30
	18%	-	18%	22%f	24%f	15%	4%	-	19%	19%	15%	15%	21%	32%	13%	10%	16%	21%	16%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1019

S6.d What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total number of UK employees is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Number of UK employees

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	184	42	92	15	31	21	136	166	12	24	34	81	9	53	131	56	23	47	48	184
Weighted total	177	41*	91*	12**	29**	20**	128	156	12**	22**	32*	74*	8**	48*	124	49*	21**	45*	47*	184
Less than 10%	18	2	14	-	2	3	15	18	3	-	5	11	3	4	13	5	3	5	6	19
	10%	6%	15%	-	7%	16%	11%	12%	21%	-	15%	15%	38%	9%	10%	11%	14%	12%	12%	10%
10-20%	18	5	7	1	4	2	14	15	3	2	4	3	-	7	15	5	3	5	3	16
	10%	13%	8%	11%	13%	10%	11%	10%	21%	11%	13%	5%	-	15%	12%	9%	15%	12%	5%	9%
Around a fifth (20%)	6	1	3	1	1	1	5	6	1	-	-	3	-	1	4	1	1	2	1	7
	3%	2%	3%	11%	2%	4%	4%	4%	5%	-	-	4%	-	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%
Around a quarter (25%)	5	-	5	-	-	-	5	5	-	1	1	2	2	2	4	-	-	3	1	6
	3%	-	6%	-	-	-	4%	3%	-	3%	4%	2%	19%	4%	3%	-	-	6%	3%	3%
Around a third (33%)	9	2	5	-	-	-	6	7	1	2	3	5	-	2	5	5	2	2	2	8
	5%	5%	5%	-	-	-	5%	5%	6%	10%	10%	7%	-	5%	4%	11%	10%	5%	5%	4%
40-50%	8	2	4	-	2	1	7	8	1	1	2	6	1	1	3	2	2	-	5	8
	4%	6%	4%	-	6%	3%	5%	5%	9%	5%	7%	8%	14%	1%	2%	3%	7%	-	11%	4%
Around a half (50%)	10	1	6	1	2	1	7	8	-	2	2	3	-	3	6	5	1	2	4	11
	6%	2%	6%	12%	6%	4%	6%	5%	-	9%	7%	4%	-	6%	5%	9%	5%	4%	8%	6%
Around two thirds (66%)	10	-	5	1	3	-	7	10	-	-	-	4	-	5	6	2	1	3	3	11
	5%	-	6%	6%	12%	-	5%	6%	-	-	-	6%	-	11%	5%	4%	4%	6%	6%	6%
Around three quarters (75%)	8	1	3	-	2	1	7	7	-	4	3	4	-	2	7	-	1	3	1	9
	5%	2%	4%	-	8%	4%	5%	5%	-	19%	8%	5%	-	4%	6%	-	5%	6%	1%	5%
More than 75%	55	17	23	5	10	6	42	51	1	8	10	27	2	13	40	17	5	14	14	59
	31%	41%	25%	41%	36%	31%	33%	32%	11%	38%	30%	36%	20%	27%	33%	36%	24%	31%	30%	32%
Don't know/Refused	31	9	17	2	3	6	14	21	3	1	2	5	1	7	20	7	3	6	8	30
	16%	23%	18%	18%	10%	27%	11%	14%	26%	5%	5%	7%	9%	15%	16%	14%	13%	14%	16%	16%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1020

S6.d What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total number of UK employees is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Number of UK employees

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment					Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
		Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	184	121	9	51	184	27	36	18	28	24	58	90	29	52	89	34	184
Weighted total	177	111	7**	53*	177	28**	34*	17**	26**	21**	51*	90*	26**	47*	88*	32**	184
Less than 10%	18	15	1	3	18	5	3	1	3	2	7	8	3	6	10	2	19
10-20%	10%	13%	17%	5%	10%	19%	10%	7%	11%	8%	14%	9%	11%	14%	11%	7%	10%
10-20%	18	8	-	8	18	4	4	2	3	2	3	12	2	3	9	4	16
10%	10%	7%	-	14%	10%	13%	12%	9%	12%	10%	5%	13%	7%	5%	10%	12%	9%
Around a fifth (20%)	6	4	-	1	6	-	1	1	3	1	1	4	-	1	4	1	7
3%	3%	4%	-	3%	3%	-	3%	5%	12%	4%	3%	5%	-	2%	5%	2%	4%
Around a quarter (25%)	5	3	1	1	5	1	4	-	1	-	-	5	-	-	5	1	6
3%	3%	3%	11%	2%	3%	3%	11%zd	-	3%	-	-	6%	-	-	5%	2%	3%
Around a third (33%)	9	5	-	3	9	-	-	1	-	2	1	6	1	1	6	1	8
5%	5%	5%	-	6%	5%	-	-	5%	-	10%	2%	7%	3%	2%	7%	2%	4%
40-50%	8	5	1	2	8	1	3	2	-	2	4	4	-	4	4	-	8
4%	4%	4%	16%	3%	4%	2%	8%	12%	-	8%	7%	5%	-	8%	5%	-	4%
Around a half (50%)	10	7	*	3	10	2	2	2	3	*	4	4	2	5	4	1	11
6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%	12%	10%	2%	7%	5%	6%	10%	5%	3%	6%
Around two thirds (66%)	10	7	-	3	10	4	2	1	1	1	3	3	4	2	4	4	11
5%	6%	-	5%	5%	13%	5%	4%	2%	6%	6%	5%	3%	16%	4%	4%	12%	6%
Around three quarters (75%)	8	5	-	3	8	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	1	4	1	1	9
5%	5%	-	5%	5%	3%	6%	6%	3%	6%	6%	6%	3%	3%	8%	2%	4%	5%
More than 75%	55	32	3	18	55	7	13	5	9	7	19	23	11	16	22	14	59
31%	28%	39%	35%	31%	26%	38%	29%	35%	35%	36%	25%	41%	35%	25%	44%	32%	
Don't know/Refused	31	20	1	8	31	4	1	2	3	2	8	18	3	6	19	4	30
78%f	18%	11%	16%	18%f	15%	2%	11%	12%	11%	15%	20%	13%	12%	21%	12%	16%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1021

S6.d What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total number of UK employees is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Number of UK employees

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	184	4	1	43	4	1	5	8	8	7	9	9	9	19	5	-	6	7	1	36	2	184
Weighted total	177	4**	1**	40*	3**	1**	3**	10**	7**	9**	12**	7**	13**	6**	-**	9**	8**	1**	31*	4**	184	
Less than 10%	18	-	-	5	20%	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-	-	28%z	-	19
10-20%	18	-	-	6	-	-	-	1	1	-	4	1	2	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	16	
20-30%	10%	-	-	15%	-	-	-	12%	10%	-	31%	20%	12%	24%	-	19%	-	-	2%	-	9%	
30-40%	6	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	7	
40-50%	3%	-	-	4%	-	100%	15%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	22%	-	-	-	-	2%	-	4%	
50-60%	5	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6	
60-70%	3%	18%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	7%	15%	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	3%	
70-80%	9	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	8	
80-90%	5%	-	-	2%	-	-	24%	-	12%	-	27%	-	-	-	-	-	9%	-	4%	-	4%	
90-100%	8	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	8	
More than 75%	4%	-	-	5%	25%	-	-	-	15%	-	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	4%	
Don't know/Refused	10	2	-	4	-	-	-	1	1	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	11	
	6%	37%	-	10%	-	-	10%	11%	-	-	7%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	6%	
	10	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	11	
	5%	-	-	1%	26%	-	19%	11%	-	12%	-	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	54%	6%	
	8	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	9	
	5%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	11%	23%	-	2%	-	5%	
	55	1	1	10	1	-	1	4	6	3	3	1	5	-	-	11%	23%	1	11	-	59	
	31%	30%	100%	24%	29%	-	23%	36%	66%	39%	28%	22%	38%	-	-	14%	29%	100%	34%	-	32%	
	31	1	-	7	-	-	1	-	2	2	2	1	2	-	-	4	3	-	4	2	30	
	18%	15%	-	17%	-	-	18%	-	27%	26%	-	35%	10%	38%	-	47%	39%	-	12%	46%	16%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1022

S6.a-d What is your best estimate for what percentage of your organisation's total (energy spend/floor area/annual turnover within Britain/number of UK employees) is represented by just the sites you have responsibility for?

Summary

Base: all participants who are responsible for one or some sites of multi-site organisation

	Energy spend (excluding transport fuel)	Overall floor area	Annual turnover	Number of UK employees
Unweighted total	184	184	184	184
Weighted total	177	177	177	177
Less than 10%	26 15%	24 14%	28 16%	18 10%
10-20%	15 8%	5 3%	11 6%	18 10%
Around a fifth (20%)	10 5%	6 3%	3 2%	6 3%
Around a quarter (25%)	4 2%	6 3%	3 2%	5 3%
Around a third (33%)	14 8%	9 5%	6 3%	9 5%
40-50%	6 3%	5 3%	3 2%	8 4%
Around a half (50%)	14 8%	8 5%	11 6%	10 6%
Around two thirds (66%)	15 9%	10 6%	9 5%	10 5%
Around three quarters (75%)	13 7%	12 7%	7 4%	8 5%
More than 75%	36 20%	45 25%	29 16%	55 31%
Don't know/Refused	24 13%	47 27%	67 38%	31 18%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1023

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	801	801	-	-	24	70	47	52	50	17	183	168	57	53	14	10	47	421	370	801
Weighted total	762	762	**	**	17**	63*	42*	56*	55*	15**	196	138	47*	47*	19**	12**	45*	400	351	801
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	1	4	-	-	-	5	5	9
B - Mining and quarrying	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2% <i>f</i>	2%	9% <i>zefhjkp</i>	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
C - Manufacturing	161	161	-	-	7	18	14	13	15	-	14	35	13	5	6	4	17	104	56	183
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	21% <i>fr</i>	21%	-	-	43%	28% <i>jm</i>	34% <i>zjm</i>	22% <i>j</i>	26% <i>f</i>	-	7%	25% <i>jm</i>	28% <i>jm</i>	11%	30%	35%	38% <i>zjm</i>	26% <i>r</i>	16%	23%
E - Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	8	8	-	-	*	1	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	6	2	11
F - Construction	1%	1%	-	-	3%	-	1%	-	3%	2%	-	1%	-	4%	13%	-	-	1%	1%	1%
G - Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	*	1	-	-	-	-	2	4	8
H - Transportation and storage	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	3% <i>f</i>	-	-	2%	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	*	1%	1%
I - Accommodation and food service activities	31	31	-	-	1	1	1	2	1	1	6	9	1	5	1	-	-	20	11	42
J - Information and communication	4%	4%	-	-	3%	1%	1%	4%	3%	5%	3%	7%	1%	11% <i>zejp</i>	6%	-	-	5%	3%	5%
K - Financial and insurance activities	76	76	-	-	1	6	2	12	9	3	22	13	3	1	2	2	2	41	32	63
L - Real estate activities	10%	10%	-	-	3%	10%	4%	21% <i>zfkmp</i>	17% <i>m</i>	18%	11%	9%	6%	2%	-	16%	4%	10%	9%	8%
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	35	35	-	-	2	3	3	3	3	1	3	6	3	5	1	1	2	18	17	42
N - Administrative and support service activities	5%	5%	-	-	12%	5%	7% <i>f</i>	6%	5%	6%	2%	4%	6%	11% <i>f</i>	4%	8%	4%	4%	5%	5%
O - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	32	32	-	-	1	5	-	3	1	-	11	4	-	2	3	-	3	11	22	26
P - Education	4%	4%	-	-	4%	7%	-	6%	2%	-	5%	3%	-	3%	18%	-	7%	3%	6% <i>q</i>	3%
Q - Human health and social work activities	25	25	-	-	-	4	-	-	3	5	4	3	1	-	-	-	3	16	7	27
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	3%	3%	-	-	-	6%	-	-	20%	3%	3%	5%	2%	-	-	-	8%	4%	2%	3%
S - Other service activities	67	67	-	-	-	3	5	3	2	1	34	10	2	-	2	-	5	36	29	50
T - Information and communication	9% <i>m</i>	9%	-	-	-	4%	11% <i>m</i>	5%	3%	8%	17% <i>zghklm</i>	7%	3%	-	11%	-	12% <i>m</i>	9%	8%	6%
U - Real estate activities	20	20	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	13	2	2	-	-	-	2	10	9	27
V - Professional, scientific and technical activities	3%	3%	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	6% <i>zk</i>	1%	5%	-	-	-	5%	3%	3%	3%
W - Information and communication	41	41	-	-	-	5	2	2	2	2	11	7	4	3	1	-	2	23	17	61
X - Administrative and support service activities	5%	5%	-	-	-	8%	4%	3%	3%	12%	6%	5%	8%	6%	6%	-	6%	6%	5%	8%
Y - Administrative and support service activities	26	26	-	-	-	2	1	-	3	1	8	2	3	4	-	-	1	18	8	20
Z - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	3%	3%	-	-	-	3%	3%	-	5%	6%	4%	2%	7%	9% <i>zgak</i>	-	-	2%	5%	2%	2%
AA - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AB - Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AC - Education	32	32	-	-	1	2	-	1	6	1	9	6	4	1	-	-	-	6	26	34
AD - Human health and social work activities	4% <i>q</i>	4%	-	-	6%	3%	-	1%	11% <i>zfgp</i>	6%	5%	4%	9% <i>fp</i>	2%	-	-	-	2%	7% <i>zq</i>	4%
AE - Human health and social work activities	40	40	-	-	1	2	4	8	1	1	11	6	1	1	2	-	7	32	34	4%
AF - Arts, entertainment and recreation	5% <i>q</i>	5%	-	-	6%	3%	10% <i>p</i>	14% <i>zehklmp</i>	2%	5%	6%	5%	2%	2%	11%	13%	2%	2%	9% <i>zq</i>	4%
AG - Arts, entertainment and recreation	25	25	-	-	1	1	2	-	2	-	4	7	2	3	-	-	11	12	18	1%
AH - Arts, entertainment and recreation	3%	3%	-	-	7%	2%	5%	-	4%	-	2%	5%	4%	7%	-	-	3%	3%	3%	2%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1023

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Weighted total	762	762	-**	-**	17**	63*	42*	56*	55*	15**	196	138	47*	47*	19**	12**	45*	400	351	801
S - Other service activities	126 16%	126 16%	-	-	2 13%	12 20%	7 16%	8 15%	9 16%	2 12%	40 21%	21 15%	5 11%	10 21%	-	2 15%	7 15%	63 16%	61 17%	141 18%
T - Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	95 12%f	95 12%	-	-	1 5%	13 21%fk	* 1%	8 14%f	12 21%f	1 6%	24 12%f	14 10%	6 13%f	9 19%f	-	-	6 13%f	53 13%	40 11%	98 12%
Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1024

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	801	146	655	162	196	169	180	34	55	275	85	260	29	98	124	421	595	199	801
Weighted total	762	138	624	154	186	164	171	31*	51*	256	85*	256	28**	101*	129	382	558	195	801
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	9	1	9	3	4	3	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	6	9	-	9
B - Mining and quarrying	1	1	1	2	2	2	-	-	-	2%k	-	-	-	-	1%	2%	2%	-	1%
C - Manufacturing	161	40	121	34	45	39	31	3	9	88	10	33	3	12	30	95	138	19	183
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	8	2	6	3	1	1	1	1	1	3	-	1	-	-	1	5	7	1	11
E - Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	1	1	1	2	1	*	*	3	2	1	-	*	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
F - Construction	5	1	4	1	1	-	3	1	-	4	-	1	-	-	*	4	5	*	8
G - Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	1	1	1	1	1	-	2	2	-	1	-	*	-	-	*	1%	1%	*	1%
H - Transportation and storage	31	5	26	3	11	6	8	1	2	10	2	14	-	-	3	24	27	3	42
I - Accommodation and food service activities	4	3	4	2	6	4	5	2	4	4	2	5	-	-	3%	6% <i>m</i>	5	2	5%
J - Information and communication	76	4	72	7	13	16	23	4	10	22	9	25	2	3	9	51	70	3	63
K - Financial and insurance activities	10	3	12	5	7	10	14	3	13	8	11	10	5	3	7	13	12	2	8%
L - Real estate activities	35	5	31	3	10	7	10	3	2	11	4	7	-	-	4	26	33	2	42
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	5	3	5	2	5	4	6	8	4	4	4	3	-	-	3%	7% <i>m</i>	6	1	5%
N - Administrative and support service activities	32	6	26	2	10	10	4	2	3	17	2	9	3	5	13	7	21	11	26
O - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	4	4	4	1	5	6	3	7	7	7	3	3	9	5	10	2	4	6	3%
P - Education	25	2	23	4	5	4	9	1	1	2	3	15	-	2	5	11	14	11	27
Q - Human health and social work activities	3	1	4	3	2	2	6	4	3	1	4	6	1	2	4	3	2	6	3%
	67	21	46	22	10	9	13	3	10	4	7	47	4	7	9	34	28	39	50
	9	15	7	14	5	5	8	9	20	2	8	16	16	7	9	9	5	20	6%
	20	4	16	9	3	3	3	1	1	9	2	5	1	2	2	10	9	11	27
	3	3	3	6	2	2	2	3	1	3	3	2	5	2	1	3	2	6	3%
	41	7	34	11	11	8	7	*	4	9	6	19	2	8	4	19	25	16	61
	5	5	5	7	6	5	4	1	7	4	7	8	8	7	3	5	4	8	8%
	26	4	22	2	7	5	8	1	3	8	8	8	4	3	4	11	17	9	20
	3	3	3	1	4	3	5	4	6	3	5	3	15	3	3	3	3	4	2%
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	32	6	26	1	16	6	4	3	2	22	2	4	1	11	8	7	20	12	34
	4	4	4	1	8	4	2	11	5	9	2	1	3	11	7	2	4	6	4%
	40	2	38	3	10	10	15	3	-	10	4	12	1	18	5	15	30	10	34
	5	1	6	2	5	6	9	8	-	4	4	5	4	17	4	4	5	5	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1024

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owmed (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Weighted total	762	138	624	154	186	164	171	31*	51*	256	85*	256	28**	101*	129	382	558	195	801
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	25	4	21	6	3	12	3	-	-	4	5	9	-	8	2	7	16	8	18
	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%	7% <i>zdf</i>	2%	-	-	2%	6% <i>l</i>	4%	-	8% <i>zno</i>	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%
S - Other service activities	126	24	102	36	27	26	28	5	3	26	22	46	6	21	27	47	87	37	141
	16% <i>l</i>	17%	16%	23% <i>dh</i>	14%	16%	16%	16%	6%	10%	25% <i>l</i>	18% <i>l</i>	22%	21% <i>o</i>	21% <i>o</i>	12%	16%	19%	18%
T - Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	95	15	80	20	25	22	18	4	6	29	13	26	2	10	19	43	74	20	98
	12%	11%	13%	13%	13%	14%	11%	12%	12%	11%	15%	10%	9%	10%	15%	11%	13%	10%	12%
Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1025

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	801	177	401	84	125	119	586	688	80	109	140	359	33	217	575	263	95	165	209	801
Weighted total	762	165	373	80*	130	116	563	662	74*	96*	131	337	27**	209	532	239	87*	148	212	801
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	9	1	5	3	1	2	8	9	-	-	-	6	2	-	7	1	2	3	3	9
B - Mining and quarrying	5	2	1	2	-	2	3	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	3	1	2	2	2	5
C - Manufacturing	161	36	96	10	17	21	117	140	11	27	17	82	9	37	129	61	34	76	30	183
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	8	1	6	-	1	2	6	6	1	*	*	3	1	3	6	2	5	2	2	11
E - Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	5	-	5	1	-	1	4	4	1	2	1	3	1	1	5	4	2	*	*	8
F - Construction	31	12	9	4	5	4	22	23	6	6	5	15	2	6	22	8	2	2	8	42
G - Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	76	19	35	8	13	14	55	66	6	8	4	33	-	24	54	28	7	11	19	63
H - Transportation and storage	35	5	23	3	3	6	25	32	4	7	11	17	2	9	26	15	4	8	8	42
I - Accommodation and food service activities	32	8	21	-	4	6	24	30	3	6	6	17	-	10	22	12	1	7	10	26
J - Information and communication	25	5	14	-	4	2	20	23	2	3	6	14	-	3	14	7	5	6	10	27
K - Financial and insurance activities	67	8	24	9	25	12	48	56	5	6	11	31	-	15	39	21	7	7	25	50
L - Real estate activities	20	3	8	5	1	6	10	14	3	3	7	10	2	3	20	12	1	4	-	27
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	41	12	16	3	10	3	35	34	6	2	6	20	1	7	27	11	2	5	12	61
N - Administrative and support service activities	26	3	12	-	11	8	17	22	9	-	2	7	-	14	13	6	-	2	11	20
O - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P - Education	32	5	13	6	7	5	23	27	1	5	10	6	1	15	26	10	3	1	6	34
Q - Human health and social work activities	40	5	14	10	10	2	33	36	2	7	7	15	1	17	20	4	-	-	19	34

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1025

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Weighted total	762	165	373	80*	130	116	563	662	74*	96*	131	337	27**	209	532	239	87*	148	212	801
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	25	3	17	3	1	6	17	23	2	1	9	12	1	6	20	8	-	1	5	18
	3%	2%	4%	4%	1%	5%	3%	4%	2%	1%	7% <i>f</i>	4%	4%	3%	4%	3%	-	1%	2%	2%
S - Other service activities	126	35	56	14	17	16	96	113	10	12	29	45	5	38	79	29	9	11	42	141
	16% <i>g</i>	21%	15%	18%	13%	14%	17%	17%	14%	13%	22%	13%	17%	18%	15% <i>g</i>	12%	10%	7%	20% <i>g</i>	18%
T - Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	95	19	48	9	18	15	72	84	13	6	14	37	2	26	54	24	5	9	38	98
	12% <i>g</i>	11%	13%	12%	14%	13%	13%	13%	17% <i>f</i>	7%	11%	11%	8%	13%	10%	10%	6%	6%	18% <i>n</i> <i>o</i> <i>p</i> <i>q</i>	12%
Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1026

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	801	489	31	279	801	93	160	86	135	114	220	387	173	193	435	157	801
Weighted total	762	458	29**	271	762	92*	152	84*	122	105*	210	366	163	185	412	146	801
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	9	9	-	-	9	1	2	2	2	-	-	8	1	-	7	2	9
1%	2% c	-	-	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	-	-	2% j	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	1%
B - Mining and quarrying	5	1	2	2	5	-	-	1	1	3	2	1	2	1	1	3	5
1%	*	7%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	2%	1%	*	1%	*	*	2%	1%	
C - Manufacturing	161	87	3	69	161	14	28	27	31	25	43	81	34	39	77	40	183
21%	19%	12%	25% a	21%	16%	18%	32% zdef	25%	23%	20%	22%	21%	21%	19%	27% n	23%	
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	8	6	-	2	8	1	-	2	2	1	2	4	1	2	4	1	11
1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	
E - Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	5	2	1	3	5	1	-	-	2	2	1	3	2	1	3	1	8
1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	*	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	
F - Construction	31	20	4	6	31	4	9	1	4	2	10	16	4	8	17	4	42
4%	4%	14%	2%	4%	5%	6%	1%	4%	2%	5%	4%	2%	4%	4%	3%	5%	
G - Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	76	52	5	19	76	11	13	9	16	13	18	32	22	16	43	15	63
10%	11%	18%	7%	10%	12%	9%	10%	13%	13%	9%	9%	14%	8%	10%	10%	8%	
H - Transportation and storage	35	19	5	12	35	1	9	8	4	8	4	18	13	3	21	11	42
5%	4%	16%	4%	5%	1%	6%	9% e	4%	7%	2%	5%	8% j	2%	5%	7% m	5%	
I - Accommodation and food service activities	32	18	-	15	32	5	5	5	9	3	3	15	12	3	17	10	26
4%	4%	-	5%	4%	6%	3%	5%	7%	3%	2%	4%	8% j	2%	4%	7% m	3%	
J - Information and communication	25	11	-	14	25	1	7	3	2	4	7	8	10	6	9	9	27
3%	2%	-	5%	3%	1%	4%	4%	1%	4%	3%	2%	6% k	3%	2%	6% n	3%	
K - Financial and insurance activities	67	35	-	32	67	9	9	5	8	13	23	33	12	20	36	10	50
9%	8%	-	12%	9%	10%	6%	6%	6%	13%	11%	9%	7%	11%	9%	7%	6%	
L - Real estate activities	20	15	-	4	20	1	2	2	3	6	4	10	5	4	12	3	27
3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	3%	3%	6% f	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	41	27	2	12	41	8	12	1	4	5	18	16	6	15	18	6	61
5%	6%	6%	4%	5%	9% g	8% g	1%	4%	5%	8% k	4%	4%	8%	4%	4%	8%	
N - Administrative and support service activities	26	16	-	10	26	2	7	-	7	1	14	8	5	12	11	3	20
3%	3%	-	4%	3%	2%	4%	-	5% g	1%	6% k	2%	3%	6% n	3%	2%	2%	
O - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P - Education	32	21	-	11	32	2	7	2	4	7	10	16	6	8	18	5	34
4%	5%	-	4%	4%	2%	4%	3%	3%	7%	5%	4%	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%	
Q - Human health and social work activities	40	23	-	17	40	5	6	1	9	1	14	16	5	12	20	3	34
5%	5%	-	6%	5%	6%	4%	1%	7% l	1%	7%	4%	3%	7%	5%	2%	4%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1026

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Weighted total	762	456	29**	271	762	92*	152	84*	122	105*	210	366	163	185	412	146	801
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	25	14	3	7	25	-	10	6	3	-	3	14	5	2	18	4	18
	3%	3%	11%	3%	3%	-	6% <i>el</i>	7% <i>el</i>	3%	-	2%	4%	3%	1%	4% <i>m</i>	3%	2%
S - Other service activities	126	84	4	36	126	24	28	9	12	10	35	68	18	33	76	14	141
	16% <i>o</i>	18%	13%	13%	16%	27% <i>zdg</i>	19% <i>h</i>	11%	9%	10%	17%	18% <i>l</i>	11%	18% <i>o</i>	19% <i>o</i>	9%	18%
T - Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	95	61	1	31	95	13	16	4	13	13	37	41	12	33	47	12	98
	12%	13%	3%	12%	12%	14%	10%	5%	11%	12%	18% <i>kl</i>	11%	7%	18% <i>no</i>	11%	8%	12%
Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1027

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	801	9	5	183	11	8	42	63	42	26	27	50	27	61	20	-	34	34	18	141	-	801
Weighted total	762	9**	5**	161	8**	5**	31*	76*	35*	32**	25**	67*	20**	41*	26**	**	32*	40*	25**	126	-**	801
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
	1%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
B - Mining and quarrying	5	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	1%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
C - Manufacturing	161	-	-	161	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	161
	21% <i>fghkmpqs</i>	-	-	100% <i>zfhkmpqs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	8	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	1%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
E - Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	5	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	1%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
F - Construction	31	-	-	-	-	-	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31
	4% <i>cs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	100% <i>zcghkmpqs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
G - Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	76	-	-	-	-	-	-	76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76
	10% <i>cfhkms</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	100% <i>zcfhkmpqs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%
H - Transportation and storage	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35
	5% <i>cs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100% <i>zcfghkmpqs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
I - Accommodation and food service activities	32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
	4% <i>cs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
J - Information and communication	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25
	3% <i>cs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
K - Financial and insurance activities	67	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67
	9% <i>cgms</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100% <i>zcfghmpqs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
L - Real estate activities	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
	3% <i>c</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41
	5% <i>cs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100% <i>zcfghkmpqs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%
N - Administrative and support service activities	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	26
	3% <i>cs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%
O - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P - Education	32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	-	-	-	-	32
	4% <i>cs</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100% <i>zcfghkmpqs</i>	-	-	-	-	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1027

D1. Sector

Base: all participants who are compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Sector																				Unwtd total (u)	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Weighted total	762	9**	5**	161	8**	5**	31*	76*	35*	32**	25**	67*	20**	41*	26**	**	32*	40*	25**	126	**	801
Q - Human health and social work activities	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	-	-	-	34
	5%cs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%zcfghkm	-	-	-	4%
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	-	18
	3%cs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	2%
S - Other service activities	126	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	126	-	141
	16%scfghkmpq	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%zcfghkmpq	-	18%
T - Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	95	1	-	9	-	*	3	11	2	-	-	1	-	6	9	-	-	2	2	46	-	98
	12%ckp	14%	-	6%	-	8%	8%	15%ckp	7%	-	-	2%	-	15%ckp	36%	-	-	6%	8%	37%zcfghkmpq	-	12%
Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1028

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	70	-	20	50	5	9	4	1	5	1	19	6	9	6	-	3	1	23	46	70
Weighted total	109*	**	11**	98*	6**	13**	5**	2**	10**	2**	33**	7**	13**	8**	**	6**	2**	34**	75*	70*
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	2 1%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	1%
B - Mining and quarrying	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C - Manufacturing	10 9%	-	1	10	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	3	-	2	-	-	-	4	6	6
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	2 2%	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	14%	43%	-	22%	-	-	-	13%	8%	9%
E - Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F - Construction	1 *	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1%
G - Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	6 5%	-	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	2	7%	-	-	1	-	3	-	1	5	3
H - Transportation and storage	1 1%	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
I - Accommodation and food service activities	6 5%	-	-	6	-	2	-	-	-	2	7%	-	2	-	-	-	-	3%	-	3%
J - Information and communication	4 3%	-	-	4	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	-	-	-	-	2	2	4
K - Financial and insurance activities	8 7%	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	8	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	3%	3%
L - Real estate activities	10 9%	-	1	10	1	1	-	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	17%	3%	9%
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	5 4%	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	3	3
N - Administrative and support service activities	8 7%	-	-	8	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	4
O - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	5 5%	-	-	5	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	3	3
P - Education	13 11%	-	2	11	*	2	2	-	-	1	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	5%	4%	4%
Q - Human health and social work activities	8 7%	-	2	6	3	-	-	-	1	-	22%	17%	22%	-	-	-	-	2	13	9
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	5 4%	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	7	-	7%	4%	-	-	3	-	-	1	7	6

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1028

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Weighted total	109*	-**	11**	98*	6**	13**	5**	2**	10**	2**	33**	7**	13**	8**	-**	6**	2**	34**	75*	70*
S - Other service activities	10	-	2	8	-	1	-	-	2	-	3	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	10	7
T - Other	9%	-	16%	8%	-	4%	-	-	23%	-	9%	-	26%	7%	-	-	-	-	13%	10%
Don't know/refused	8	-	-	8	-	2	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	6	4
	8%	-	-	8%	-	15%	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	22%	-	-	-	6%	8%	6%
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1029

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	70	17	53	27	15	15	9	1	2	29	11	18	7	14	10	19	45	25	70
Weighted total	109*	29**	80*	45**	20**	27**	10**	1**	4**	47**	19**	24**	13**	21**	17**	26**	69*	40**	70*
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1
B - Mining and quarrying	1%	-	2%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	2%	-	1%
C - Manufacturing	10	8	2	8	-	2	-	-	-	7	2	1	2	4	2	-	9	2	6
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	9%	29%	2%	18%	-	7%	-	-	-	16%	12%	2%	18%	19%	14%	-	12%	4%	9%
E - Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	2	2	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	2	2
F - Construction	2%	6%	1%	4%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	-	-	2%	1%	4%	3%
G - Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
H - Transportation and storage	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
I - Accommodation and food service activities	* 6	2% -	- 6	1% 5	- -	- -	1 5	- -	- -	1% 5	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	6 21%	3 5%	2 6%	3 4%
J - Information and communication	1	*	1	1	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	*	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
K - Financial and insurance activities	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	-	-	4%	-	2%	-	3%
L - Real estate activities	6	2	4	2	2	2	-	-	-	2	4	4	-	2	4	-	6	-	3
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	5%	8%	4%	4%	11%	7%	-	-	-	4%	-	18%	-	8%	25%	-	8%	-	4%
N - Administrative and support service activities	4	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	2	2	2
O - Public administration and defence, compulsory social security	3%	7%	2%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	15%	-	-	-	2%	5%	3%
P - Education	8	-	8	4	2	1	2	-	-	2	4	3	2	-	-	4	5	4	6
Q - Human health and social work activities	7%	-	10%	8%	11%	2%	16%	-	-	3%	19%	12%	18%	-	-	14%	7%	9%	9%
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	10	-	10	-	6	5	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	2	4	3	8	2	6
	9%	-	13%	-	28%	17%	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	10%	22%	11%	12%	5%	9%
	5	2	2	3	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	1	2	-	-	-	2	3	3
	4%	8%	3%	6%	-	6%	-	-	-	4%	12%	2%	4%	-	-	-	3%	7%	4%
	8	6	2	6	-	-	2	-	-	2	4	2	2	2	-	-	4	4	4
	7%	21%	2%	13%	-	-	24%	-	-	5%	19%	9%	15%	10%	-	-	6%	10%	6%
	5	-	5	-	-	-	2	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	-	5	-	3
	5%	-	6%	-	-	-	19%	100%	50%	11%	-	-	-	-	8%	14%	7%	-	4%
	13	1	12	4	3	4	2	-	-	7	-	2	*	3	2	2	3	10	9
	11%	2%	15%	9%	15%	13%	20%	-	-	16%	-	7%	3%	13%	10%	6%	4%	25%	13%
	8	-	8	2	1	4	*	-	-	2	4	1	-	2	1	-	6	2	6
	7%	-	9%	4%	6%	15%	5%	-	-	5%	22%	4%	-	9%	4%	2%	8%	4%	9%
	5	-	5	-	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	2	2
	4%	-	6%	-	11%	9%	-	-	-	5%	-	10%	-	11%	-	-	3%	6%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1029

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total
	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Weighted total 109*	29**	80*	45**	20**	27**	10**	1**	4**	47**	19**	24**	13**	21**	17**	26**	69*	40**	70*
S - Other service activities 10 9%	2	7	4	1	4	1	-	-	1	2	2	2	2	2	6	4	7	
T - Other 8 8%	2	6	2	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	4	6	2	4	
Don't know/refused -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1030

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	70	19	35	5	10	-	15	23	4	7	6	10	3	13	43	9	3	6	22	70
Weighted total	109*	30**	51**	9**	17**	-**	15**	26**	6**	4**	9**	14**	3**	12**	66*	12**	4**	11**	36**	70*
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
B - Mining and quarrying	1%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	1%
C - Manufacturing	10	3	7	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	1	6	-	2	2	3	6
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	9%	11%	14%	-	-	-	4%	2%	-	-	-	22%	-	5%	9%	-	44%	16%	8%	9%
E - Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
F - Construction	2%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	14%	-	-	-	15%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	3%
G - Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
H - Transportation and storage	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1
I - Accommodation and food service activities	*	2%	-	-	-	-	4%	2%	-	14%	-	-	-	4%	1%	-	-	-	-	1%
J - Information and communication	6	-	3	-	2	-	3	6	3	-	-	5	-	1	6	-	-	-	-	3
K - Financial and insurance activities	5%	-	7%	-	13%	-	19%	21%	54%	-	-	35%	-	4%	8%	-	-	-	-	4%
L - Real estate activities	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	2
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	1%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	13%	-	-	-	9%	2%	-	4%	-	-	3%
N - Administrative and support service activities	6	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	3
O - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	5%	-	7%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	4%
P - Education	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	3
Q - Human health and social work activities	3%	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	5%	3%
	8	5	2	1	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	3	-	1	4	-	1	2	4	6
	7%	15%	4%	7%	4%	-	5%	8%	-	-	-	20%	-	5%	6%	-	18%	20%	11%	9%
	10	-	7	-	3	-	3	3	1	-	-	2	1	-	10	4	1	-	-	6
	9%	-	14%	-	20%	-	20%	11%	-	15%	-	16%	16%	-	16%	34%	38%	-	-	9%
	5	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	3
	4%	8%	-	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%	3%	-	-	-	-	4%
	8	6	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	4
	7%	20%	-	23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	-	6%
	5	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-	3
	5%	6%	3%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	41%	-	-	-	4%
	13	4	8	-	-	-	3	3	2	1	2	*	-	2	12	1	-	2	1	9
	11%	14%	16%	-	-	-	22%	12%	37%	17%	24%	3%	-	13%	18%	5%	-	20%	3%	13%
	8	3	1	-	3	-	*	*	-	-	-	1	-	*	1	-	-	-	7	6
	7%	10%	2%	-	20%	-	3%	2%	-	-	-	3%	-	4%	2%	-	-	-	18%	9%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1030

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Weighted total	109*	30**	51**	9**	17**	-**	15**	26**	6**	4**	9**	14**	3**	12**	66*	12**	4**	11**	36**	70*
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	5	-	-	-	2	-	2	5	-	-	5	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	2	2
S - Other service activities	10	3	6	-	1	-	1	3	1	1	2	-	-	3	4	1	-	-	5	7
T - Other	8	-	4	-	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	2	-	2	2	4
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1031

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	70	41	1	27	70	17	10	6	5	7	23	29	14	20	31	14	70
Weighted total	109*	64*	2**	42**	109*	28**	17**	5**	8**	12**	34**	45**	24**	32**	45**	26**	70*
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	2	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	1
B - Mining and quarrying	1%	3%	-	-	1%	6%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	5%	-	-	1%
C - Manufacturing	10	6	-	4	10	4	-	-	-	-	4	6	-	2	6	-	6
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	9%	10%	-	9%	9%	14%	-	-	-	-	12%	14%	-	7%	14%	-	9%
E - Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	2	-	-	2	2	2	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	2
F - Construction	2%	-	-	5%	2%	6%	-	12%	-	-	5%	1%	-	5%	1%	-	3%
G - Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
H - Transportation and storage	* 1%	1%	-	-	*	-	3%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%
I - Accommodation and food service activities	6	3	-	2	6	-	3	1	-	-	2	-	3	2	-	3	3
J - Information and communication	5%	5%	-	5%	5%	-	17%	12%	-	-	7%	-	14%	7%	-	13%	4%
K - Financial and insurance activities	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	*	-	1	*	2
L - Real estate activities	1%	2%	-	-	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	3%
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	6	4	-	2	6	-	-	-	4	2	-	2	4	-	2	4	3
N - Administrative and support service activities	5%	6%	-	5%	5%	-	-	-	48%	16%	-	4%	17%	-	4%	16%	4%
O - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	4	-	-	2	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	2	2
P - Education	3%	-	-	5%	3%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	8%	-	-	7%	3%
Q - Human health and social work activities	8	5	-	4	8	1	-	-	-	-	4	2	2	4	2	2	6
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	7%	7%	-	9%	7%	5%	-	-	-	-	12%	4%	9%	11%	5%	9%	9%
	10	4	-	6	10	-	4	-	2	3	4	4	2	2	8	-	6
	9%	6%	-	15%	9%	-	22%	-	25%	24%	11%	10%	10%	7%	18%	-	9%
	5	2	-	3	5	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	1	2	2	1	3
	4%	3%	-	7%	4%	8%	-	-	-	-	5%	5%	2%	5%	5%	2%	4%
	8	6	-	2	8	4	4	-	-	-	2	6	-	4	2	2	4
	7%	10%	-	4%	7%	13%	26%	-	-	-	6%	14%	-	11%	5%	8%	6%
	5	3	2	-	5	-	-	-	-	3	2	-	3	2	1	2	3
	5%	5%	100%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	26%	6%	-	13%	6%	3%	7%	4%
	13	7	-	5	13	4	3	2	-	-	4	7	-	4	9	-	9
	11%	11%	-	13%	11%	13%	20%	35%	-	-	10%	16%	-	11%	20%	-	13%
	8	6	-	2	8	5	-	-	-	-	1	6	-	1	4	3	6
	7%	9%	-	4%	7%	16%	-	6%	-	-	1%	14%	-	2%	8%	11%	9%
	5	5	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	2
	4%	7%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	20%	-	-	10%	-	-	9%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1031

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Weighted total	109*	64*	2**	42**	109*	28**	17**	5**	8**	12**	34**	45**	24**	32**	45**	26**	70*
S - Other service activities	10	6	-	4	10	1	2	-	2	-	5	2	2	5	3	2	7
	9%	9%	-	10%	9%	2%	13%	-	20%	-	15%	5%	7%	14%	6%	6%	10%
T - Other	8	4	-	4	8	2	-	2	-	2	2	4	2	2	4	2	4
	8%	6%	-	10%	8%	8%	-	42%	-	15%	7%	8%	9%	7%	8%	9%	6%
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1032

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	70	1	-	6	2	-	1	3	2	3	2	6	6	3	4	3	9	6	2	7	4	70
Weighted total	109*	2**	-**	10**	2**	-**	1**	6**	1**	6**	4**	8**	10**	5**	8**	5**	13**	8**	5**	10**	8**	70*
A - Agriculture, forestry and fishing	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
B - Mining and quarrying	1%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
C - Manufacturing	10	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
D - Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	9%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%
E - Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
F - Construction	2%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
G - Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
H - Transportation and storage	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
I - Accommodation and food service activities	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
J - Information and communication	6	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
K - Financial and insurance activities	5%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
L - Real estate activities	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
N - Administrative and support service activities	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
O - Public administration and defence compulsory social security	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
P - Education	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%
	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%
	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	9
	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	13%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1032

D1b. Please can you tell me the principle area of activity for your organisation?

Base: all participants who are non-compliers according to Environment Agency sample

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)	(u)
Weighted total	109*	2**	..*	10**	2**	..*	1**	6**	1**	6**	4**	8**	10**	5**	8**	5**	13**	8**	5**	10**	8**	70*
Q - Human health and social work activities	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	6
R - Arts, entertainment and recreation	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	2
S - Other service activities	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	7
T - Other	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	4
Don't know/refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	6%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1033

D2. Which of the following best describes how your organisation typically pays for its premises?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Rented	105	86	2	17	4	9	5	5	7	1	33	23	3	3	2	4	7	59	45	98
	12%	11%	17%	17%	15%	11%	11%	9%	11%	5%	14%	16% <i>l</i>	5%	6%	8%	24%	15%	14%	11%	11%
Leased	281	257	4	20	4	22	10	23	10	11	89	49	21	16	3	1	17	166	113	280
	32% <i>h</i>	34% <i>c</i>	38%	20%	16%	29%	21%	39% <i>h</i>	15%	60%	39% <i>fh</i>	33% <i>h</i>	36% <i>h</i>	28%	17%	3%	37% <i>h</i>	38% <i>zr</i>	26%	32%
Lease Purchase	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	*	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	4
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	*
Owned - Outright	290	244	3	43	10	26	20	18	35	2	50	42	22	24	10	12	16	123	164	290
	33% <i>f</i>	32%	27%	43%	43%	34%	43% <i>f</i>	32%	53% <i>zegijk</i>	11%	22%	29%	37% <i>f</i>	43% <i>f</i>	54%	68%	34%	28%	39% <i>q</i>	33%
Owned - Mortgage	17	16	1	-	*	3	1	1	1	1	5	4	1	1	-	-	-	8	9	19
	2%	2%	9%	-	2%	4%	1%	2%	1%	5%	2%	2%	2%	2%	-	-	-	2%	2%	2%
Mixture	152	136	1	14	5	13	10	10	10	3	41	24	11	11	4	1	6	64	85	159
	17%	18%	9%	15%	20%	18%	21%	18%	16%	18%	18%	17%	19%	19%	21%	4%	13%	15%	20%	18%
Owned as well as leased (not specific)	8	6	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	3	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	7	8
	1%	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	-	-	-	*	2%	1%
Other	6	4	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	5
	1%	1%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3% <i>z</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%
Not sure	13	13	-	-	1	3	1	-	3	-	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	7	3	15
	2%	2%	-	-	3%	4%	2%	-	4%	-	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	1%	2%
Don't want to say	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
	*	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1034

D2. Which of the following best describes how your organisation typically pays for its premises?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	169	211	184	169	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Rented	105	30	75	45	20	16	15	3	4	-	104	-	14	12	17	31	68	36	98
	12% <i>ko</i>	18% <i>b</i>	11%	22% <i>zdefh</i>	10%	9%	8%	9%	7%	-	100% <i>zjk</i>	-	34%	10%	11%	8%	11%	15%	11%
Leased	281	59	222	71	56	54	63	12	23	-	-	278	19	43	48	130	174	104	280
	32% <i>ij</i>	35%	32%	36%	27%	28%	35%	37%	43% <i>d</i>	-	-	99% <i>zlj</i>	45%	35%	33%	32%	28%	44% <i>zlp</i>	32%
Lease Purchase	3	-	3	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	3	-	4
	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	-
Owned - Outright	290	66	224	58	90	75	49	9	8	286	-	-	8	44	49	148	218	70	290
	33% <i>hk</i>	40%	32%	29% <i>h</i>	44% <i>zcfh</i>	39% <i>fh</i>	27%	28%	15%	95% <i>zjk</i>	-	-	18%	36%	34%	36%	35%	30%	33%
Owned - Mortgage	17	2	15	2	12	2	1	-	-	17	-	-	*	3	6	8	12	5	19
	2% <i>k</i>	1%	2%	1%	6% <i>zcef</i>	1%	-	-	-	5% <i>zjk</i>	-	-	1%	2%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Mixture	152	3	149	17	27	36	45	7	20	-	-	-	1	18	26	77	135	16	159
	17% <i>acjkkq</i>	2%	21% <i>a</i>	8%	13%	19% <i>c</i>	25% <i>zcd</i>	22% <i>c</i>	36% <i>zcd</i>	-	-	-	2%	14%	17%	19%	21% <i>q</i>	7%	18%
Owned as well as leased (not specific)	8	-	8	1	2	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	8	-	8
	1%	-	1%	*	1%	2%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%
Other	6	3	3	4	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	4	3	3	5
	1%	2%	*	2%	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%	*	1%	1%
Not sure	13	4	9	3	2	3	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	5	11	1	15
	2% <i>l</i>	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Don't want to say	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	2
	*	-	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1035

D2. Which of the following best describes how your organisation typically pays for its premises?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Rented	105	36	33	8	26	11	68	76	12	6	11	38	2	20	51	19	5	12	51	98
	12% <i>bn</i>	19% <i>zb</i>	8%	9%	17% <i>b</i>	9%	12%	11%	15% <i>i</i>	6%	8%	11%	7%	9%	9%	7%	5%	7%	21% <i>znopq</i>	11%
Leased	281	64	127	36	51	40	192	229	20	30	47	119	7	72	170	71	20	40	101	280
	32%	33%	30%	41%	34%	34%	33%	33%	25%	30%	34%	34%	24%	33%	28%	28%	22%	25%	41% <i>znopq</i>	32%
Lease Purchase	3	1	1	1	-	-	3	3	1	2	1	1	-	2	2	*	2	1	-	4
	*	*	*	2%	-	-	1%	*	1%	2% <i>zg</i>	1%	*	-	1%	*	*	2% <i>zr</i>	1%	-	*
Owned - Outright	290	69	161	20	35	32	192	224	27	35	48	121	13	78	223	90	45	81	59	290
	33% <i>dr</i>	35% <i>d</i>	38% <i>cd</i>	23%	23%	27%	33%	33%	34%	35%	34%	34%	41%	35%	37% <i>r</i>	36% <i>r</i>	49% <i>znor</i>	51% <i>znor</i>	24%	33%
Owned - Mortgage	17	4	9	2	1	1	15	17	-	5	3	6	2	6	12	7	2	*	4	19
	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	-	5%	2%	2%	5%	3%	2%	3%	2%	*	1%	2%
Mixture	152	16	83	21	29	29	99	124	19	22	30	63	7	39	123	56	15	20	26	159
	17% <i>ar</i>	8%	20% <i>a</i>	23% <i>a</i>	20% <i>a</i>	25%	17%	18%	23%	22%	22%	18%	21%	17%	20% <i>qr</i>	22% <i>qr</i>	16%	12%	10%	18%
Owned as well as leased (not specific)	8	1	4	-	3	1	3	7	-	-	-	4	1	3	8	2	-	3	-	8
	1%	*	1%	-	2%	1%	*	1%	-	-	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	2% <i>r</i>	-	1%
Other	6	1	-	1	3	-	3	3	-	-	-	1	-	1	3	1	1	-	3	5
	1%	1%	-	1%	2% <i>b</i>	-	1%	*	-	-	-	*	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%
Not sure	13	2	7	2	1	3	9	11	1	1	1	3	-	1	7	6	2	3	5	15
	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	*	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Don't want to say	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1% <i>g</i>	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1036

D2. Which of the following best describes how your organisation typically pays for its premises?

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)		
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Rented	105	67	*	36	105	31	16	12	8	2	29	56	16	31	51	18	98
	12% <i>f</i>	13%	1%	11%	12% <i>f</i>	26% <i>zdfghi</i>	9% <i>f</i>	14% <i>f</i>	6%	1%	12%	14%	8%	14%	11%	11%	11%
Leased	281	164	12	103	281	42	57	19	36	36	97	122	59	87	140	51	280
	32% <i>g</i>	31%	39%	33%	32% <i>g</i>	35%	34%	22%	28%	31%	40% <i>zk</i>	30%	31%	40% <i>n</i>	31%	29%	32%
Lease Purchase	3	2	1	-	3	-	-	1	-	*	-	2	1	-	1	2	4
	*	*	4%	-	*	-	-	1%	-	*	-	1%	1%	-	*	1%	*
Owned - Outright	290	180	10	100	290	22	59	37	51	51	65	143	73	57	159	65	290
	33% <i>e</i>	34%	32%	32%	33% <i>e</i>	18%	35% <i>e</i>	42% <i>e</i>	39% <i>e</i>	43% <i>zde</i>	27%	35% <i>f</i>	39% <i>j</i>	26%	35% <i>m</i>	38% <i>m</i>	33%
Owned - Mortgage	17	10	*	7	17	1	2	1	3	4	3	11	3	3	13	1	19
	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	*	1%	1%	2%	4%	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%
Mixture	152	91	7	52	152	19	34	15	30	22	43	72	29	32	87	27	159
	17%	17%	22%	17%	17%	15%	20%	17%	23%	19%	18%	18%	15%	15%	19%	16%	18%
Owned as well as leased (not specific)	8	6	1	2	8	2	2	-	2	1	1	1	6	1	1	6	8
	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	*	*	3% <i>zk</i>	*	*	3% <i>zn</i>	1%
Other	6	2	-	5	6	1	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	4	2	-	5
	1%	*	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	2%	*	-	2%	*	-	1%
Not sure	13	4	1	8	13	2	-	2	*	2	1	8	1	2	8	3	15
	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	2%	-	3% <i>f</i>	*	2%	1%	2%	*	1%	2%	2%	2%
Don't want to say	2	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	2
	*	*	-	*	*	1%	-	-	-	1%	*	*	-	*	*	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1037

D2. Which of the following best describes how your organisation typically pays for its premises?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Rented	105	-	-	12	-	-	2	10	4	2	3	11	3	8	12	-	2	8	5	24	-	98
	12%	-	-	7%	-	-	5%	12%	12%	6%	12%	14%	9%	18%cp	34%	-	4%	16%	18%	18%cp	-	11%
Leased	281	-	1	34	3	1	13	26	7	13	19	50	5	20	10	-	6	13	12	48	-	280
	32%cp	-	19%	20%	33%	13%	42%chp	32%	19%	33%	67%	67%zcfghmpqs7%	7%	44%chp	28%	-	14%	29%	40%	36%cp	-	32%
Lease Purchase	3	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	*	-	-	1%	-	-	3%zs	1%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Owned - Outright	290	5	3	95	3	3	10	28	8	15	2	6	13	10	10	5	30	11	6	24	2	290
	33%ks	42%	53%	56%zlfghkmqs33%	33%	56%	33%ks	34%ks	23%k	38%	8%	8%	44%	22%k	30%	100%	66%zlfghkmqs24%k	24%k	22%	18%	23%	33%
Owned - Mortgage	17	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	4	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	19
	2%	-	-	1%	-	8%	-	-	8%zcgk	11%	-	-	10%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	-	2%	-	2%
Mixture	152	5	1	23	3	1	5	18	9	23	4	8	7	6	3	-	7	12	4	30	2	159
	17%	50%	28%	14%	26%	22%	18%	22%	26%	11%	10%	11%	22%	14%	8%	-	17%	25%	12%	22%	22%	18%
Owned as well as leased (not specific)	8	1	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	8
	1%	8%	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	28%	1%
Other	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	5
	1%	-	-	9%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	28%	1%
Not sure	13	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	*	-	-	-	-	2	2	3	-	15
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	4%	-	3%	-	2%	1%	-	-	-	-	3%	7%	2%	-	2%
Don't want to say	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	3%zs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1038

D3. Approximately how many people are employed by your organisation overall, not including any subsidiaries or other group members?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Less than 250	199 23%	154 20%	4 31%	42 43%za	5 21%	17 23%	8 18%	7 11%	8 12%	4 23%	64 26%ghm	41 28%ghm	18 25%gh	8 14%	4 20%	6 36%	7 15%	106 25%	93 22%	189 22%
250 - 499	207 24%	186 24%	4 36%	16 17%	6 24%	20 26%	10 22%	20 34%p	20 23%	7 41%	47 21%	37 26%	16 27%	14 25%	3 18%	3 15%	6 12%	100 23%	104 24%	211 24%
500 - 999	191 22%j	164 22%	1 11%	26 26%	7 27%j	20 26%j	12 20%	12 31%j	21 8%	1 8%	28 12%	27 19%	15 25%j	19 34%jk	6 34%	8 44%	11 25%j	89 21%	99 23%	184 21%
1,000 - 4,999	181 21%c	171 22%c	3 22%	7 8%	2 9%	15 20%	14 30%l	15 26%	15 24%	5 28%	54 23%	25 17%	8 14%	11 21%	2 13%	1 4%	10 21%	85 20%	91 21%	189 22%
5,000 - 9,999	33 4%	31 4%	-	1 1%	2 10%	2 3%	2 4%	2 4%	4 7%	-	8 3%	5 4%	1 2%	-	3 15%	-	3 7%	18 4%	15 3%	35 4%
10,000+	55 6%e	51 7%	-	4 4%	1 3%	-	-	3 4%	3 4%	-	26 11%zefl	9 6%e	-	4 7%e	-	-	10 21%zefghklm	31 7%	23 5%	57 7%
Don't know/ Refused	6 1%	5 1%	-	2 2%	1 3%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	4 1%	2 *	6 1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1039

D3. Approximately how many people are employed by your organisation overall, not including any subsidiaries or other group members?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Less than 250	199	97	102	199	-	-	-	-	-	59	45	69	30	37	37	58	102	97	189
	23% <i>bdefghop58%zb</i>	15%	100% <i>zdefgh</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%	43% <i>zjk</i>	25%	74%	30% <i>o</i>	25% <i>o</i>	14%	16%	41% <i>zp</i>	22%
250 - 499	207	44	162	-	207	-	-	-	-	101	19	55	3	45	54	66	154	52	211
	24% <i>cefgho</i>	27%	23%	-	100% <i>zcefgh</i>	-	-	-	-	33% <i>zjk</i>	19%	20%	7%	36% <i>zo</i>	37% <i>zo</i>	16%	25%	22%	24%
500 - 999	191	13	178	-	-	191	-	-	-	77	16	54	5	30	33	90	153	36	184
	22% <i>acdfghq</i>	8%	25% <i>a</i>	-	-	100% <i>zcdtgh</i>	-	-	-	25%	16%	19%	11%	24%	23%	22%	24% <i>q</i>	15%	21%
1,000 - 4,999	181	12	168	-	-	-	181	-	-	49	14	63	1	11	17	121	143	35	189
	21% <i>acdeghmn7%</i>	24% <i>a</i>	-	-	-	100% <i>zcddegh</i>	-	-	-	16%	14%	23%	3%	9%	12%	30% <i>zmn</i>	23% <i>q</i>	15%	22%
5,000 - 9,999	33	-	33	-	-	-	33	-	-	9	3	12	-	-	4	24	27	5	35
	4% <i>acdef</i>	-	5% <i>a</i>	-	-	-	100% <i>zcddefh</i>	-	-	3%	3%	4%	-	-	3%	6% <i>m</i>	4%	2%	4%
10,000+	55	-	54	-	-	-	-	55	-	8	4	23	2	1	-	47	44	9	57
	6% <i>acdeflmn</i>	-	8% <i>a</i>	-	-	-	-	100% <i>zcdelfg</i>	3%	4%	8% <i>l</i>	5%	1%	-	11% <i>zmn</i>	7%	4%	7%	
Don't know/ Refused	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	4	2	6
	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2% <i>l</i>	1%	-	-	*	*	1%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/a/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1040

D3. Approximately how many people are employed by your organisation overall, not including any subsidiaries or other group members?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Less than 250	199	61	91	10	34	14	119	135	16	16	24	66	6	33	103	25	13	27	90	189
	23% <i>cemno</i>	31% <i>zbc</i>	21%	12%	23%	12%	21%	20%	20%	16%	17%	19%	18%	15%	17% <i>o</i>	10%	15%	17% <i>o</i>	36% <i>znopq</i>	22%
250 - 499	207	41	103	25	30	21	152	174	17	23	34	91	8	53	139	37	27	40	57	211
	24% <i>o</i>	21%	24%	28%	21%	18%	26%	25%	21%	23%	24%	26%	25%	24%	23% <i>o</i>	15%	30% <i>o</i>	25% <i>o</i>	23% <i>o</i>	24%
500 - 999	191	40	90	24	37	24	131	159	14	24	32	89	8	44	136	42	16	35	52	184
	22%	20%	21%	26%	25%	21%	23%	23%	17%	24%	23%	25%	25%	20%	23%	17%	17%	22%	21%	21%
1,000 - 4,999	181	38	88	25	25	26	127	152	17	22	37	66	7	67	137	81	14	32	42	189
	21%	19%	21%	28%	17%	22%	22%	22%	21%	22%	26%	19%	24%	30% <i>zk</i>	23%	32% <i>znppqr</i>	15%	20%	17%	22%
5,000 - 9,999	33	5	20	2	5	14	15	28	3	6	5	14	1	9	29	26	6	5	2	35
	4% <i>r</i>	3%	5%	2%	3%	12% <i>zf</i>	3%	4%	4%	6%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5% <i>r</i>	10% <i>znqr</i>	7% <i>r</i>	3%	1%	4%
10,000+	55	7	29	3	14	14	32	37	13	9	8	25	1	14	51	40	14	19	3	57
	6% <i>r</i>	4%	7%	4%	9% <i>a</i>	12% <i>zf</i>	6%	5%	16% <i>zgj</i>	9%	5%	7%	3%	6%	9% <i>r</i>	16% <i>znr</i>	16% <i>znr</i>	12% <i>zr</i>	1%	7%
Don't know/ Refused	6	3	2	-	2	2	1	3	-	1	1	-	-	*	3	1	-	1	*	6
	1%	1%	*	-	1%	2% <i>f</i>	*	*	-	1%	1%	-	-	*	1%	1%	-	*	*	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1041

D3. Approximately how many people are employed by your organisation overall, not including any subsidiaries or other group members?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Less than 250	199	107	7	83	199	50	38	16	12	8	69	92	33	62	98	32	189
	23% <i>hi</i>	21%	23%	27%	23% <i>hi</i>	42% <i>zdfghi</i>	23% <i>hi</i>	18% <i>i</i>	9%	7%	28% <i>i</i>	22%	17%	29% <i>o</i>	22%	19%	22%
250 - 499	207	132	3	72	207	28	47	22	41	11	65	89	46	58	98	46	211
	24% <i>f</i>	25%	10%	23%	24% <i>i</i>	23% <i>i</i>	28% <i>i</i>	25% <i>i</i>	31% <i>f</i>	10%	26%	22%	25%	26%	21%	27%	24%
500 - 999	191	122	4	62	191	26	41	25	27	24	48	90	45	40	102	46	184
	22%	23%	15%	20%	22%	21%	24%	28%	21%	21%	20%	22%	24%	19%	22%	27%	21%
1,000 - 4,999	181	104	11	65	181	12	34	20	38	30	45	87	44	40	102	34	189
	21% <i>e</i>	20%	37%	21%	21% <i>e</i>	10%	20% <i>e</i>	23% <i>e</i>	29% <i>zde</i>	25% <i>e</i>	18%	21%	23%	19%	22%	20%	22%
5,000 - 9,999	33	22	1	10	33	3	3	3	2	16	7	18	6	9	20	3	35
	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	2%	2%	4%	2%	13% <i>zdefgh</i>	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	2%	4%
10,000+	55	31	4	20	55	1	5	2	10	29	11	31	13	8	36	11	57
	6% <i>e</i>	6%	12%	6%	6% <i>e</i>	1%	3%	3%	8% <i>e</i>	24% <i>zdefgh</i>	4%	8%	7%	4%	8%	6%	7%
Don't know/ Refused	6	4	-	1	6	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	1	-	6
	1%	1%	-	1	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	*	1%	-	*	*	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1042

D3. Approximately how many people are employed by your organisation overall, not including any subsidiaries or other group members?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Less than 250	199	5	3	42	5	1	3	12	4	4	6	26	9	14	8	-	5	5	6	40	2	189
	23%	42%	53%	25%	50%	21%	11%	15%	10%	10%	22%	34% <i>fghpq</i>	32%	31% <i>fghpq</i>	23%	-	11%	10%	20%	29% <i>fghpq</i>	28%	22%
250 - 499	207	4	1	45	1	1	11	13	11	12	5	12	9	11	7	-	19	11	6	28	2	211
	24%	34%	19%	26%	13%	20%	34% <i>gk</i>	16%	29%	33%	16%	16%	29%	23%	20%	-	42% <i>zgks</i>	23%	19%	21%	23%	24%
500 - 999	191	3	1	41	1	-	6	16	7	12	4	9	8	10	5	-	9	14	14	30	2	184
	22%	24%	15%	24%	6%	-	20%	20%	20%	30%	12%	13%	26%	21%	13%	-	21%	29%	49%	22%	28%	21%
1,000 - 4,999	181	-	1	31	1	3	8	24	10	4	9	15	3	7	10	2	6	15	3	28	-	189
	21%	-	13%	18%	13%	48%	26%	29%	26%	12%	34%	20%	9%	16%	31%	38%	14%	32%	12%	21%	-	22%
5,000 - 9,999	33	-	-	3	1	1	1	4	3	2	1	3	1	*	1	1	3	3	-	5	-	35
	4%	-	-	2%	8%	11%	2%	5%	7%	6%	5%	4%	3%	1%	3%	27%	7%	5%	-	4%	-	4%
10,000+	55	-	-	9	1	-	2	10	2	3	1	10	2	4	3	2	2	-	-	3	2	57
	6%	-	-	5%	11%	-	6%	12% <i>qqs</i>	5%	9%	5%	13% <i>cqs</i>	2%	8%	9%	35%	5%	-	-	2%	22%	7%
Don't know/ Refused	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	*	-	6
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	2%	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1043

D4. Approximately what is your company's annual turnover within Britain? If you are not sure, please give me your best estimate.

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Up to £250,000	5 1%	3 *	- -	2 2%	- -	- -	- -	- -	3 5%zj	- -	1 *	1 1%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	3 1%	2 1%	4 *
£250,000-£499,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
£500,000-£749,999	2 *	-	-	2 2%a	-	2 3%zj	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	1 *
£750,000-£999,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
£1m up to £1.25m	* *	* *	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- *	- *	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- *	1 *
£1.25m up to £1.5m	4 *	2 *	- -	2 2%	- -	2 3%z	- -	- -	- -	- -	2 1%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- 1%	4 *
£1.5m up to £2m	3 *	2 *	- 4%	- -	2 2%	- -	1 2%	- -	- -	- -	1 *	1 *	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 *	1 *	4 *
£2m up to £5m	27 3%	21 3%	- -	6 6%	- -	3 4%	4 8%hk	2 3%	- -	- -	10 4%	2 2%	3 3%	2 3%	- -	- -	3 6%	13 3%	14 3%	24 3%
£5m up to £25m	123 14%	101 13%	2 20%	19 20%	2 10%	14 18%	8 17%	10 17%	8 12%	7 38%	24 10%	18 12%	13 22%j	8 15%	2 11%	3 20%	4 8%	46 11%	76 18%q	112 13%
£25m up to £50m	146 17%	129 17%	1 12%	15 16%	5 22%	14 18%	8 17%	8 13%	11 17%	3 18%	41 18%	22 15%	10 16%	7 13%	5 26%	3 18%	6 13%	66 15%	80 19%	134 15%
More than £50m	408 47%c	382 50%c	5 41%	22 22%	13 56%	33 43%	17 37%	33 57%l	35 53%	4 23%	106 46%	80 55%ll	22 37%	25 46%	8 41%	5 29%	23 49%	225 52%r	180 42%	440 51%
Refused	153 18%	121 16%	3 24%	29 30%za	3 11%	9 11%	9 19%	5 9%	8 13%	4 21%	44 19%	23 15%	13 22%	12 23%	4 22%	6 33%	11 24%	78 18%	68 16%	149 17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1044

D4. Approximately what is your company's annual turnover within Britain? If you are not sure, please give me your best estimate.

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owmed (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Up to £250,000	5	2	3	3	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	1	5	-	-	-	1	4	4
	1%	1%	*	2%	-	-	-	-	-	3%zdef	3%zik	*	13%	-	-	-	*	2%p	*
£250,000-£499,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
£500,000-£749,999	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	1
	*	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%zik	-	5%	-	-	-	-	1%p	*
£750,000-£999,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
£1m up to £1.25m	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	1
	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*	*
£1.25m up to £1.5m	4	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	-	4	2
	*	1%	*	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	9%	-	-	-	-	2%p	*
£1.5m up to £2m	3	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	3	-	-	-	1	2	4
	*	*	*	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*	6%	-	-	-	*	1%	*
£2m up to £5m	27	14	13	21	3	3	1	-	-	5	9	14	27	-	-	-	14	13	24
	3%o	8%zb	2%	10%zdefh	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	8%zi	5%j	66%	-	-	-	2%	6%p	3%
£5m up to £25m	123	34	89	37	45	30	11	-	1	46	12	42	-	123	-	-	74	48	112
	14%fghno	20%b	13%	19%fgh	22%zigh	15%fgh	6%	-	1%	15%	12%	15%	-	100%zno	-	-	12%	20%zp	13%
£25m up to £50m	146	34	112	37	54	33	17	4	-	55	17	48	-	-	146	-	109	37	134
	17%fhmo	20%	16%	15%fh	26%zfh	17%fh	9%h	12%h	-	18%	16%	17%	-	-	100%zmo	-	17%	16%	15%
More than £50m	408	41	367	58	66	90	121	24	47	154	29	130	-	-	-	408	329	73	440
	47%acdjmnpq	25%	52%a	29%	32%	47%cd	67%zcde	74%zcde	86%zdef	51%j	28%	47%j	-	-	-	100%zmn	52%q	31%	51%
Refused	153	39	114	36	38	34	30	5	5	40	31	41	-	-	-	-	99	52	149
	18%mmo	23%	16%	18%	19%	18%	17%	14%	9%	13%	30%zik	15%	-	-	-	-	16%	22%p	17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1045

D4. Approximately what is your company's annual turnover within Britain? If you are not sure, please give me your best estimate.

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Up to £250,000	5 1%	2 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	4	4
£250,000-£499,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3% <i>km</i>	-	-	-	-	1%	2% <i>n</i>	-
£500,000-£749,999	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
£750,000-£999,999	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-
£1m up to £1.25m	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
£1.25m up to £1.5m	4	2	2	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	2
£1.5m up to £2m	3	2	1	-	-	1	2	2	-	1	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	1	1	4
£2m up to £5m	27 3% <i>no</i>	5 3%	14 3%	1 1%	6 4%	2 1%	14 2%	16 2%	-	-	4 3%	5 1%	-	6 3%	7 1%	2 1%	1 1%	1	19 6% <i>znopq</i>	24 3%
£5m up to £25m	123 14% <i>op</i>	20 10%	65 15%	16 18%	20 13%	10 9%	84 14%	99 14%	10 13%	9 9%	23 16%	46 13%	3 10%	36 16%	66 11% <i>op</i>	8 3%	1 1%	16 10% <i>op</i>	52 21% <i>znopq</i>	112 13%
£25m up to £50m	146 17%	36 19% <i>c</i>	78 18% <i>c</i>	8 8%	23 15%	11 10%	109 19% <i>e</i>	118 17%	10 12%	13 13%	27 19%	60 17%	7 24%	32 14%	105 18%	31 12%	13 14%	27 17%	36 15%	134 15%
More than £50m	408 47% <i>r</i>	86 44%	197 46%	44 49%	76 52%	76 65% <i>zf</i>	272 47%	338 49%	48 60% <i>z</i>	60 61% <i>zgj</i>	66 47%	191 54% <i>z</i>	14 46%	122 55% <i>z</i>	314 53% <i>zr</i>	166 66% <i>znqr</i>	54 60% <i>zr</i>	81 51% <i>r</i>	89 36%	440 51%
Refused	153 18% <i>m</i>	40 20%	62 15%	20 23%	23 15%	16 14%	93 16%	112 16%	12 15%	17 17%	21 15%	47 13%	5 16%	24 11%	102 17%	43 17%	22 24%	32 20%	41 17%	149 17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1046

D4. Approximately what is your company's annual turnover within Britain? If you are not sure, please give me your best estimate.

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Up to £250,000	5	2	-	3	5	1	1	-	-	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	4
	1%	*	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	*	1%	2%	*	1%	*
£250,000-£499,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
£500,000-£749,999	2	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	*
£750,000-£999,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
£1m up to £1.25m	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	*
£1.25m up to £1.5m	4	-	-	4	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4	2
	*	-	-	1% <i>a</i>	*	3% <i>zdf</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	2% <i>zjk</i>	-	-	2% <i>zn</i>	*
£1.5m up to £2m	3	3	-	-	3	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	2	1	1	4
	*	1%	-	-	*	-	1%	1%	-	-	*	*	*	*	1%	1%	*
£2m up to £5m	27	14	4	10	27	10	1	-	3	-	15	11	2	15	10	2	24
	3%	3%	12%	3%	3%	8% <i>zdfghi</i>	1%	-	2%	-	6% <i>zkl</i>	3%	1%	7% <i>zno</i>	2%	1%	3%
£5m up to £25m	123	76	4	42	123	23	26	6	21	7	34	69	17	28	73	20	112
	14% <i>l</i>	15%	13%	13%	14% <i>l</i>	19% <i>gl</i>	15% <i>l</i>	7%	16% <i>l</i>	6%	14%	17% <i>l</i>	9%	13%	16%	11%	13%
£25m up to £50m	146	85	5	56	146	25	29	19	22	16	48	64	31	41	77	25	134
	17%	16%	16%	18%	17%	20%	17%	22%	17%	14%	20%	16%	17%	19%	17%	14%	15%
More than £50m	408	250	14	142	408	36	83	52	73	86	108	194	97	97	222	82	440
	47% <i>e</i>	48%	48%	45%	47% <i>e</i>	30%	49% <i>e</i>	58% <i>zde</i>	56% <i>e</i>	74% <i>zdelgh</i>	44%	47%	52%	45%	49%	48%	51%
Refused	153	90	3	56	153	22	25	10	12	7	34	70	34	31	72	38	149
	18% <i>hi</i>	17%	10%	18%	18% <i>hi</i>	18% <i>i</i>	15% <i>l</i>	11%	9%	6%	14%	17%	18%	14%	16%	22%	17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1047

D4. Approximately what is your company's annual turnover within Britain? If you are not sure, please give me your best estimate.

Base: all participants

	Sector																				Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Up to £250,000	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	4
£250,000-£499,999	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	2%z	-	*
£500,000-£749,999	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
£750,000-£999,999	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
£1m up to £1.25m	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
£1.25m up to £1.5m	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
£1.5m up to £2m	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	5%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
£2m up to £5m	27	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	7	1	3	3	-	1	1	-	5	-	24
£5m up to £25m	123	-	1	16	-	-	-	3	-	7	2	7	4	8	5	-	14	19	11	24	2	112
£25m up to £50m	146	1	2	33	1	*	3	9	5	17	5	9	5	4	4	1	10	6	2	29	-	134
More than £50m	408	13%	40%	19%	7%	8%	11%	11%	13%	46%	17%	11%	18%	8%	11%	27%	23%	12%	9%	22% <i>m</i>	-	15%
Refused	153	1	2	21	4	1	4	11	5	4	8	16	6	11	8	-	11	5	9	24	2	149
	18%	12%	32%	12%	38%	14%	13%	14%	14%	11%	30%	21%	19%	24% <i>c</i>	22%	-	25%	11%	29%	18%	23%	17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1048

D5. Which, if any, of the following schemes does your organisation participate in?

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region														Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme	251	239	2	10	10	20	13	15	19	4	72	30	14	17	10	3	21	148	101	272
	29% <i>ck</i>	31% <i>c</i>	16%	11%	43%	27%	29%	25%	29%	22%	31% <i>k</i>	20%	23%	31%	56%	16%	45% <i>zekl</i>	34% <i>r</i>	24%	31%
EU Emissions Trading Scheme	90	87	1	3	2	6	9	4	8	-	27	11	3	6	3	-	10	61	28	98
	10% <i>r</i>	11%	6%	3%	10%	8%	19% <i>kl</i>	7%	12%	-	12%	8%	5%	11%	16%	-	21% <i>zkl</i>	14% <i>r</i>	6%	11%
Climate Change Agreement	159	148	*	11	4	16	14	8	10	1	34	25	9	9	4	4	19	103	55	171
	18% <i>r</i>	19%	4%	11%	17%	22%	31% <i>zgjkl</i>	13%	15%	7%	15%	17%	14%	16%	23%	21%	42% <i>zaghjklm</i>	24% <i>zr</i>	13%	20%
Climate Change Levy	327	297	3	27	8	35	22	25	27	2	68	52	26	20	5	5	25	178	145	340
	38%	39%	24%	28%	34%	46% <i>j</i>	48% <i>j</i>	43%	41%	12%	30%	36%	43%	37%	27%	26%	55% <i>zjk</i>	41%	34%	39%
Mandatory greenhouse gas reporting	146	135	-	11	4	11	7	7	9	3	51	15	10	10	5	-	12	89	56	157
	17% <i>k</i>	18%	-	11%	19%	15%	15%	11%	13%	19%	22% <i>k</i>	10%	16%	19%	25%	-	27% <i>k</i>	20% <i>r</i>	13%	18%
Energy Performance Certificate (EPC)	324	274	3	47	9	22	15	26	22	7	87	44	28	30	7	7	14	156	165	321
	37%	36%	25%	48%	40%	30%	32%	45%	33%	37%	38%	30%	46% <i>k</i>	54% <i>zefhjkp</i>	38%	41%	30%	36%	39%	37%
Display Energy Certificates (DEC)	212	176	4	32	6	15	12	14	10	3	59	36	13	20	4	5	9	92	120	209
	24%	23%	36%	33%	27%	20%	26%	24%	15%	18%	26%	25%	22%	36% <i>h</i>	22%	31%	19%	21%	28% <i>q</i>	24%
None of these	248	212	3	32	7	24	9	16	22	7	74	40	13	12	5	8	8	107	134	231
	28%	28%	30%	33%	32%	32%	18%	27%	34%	40%	32%	28%	22%	21%	27%	45%	18%	25%	32% <i>q</i>	27%
Don't know	25	17	1	8	-	3	-	2	1	-	10	6	1	1	-	1	2	11	13	22
	3%	2%	4%	8% <i>a</i>	-	3%	-	3%	1%	-	4%	4%	2%	2%	-	3%	4%	2%	3%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1049

D5. Which, if any, of the following schemes does your organisation participate in?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)	
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871	
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871	
CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme	251	33	218	25	37	42	81	26	40	96	18	70	3	8	31	166	193	54	272	
		26%acdjm	20%	31%a	13%	18%	22%c	45%zcde	76%zdef	73%zdef	32%j	18%	25%	8%	7%	21%mn	41%zmn	31%q	23%	31%
EU Emissions Trading Scheme	90	20	71	13	27	16	14	6	14	46	5	22	1	1	13	54	65	24	98	
		10%am	12%	10%	7%	13%	8%	8%	19%c	26%zdef	15%zjk	5%	8%	2%	1%	9%mn	13%mn	10%	10%	11%
Climate Change Agreement	159	34	125	27	40	35	32	5	19	81	12	41	2	16	27	81	125	33	171	
		18%	20%	18%	14%	20%	18%	15%	34%zdef	27%zjk	11%	15%	6%	13%	19%	20%	20%	14%	20%	
Climate Change Levy	327	58	269	50	67	79	79	19	33	143	16	98	5	32	58	184	253	70	340	
		36%cmq	35%	38%	25%	32%	41%cd	44%cd	57%zcd	60%zcd	47%zjk	16%	35%j	13%	26%	40%mn	45%zmn	40%q	30%	39%
Mandatory greenhouse gas reporting	146	14	132	15	25	30	33	8	35	45	12	49	2	4	13	96	107	37	157	
		17%acmn	9%	19%a	8%	12%	16%cd	18%cd	26%cd	63%zdefg	15%	12%	4%	4%	9%	24%zmn	17%	16%	18%	
Energy Performance Certificate (EPC)	324	39	285	46	75	71	77	18	33	126	23	98	6	41	55	160	238	82	321	
		37%acj	23%	40%a	23%	36%cd	37%cd	43%cd	53%cd	61%zdef	42%j	23%	35%j	14%	33%	38%	39%	38%	35%	37%
Display Energy Certificates (DEC)	212	31	181	37	53	46	49	9	17	76	17	69	4	34	44	98	151	60	209	
		24%	18%	26%	18%	26%	24%	27%	27%	32%cd	25%	25%	10%	28%	30%	24%	24%	26%	24%	
None of these	248	59	188	90	57	52	42	2	3	62	51	100	29	52	36	89	160	86	231	
		26%ghio	36%b	27%	45%zdefgh	28%gh	27%gh	24%gh	7%	6%	20%	49%zlk	36%z	72%	42%zno	25%	22%	25%	37%zpr	27%
Don't know	25	9	16	7	11	3	1	1	-	8	2	9	2	5	5	5	18	7	22	
		3%	6%b	2%	3%	5%f	2%	-	-	3%	2%	3%	4%	4%	3%	1%	3%	3%	3%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1050

D5. Which, if any, of the following schemes does your organisation participate in?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme	251 29% <i>r</i>	44 23%	137 32% <i>a</i>	24 27%	42 29%	50 43% <i>z</i> <i>f</i>	161 28%	201 29%	30 38%	42 42%	49 35%	110 31%	9 30%	79 36%	251 42% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	251 100% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>p</i> <i>q</i> <i>r</i>	46 51% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	68 43% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	-	272 31%
EU Emissions Trading Scheme	90 10% <i>r</i>	18 9%	47 11%	10 12%	14 9%	16 14%	56 10%	71 10%	6 7%	21 21%	14 10%	42 12%	3 11%	24 11%	90 15% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	46 18% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	90 100% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>o</i> <i>q</i> <i>r</i>	59 37% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>o</i> <i>r</i>	59 -	98 11%
Climate Change Agreement	159 18% <i>d</i> <i>r</i>	34 17%	99 23% <i>z</i> <i>c</i> <i>d</i>	9 10%	15 10%	26 22%	104 18%	130 19%	18 22%	27 27%	31 22%	72 20%	10 31%	37 17%	159 27% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	68 27% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	59 65% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>o</i> <i>r</i>	159 100% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>o</i> <i>p</i> <i>r</i>	159 -	171 20%
Climate Change Levy	327 38% <i>r</i>	68 35%	185 44% <i>c</i> <i>d</i>	28 31%	44 30%	62 54% <i>z</i> <i>f</i>	200 35%	251 36%	39 49%	51 51%	55 39%	144 41%	19 61% <i>z</i> <i>k</i> <i>m</i>	82 37%	327 55% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	165 66% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>r</i>	62 69% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>r</i>	127 80% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>o</i> <i>r</i>	127 -	340 39%
Mandatory greenhouse gas reporting	146 17% <i>r</i>	29 15%	77 18%	12 13%	28 19%	36 31% <i>z</i> <i>f</i>	91 16%	116 17%	28 35% <i>z</i> <i>g</i> <i>j</i>	26 26%	29 21%	61 17%	8 27%	34 15%	146 24% <i>z</i> <i>r</i>	90 36% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>r</i>	43 47% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>r</i>	55 35% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>r</i>	55 -	157 18%
Energy Performance Certificate (EPC)	324 37% <i>r</i>	63 32%	166 39%	39 43%	51 34%	55 47% <i>f</i>	201 35%	250 36%	39 49%	55 55%	89 63% <i>z</i> <i>g</i>	131 37%	18 57% <i>z</i> <i>k</i>	85 38%	324 54% <i>z</i> <i>p</i> <i>q</i> <i>r</i>	136 54% <i>z</i> <i>p</i> <i>q</i> <i>r</i>	37 41% <i>r</i>	66 41% <i>r</i>	66 -	321 37%
Display Energy Certificates (DEC)	212 24% <i>r</i>	43 22%	115 27%	25 27%	27 18%	31 27%	136 24%	169 25%	31 38% <i>z</i> <i>g</i>	33 33%	107 76% <i>z</i> <i>g</i> <i>h</i> <i>i</i>	84 24%	12 40%	52 24%	212 35% <i>z</i> <i>q</i> <i>r</i>	72 29% <i>r</i>	26 29% <i>r</i>	43 27% <i>r</i>	43 -	209 24%
None of these	248 28% <i>e</i> <i>l</i> <i>j</i> <i>n</i> <i>o</i> <i>p</i> <i>q</i>	66 34% <i>b</i>	99 23%	23 26%	54 37% <i>b</i>	16 14%	176 30% <i>e</i>	193 28% <i>j</i>	16 20% <i>j</i>	12 12%	13 9%	94 27%	5 15%	52 24%	-	-	-	-	248 100% <i>z</i> <i>n</i> <i>o</i> <i>p</i> <i>q</i>	231 27%
Don't know	25 3% <i>f</i> <i>o</i> <i>q</i> <i>r</i>	8 4%	8 2%	4 5%	4 3%	6 5% <i>f</i>	7 1%	17 2%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	9 2%	-	4 2%	-	-	-	-	22 3%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s
* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1051

D5. Which, if any, of the following schemes does your organisation participate in?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme	251	140	11	100	251	14	26	37	49	79	62	119	67	50	144	55	272
	29%ef	27%	35%	32%	29%ef	12%	16%	42%zdef	37%ef	67%zdefgh	25%	29%	36%j	23%	32%m	32%	31%
EU Emissions Trading Scheme	90	50	5	36	90	5	11	12	18	27	17	38	34	11	42	35	98
	10%m	9%	15%	12%	10%	4%	6%	14%e	13%e	23%zdef	7%	9%	18%zjk	5%	9%	21%zmn	11%
Climate Change Agreement	159	102	7	50	159	11	25	25	26	40	25	67	64	24	69	62	171
	18%ejm	20%	22%	16%	18%e	9%	15%	29%zdef	20%e	34%zdefh	10%	16%	34%zjk	11%	15%	36%zmn	20%
Climate Change Levy	327	207	16	103	327	29	53	47	57	78	73	160	89	65	171	85	340
	38%ej	40%	52%	33%	38%e	25%	32%	53%zdef	43%ef	67%zdefh	30%	39%j	47%zj	30%	37%	50%zmn	39%
Mandatory greenhouse gas reporting	146	93	9	44	146	8	17	14	22	50	31	68	45	23	77	44	157
	17%em	18%	31%	14%	17%e	6%	10%	16%e	17%e	43%zdefgh	13%	17%	24%zj	11%	17%	26%zmn	18%
Energy Performance Certificate (EPC)	324	202	15	105	324	26	59	34	56	76	64	169	85	52	200	66	321
	37%ejm	39%	51%	33%	37%e	22%	35%e	38%e	43%e	65%zdefgh	26%	41%j	45%j	24%	44%zm	39%am	37%
Display Energy Certificates (DEC)	212	137	12	64	212	22	43	29	32	46	42	105	59	35	127	46	209
	24%jm	26%	39%	20%	24%	18%	25%	32%e	24%	39%zdefh	17%	26%j	32%j	16%	28%am	27%am	24%
None of these	248	138	7	101	248	54	59	20	21	6	92	108	34	91	113	36	231
	28%hil	27%	21%	32%	28%hi	45%zdghi	35%ghi	22%l	16%l	5%	37%zkl	26%	18%	42%zno	25%	21%	27%
Don't know	25	18	-	7	25	2	2	2	2	-	5	10	7	5	9	7	22
	3%	3%	-	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%	4%	3%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1052

D5. Which, if any, of the following schemes does your organisation participate in?

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total (u)	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871	
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871	
CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme	251	1	1	61	2	4	8	28	15	12	7	21	16	11	6	5	11	4	8	30	2	272
	29% <i>q</i>	7%	13%	36% <i>qs</i>	18%	79%	25% <i>q</i>	35% <i>q</i>	40% <i>qs</i>	31%	24%	28% <i>q</i>	53%	24% <i>q</i>	18%	100%	25%	8%	27%	22%	22%	31%
EU Emissions Trading Scheme	90	2	2	36	5	2	2	7	4	1	5	8	3	2	-	3	-	-	9	-	98	
	10% <i>q</i>	14%	47%	21% <i>zlgmqs</i>	51%	35%	5%	8%	12% <i>q</i>	3%	16%	11%	9%	5%	-	7%	-	-	7%	-	11%	
Climate Change Agreement	159	3	2	78	2	*	2	11	9	7	6	9	4	5	2	-	3	-	3	11	2	171
	18% <i>qs</i>	30%	47%	46% <i>zlgkmpqs</i>	10%	8%	5%	14% <i>q</i>	24% <i>fpqs</i>	18%	20%	12% <i>q</i>	13%	12% <i>q</i>	6%	-	7%	-	11%	8%	28%	20%
Climate Change Levy	327	4	1	105	5	4	11	30	17	9	22	6	10	5	3	20	3	17	35	2	340	
	38% <i>mq</i>	38%	28%	61% <i>zlgkms</i>	49%	79%	35% <i>q</i>	37% <i>q</i>	48% <i>mq</i>	45%	31%	30% <i>q</i>	21%	22% <i>q</i>	15%	65%	45% <i>mq</i>	6%	60%	26% <i>q</i>	22%	39%
Mandatory greenhouse gas reporting	146	2	2	26	3	2	7	12	5	9	6	18	8	9	4	5	3	1	1	20	2	157
	17% <i>q</i>	14%	34%	15% <i>q</i>	33%	35%	22% <i>q</i>	15%	15%	24%	23%	23% <i>q</i>	27%	20% <i>q</i>	12%	100%	8%	3%	4%	15% <i>q</i>	22%	18%
Energy Performance Certificate (EPC)	324	4	2	32	3	3	14	39	16	17	9	25	29	14	9	5	31	14	8	47	2	321
	37% <i>c</i>	36%	32%	19%	34%	56%	45% <i>c</i>	48% <i>c</i>	44%	31%	33% <i>c</i>	97%	31%	28%	100%	69% <i>zcfghkms</i>	9%	29%	35% <i>c</i>	22%	22%	37%
Display Energy Certificates (DEC)	212	3	1	14	1	1	9	13	12	11	4	18	17	8	5	3	25	10	12	41	2	209
	24% <i>c</i>	30%	13%	8%	15%	25%	30% <i>c</i>	16%	33% <i>cg</i>	30%	14%	25% <i>c</i>	57%	18% <i>c</i>	16%	65%	56% <i>zcfghkms</i>	11% <i>c</i>	41%	30% <i>cg</i>	22%	24%
None of these	248	4	2	33	2	*	8	19	8	3	10	12	29	-	7	26	7	7	47	2	231	
	28% <i>c</i>	40%	40%	19%	15%	8%	25% <i>c</i>	23%	23%	27%	43%	38% <i>cp</i>	-	27%	57%	-	14%	54% <i>zcfghmps</i>	23%	35% <i>cp</i>	28%	27%
Don't know	25	-	-	3	-	-	1	3	1	2	-	3	-	3	1	-	1	-	5	2	22	
	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	3%	4%	2%	6%	-	4%	-	7% <i>c</i>	3%	-	1%	-	4%	23%	3%	

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions: Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1053

D6. Is your organisation part of a wider corporate group? i.e. one of two or more active organisations working as a collection of parent and subsidiary firms.

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes	433	400	5	29	11	36	20	28	32	11	110	79	24	27	10	3	35	433	-	444
	50% <i>cr</i>	52% <i>c</i>	42%	29%	48%	47%	43%	49%	48%	63%	48%	55%	41%	49%	51%	19%	76% <i>zefghklm</i>	100% <i>zr</i>	-	51%
No	426	351	6	69	12	38	26	29	32	6	116	66	35	28	9	14	10	-	426	416
	49% <i>pg</i>	46%	54%	71% <i>za</i>	52%	50% <i>p</i>	56% <i>p</i>	49% <i>p</i>	49% <i>p</i>	37%	51% <i>p</i>	45% <i>p</i>	58% <i>p</i>	51% <i>p</i>	49%	81%	21%	-	100% <i>zq</i>	48%
Don't know	12	11	1	-	-	2	1	2	1	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	11
	1% <i>qr</i>	1%	5%	-	-	2%	1%	2%	3%	-	1%	*	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1054

D6. Is your organisation part of a wider corporate group? i.e. one of two or more active organisations working as a collection of parent and subsidiary firms.

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	(r)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes	433	78	355	106	100	89	85	18	31	131	58	167	19	46	66	225	321	109	444
	50% <i>m</i>	47%	50%	53%	48%	47%	47%	55%	56%	43%	56% <i>l</i>	60% <i>z</i>	47%	37%	45%	55% <i>m</i>	51%	46%	51%
No	426	87	339	93	104	99	91	15	23	170	45	111	22	76	80	180	299	122	416
	49% <i>k</i>	52%	48%	47%	50%	52%	51%	45%	41%	56% <i>z</i> / <i>j</i> / <i>k</i>	43%	40%	53%	62% <i>z</i> / <i>o</i>	55% <i>o</i>	44%	48%	52%	48%
Don't know	12	2	10	-	3	3	4	-	2	2	1	2	-	1	-	3	7	4	11
	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	-	3% <i>c</i>	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1055

D6. Is your organisation part of a wider corporate group? i.e. one of two or more active organisations working as a collection of parent and subsidiary firms.

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)		None (r)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes	433 50%	83 43%	224 53% ^a	44 49%	74 50%	70 61% ^z	289 50%	347 50%	43 54%	54 54%	60 43%	181 51%	18 58%	108 49%	315 53% ^r	148 53% ^{zr}	61 68% ^{znr}	103 65% ^{znr}	107 43%	444 51%
No	426 49% ^{opq}	110 56% ^b	194 46%	44 49%	72 49%	46 39%	279 48%	331 48%	36 45%	44 45%	79 56%	166 47%	13 41%	113 51%	278 47% ^{pq}	101 40%	28 31%	55 35%	134 54% ^{opq}	416 48%
Don't know	12 1%	2 1%	6 1%	2 2%	2 1%	-	9	11	1	1	1	5	1	-	5	2	1	1	6	11
						-	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1056

D6. Is your organisation part of a wider corporate group? i.e. one of two or more active organisations working as a collection of parent and subsidiary firms.

Base: all participants

Total (z)	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment							Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total
	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	(p)	
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes	433	246	14	169	433	55	81	46	70	62	120	211	92	99	238	87	444
	50%	47%	46%	54%	50%	46%	48%	52%	54%	53%	49%	51%	49%	45%	52%	50%	51%
No	426	271	16	137	426	64	85	42	60	54	122	197	92	118	213	81	416
	49%	52% ^c	54%	44%	49%	53%	50%	47%	46%	46%	50%	48%	49%	54%	47%	47%	48%
Don't know	12	5	-	7	12	2	3	1	-	2	3	2	3	1	6	4	11
	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1057

D6. Is your organisation part of a wider corporate group? i.e. one of two or more active organisations working as a collection of parent and subsidiary firms.

Base: all participants

	Total (z)	Sector																			Unwtd total	
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)	Other service activities (s)		Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes	433	5	3	109	6	2	20	41	19	12	18	42	18	25	22	2	6	8	11	63	2	444
	50% <i>pq</i>	43%	60%	63% <i>zpq</i>	55%	33%	64% <i>pq</i>	51% <i>pq</i>	52% <i>pq</i>	33%	63%	56% <i>pq</i>	62%	54% <i>pq</i>	65%	35%	14%	17%	36%	47% <i>pq</i>	23%	51%
No	426	6	2	61	4	4	11	37	17	26	9	32	12	20	12	3	39	39	17	70	6	416
	49% <i>c</i>	57%	40%	36%	40%	67%	36%	46%	48%	67%	31%	42%	38%	44%	35%	65%	86% <i>zcfghkms</i>	83% <i>zcfghkms</i>	57%	52% <i>c</i>	77%	48%
Don't know	12	-	-	1	1	-	-	3	-	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	11
	1%	-	-	1%	5%	-	-	3%	-	-	6%	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	7%	1%	-	1%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1058

D7a. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Energy use is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	444	421	8	15	15	37	22	25	27	10	101	95	30	30	7	4	36	444	-	444
Weighted total	433	400	5**	29**	11**	36*	20**	28**	32**	11**	110*	79*	24**	27**	10**	3**	35*	433	-**	444
Less than 10%	83	82	1	-	3	5	4	5	7	2	19	12	8	3	1	-	11	83	-	92
	19%	21%	14%	-	28%	15%	22%	17%	22%	14%	17%	15%	31%	11%	10%	-	32%	19%	-	21%
10-20%	60	55	1	4	-	6	4	5	5	1	19	7	2	2	3	2	5	60	-	58
	14%	14%	28%	12%	-	16%	18%	18%	17%	9%	17%	9%	9%	8%	33%	45%	13%	14%	-	13%
Around a fifth (20%)	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	2
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	*	-	*
Around a quarter (25%)	17	13	-	4	-	1	-	1	1	2	6	2	-	2	1	-	1	17	-	17
	4%	3%	-	13%	-	2%	-	2%	4%	19%	6%	3%	-	7%	8%	-	3%	4%	-	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	1	-	1	-	1	1	9	-	11
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	3%	2%	-	4%	-	21%	1%	2%	-	2%
40-50%	9	9	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	9	-	11
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	9%	-	9%	-	1%	3%	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	-	2%
Around a half (50%)	17	17	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	1	7	4	1	1	-	-	-	17	-	21
	4%	4%	11%	-	10%	5%	3%	-	-	8%	7%	5%	2%	5%	-	-	-	4%	-	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	3	2	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3
	1%	*	-	5%	12%	3%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	14	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	6	6	-	1	-	-	-	-	14	-	13
	3%	4%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	5%	8%	-	3%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	3%
More than 75%	77	64	1	13	3	9	4	7	6	-	19	9	6	10	2	1	1	77	-	74
	18%p	16%	11%	44%	28%	24%p	21%	24%	18%	-	17%p	12%	23%	39%	21%	34%	2%	18%	-	17%
Don't know	142	133	2	8	3	11	5	11	9	4	29	35	9	6	3	-	15	142	-	142
	33%	33%	36%	26%	22%	31%	26%	38%	30%	38%	26%	44%j	36%	23%	28%	-	43%	33%	-	32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1059

D7a. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Energy use is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	444	82	362	110	101	88	90	19	34	133	58	168	17	41	59	247	334	108	444
Weighted total	433	78*	355	106*	100*	89*	85*	18**	31**	131	58*	167	19**	46*	66*	225	321	109*	444
Less than 10%	83	13	70	28	15	18	18	-	4	21	12	39	5	11	13	42	59	24	92
	19%	17%	20%	26%	15%	20%	21%	-	12%	16%	21%	24%	25%	25%	21%	19%	18%	22%	21%
10-20%	60	13	47	17	9	14	11	1	7	21	6	23	4	8	5	32	40	20	58
	14%	16%	13%	16%	9%	15%	12%	5%	22%	16%	10%	14%	22%	18%	7%	14%	12%	19%	13%
Around a fifth (20%)	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	-	2
	*	-	*	-	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	*
Around a quarter (25%)	17	3	14	3	1	5	5	2	-	5	3	7	-	2	-	9	12	5	17
	4%	4%	4%	3%	1%	6%	6%	13%	-	4%	5%	4%	-	5%	-	4%	4%	5%	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	1	8	3	1	1	3	-	-	4	1	3	-	2	2	4	4	5	11
	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	4%	-	-	3%	2%	2%	-	4%	3%	2%	1%	4%	2%
40-50%	9	2	7	2	1	2	3	1	1	4	1	3	-	2	2	5	9	-	11
	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	5%	3%	3%	1%	2%	-	4%	2%	2%	3%	-	2%
Around a half (50%)	17	2	15	2	5	3	5	-	2	7	2	6	-	1	3	11	15	2	21
	4%	3%	4%	2%	5%	3%	6%	-	7%	5%	3%	4%	-	1%	5%	5%	5%	2%	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	3	-	3	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	3
	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	*	1%	1%	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	-	14	2	1	5	6	-	1	5	1	4	-	1	-	10	11	2	13
	3%	-	4%	1%	1%	5%	7% <i>d</i>	-	4%	4%	2%	3%	-	2%	-	4%	4%	1%	3%
More than 75%	77	10	67	5	24	19	13	5	8	32	9	16	2	11	13	41	65	11	74
	18% <i>ck</i>	13%	19%	5%	24% <i>c</i>	22% <i>c</i>	16% <i>c</i>	30%	25%	24% <i>k</i>	15%	10%	12%	24%	20%	18%	20% <i>q</i>	10%	17%
Don't know	142	34	108	45	40	21	20	9	7	33	23	61	8	9	25	67	102	40	142
	33%	44% <i>b</i>	30%	42% <i>ef</i>	40% <i>ef</i>	24%	23%	48%	24%	26%	39%	37%	41%	19%	39%	30%	32%	36%	32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1060

D7a. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Energy use is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	444	89	232	44	70	69	305	363	48	61	65	190	21	113	328	160	65	111	107	444
Weighted total	433	83*	224	44*	74*	70*	289	347	43*	54*	60*	181	18**	108*	315	148	61*	103*	107*	444
Less than 10%	83	15	41	3	20	11	56	67	4	8	10	40	2	18	62	30	19	27	21	92
	19%	18%	18%	8%	27% ^c	16%	19%	19%	9%	14%	16%	22%	10%	17%	20%	20%	30%	27%	19%	21%
10-20%	60	6	36	5	12	7	43	46	9	6	12	21	4	16	45	18	8	14	16	58
	14%	7%	16% ^a	11%	17%	10%	15%	13%	21%	12%	20%	11%	22%	14%	14%	12%	12%	13%	15%	13%
Around a fifth (20%)	2	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	2
	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-
Around a quarter (25%)	17	3	9	3	2	1	10	12	2	1	3	7	1	4	12	6	3	4	4	17
	4%	4%	4%	7%	2%	2%	3%	3%	5%	1%	5%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	2	5	-	2	-	9	9	1	2	2	4	1	2	6	4	2	4	2	11
	2%	2%	2%	-	3%	-	3%	2%	2%	5%	4%	2%	7%	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%	2%
40-50%	9	-	6	2	1	-	7	7	-	3	1	4	-	1	8	4	1	2	2	11
	2%	-	2%	4%	1%	-	2%	2%	-	6%	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Around a half (50%)	17	4	9	1	3	2	12	12	4	4	3	8	-	4	11	5	1	1	6	21
	4%	5%	4%	2%	4%	3%	4%	3%	9%	8%	6%	4%	-	4%	3%	4%	2%	1%	6%	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	3	-	1	-	2	-	2	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	3	2	1	-	-	3
	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	1%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	2%	-	-	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	7	6	2	-	4	9	13	1	1	2	4	1	6	10	3	-	2	5	13
	3%	8% ^{bd}	3%	4%	-	5%	3%	4%	2%	2%	3%	2%	7%	5%	3%	2%	-	2%	4%	3%
More than 75%	77	10	43	10	14	17	46	59	10	9	9	34	5	16	60	25	14	20	12	74
	18%	12%	19%	22%	18%	24%	16%	17%	23%	17%	14%	19%	28%	15%	19%	17%	22%	20%	12%	17%
Don't know	142	35	68	19	19	26	94	120	12	19	17	57	4	41	97	49	13	29	39	142
	33%	42% ^d	31%	43%	25%	38%	33%	35%	27%	36%	29%	32%	23%	38%	31%	33%	22%	28%	36%	32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1061

D7a. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Energy use is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	444	254	15	173	444	55	82	46	76	64	123	215	96	102	242	93	444
Weighted total	433	246	14**	169	433	55*	81*	46*	70*	62*	120	211	92*	99*	238	87*	444
Less than 10%	83	43	3	37	83	12	20	8	15	7	29	35	16	25	37	19	92
	19%	17%	24%	22%	19%	23%	25%	17%	22%	12%	24%	17%	18%	26% <i>n</i>	16%	22%	21%
10-20%	60	27	2	30	60	6	4	6	10	18	11	34	14	9	32	17	58
	14% <i>f</i>	11%	14%	17%	14% <i>f</i>	10%	5%	14%	15%	30% <i>zdef</i>	9%	16%	16%	9%	13%	19%	13%
Around a fifth (20%)	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	2
	*	1%	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	*
Around a quarter (25%)	17	14	-	3	17	3	1	3	3	2	1	12	3	1	10	6	17
	4%	6% <i>c</i>	-	2%	4%	6%	1%	7%	4%	3%	1%	5%	3%	1%	4%	7% <i>m</i>	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	5	-	3	9	-	3	1	1	3	1	7	1	2	6	1	11
	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	3%	2%	2%	4%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%
40-50%	9	6	1	2	9	1	-	2	1	3	1	7	1	1	7	1	11
	2%	2%	6%	1%	2%	1%	-	4%	2%	4%	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%
Around a half (50%)	17	7	3	8	17	1	3	*	7	3	5	9	3	4	11	3	21
	4%	3%	19%	5%	4%	1%	3%	1%	10%	5%	4%	4%	3%	4%	5%	3%	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	3	1	-	2	3	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	2	-	1	2	3
	1%	*	-	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	-	2% <i>k</i>	-	1%	2%	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	10	-	4	14	-	5	2	-	1	7	6	2	6	6	2	13
	3%	4%	-	3%	3%	-	6%	4%	-	2%	5%	3%	2%	6%	3%	2%	3%
More than 75%	77	49	2	26	77	6	16	9	14	16	18	35	19	15	42	18	74
	18%	20%	13%	15%	18%	10%	19%	20%	20%	26% <i>ee</i>	15%	16%	21%	15%	17%	21%	17%
Don't know	142	82	3	55	142	27	29	13	17	9	44	65	31	37	83	19	142
	33% <i>l</i>	33%	23%	32%	33% <i>l</i>	49% <i>zdh</i>	36% <i>i</i>	29%	24%	15%	37%	31%	33%	37% <i>o</i>	35% <i>o</i>	22%	32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1062

D7a. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Energy use is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	444	4	4	123	8	3	27	33	23	9	19	31	18	35	16	1	6	7	7	69	1	444
Weighted total	433	5**	3**	109	6**	2**	20**	41**	19**	12**	18**	42**	18**	25*	22**	2**	6**	8**	11**	63*	2**	444
Less than 10%	83	-	1	31	1	-	2	8	7	-	4	2	3	8	2	-	-	-	4	12	-	92
	19%	-	22%	28%z	11%	-	11%	18%	35%	-	24%	5%	16%	31%	9%	-	-	-	38%	19%	-	21%
10-20%	60	-	1	14	1	1	5	2	2	5	14	-	2	3	-	1	2	-	8	-	58	
	14%	-	24%	13%	14%	40%	4%	11%	10%	15%	26%	32%	-	8%	15%	-	21%	23%	-	12%	-	13%
Around a fifth (20%)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Around a quarter (25%)	17	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	1	-	1	2	2	1	4	-	-	-	-	3	-	17
	4%	-	-	4%	-	-	13%	-	4%	-	4%	4%	8%	3%	16%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	11
	2%	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	7%	2%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	2%
40-50%	9	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	11
	2%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	15%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	2%
Around a half (50%)	17	-	-	4	-	-	2	-	1	2	-	1	*	2	2	-	-	1	-	2	-	21
	4%	-	-	4%	-	-	8%	-	5%	16%	-	3%	2%	9%	10%	-	-	6%	-	3%	-	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	3
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	11%	-	-	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	1	-	-	-	-	2	3	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	5	-	13
	3%	19%	-	-	-	-	9%	8%	-	9%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	14%	-	7%	8% ^c	-	3%
More than 75%	77	2	-	18	2	1	4	12	1	1	2	4	9	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	74
	16% ^s	50%	-	16% ^s	44%	35%	21%	30%	4%	5%	11%	9%	50%	13%	15%	100%	49%	33%	19%	5%	100%	17%
Don't know	142	1	2	35	2	-	7	14	5	7	4	18	2	6	7	-	1	3	3	26	-	142
	33%	30%	54%	33%	31%	25%	35%	33%	25%	55%	23%	43%	12%	24%	31%	-	16%	37%	26%	40%	-	32%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1063

D7b. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Annual turnover within the UK is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	444	421	8	15	15	37	22	25	27	10	101	95	30	30	7	4	36	444	-	444
Weighted total	433	400	5**	29**	11**	36*	20**	28**	32**	11**	110*	79*	24**	27**	10**	3**	35*	433	-**	444
Less than 10%	31	31	-	-	3	2	2	3	3	1	6	6	2	1	-	1	3	31	-	38
	7%	8%	-	-	26%	5%	9%	9%	9%	7%	5%	7%	7%	4%	-	22%	10%	7%	-	9%
10-20%	50	48	-	2	-	2	2	4	5	4	11	12	2	2	-	-	5	50	-	49
	12%	12%	-	7%	-	7%	9%	14%	17%	37%	10%	15%	7%	9%	-	-	15%	12%	-	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Around a quarter (25%)	22	18	-	4	-	2	-	4	-	2	7	2	-	1	-	-	2	22	-	19
	5%	5%	-	12%	-	5%	-	13%	-	16%	6%	3%	-	5%	-	-	6%	5%	-	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	9	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	9	-	10
	2%	2%	10%	-	-	3%	-	4%	3%	-	4%	1%	-	2%	-	21%	-	2%	-	2%
40-50%	11	9	1	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	2	-	1	-	-	3	11	-	11
	3%	2%	14%	6%	-	-	-	7%	-	3%	2%	-	-	3%	-	-	8%	3%	-	2%
Around a half (50%)	22	21	1	-	*	2	1	-	4	-	2	6	1	2	2	-	1	22	-	24
	5%	5%	11%	-	4%	5%	4%	-	12%	-	2%	8%	5%	7%	21%	-	3%	5%	-	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	4	3	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	4
	1%	1%	-	5%	12%	-	-	-	-	8%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	20	20	-	-	1	5	-	1	1	-	4	6	-	1	-	-	1	20	-	21
	5%	5%	-	-	5%	14%zj	-	4%	3%	-	4%	8%	-	3%	-	-	2%	5%	-	5%
More than 75%	128	120	2	7	3	6	8	8	11	1	34	20	9	9	3	2	128	-	133	
	30%	30%	39%	23%	26%	17%	41%	29%	33%	9%	30%	25%	36%	35%	31%	57%	35%	30%	-	30%
Don't know	135	121	1	13	3	16	7	8	5	2	38	25	11	8	5	-	7	135	-	134
	31%	30%	26%	47%	26%	44%p	36%	27%	16%	22%	34%	31%	45%	31%	48%	-	20%	31%	-	30%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1064

D7b. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Annual turnover within the UK is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	444	82	362	110	101	88	90	19	34	133	58	168	17	41	59	247	334	108	444
Weighted total	433	78*	355	106*	100*	89*	85*	18**	31**	131	58*	167	19**	46*	66*	225	321	109*	444
Less than 10%	31	3	29	10	6	10	2	-	4	10	2	13	1	9	3	14	25	6	38
	7%	3%	8%	9%	6%	11% <i>f</i>	2%	-	12%	7%	3%	8%	7%	15% <i>zno</i>	5%	6%	8%	5%	9%
10-20%	50	11	39	15	10	8	8	5	5	13	7	22	3	9	9	26	35	15	49
	12%	14%	11%	14%	10%	9%	9%	25%	18%	10%	13%	13%	14%	20%	14%	12%	11%	14%	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*
Around a quarter (25%)	22	3	19	2	6	3	7	2	3	5	-	13	1	2	5	13	17	5	19
	5%	3%	5%	2%	6%	3%	8% <i>c</i>	9%	8%	4%	-	8% <i>j</i>	4%	4%	8%	6%	5%	5%	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	2	7	2	3	2	1	1	1	5	-	2	-	-	1	8	7	2	10
	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	4%	3%	4%	-	1%	-	1%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%
40-50%	11	-	11	1	1	7	2	-	-	4	2	3	2	-	2	6	10	1	11
	3%	-	3%	1%	1%	7% <i>zcd</i>	3%	-	-	3%	3%	2%	9%	-	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%
Around a half (50%)	22	4	17	6	3	6	6	-	1	7	1	6	-	4	3	12	19	2	24
	5%	6%	5%	6%	3%	6%	7%	-	2%	5%	2%	4%	-	9%	5%	5%	6%	2%	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	4	1	3	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	4	-	4
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	3% <i>o</i>	*	1%	-	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	20	1	19	2	8	5	4	1	1	6	4	6	-	2	1	14	18	2	21
	5%	2%	5%	2%	8%	5%	5%	4%	2%	5%	6%	4%	-	5%	2%	6%	6%	1%	5%
More than 75%	128	23	105	26	30	31	27	6	7	47	21	37	5	11	21	80	93	34	133
	30%	30%	30%	24%	31%	34%	31%	31%	24%	36% <i>k</i>	37%	22%	28%	23%	32%	36%	29%	31%	30%
Don't know	135	30	106	42	31	19	27	5	9	35	20	63	7	9	18	50	92	43	134
	31% <i>d</i>	38%	30%	40% <i>e</i>	31%	22%	31%	27%	31%	26%	34%	38%	38%	19%	27%	22%	29%	39%	30%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1065

D7b. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Annual turnover within the UK is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	444	89	232	44	70	69	305	363	48	61	65	190	21	113	328	160	65	111	107	444
Weighted total	433	83*	224	44*	74*	70*	289	347	43*	54*	60*	181	18**	108*	315	148	61*	103*	107*	444
Less than 10%	31 7%	4 5%	22 10%	2 4%	3 5%	7 11%	21 7%	28 8%	3 7%	5 9%	8 14%	18 10% <i>m</i>	2 10%	4 3%	21 7%	8 5%	6 11%	8 8%	10 9%	38 9%
10-20%	50 12%	6 7%	26 11%	5 11%	13 17%	9 13%	34 12%	39 11%	8 18%	3 6%	7 11%	21 12%	2 10%	13 12%	37 12%	14 10%	6 10%	11 11%	11 11%	49 11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1 *	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 *
Around a quarter (25%)	22 5%	3 3%	14 6%	3 6%	2 3%	3 5%	13 4%	16 5%	3 8%	1 2%	3 5%	9 5%	-	9 8%	18 6%	6 4%	3 4%	6 6%	4 4%	19 4%
Around a third (33%)	9 2%	2 2%	6 3%	1 3%	-	4 6%	5 2%	8 2%	1 2%	2 3%	1 2%	6 3%	1 4%	2 2%	9 3%	5 4%	5 8% <i>zr</i>	6 6% <i>zr</i>	-	10 2%
40-50%	11 3%	2 2%	6 3%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%	6 2%	8 2%	1 2%	1 2%	-	6 4%	1 3%	3 3%	7 2%	3 2%	1 1%	2 2%	2 2%	11 2%
Around a half (50%)	22 5%	3 4%	10 4%	6 14% <i>zbd</i>	1 2%	2 3%	15 5%	17 5%	1 2%	4 7%	1 2%	13 7%	1 4%	2 2%	15 5%	7 5%	1 2%	5 4%	6 6%	24 5%
Around two thirds (66%)	4 1%	1 1%	1 *	1 2%	1 2%	-	2 1%	2 *	-	-	1 2%	-	-	1 1%	4 1%	1 1%	1 2%	-	4 1%	
Around three quarters (75%)	20 5%	8 10% <i>b</i>	6 3%	2 5%	3 4%	1 1%	17 6%	15 4%	3 8%	2 3%	3 6%	9 5%	1 4%	6 5%	14 4%	6 4%	1 2%	2 2%	6 6%	21 5%
More than 75%	128 30% <i>j</i>	22 27%	67 30%	11 26%	27 37%	19 27%	89 31%	104 30% <i>j</i>	10 23%	21 40% <i>j</i>	10 16%	53 29%	6 32%	31 29%	91 29%	46 31%	15 25%	29 28%	33 31%	133 30%
Don't know	135 31%	31 38%	66 30%	12 27%	22 29%	23 33%	88 30%	110 32%	13 29%	15 28%	26 43%	45 25%	6 31%	37 34%	98 31%	52 35%	21 35%	34 33%	33 31%	134 30%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1066

D7b. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Annual turnover within the UK is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	444	254	15	173	444	55	82	46	76	64	123	215	96	102	242	93	444
Weighted total	433	246	14**	169	433	55*	81*	46*	70*	62*	120	211	92*	99*	238	87*	444
Less than 10%	31	15	2	15	31	9	6	2	3	5	8	17	6	6	17	8	38
	7%	6%	14%	9%	7%	16% <i>zdh</i>	7%	4%	4%	8%	7%	8%	6%	6%	7%	9%	9%
10-20%	50	33	-	15	50	11	14	3	9	8	13	23	11	14	26	9	49
	12%	14%	-	9%	12%	21%	17%	6%	13%	13%	11%	11%	12%	14%	11%	10%	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*
Around a quarter (25%)	22	10	2	10	22	4	2	3	2	8	5	13	4	5	12	6	19
	5%	4%	11%	6%	5%	8%	3%	7%	3%	12% <i>zdf</i>	4%	6%	4%	5%	5%	7%	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	7	1	1	9	-	-	2	3	4	-	4	5	-	4	5	10
	2%	3%	7%	1%	2%	-	-	4%	4%	6% <i>fl</i>	-	2%	6% <i>jl</i>	-	2%	6% <i>mn</i>	2%
40-50%	11	5	-	6	11	1	-	1	2	3	3	6	1	2	6	2	11
	3%	2%	-	3%	3%	1%	-	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%
Around a half (50%)	22	9	1	11	22	1	4	*	5	3	5	12	6	4	13	4	24
	5%	4%	7%	7%	5%	2%	5%	1%	7%	5%	4%	5%	6%	4%	6%	5%	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	4	3	-	1	4	-	1	-	1	-	1	3	-	-	4	-	4
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	2%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	2%	-	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	20	10	-	10	20	-	6	5	3	1	8	6	5	9	6	5	21
	5%	4%	-	6%	5%	-	8%	10% <i>ee</i>	5%	1%	7%	3%	6%	9% <i>nn</i>	3%	6%	5%
More than 75%	128	76	3	50	128	16	27	15	25	18	35	63	25	30	73	21	133
	30%	31%	19%	29%	30%	29%	33%	33%	36%	30%	29%	30%	28%	31%	31%	24%	30%
Don't know	135	78	6	50	135	13	20	15	16	12	41	64	28	28	76	27	134
	31%	31%	43%	30%	31%	23%	24%	32%	23%	20%	34%	30%	31%	29%	32%	31%	30%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1067

D7b. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Annual turnover within the UK is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	444	4	4	123	8	3	27	33	23	9	19	31	18	35	16	1	6	7	7	69	1	444
Weighted total	433	5**	3**	109	6**	2**	20**	41**	19**	12**	18**	42**	18**	25*	22**	2**	6**	8**	11**	63*	2**	444
Less than 10%	31	-	1	9	1	-	-	4	1	-	1	3	2	-	-	-	-	4	-	5	-	38
	7%	-	24%	8%	11%	-	-	10%	6%	-	5%	2%	14%	10%	-	-	-	46%	-	8%	-	9%
10-20%	50	-	-	12	-	-	-	5	1	-	4	2	2	4	10	-	-	-	-	9	-	49
	12%	-	-	11%	-	-	-	13%	4%	-	22%	4%	13%	15%	47%	-	-	-	-	15%	-	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Around a quarter (25%)	22	-	-	5	-	-	1	2	3	2	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	19
	5%	-	-	5%	-	-	7%	4%	15%	15%	4%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	-	4%
Around a third (33%)	9	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	10
	2%	-	-	3%	33%	-	-	-	8%	-	-	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	2%
40-50%	11	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	11
	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	11%	-	12%	-	-	2%	4%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	2%
Around a half (50%)	22	2	-	7	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	2	*	1	-	-	-	1	-	7	-	24
	5%	36%	-	6%	-	-	3%	6%	-	-	-	5%	2%	2%	-	-	-	6%	-	11%	-	5%
Around two thirds (66%)	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	12%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	20	-	-	3	1	-	3	3	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	3	21
	5%	-	-	3%	14%	-	16%	7%	3%	-	8%	-	4%	3%	6%	-	-	-	-	18%	5%	5%
More than 75%	128	1	2	41	1	1	5	15	4	6	3	9	5	8	4	-	3	2	4	14	-	133
	30%	30%	54%	39% ^s	14%	75%	24%	36%	21%	45%	18%	22%	24%	31%	20%	-	49%	21%	38%	23%	-	30%
Don't know	135	2	1	26	2	-	8	9	5	5	7	23	3	8	5	2	3	2	5	18	2	134
	31%	33%	22%	24%	28%	25%	39%	22%	27%	39%	39%	54%	16%	31%	23%	100%	51%	26%	44%	29%	100%	30%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1068

D7c. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK employees is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	444	421	8	15	15	37	22	25	27	10	101	95	30	30	7	4	36	444	-	444
Weighted total	433	400	5**	29**	11**	36*	20**	28**	32**	11**	110*	79*	24**	27**	10**	3**	35*	433	**	444
Less than 10%	48	47	1	-	3	2	1	3	6	2	9	7	5	3	-	-	6	48	-	47
	11%	12%	24%	-	22%	7%	3%	11%	21%	14%	8%	8%	22%	13%	-	-	17%	11%	-	11%
10-20%	44	44	-	-	-	2	1	5	1	-	17	10	1	2	1	-	3	44	-	47
	10%	11%	-	-	-	7%	5%	17%	3%	-	15%	13%	3%	9%	12%	-	9%	10%	-	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	4	4	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	3
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	3%	7%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
Around a quarter (25%)	34	28	1	5	-	2	3	2	1	2	9	5	1	1	2	1	3	34	-	33
	8%	7%	14%	18%	-	5%	16%	8%	4%	16%	8%	6%	2%	4%	21%	22%	9%	8%	-	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	8	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	9
	2%	2%	-	-	-	3%	-	3%	6%	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	2%	2%	-	2%
40-50%	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	4	-	5
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	21%	-	1%	-	1%
Around a half (50%)	27	26	1	-	-	2	2	-	1	1	13	4	1	2	-	-	2	27	-	29
	6%	7%	11%	-	-	5%	8%	-	4%	8%	12%	5%	2%	7%	-	-	5%	6%	-	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	2	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
	1%	*	-	5%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	*
Around three quarters (75%)	16	13	-	4	1	3	1	-	2	4	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	16	-	15
	4%	3%	-	13%	10%	9% <i>z</i>	4%	-	6%	35%	-	4%	-	10%	-	-	-	4%	-	3%
More than 75%	167	157	1	9	5	11	10	10	11	1	43	30	12	10	4	2	17	167	-	173
	39%	39%	25%	31%	40%	29%	50%	35%	35%	9%	39%	38%	47%	39%	39%	57%	47%	39%	-	39%
Don't know	79	69	1	9	2	13	2	6	5	2	16	17	6	5	3	-	4	79	-	81
	18%	17%	26%	32%	16%	35% <i>zjp</i>	11%	20%	15%	17%	14%	21%	24%	18%	28%	-	13%	18%	-	18%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1069

D7c. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK employees is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	444	82	362	110	101	88	90	19	34	133	58	168	17	41	59	247	334	108	444
Weighted total	433	78*	355	106*	100*	89*	85*	18**	31**	131	58*	167	19**	46*	66*	225	321	109*	444
Less than 10%	48	10	38	16	10	7	7	3	5	12	3	25	1	11	7	23	33	14	47
	11%	13%	11%	15%	10%	8%	8%	15%	17%	9%	6%	15%	5%	25%zo	11%	10%	10%	13%	11%
10-20%	44	7	37	13	8	7	7	3	6	11	4	21	3	2	9	25	32	12	47
	10%	9%	11%	12%	8%	8%	8%	16%	20%	8%	7%	13%	18%	4%	14%	11%	10%	11%	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	4	1	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	2	2	2	3
	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Around a quarter (25%)	34	3	30	4	5	11	9	2	3	14	4	11	4	2	6	19	27	7	33
	8%	4%	9%	3%	5%	12%c	10%	12%	11%	10%	6%	6%	19%	5%	10%	9%	8%	6%	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	2	6	3	2	1	1	1	-	4	-	1	-	2	-	5	7	1	9
	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	4%	-	3%	1%	1%	-	4%	-	2%	2%	1%	2%
40-50%	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	2	4	-	5
	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	-	2%	-	1%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	-	1%
Around a half (50%)	27	6	21	5	10	5	6	-	1	8	3	14	1	2	6	12	20	7	29
	6%	8%	6%	4%	10%	5%	7%	-	5%	6%	5%	8%	7%	5%	9%	5%	6%	6%	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	2
	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	5%	-	2%	-	-	1%	*
Around three quarters (75%)	16	3	13	4	5	3	4	-	2	5	-	9	-	6	1	9	12	4	15
	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	3%	4%	-	6%	4%	-	5%	-	13%zno	1%	4%	4%	4%	3%
More than 75%	167	27	140	33	42	41	34	8	7	54	28	49	4	16	26	98	126	39	173
	39%	34%	39%	31%	42%	46%	40%	43%	23%	41%	47%k	30%	23%	35%	39%	44%	39%	36%	39%
Don't know	79	17	62	28	13	13	16	2	5	20	16	34	5	4	6	30	56	23	81
	18%	22%	17%	26%d	13%	15%	19%	11%	16%	15%	27%	20%	24%	9%	8%	13%	17%	21%	18%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1070

D7c. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK employees is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	444	89	232	44	70	69	305	363	48	61	65	190	21	113	328	160	65	111	107	444
Weighted total	433	83*	224	44*	74*	70*	289	347	43*	54*	60*	181	18**	108*	315	148	61*	103*	107*	444
Less than 10%	48	3	30	2	9	11	31	39	4	4	9	15	2	16	35	12	8	14	12	47
	11%	4%	14% ^a	5%	12%	15%	11%	11%	10%	7%	15%	9%	14%	15%	11%	8%	14%	13%	11%	11%
10-20%	44	7	21	4	11	8	32	38	10	5	11	20	3	6	34	14	7	13	10	47
	10%	8%	10%	10%	15%	12%	11%	11%	23% ^{zg}	9%	18%	11%	15%	5%	11%	9%	12%	12%	9%	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	4	-	1	-	2	-	3	3	-	1	-	3	-	-	2	2	-	1	2	3
	1%	-	*	-	3%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	-	2%	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	2%	1%
Around a quarter (25%)	34	8	20	3	2	4	19	23	3	3	3	14	2	14	25	10	5	7	7	33
	8%	10%	9%	7%	2%	5%	7%	7%	6%	6%	5%	8%	10%	13%	8%	7%	8%	6%	6%	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	2	6	-	-	2	6	8	-	*	-	3	-	3	6	2	1	1	2	9
	2%	3%	3%	-	-	3%	2%	2%	-	1%	-	2%	-	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%
40-50%	4	-	2	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	-	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	5
	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	4%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Around a half (50%)	27	3	18	1	5	5	18	21	3	3	6	13	-	8	19	8	6	9	8	29
	6%	3%	8%	2%	7%	7%	6%	6%	7%	5%	10%	7%	-	7%	6%	5%	10%	8%	7%	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	2
	1%	-	*	-	2%	-	*	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	*	1%	2%	-	1%	*
Around three quarters (75%)	16	3	5	8	-	1	9	10	1	2	1	8	-	1	9	5	-	1	8	15
	4%	4%	2%	19% ^{zabd}	-	1%	3%	3%	2%	4%	1%	5%	-	1%	3%	3%	-	1%	7% ^{pa}	3%
More than 75%	167	34	86	16	30	24	117	137	14	29	17	72	7	41	125	62	24	41	38	173
	39%	41%	38%	36%	41%	35%	41%	40%	33%	54% ^{zhj}	28%	40%	39%	38%	40%	42%	39%	40%	36%	39%
Don't know	79	23	34	8	13	15	51	65	8	7	13	30	3	17	57	31	7	14	20	81
	18%	27% ^b	15%	19%	17%	21%	18%	19%	18%	13%	22%	16%	19%	16%	18%	21%	12%	14%	19%	18%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1071

D7c. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK employees is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	444	254	15	173	444	55	82	46	76	64	123	215	96	102	242	93	444
Weighted total	433	246	14**	169	433	55*	81*	46*	70*	62*	120	211	92*	99*	238	87*	444
Less than 10%	48	26	4	18	48	9	11	2	5	7	13	24	10	13	25	8	47
	11%	10%	28%	11%	11%	17%	14%	5%	8%	11%	10%	11%	11%	14%	11%	9%	11%
10-20%	44	19	2	22	44	6	8	2	4	10	9	28	5	8	26	9	47
	10%	8%	11%	13%	10%	11%	10%	5%	6%	16%	7%	13%	6%	8%	11%	10%	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	4	1	-	2	4	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	1	2	3
	1%	*	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	1%	2%	-	*	3%	1%
Around a quarter (25%)	34	23	1	10	34	3	5	5	5	8	9	16	8	8	19	7	33
	8%	9%	6%	6%	8%	6%	6%	11%	7%	13%	8%	7%	9%	8%	8%	8%	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	5	1	2	8	-	1	1	2	1	-	6	2	-	6	2	9
	2%	2%	7%	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	3%	2%	-	3%	2%	-	3%	2%	2%
40-50%	4	2	-	2	4	1	-	1	3	-	1	2	2	-	2	2	5
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	4%	-	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	1%
Around a half (50%)	27	15	2	9	27	2	7	3	5	4	9	7	9	6	13	7	29
	6%	6%	15%	6%	6%	3%	8%	6%	8%	6%	8%	3%	10%	6%	5%	9%	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	2	1	-	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	2
	1%	*	-	1%	1%	-	3%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	1%	1%	-	*
Around three quarters (75%)	16	9	*	7	16	4	3	2	3	2	7	6	4	6	6	4	15
	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%	7%	4%	5%	4%	3%	6%	3%	4%	6%	3%	4%	3%
More than 75%	167	101	1	65	167	22	32	21	32	25	42	84	37	34	95	33	173
	39%	41%	6%	38%	39%	40%	40%	45%	45%	40%	35%	40%	40%	35%	40%	39%	39%
Don't know	79	43	3	31	79	7	12	9	11	5	29	37	13	22	42	12	81
	18%	18%	23%	18%	18%	13%	15%	19%	16%	8%	24%	18%	14%	22%	18%	14%	18%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1072

D7c. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK employees is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	444	4	4	123	8	3	27	33	23	9	19	31	18	35	16	1	6	7	7	69	1	444
Weighted total	433	5**	3**	109	6**	2**	20**	41**	19**	12**	18**	42**	18**	25*	22**	2**	6**	8**	11**	63*	2**	444
Less than 10%	48	2	-	10	1	-	2	5	4	-	4	2	1	2	4	-	-	4	2	7	-	47
	11%	33%	-	9%	11%	-	8%	12%	21%	-	24%	4%	6%	9%	18%	-	-	46%	19%	10%	-	11%
10-20%	44	-	-	12	-	-	2	2	2	-	1	4	3	4	3	-	-	-	-	11	-	47
	10%	-	-	11%	-	-	12%	6%	12%	-	8%	9%	14%	15%	13%	-	-	-	-	17%	-	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
Around a quarter (25%)	34	-	-	8	2	-	3	1	2	3	1	6	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	3	-	33
	8%	-	-	8%	28%	-	16%	3%	10%	25%	7%	15%	-	9%	6%	-	-	10%	-	4%	-	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	9
	2%	-	-	1%	14%	-	-	2%	5%	-	5%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	2%
40-50%	4	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5
	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
Around a half (50%)	27	-	-	8	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	3	2	2	2	-	-	1	-	4	-	29
	6%	-	-	8%	-	-	7%	4%	7%	-	-	8%	10%	7%	10%	-	-	6%	-	7%	-	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Around three quarters (75%)	16	1	-	2	-	-	-	4	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	2	-	-	1	2	-	15
	4%	19%	-	2%	-	-	-	9%	-	-	8%	2%	-	3%	9%	100%	-	-	7%	4%	-	3%
More than 75%	167	1	2	50	2	2	7	17	5	6	4	12	10	9	6	-	3	2	5	24	-	173
	39%	30%	78%	46%	39%	100%	36%	42%	28%	45%	21%	28%	36%	38%	25%	-	49%	21%	49%	38%	-	39%
Don't know	79	1	1	14	-	-	4	9	3	4	5	12	1	3	3	-	3	1	3	10	2	81
	18%	17%	22%	13%	8%	-	18%	23%	17%	30%	27%	29%	4%	14%	14%	-	51%	17%	26%	16%	100%	18%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1073

D7d. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK based sites is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Compliance			Region												Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total (s)	
		Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)		No (r)
Unweighted total	444	421	8	15	15	37	22	25	27	10	101	95	30	30	7	4	36	444	-	444
Weighted total	433	400	5**	29**	11**	36*	20**	28**	32**	11**	110*	79*	24**	27**	10**	3**	35*	433	**	444
Less than 10%	47	46	1	-	3	3	-	6	1	2	14	9	6	1	1	-	3	47	-	49
	11%	12%	14%	-	22%	7%	-	20%	4%	16%	13%	11%	24%	3%	12%	-	8%	11%	-	11%
10-20%	49	47	1	2	-	6	3	2	7	-	13	7	1	4	2	1	4	49	-	49
	11%	12%	11%	7%	-	17%	13%	6%	23%	-	12%	8%	2%	17%	21%	22%	12%	11%	-	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
Around a quarter (25%)	29	27	-	2	*	5	1	2	3	2	5	5	1	4	-	-	1	29	-	30
	7%	7%	-	7%	4%	15% <i>j</i>	7%	6%	11%	16%	4%	7%	2%	13%	-	-	3%	7%	-	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	8	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	8	-	8
	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	3%	-	1%	-	-	8%	-	21%	-	2%	-	2%
40-50%	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	7
	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%
Around a half (50%)	26	22	-	4	1	-	2	1	1	-	6	3	1	3	2	-	6	26	-	29
	6%	6%	-	12%	6%	-	11%	4%	2%	-	5%	3%	5%	12%	21%	-	16% <i>sizek</i>	6%	-	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	5	5	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5
	1%	1%	-	-	5%	-	-	4%	-	-	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	13	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	3	3	1	1	-	-	1	14	-	16
	3%	3%	-	5%	12%	2%	-	-	-	26%	3%	4%	5%	3%	-	-	2%	3%	-	4%
More than 75%	178	160	2	16	4	12	12	11	14	5	46	32	10	10	3	2	17	178	-	176
	41%	40%	50%	55%	38%	33%	59%	37%	43%	42%	41%	43%	37%	30%	57%	-	48%	41%	-	40%
Don't know	71	65	1	4	1	10	1	5	4	-	18	16	4	2	2	-	4	71	-	74
	16%	16%	26%	15%	12%	27%	7%	18%	12%	-	17%	21%	15%	8%	16%	-	11%	16%	-	17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1074

D7d. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK based sites is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)
		Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)	No (q)	
Unweighted total	444	82	362	110	101	88	90	19	34	133	58	168	17	41	59	247	334	108	444
Weighted total	433	78*	355	106*	100*	89*	85*	18**	31**	131	58*	167	19**	46*	66*	225	321	109*	444
Less than 10%	47	10	37	18	5	6	10	-	7	8	5	26	3	8	7	25	34	13	49
	11%	12%	11%	17% <i>d</i>	5%	7%	11%	-	24%	6%	8%	16% <i>f</i>	15%	17%	11%	11%	11%	12%	11%
10-20%	49	9	40	12	13	12	5	3	4	21	2	22	3	10	10	24	37	13	49
	11%	12%	11%	12%	13%	13%	6%	17%	13%	16% <i>f</i>	4%	13%	16%	22%	15%	11%	11%	12%	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	-	*
Around a quarter (25%)	29	1	28	4	7	7	9	2	-	6	4	12	3	3	3	14	19	10	30
	7%	2%	8%	3%	7%	8%	11%	11%	-	4%	7%	7%	17%	6%	5%	6%	6%	9%	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	4	4	2	1	4	-	1	-	4	-	3	-	1	1	4	5	3	8
	2%	4%	1%	2%	1%	5%	-	4%	-	3%	-	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%
40-50%	5	1	4	2	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	1	2	3	2	7
	1%	2%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	-	2%	-	1%	3%	-	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%
Around a half (50%)	26	4	22	3	6	6	2	3	6	15	4	6	2	1	1	18	20	6	29
	6%	5%	6%	3%	6%	6%	2%	16%	20%	11% <i>k</i>	6%	4%	12%	2%	2%	8%	6%	5%	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	5	1	4	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	4	1	5
	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	-	14	4	3	3	4	-	-	-	1	6	-	3	2	6	13	1	16
	3%	-	4%	4%	3%	4%	5%	-	-	-	2%	4% <i>f</i>	-	6%	3%	3%	4%	1%	4%
More than 75%	178	31	146	39	48	34	40	6	7	58	24	63	4	17	30	100	134	43	176
	41%	40%	41%	36%	49%	39%	47%	34%	22%	44%	42%	38%	23%	38%	45%	45%	42%	39%	40%
Don't know	71	17	54	20	15	15	13	3	5	17	17	26	3	4	9	29	51	19	74
	16%	21%	15%	18%	15%	17%	15%	17%	17%	13%	28% <i>z</i>	16%	14%	8%	14%	13%	16%	17%	17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016
Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017
Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1075

D7d. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK based sites is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total (s)
		Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	
Unweighted total	444	89	232	44	70	69	305	363	48	61	65	190	21	113	328	160	65	111	107	444
Weighted total	433	83*	224	44*	74*	70*	289	347	43*	54*	60*	181	18**	108*	315	148	61*	103*	107*	444
Less than 10%	47	7	28	2	9	10	29	39	5	4	9	22	2	10	35	17	7	10	12	49
	11%	8%	12%	5%	12%	14%	10%	11%	11%	8%	16%	12%	10%	9%	11%	11%	11%	10%	11%	11%
10-20%	49	7	33	4	6	6	36	39	7	3	8	28	4	6	37	13	9	17	12	49
	11%	8%	15%	8%	8%	9%	13%	11%	16%	6%	13%	15% <i>m</i>	21%	6%	12%	8%	15%	17%	12%	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
	*	-	1%	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1%	-	-	-	*
Around a quarter (25%)	29	8	15	3	3	2	21	25	3	3	5	9	1	9	21	8	4	5	8	30
	7%	9%	7%	6%	5%	3%	7%	7%	6%	6%	9%	5%	6%	9%	7%	6%	6%	5%	8%	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	2	5	-	1	1	6	6	-	1	-	1	1	3	6	5	1	1	1	8
	2%	2%	2%	-	1%	1%	2%	2%	-	2%	-	1%	8%	3%	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%
40-50%	5	2	1	-	1	1	3	4	1	1	-	2	1	1	3	2	-	1	1	7
	1%	2%	*	-	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	-	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	2%
Around a half (50%)	26	6	7	6	6	5	15	18	3	8	4	12	2	9	21	13	6	8	3	29
	6%	7%	3%	13% <i>b</i>	9%	7%	5%	5%	7%	15% <i>zg</i>	7%	7%	12%	8%	7%	9%	10%	7%	3%	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	5	-	4	2	-	-	4	4	-	2	-	1	-	3	4	1	1	2	1	5
	1%	-	2%	4%	-	-	1%	1%	-	3%	-	1%	-	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	2	7	2	3	-	11	9	3	-	3	5	-	5	8	4	4	3	6	16
	3%	2%	3%	4%	5%	-	4%	3%	6%	-	5%	3%	-	4%	3%	3%	6%	3%	6%	4%
More than 75%	178	39	85	19	34	26	118	140	14	24	21	81	6	39	127	56	24	41	47	176
	41%	47%	38%	43%	46%	37%	41%	40%	33%	45%	35%	45%	31%	37%	40%	38%	39%	40%	44%	40%
Don't know	71	11	39	7	11	18	45	61	8	7	9	19	1	23	52	27	6	14	15	74
	16%	14%	17%	16%	14%	26%	16%	18%	20%	12%	15%	11%	8%	22% <i>k</i>	16%	18%	10%	14%	14%	17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1076

D7d. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK based sites is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total (p)	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)		High (o)
Unweighted total	444	254	15	173	444	55	82	46	76	64	123	215	96	102	242	93	444
Weighted total	433	246	14**	169	433	55*	81*	46*	70*	62*	120	211	92*	99*	238	87*	444
Less than 10%	47	23	4	20	47	10	9	5	6	8	16	22	7	16	23	6	49
	11%	9%	28%	12%	11%	19%	11%	11%	8%	13%	13%	11%	8%	16%	10%	7%	11%
10-20%	49	25	3	21	49	4	9	1	9	13	12	26	12	11	24	14	49
	11%	10%	23%	12%	11%	8%	11%	2%	13%	20% ^g	10%	12%	13%	12%	10%	16%	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
	*	-	-	1%	*	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	*
Around a quarter (25%)	29	17	3	9	29	3	6	3	6	6	6	17	6	5	18	6	30
	7%	7%	18%	5%	7%	5%	7%	7%	8%	10%	5%	8%	6%	5%	7%	7%	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	6	-	2	8	-	4	1	1	-	2	4	1	2	4	2	8
	2%	2%	-	1%	2%	-	5%	2%	1%	-	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
40-50%	5	3	-	2	5	1	1	-	1	2	1	3	1	-	4	1	7
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	-	2%	2%	2%
Around a half (50%)	26	18	*	8	26	1	3	4	5	9	7	13	6	5	15	6	29
	6%	7%	3%	5%	6%	1%	3%	4%	7%	15% ^{zdef}	5%	6%	7%	5%	6%	7%	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	5	5	-	-	5	-	1	2	1	-	2	2	2	1	2	2	5
	1%	2%	-	-	1%	-	1%	5%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	9	1	5	14	1	3	2	4	1	5	5	4	3	8	3	16
	3%	4%	5%	3%	3%	2%	3%	4%	6%	1%	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%
More than 75%	178	100	2	74	178	26	37	19	31	16	52	86	35	38	101	32	176
	41% ^f	41%	13%	44%	41% ^f	47% ^f	46% ^f	42%	44%	26%	43%	41%	39%	39%	43%	36%	40%
Don't know	71	40	1	28	71	9	9	9	7	6	18	32	19	17	39	13	74
	16%	16%	9%	16%	16%	17%	11%	19%	11%	10%	15%	15%	20%	17%	16%	15%	17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/a/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1077

D7d. Thinking about the relative size of your own organisation within this wider corporate group, please can you tell me what proportion of the group's total Number of UK based sites is represented by your own organisation?

Base: all participants whose organisation is part of a wider corporate group

	Total (z)	Sector																		Unwtd total (u)		
		Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	444	4	4	123	8	3	27	33	23	9	19	31	18	35	16	1	6	7	7	69	1	444
Weighted total	433	5**	3**	109	6**	2**	20**	41**	19**	12**	18**	42**	18**	25*	22**	2**	6**	8**	11**	63*	2**	444
Less than 10%	47	1	-	6	-	-	2	5	2	-	4	5	1	4	2	-	-	4	2	9	-	49
	11%	17%	-	6%	-	-	10%	13%	11%	-	25%	11%	6%	16%	9%	-	-	46%	19%	14%	-	11%
10-20%	49	-	-	20	-	-	1	4	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	-	-	1	-	7	-	49
	11%	-	-	19%z	-	-	6%	10%	13%	15%	17%	5%	10%	7%	13%	-	-	6%	-	11%	-	11%
Around a fifth (20%)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Around a quarter (25%)	29	-	-	6	1	-	3	-	2	1	3	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	2	4	-	30
	7%	-	-	6%	23%	-	15%	-	11%	10%	7%	7%	-	7%	15%	-	-	-	18%	6%	-	7%
Around a third (33%)	8	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	8
	2%	-	-	2%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%	3%	-	2%
40-50%	5	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	7
	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	5%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	2%
Around a half (50%)	26	2	-	9	-	-	1	3	-	-	4	3	3	3	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	29
	6%	33%	-	8% s	-	-	2%	15%	-	-	10%	15%	11% s	-	100%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	7%
Around two thirds (66%)	5	-	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	4%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
Around three quarters (75%)	14	-	-	2	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	16
	3%	-	-	1%	11%	-	4%	2%	-	-	3%	11%	5%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	6%	-	4%
More than 75%	178	2	2	48	2	2	9	20	7	6	4	15	8	10	8	-	4	2	2	26	-	176
	41%	50%	78%	45%	41%	100%	47%	47%	34%	45%	24%	37%	45%	41%	34%	-	63%	21%	19%	41%	-	40%
Don't know	71	-	1	11	-	-	3	8	3	4	4	11	1	2	4	-	2	2	3	9	2	74
	16%	-	22%	10%	-	-	14%	19%	15%	30%	22%	27%	8%	10%	19%	-	37%	26%	26%	15%	100%	17%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1078

D8. Many thanks for your time in completing this questionnaire. As part of our quality procedures a research manager may be in contact with you to verify/clarify some of your responses, is this ok?

Base: all participants

	Compliance			Region													Part of wider corporate group		Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Compliant (a)	Intend to comply (b)	Non-notifying (c)	North East (d)	North West (e)	Yorkshire and the Humber (f)	East Midlands (g)	West Midlands (h)	East of England (i)	London (j)	South East (k)	South West (l)	Scotland (m)	Wales (n)	Northern Ireland (o)	Outside UK (p)	Yes (q)	No (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	801	20	50	29	79	51	53	55	18	202	174	66	59	14	13	48	444	416	871
Weighted total	871	762	11**	98*	23**	76*	46*	58*	66*	17**	228	146	60*	55*	19**	18**	46*	433	426	871
Yes	830	728	11	92	22	69	42	57	65	17	216	139	59	52	19	18	45	411	411	832
	95%	96%	95%	94%	96%	91%	91%	97%	99%	100%	94%	95%	99%	96%	100%	100%	96%	95%	97%	96%
No	41	34	1	6	1	7	4	2	1	-	13	7	1	2	-	-	2	22	15	39
	5%	4%	5%	6%	4%	9%	9%	3%	1%	-	6%	5%	1%	4%	-	-	4%	5%	3%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p - z/q/r - z/s

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1079

D8. Many thanks for your time in completing this questionnaire. As part of our quality procedures a research manager may be in contact with you to verify/clarify some of your responses, is this ok?

Base: all participants

	Number of sites		Number of employees						Premises			Turnover				Own or lease vehicles		Unwtd total (r)	
	Total (z)	Single (a)	Multi (b)	Less than 250 (c)	250-499 (d)	500-999 (e)	1,000-4,999 (f)	5,000-9,999 (g)	10,000+ (h)	Owned (i)	Rented (j)	Leased (k)	Up to £5m (l)	£5m-£25m (m)	£25m-£50m (n)	More than £50m (o)	Yes (p)		No (q)
Unweighted total	871	163	708	189	211	184	189	35	57	304	96	278	36	112	134	440	640	224	871
Weighted total	871	167	704	199	207	191	181	33*	55*	303	104*	279	41**	123*	146	408	628	235	871
Yes	830	158	672	189	196	183	171	33	55	293	94	269	39	121	144	395	606	218	832
	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	96%	95%	100%	100%	97% <i>sj</i>	90%	96% <i>sj</i>	95%	99%	99%	97%	97% <i>q</i>	93%	96%
No	41	8	32	11	10	8	9	-	-	10	10	11	2	1	2	13	21	17	39
	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%	-	-	3%	10% <i>lk</i>	4%	5%	1%	1%	3%	3%	7% <i>p</i>	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b - z/c/d/e/f/g/h - z/i/j/k - z/l/m/n/o - z/p/q - z/r
* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1080

D8. Many thanks for your time in completing this questionnaire. As part of our quality procedures a research manager may be in contact with you to verify/clarify some of your responses, is this ok?

Base: all participants

	Require board approval for energy efficiency investment				Commissioned follow on work from external LA		Compliance route				Budget for energy efficiency improvements			Participation in other EE schemes					Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Always (a)	Above a threshold (b)	In certain other circumstances (c)	Never (d)	Yes (e)	No (f)	Audits - external LA (g)	Audits - internal LA (h)	ISO 50001 (i)	DECs (j)	Entirely new (k)	Displace other EE investment (l)	Displace non-EE investment (m)	Any (n)	CRC (o)	ETS (p)	CCA (q)	None (r)	(s)
Unweighted total	871	196	436	89	135	119	601	711	84	116	146	369	36	230	618	272	98	171	231	871
Weighted total	871	195	423	89*	148	116	578	688	80*	100	140	351	31*	221	598	251	90*	159	248	871
Yes	830	184	411	89	136	110	553	657	76	96	135	341	29	214	580	244	90	157	232	832
	95%	94%	97% ^d	99% ^d	92%	95%	96%	95%	95%	96%	96%	97%	95%	97%	97% ^r	97%	99% ^r	99% ^r	94%	96%
No	41	11	13	1	12	6	24	31	4	4	5	11	2	7	19	7	1	2	16	39
	5%	6%	3%	1%	8% ^{bc}	5%	4%	5%	5%	4%	4%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	1%	1%	6% ^{npq}	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d - z/e/f - z/g/h/i/j - z/k/l/m - z/n/o/p/q/r - z/s

* small base

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1081

D8. Many thanks for your time in completing this questionnaire. As part of our quality procedures a research manager may be in contact with you to verify/clarify some of your responses, is this ok?

Base: all participants

	Action on Energy Efficiency since early 2015			Energy Efficiency investment						Board priority on EE in 2015			Organisational priority on EE in 2015			Unwtd total	
	Total (z)	Increased (a)	Decreased (b)	Stayed the same (c)	£0 - no investment (d)	Less than £10,000 (e)	£10,000 - £49,999 (f)	£50,000 - £99,999 (g)	£100,000 - £499,999 (h)	£500,000 or more (i)	Low (j)	Medium (k)	High (l)	Low (m)	Medium (n)	High (o)	(p)
Unweighted total	871	530	32	306	871	110	170	92	140	121	243	416	187	213	466	171	871
Weighted total	871	522	30**	313	871	120*	168	88*	130	117	244	411	187	217	457	172	871
Yes	830	501	30	293	830	112	159	85	127	117	229	395	183	202	442	167	832
	95%	96%	100%	94%	95%	93%	95%	96%	97%	100% ^{zdef}	94%	96%	98%	93%	97% ^{nm}	97%	96%
No	41	20	-	20	41	8	9	3	4	*	16	16	4	16	15	4	39
	5% ^l	4%	-	6%	5% ^l	7% ^l	5% ^l	4%	3%	*	6%	4%	2%	7% ⁿ	3%	3%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c - z/d/e/f/g/h/i - z/j/k/l - z/m/n/o - z/p

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

ESOS Evaluation - representative survey of parent organisations 2016
DRAFT - Internal Use only -

Table 1082

D8. Many thanks for your time in completing this questionnaire. As part of our quality procedures a research manager may be in contact with you to verify/clarify some of your responses, is this ok?

Base: all participants

	Sector																			Unwtd total		
	Total (z)	Agriculture, forestry and fishing (a)	Mining and quarrying (b)	Manufacturing (c)	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (d)	Water supply sewerage, waste management and remediation activities (e)	Construction (f)	Wholesale and retail trade repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (g)	Transportation and storage (h)	Accommodation and food service activities (i)	Information and communication (j)	Financial and insurance activities (k)	Real estate activities (l)	Professional, scientific and technical activities (m)	Administrative and support service activities (n)	Public administration and defence compulsory social security (o)	Education (p)	Human health and social work activities (q)	Arts, entertainment and recreation (r)		Other service activities (s)	Other (t)
Unweighted total	871	10	5	189	13	8	43	66	44	29	29	56	33	64	24	3	43	40	20	148	4	871
Weighted total	871	11**	5**	171	10**	5**	31*	81*	36*	38**	28**	75*	30**	45*	34**	5**	45*	47*	29**	135	8**	871
Yes	830	10	4	161	10	5	30	78	36	38	27	67	29	45	34	5	43	46	27	130	6	832
	95%	92%	87%	94%	100%	86%	97%	97%	100%	100%	94%	89%	96%	98%	100%	100%	96%	97%	92%	96%	77%	96%
No	41	1	1	10	-	1	1	3	-	-	2	8	1	1	-	-	2	1	2	5	2	39
	5%	8%	13%	6%	-	14%	3%	3%	-	-	6%	11%	4%	2%	-	-	4%	3%	8%	4%	23%	4%

Respondent type : Organisations eligible for ESOS according to Environment Agency data as of August 2016

Fieldwork dates : 9th September 2016 - 27th January 2017

Source : Ipsos MORI (JN15-015049-01)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - z/a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h/i/j/k/l/m/n/o/p/q/r/s/t - z/u

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing