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These examples come from having tracked games of Quinnipiac University for the 2014-15 season.
Individual and pairing ZED
Individual zone entry defense (ZED)

ZED% for defensemen (higher = better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defensemen</th>
<th>ZED%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is it enough to just track individual D?

ZED% for defensemen - (higher = better)
D partner has impact on "targeted D"

ZED% for common pairings (higher = better)
Team success at ZED
Team success at forcing dump and chase

Opponent uncontrolled attempt % (higher = better)
Team success at stopping controlled entries

Controlled entry defense % (higher = better)
Team success at stopping uncontrolled entries

Uncontrolled entry defense % (higher = better)
Overall team success at stopping entries

Overall entry defense % (higher = better)
Estimating GA from components of ZED

Expected GA based on zone-entry stats only

Bentley at Lowell
Lowell Connecticut
Northeastern (1) Northeastern (2)
Colgate Cornell at Union
at RPI at Clarkson Massachusetts at Massachusetts
Dartmouth Harvard
Princeton at Princeton at St. Cloud (1) at St. Cloud (2)
RPI Union

Actual GA
Expected GA
Zone entries on offense
Further splitting entry types: carries

ES carry entry % (higher = better)
Further splitting entry types: vs. passes

ES pass entry % (higher = better)
Uncontrolled entries: least successful

ES uncontrolled entry % (higher = better)
Entries: overall success

ES total entry % (higher = better)