

D2Di (Device-to-Device Interoperability)	
Opportunities	Risks
<b>Education</b> for end users	<b>Reliability</b> Issues
Having interoperable products that <b>work as expected and meet customer expectations</b>	Systems that <b>do not work as expected or advertised</b> prevent future adoption of the technology, bring us back to where we started (expensive on/off switches)
Workforce <b>training and education</b> on benefits of lighting controls with a focus on utility, prop mgrs and ESCOs	DLC <b>direction not consistent with market need or direction</b>
<b>Simpler</b> system operation	<b>Lack of direction</b>
<b>HVAC system connectivity + high density sensors</b>	<b>Diluted responsibility.</b> Cost/ROI
<b>Increasing market adoption</b>	<b>misinformation</b> and a one size fits all mentality
<b>Adoption</b>	<b>Stranded saving</b>
To ensure customer satisfaction to drive efficient systems. Systems need to <b>play nice at the top level</b> to allow utility programs to build out incentive programs resulting in installations of the most efficient.	Failure of connectivity causes <b>finger pointing</b> – who’s is responsible - and opens door for risks such as security breaches

Room Controls	
Opportunities	Risks
<b>Simplicity</b>	<b>Complication</b> , especially related to vocabulary
<b>Simplifying</b> the controls buying process equals selling more controls	Asking info of contractors/installers that they may not have, <b>overcomplicating</b>
<b>New customers increase adoption.</b> Fills gap for some customers.	Too <b>complicated</b> and end up like NLCs. Could be a turn off if too complicated
Crazy, mad, wild <b>energy savings and ease of use</b>	People <b>lack awareness on space/room based approach</b>
<b>Market size</b>	<b>Education</b>
Increased <b>adoption</b>	<b>Lack of scalability and potential conflict with code</b>
Installers don't have to know the strategies or do any custom settings to achieve savings - <b>set it and forget it</b>	Some control strategies <b>not utilized once installed</b>
Further <b>adoption</b> of controls and allows accessibility for customers to install controls	<b>One size might not fit all</b> -- smaller businesses = more specialized systems -- still does not work, overly complicated therefore driving people away.

Efficacy	
Opportunities	Risks
<b>App based tools</b> for application efficacy	<b>Program adoption and manufacturer participation</b>
Looking outside of the luminaire	Distraction from the actual goal of increasing controls adoption
<b>None</b> + utilities could still incentivize products. LAE - Brings in NEBs and tunable platforms. Would enable incentives around tunable and grow markets	<b>Chaos throughout lighting supply chain</b> (mfr staff resources, marketing, education). <b>Efficacy increase trumps innovation.</b> Every 3 years, no sooner (Mfrs, test labs, implementers)
<b>Increased energy savings</b>	<b>Product cycle development and utility program implementation</b>
Stop half measures (tubes and lamps) and <b>open door for more controls</b>	<b>Manufacturers walk away</b>
<b>Expanding the list of factors considered in updates to efficacy requirements</b>	<b>Increasing the cadence of DLC spec changes</b>
<b>Enable innovation in products</b> by creating flexible PUDs	Creating further <b>disruption to supply chain</b> (delisting, stranded products)
<b>New fixture designs and reducing overall energy usage</b>	<b>Diminishing return.</b> Can't squeeze anymore out.